1914.

NEW ZEALAND.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

(REPORTS OF THE) ON THE PETITIONS FOR AND AGAINST THE RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN STATE SCHOOLS REFERENDUM BILL, TOGETHER WITH MINUTES OF EVIDENCE AND APPENDICES.

(MR. G. M. THOMSON, CHAIRMAN.)

Reports brought up on the 30th day of October, 1914, and, together with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendices, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF REFERENCE.

Extract from the Journals of the House of Representatives.

FRIDAY, THE 10TH DAY OF JULY, 1914.

Ordered, "That a Committee be appointed, consisting of ten members, to consider all matters relating to school-teachers, education, and public instruction generally, public-school training of teachers, higher education, technical education, manual instruction, and such other matters affecting education as may be referred to it; to have power to call for persons and papers; three to be a quorum: the Committee to consist of Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Hanan, Mr. McCallum, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Poland, Mr. Sidey, Mr. Statham, Mr. G. M. Thomson, Mr. J. C. Thomson, and the mover."—(Hon. Mr. ALLEN.)

REPORTS.

No. 487.—Petition of Reverend Professor WILLIAM HEWITSON, and 89 similar Petitions (as per Schedule, *vide* I.–13).

OBJECTING to certain provisions embodied in the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill.

I am directed to report that the Committee has heard evidence on the subject-matter of these petitions—much latitude being allowed witnesses in the desire to get all the facts—and is of opinion that the New Zealand State system of free, secular, and compulsory education (under which our children have received incalculable benefits, and under which, after thirty-seven years' experience, our people—the immense majority of whom have passed through our schools—compare most favourably morally, socially, and religiously with the people of any other part of the world) should be maintained. Further, that the Committee is fully alive to the value of biblical and religious instruction, and is of opinion that full opportunity should be given for the adoption of a voluntary system, such as that known as the Nelson system, in which the teaching is imparted outside the statutory school hours, under which the State exercises no authority in religious matters, and under which there is no compulsion or violation of rights of conscience.

30th October, 1914.

No. 211.—Petition of NITA PARK and 989 Others; No. 245—Petition of LUCRETIA BAKER and 50 Others; and No. 289—Petition of GEORGE A. PAGE and 17 Others.

PRAYING that the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill be passed into law.

I am directed to report that the Committee is of opinion that the proposals in the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill, introduced this session by the Hon. James Allen, should not be allowed to become law.

30th October, 1914.

No. 42.—Petition of AUGUST FROMONT and 1,312 Others, and 59 similar Petitions (as per Schedule, *vide* I.–13).

PRAYING that the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill be not passed.

I am directed to report that the Committee is of opinion the proposals in the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill, introduced this session by the Hon. James Allen, should not be allowed to become law.

30th October, 1914.

No. 12.—Petition of Professor THOMAS A. HUNTER and 21 Others, and 77 similar Petitions (as per Schedule, *vide* I.–13).

PRAYING that the national system of education on its present free, secular, and compulsory basis be maintained.

I am directed to report that the Committee has heard evidence on the subject-matter of these petitions—much latitude being allowed witnesses in the desire to get all the facts—and is of opinion that the New Zealand State system of free, secular, and compulsory education (under which our children have received incalculable benefits, and under which, after thirty-seven years' experience, our people—the immense majority of whom have passed through our schools—compare most favourably morally, socially, and religiously with the people of any other part of the world) should be maintained.

30th October, 1914.

No. 316.—Petition of Most Rev. THOMAS O'SHEA (Coadjutor, Bishop of Wellington), Right Rev. WILLIAM HENRY CLEARY (Bishop of Auckland), and 2,488 Others.

PRAYING that, if the petition signed by 140,000 persons, as alleged, in favour of the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill has been presented to your honourable House, the same may be referred to a Committee of your honourable House, and that your petitioners may be afforded an opportunity of being heard thereon.

I am directed to report that, as no petition signed by 140,000 persons in favour of the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill has been presented to your honourable House, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

30th October, 1914.

INDEX TO WITNESSES.

No.	Name of Witness.	Representing	Date.	Summary.	Pages.
6	Bates, Daniel Cross, Rev. ..	Independent ..	16/10/14	Statement in chief	84–89
6	" " " ..	" ..	16/10/14	Cross-examined by Canon Garland ..	90–91
7	" " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	" Professor Hunter ..	91–93
9	" " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	Cross-examining Rev. John Paterson ..	103–104
11	" " " ..	" ..	20/10/14	" Rev. W. A. Keay ..	108–111
20	" " " ..	" ..	26/10/14	" Canon Garland ..	182–186
4	Caughley, John, M.A. ..	N.Z. Educational Institute	14/10/14	Statement in chief	54–68
4	" " " ..	Ditto ..	14/10/14	Cross-examined by Canon Garland ..	69–78
5	" " " ..	" ..	16/10/14	" " ..	78–84
15	" " " ..	" ..	23/10/14	Cross-examining Canon Garland ..	146–158
16	" " " ..	" ..	24/10/14	" " ..	158–167
17	" " " ..	" ..	24/10/14	" Rev. G. S. Cook ..	167–168
1	Cleary, Henry William, Right Rev., Bishop of Auckland	Catholic Federation of N.Z.	24/7/14	Statement in chief	1–19
2	Ditto	Ditto ..	4/8/14	Cross-examined by Canon Garland ..	19–21
2	"	" ..	4/8/14	" Professor T. A. Hunter	22–27
2	"	" ..	4/8/14	" Canon Garland ..	27–31
18	"	" ..	26/10/14	Cross-examining Canon Garland ..	169–182
19	"	" ..	26/10/14	" Professor T. A. Hunter	182
8	Cook, George Samuel, Rev. ..	Bible-in-Schools League	19/10/14	Statement in chief	93–97
8	" " " ..	Ditto ..	19/10/14	Cross-examined by Professor T. A. Hunter	97–101
8	" " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	" Canon Garland ..	101–102
12	" " " ..	" ..	20/10/14	" Professor T. A. Hunter	114–115
17	" " " ..	" ..	24/10/14	" John Caughley, M.A.	167–168
2	Garland, David John, Rev. Canon	" ..	4/8/14	Cross-examining Right Rev. H. W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland	19–21
2	Ditto	" ..	4/8/14	Ditto	27–31
3	"	" ..	9/10/14	Cross-examining Professor T. A. Hunter	47–54
4	"	" ..	14/10/14	" John Caughley, M.A. ..	69–78
5	"	" ..	16/10/14	" " " ..	78–84
6	"	" ..	16/10/14	" Rev. D. C. Bates ..	90–91
8	"	" ..	19/10/14	" Rev. G. S. Cook ..	101–102
9	"	" ..	19/10/14	" Rev. John Paterson ..	105–107
11	"	" ..	20/10/14	" Rev. W. A. Keay ..	113
13	"	" ..	21/10/14	Statement in chief	115–132
14	"	" ..	22/10/14	Cross-examined by Professor T. A. Hunter	132–145
15	"	" ..	23/10/14	" "	145–146
15	"	" ..	23/10/14	" John Caughley, M.A.	146–158
16	"	" ..	24/10/14	" " "	158–167
18	"	" ..	26/10/14	Cross-examined by Right Rev. H. W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland	169–182
20	"	" ..	26/10/14	Cross-examined by Rev. D. C. Bates ..	182–186
2	Hunter, Thomas A., Professor	National Schools Defence League	4/8/14	Cross-examining Right Rev. H. W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland	22–27
3	" " "	Ditto ..	9/10/14	Statement in chief	32–47
3	" " "	" ..	9/10/14	Cross-examined by Canon Garland ..	47–54
7	" " "	" ..	19/10/14	Cross-examining Rev. D. C. Bates ..	91–93
8	" " "	" ..	19/10/14	" Rev. G. S. Cook ..	97–101
9	" " "	" ..	19/10/14	" Rev. John Paterson ..	104–105
11	" " "	" ..	20/10/14	" Rev. W. A. Keay ..	111–113
12	" " "	" ..	20/10/14	" Rev. G. S. Cook ..	114–115
14	" " "	" ..	22/10/14	" Canon Garland ..	132–145
15	" " "	" ..	23/10/14	" "	145–146
19	" " "	" ..	26/10/14	Cross-examined by Right Rev. H. W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland	182
10	Keay, William Alfred, Rev...	Bible-in-Schools League	19/10/14	Statement in chief	107–108
11	" " " ..	Ditto ..	20/10/14	Cross-examined by Rev. D. C. Bates ..	108–111
11	" " " ..	" ..	20/10/14	" Professor T. A. Hunter	111–113
11	" " " ..	" ..	20/10/14	" Canon Garland ..	113
9	Paterson, John, M.A., Rev. ..	" ..	19/10/14	Statement in chief	102–103
9	" " " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	Cross-examined by Rev D. C. Bates ..	103–104
9	" " " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	" Professor T. A. Hunter	104–105
9	" " " " ..	" ..	19/10/14	" Canon Garland ..	105–107

INDEX TO APPENDICES.

Appendix.	Submitted by	Pages.
A	Rev. G. S. Cook, representing Bible-in-Schools League	187–195
B	Rev. Canon D. J. Garland, representing Bible-in-Schools League	195–219
C	Professor T. A. Hunter, representing National Schools Defence League	220–228
D	Rev. Canon D. J. Garland, on Bishop Cleary's statement	228–241
E	" on Professor Hunter's statement	241–252
F	" on Mr. Caughley's statement	252–254
G	" on Rev. D. C. Bates's statement	255–258
H	"	258–261
I	Right Rev. Henry W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland, in rebuttal of Canon Garland's notes embodied in Appendix D	261–265
J	Miscellaneous correspondence	265–266

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

FRIDAY, 24TH JULY, 1914.

Statement of the Right Reverend HENRY WILLIAM CLEARY, Bishop of Auckland. (No. 1.)

1. I am here to-day to give evidence in connection with a certain petition now before both Houses of the Parliament of New Zealand. The petition in question is that of the Catholic Archbishop and Bishops and clergy of New Zealand, and of the Catholic Federated Societies representing the Catholic lay electors of New Zealand.

2. The matter of our petition deals with the request of an organization styled the "Bible in State Schools League" for legislation to enable a plebiscite (misnamed a "referendum") to be taken on a proposal to introduce a certain type of "religious instruction" into the public schools of this Dominion. Your petitioners have (among other things) declared "that support for the aforesaid plebiscite has been sought by grave and persistent misrepresentations." The nature of these misrepresentations has been broadly indicated in the petition. And your petitioners add, "In regard to the general subject of this our petition, and, especially in regard to the above-mentioned misrepresentations and false statements, your petitioners request your honourable House to direct its Petition Committee to take evidence which the Right. Rev. Henry W. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland, is prepared to tender on our behalf." A Bill is now before Parliament embodying the demand of that League, in its latest form, and the evidence which I propose to tender will refer, in its entirety, to that Bill, or to the statements or considerations which led to its introduction, or by which it has been commended or is likely to be commended to your honourable House.

3. The chief reason assigned for the introduction of this "referendum" Bill is this: that it is alleged to have been petitioned for by some 140,000 electors of New Zealand. And we gather from a remark of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister that, in point of fact, the Bill was apparently introduced on that account. For some unexplained reason, this alleged petition of the Bible in State Schools League has not yet been presented to Parliament. This leads to the following anomalous position: The allegation of such a petition is pressed upon Parliament as a ground for a radical alteration in our law—namely, a proposal for (in effect) ballot-box legislation over the head of Parliament. It seems to me to have been the plain duty of the League seeking such an important legislative change to place their alleged petition before Parliament. Then, if Parliament deemed it advisable, an opportunity could have been afforded to the League to give evidence in support of its claim, and to opponents to scrutinize the League's petition. As matters stand, it seems to me that the opponents of the particular change demanded are, in effect, called upon to justify their opposition to it. In other words, the proposed alteration of the law seems to be treated as if it were in possession, and the existing law is to be treated as if it were merely the claimant for possession. We Catholics can never accept as satisfactory to us a purely secular system of public instruction; but we recognize at the same time that it is in possession; and if, as regards the results of the non-presentation of the League's petition, the situation be the topsy-turvy one just now described by me, I must be taken as strongly protesting against it on behalf of those whom I represent here to-day.

I. THE LEAGUE AND THE BILL.

1. The Bill now before the House embodies (as stated) the latest phase of the missing petition of the organization which (for some mysterious reason) styles itself "The Bible in State Schools League." As a matter of fact, the Anglican Bishop of Wellington (a member of the executive of that League) styles the ballot-paper in the Bill, "our question, and ours only" (*Auckland Star*, 8th July, 1914). "The Bible" is defined as "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments." But the Bible in State Schools League does not want "The Bible" in State schools, but only scraps or fragments, or (as the Bill says) selections from it. Moreover, the League's petition and the provisions of the Bill are an admission of what follows:—

(*a*.) That those biblical scraps or selections are to be prepared by the Government:

(*b*.) That the electors of the Dominion are not to be allowed an opportunity of seeing and criticizing them before voting upon them:

(*c*.) That the proposed Government biblical fragments are to be of such a nature that many people will, on grounds of conscience, object to them—hence the conscience clause for pupils (but not for taxpayers or teachers):

(*d*.) That the Government fragments from "the Bible" are to be compiled by the State, printed, bound, stored, and distributed by the State, and taught by the State, at the cost of *all* the people of the State:

(*e*.) That conscientiously objecting teachers must teach them, or take the consequences of refusal:

(*f*.) That conscientiously objecting parents must submit to have their children taught it unless specially and individually exempted; and no exemptions will be given unless the parents adopt the humiliating resort of protesting against it—presumably in writing, as in Australia.

2. Stated briefly, the privilege of State-picked, State-taught, State-endowed extracts from "the Bible" is to be strictly reserved to one privileged party—namely, the party whose conscience

can accept biblical matter selected at will by the Government, forced upon the nation by the Government, and taught by the Government. To the many who cannot, in conscience, accept a Bible edited (perhaps gravely mutilated) by the Government, the Government is asked to say, in effect, "You shall be put outside the pale; you shall pay for the sort of Bible scraps we edit and teach; but you shall get no benefit from them unless you and your conscience conform to the State religion.

3. The League demands, and the Bill provides, a revolutionary change in our Education Act. and in the relation of the various religious denominations towards the Government and towards each other. Catholics go even further than the League in their views as to the essential union of religion and true education. Catholics alone have proved the utter sincerity of their convictions herein by long-sustained and ever-increasing sacrifices of money, personal effort, and numberless devoted human lives. They would joyfully aid their Protestant fellow-citizens to secure biblical and religious instruction for their children in the public schools so long as the equal rights of conscience of other interested parties before the law are not thereby violated. They would wish to see the education system made truly national—suited for all the people of the nation: secular for those desiring it secular, and religious (on fair conditions all round) for those desiring it religious. But they can never accept such an attempt at a solution of the difficulty as that now demanded by the League and embodied in the Bill: a scheme that violates rights of conscience which God gave, and which no League, Government, or majority can in justice take away.

II. Arguments for the Bill.

The arguments already advanced, and likely to be advanced, in support of the present Bill are (summarily stated) based upon the following chief grounds, as set forth by the League in its official literature, or by League exponents on the platform and in the Press.

1. There is a serious decline in domestic religion, much "paganism," "barbarism," "atheism," &c The secular system is a focus thereof. The League Churches can see no other way out of the difficulty unless by the State teaching of State-compiled biblical extracts, and the right of entry for the clergy into the public schools during working-hours.

2. A large body of electors have signed a petition (not yet presented) that this matter of "religious instruction" and conscience be decided, not by Parliament, but by a plebiscite (misnamed a "referendum") over the head of Parliament.

3. The proposed scheme "works smoothly," "absolutely without friction," and without any "sectarian difficulty" in certain parts of Australia.

4. The proposed scheme affords "equal rights," "equal treatment," and "equal opportunities to all," and "special privileges to none."

5. If Parliament and the people will not adopt the League's scheme, the League will work "detriment" to—or even "wreck"—the "national system," by establishing a rival system of denominational schools.

III. A Confession of Failure.

1. The League's cry of denominational failure represents a vast falling-off in spirit, hope, and energy from pre-agitation days, when the League clergy proudly pointed to the achievements of their denominations in moulding the national character in Great Britain as to make it (they said) first among the nations of the earth.

2. Out of the numerous lamentations about the decline in personal and domestic religion, let the following suffice: A right reverend member of the League executive (Bishop Averill) tells us that religion is now running risks of becoming a "vague sentiment," a "refined form of agnosticism" (*New Zealand Herald*, 25th May, 1914). At Gisborne, two League orators pleaded the small extent of Bible-reading in the homes as a reason for the Government introducing it into the schools (*Poverty Bay Herald*, 22nd April, 1914). Rev. C. H. Laws and Bishop Averill lament the spread of "heathenism" and "appalling ignorance" of religion among followers of their respective faiths (*Auckland Star*, 23rd May, 1914, and *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 19th June, 1913). No account is here taken of the League pulpit sermons on that well-worn subject, "Why don't men go to church?"

The Secular System.

3. According to statements and arguments put forward by the League or by its exponents in favour of this Bill, there is a measure of connection between those conditions and the secular system. One official League publication declares that under that system "your scholar comes out of your hand a barbarian." An editorial article in the chief League organ (the *Outlook*) states that children in our secular schools are "educated on pagan principles." Prominent League officials (such as Canon Garland, Rev. Isaac Jolly, Rev. John Mackenzie—all members of the League executive) and others describe the secular system as a system of "white heathenism," "dogmatic secularism," "Godless," "a relic of barbarism," "the desolating blight of secularism," and a system that "degrades morals." (Fuller details and references to these and other denunciations will be found on pages 2 and 3 of the Catholic Federation series of publications, No. 4, copies of which are herewith presented to your Committee.)

4. By their strenuous personal efforts and sacrifices of nearly forty years, Catholics have proved the sincerity of their conviction as to the evil of divorcing religion from the school period of a child's training. At the same time we recognize that social phenomena are, as a rule, very complex, and that it is at times hard to trace the play of cause and effect. By all means let us attribute to the secular system the evils which, in its nature, and in the circumstances of its operation in this country, it is calculated to produce. But the League clergy have been laying to its charge a serious measure of bad results which are fairly traceable to their own act or default.

IV. WHERE LEAGUE CLERGY ARE TO BLAME.

The League clergy, in a word, have been proclaiming their denominational failure as an argument in favour of this Bill. In other words, the clergy in question seem to consider it worth while to pillory and expose themselves before the public, if by this means they may coax or force the Government to shoulder a part of their denominational responsibilities. Speaking at the Presbyterian General Assembly, in 1913, ex-Moderator Rev. A. Cameron said, in this connection, "It is the Church crying out in its weakness, calling for the assistance of the State. The Church is crying out that it cannot do this work, and it is calling for Cæsar to help it. The home has been so neglected by the Church that parents are not doing their duty. Now we have to compel the school and the teacher to do what the parents should have done." It would (he added) be an injustice to the teacher, to the children, "and to the whole Church" to impose that duty upon the teacher. (*Outlook*, 20th January, 1914.) In advancing the argument of denominational failure in support of this Bill the League clergy, however, concealed from their petitioners the vital facts and considerations set down in the following paragraphs:—

1. What, precisely, have the League clergy been doing during the past thirty-seven years to keep alive religion in the place where religion should begin—namely, the home? Mr. John Caughley, M.A. (a foremost Presbyterian elder and Sunday-school superintendent), gives the following testimony hereon: (*a*.) "The writer has, during the last twenty-five years, heard some 2,000 sermons preached; but not more than ten of these were directed towards impressing on Christian (not irreligious) parents their duty and privilege in regard to the religious training of their children—though, at every baptism, the parent and the Church made solemn vows before God that they would see to his training." (Article in *Auckland Star* in December, 1912.) (*b*.) Of the members of the Bible-in-schools League he says, in the same article, "Not one-fifth of these have read the Bible regularly with their children throughout this year"; and he laments the "almost universal banishment of the Bible from the place where, first of all, it should be recognized." So far as the present writer is aware, there has never been a reply to this indictment.

2. This "pagan," "barbarous," "atheist," and "morally degrading" system was created by the direct votes of the League denominations. In actual practice, it has been steadily fostered by the vast bulk of the League clergy. At most they have fought the "paganism" of the secular system as British armchair warriors fought Kruger—with their mouths—not with heart and hand and coin and personal effort. Even since the beginning of the present agitation no case has been recorded of even one League clergyman removing his children from the "desolating blight" of schools which they now discover to be seed-plots of "barbarism," "heathenism," "atheism," and "degradation." Have they not thereby condoned—nay, even contributed to—the very "heathenism," &c., which they now (as part of a political campaign) so loudly complain? These facts have an obvious and important bearing upon this Bill, and the grounds upon which it has been introduced and commended to the Parliament of New Zealand.

3. Under the present (secular) Education Act, facilities (such as they are) are offered to the clergy and others for religious instruction outside of school hours. Here and there, small and elect bodies of devoted Protestant clergy and lay helpers have faithfully done what they could thus to bring religion and its sweet influences to children in the public schools. They claim a real measure of success, and their work has been blessed and encouraged by Synods and Assemblies. For instance, thirty-two zealous Protestant instructors have brought religion to all but three of the State schools of Dunedin. They are regularly imparting religious instruction to 2,643 out of 2,906 on the standards register in eleven Dunedin schools. The detailed figures for each school were supplied by the instructors' convener (Rev. I. K. M'Intyre) to the *Outlook* (Dunedin) of the 9th June, 1914.

4. What are the League clergy doing to combat within the school buildings the "paganism," "heathenism," "atheism," and "moral degradation" of the system to which they now send their children to be trained? The great body of them are doing simply nothing. This was shown in sufficient detail by a New Zealand parliamentary return of the 2nd November, 1903 (published in No. 37 of session, 1903, p. 259). About seven-eighths of them did not take the trouble of visiting the schools for religious instruction; only nine schools in every hundred in New Zealand were visited by the clergy; and out of the total number of clergy visits paid to the schools the Catholic clergy (although they had so many religious schools of their own) paid proportionately about twice as many as the others. Is not this grave neglect at least a partial cause of so much spiritual "ignorance" and practical "heathenism" as may exist among their several flocks? Here again are disturbing facts which have an important bearing upon the "Referendum" Bill now before Parliament. It is well that these significant facts should also be known to Parliament and the country.

5. The League and the League clergy are now threatening that, if Parliament and the country do not meet their wish, they will "wreck" or cause "detriment" to the present "national" system by starting a rival denominational system. (Their words—including those of an official League publication—are quoted, and duly referenced, on pages 7–10 of the Catholic Federation Series, No. 6, copies of which are herewith presented to the members of your Committee.) Who is preventing their now opening schools of their own? Who has prevented their doing so for the past thirty-seven years? Yet during all that long period—with only a very occasional verbal protest—the clergy of those large and wealthy denominations have accepted the "paganism," "heathenism," "barbarism," "atheism," which they now discover in the secular system, rather than go—and urge their people to go—to the cost of inaugurating (as the vastly smaller and poorer Catholic body did) a system of primary Christian schools. Is not this evidence that they have not considered good Christian, anti-"atheistical" schools deserving of so much personal effort and sacrifice? And are they not thereby, on their own confession, promoting the very

"heathenism" of which they now complain? Is the Parliament of New Zealand going to be swayed by such idle clerical threats to "wreck" what is called the "national system"?

6. Yet another argument for this Bill has been put forward by a number of prominent members of the League. For instance, the Anglican Bishop of Waiapu (now of Auckland), and other members of the League executive, complain of the decline of family piety and worship among their people (see, for instance, the *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 19th June, 1913). *Religion should begin in the home.* And the League denominations should look first within themselves for the cause—and for the remedy. Thus, at a meeting of the Dunedin Presbytery on the 4th July, 1905, the Rev. James Chisholm, an able and learned minister, made this phase of the League agitation the subject of pointed reference. He did not disparage the effort "to introduce Bible lessons into public schools." (Catholics favour this, on fair conditions.) But he said, "The most effective way of meeting the necessity that exists for the religious training of children lies in the direction of using all available means which the Church can command to quicken the sense of parental responsibility, and revive family piety, and make the home what it was meant to be, and what all Scripture and history proves it capable of becoming—even the seat of the Christian discipline and nursery of noble youth." "I feel strongly," said the Rev. Mr. Chisholm, in the same discourse, "that the agitation that has been carried on for so many years has diverted the attention of our people from the much more important matter of Christian training in the home. . . . It seems to me that the real weakness of our whole church life—the weakness that is undoubtedly growing amongst us—is just a defective family life and training; and all the agitation that has existed in this or other matters seems merely to have diverted the attention of our people from that. I think that if half the amount of energy that has been spent in trying to introduce Bible lessons in schools had been spent in endeavouring to revive family piety, our Church would have been vastly the better now." (*Otago Daily Times*, 5th July, 1905.)

At a meeting of the Dunedin Presbytery on the 7th October, 1913, the Rev. A. Whyte (Port Chalmers) is reported as follows in the *Outlook* (the Presbyterian organ) of the 14th October, 1913: "He said there was one supreme danger of the Protestant Church, and that was that it should lose the spirit of sacrifice. In the Roman Catholic Church the sacrifice was tremendous. Men, women, and estates were magnificently offered for the work of Christ and the Church. . . . He refused to entertain the thought that the Church of John Calvin and John Knox would be behind the Roman Catholic Church in self-sacrifice for the religious education of its youth. They were told that the Roman Catholics had given £2,000,000, and they believed that the Presbyterian Church would not be behind them."

7. Passing reference may be here made to two causes which contribute in a serious measure to the spread of indifferentism and irreligion among the League denominations in various lands. These are: (*a.*) The spread, among League denomination clergy in various lands, of fuzzy modernistic views of the Bible—the paring-down, for instance, of its character as a Divine revelation in the old orthodox Protestant sense; the doubting or outright denial of the Virgin-birth of Christ, of His true Godhead, of His resurrection and ascension, &c. All this has enormously lowered the Bible in the estimation of their people. (*b.*) The other factor contributing to indifferentism and irreligion among League denominations is this: The discussions, in various places, as to whether clergymen may properly continue to officiate in a denomination in whose doctrinal standards they have in part ceased to believe. Evidence of this will be produced on demand. In New Zealand, the League proposes to force such double-mindedness and insincerity upon conscientiously objecting and even unbelieving teachers. Two members of the League executive, for instance, expressly approve of agnostic teachers teaching biblical lessons to children—Bishop Averill in the *Hawke's Bay Herald* (19th June, 1913) and Dean Fitchett (in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 14th June, 1913). Such double-mindedness is described as "sinful," "doubly a sin," and "lowering to conscience" by two such noted Anglicans as Archbishop Whately (in his "Lessons on Morals") and Thomas Arnold (in his "Christian Life"). It is highly calculated to render the clergy and the pulpit suspect, to palliate or encourage the habit of defying conscience, and to extend the practical "heathenism," &c., which the League clergy now so vehemently condemn in the secular system. So far as the clergy have been shown to be blameworthy for the decline of faith and family piety, the direct and obvious remedy is a change of heart in the clergy that may be at fault. Such defaults as have been referred to here are not to be cured, or even palliated, by a Bill having for its object to enable a section of the clergy to abdicate one of the most sacred functions of the Christian industry and force it upon the shoulders of unwilling State officials. As will be shown later on, New South Wales (the oldest Government Bible-extracts State) is, herein, a warning example to New Zealand.

V. A Contrast.

1. In one other way the League's argument for this Bill—based upon the League's denominational incapacity—fails signally. It emphasizes, too, by a vivid local contrast, the degree of blame to be attached to the League clergy for so much of "paganism," "heathenism," &c., as may exist among their respective flocks. It is to contrast their action (or inaction), and its calculable results, with that of the Catholic clergy. Briefly stated, (*a*) the Catholic clergy and their people believe intensely in the Bible as in very deed and truth God's revelation to men; they would give blood and life for the literal truth of those fundamental Christian dogmas (mentioned above) which are being questioned or denied among League denominations; and (*b*) with an intense and living faith and love, they have flung themselves into the work of religious education of the little ones for whom the Saviour gave blood and life. What are the results? "Such the pastor, such the flock." We, too, have to mourn sons that leave us for the husks of

swine. But with our vivid faith, and with the children—the hope of the future—gathered in the Church's mother-arms, she is racked with no failing trust in God's unfailing Word, smitten with no dying devotion, crippled with no array of empty Sunday benches. There is growing vigour in her limbs, high courage in her heart, within her soul a glorious hope. She looks into the future with fearless and unwavering eye. From her strong heart goes up no cry of failure, no appeal to Cæsar or to Parliaments to relieve her of part of her divinely imposed burden lest she faint by the way.

2. Cannot the League read the two contrasting omens? An official League leaflet speaks about "the Roman Catholic devotion in supporting their own schools." If their example is deserving of admiration, is it not still more worthy of imitation? We have every sympathy for, and willingness to aid, the introduction of the Bible into the public schools, on conditions fair to all users and supporters of those schools. But the scheme should be just, and the grounds of it fairly stated. It is not just for the League to demand for itself (through a plebiscite) special privileges of State biblical teaching at State cost which it refuses to all others. And it is not a fair statement of the position to demand such special privileges because of alleged "heathenism" and irreligion for which the League clergy are themselves in part responsible. In thirty-seven years the great body of them have done practically nothing to bring religion into what they now call the "pagan" and "atheistic" State schools. And (to give a slightly altered turn to the Rev. James Chisholm's quoted statement) if they had put half as much money and energy into leagues of family prayer and Bible-reading as they have put into political agitation, their various denominations "would have been vastly the better by now."

VI. The Missing Petition.

1. The chief argument put forward (and likely to be repeated shortly in Parliament) in support of this Bill is this: that a large body of electors have signed petition cards, as hereunder, in favour of it. As already stated, this petition has not been presented. But the League statement has (as we gather from the Right. Hon. the Prime Minister's recent remark) given rise to the Bill now before your honourable House. In fact, the League's petition-card is, in a modified form, what Bishop Sprott describes as the League's own and "only" ballot-paper in the Bill. It is the source, inspiration, and substance of the Bill. The only difference in substance between the League's petition and the League's ballot-paper in the Bill is this: the League's ballot-paper gives the League more than the League's petition asked for. It is well that Parliament should know both their points of resemblance and their still more significant points of divergence in favour of the League.

2. The League's petition-card, demanding this Bill is printed on both sides. The front of the card bears (among others) the following words: "I am in favour of the system of religious instruction in State schools described on the other side, and request a referendum to be taken thereon." The "system of religious instruction" is officially "described" by the League as follows "on the other side" of its petition-card:—

"OBJECTIVE.

"*System of Religious Instruction in State Schools prevailing in Australia.*

"Lessons read in school hours by the children themselves from Scripture books provided by the Education Department; State-school teachers supervising the reading but not giving sectarian or dogmatic teaching:

"Visits during school hours by ministers or accredited teachers from the churches, instructing children in the faith of their fathers:

"Conscience clause, by which the parent has complete control of the child's religious instruction in the public school.

"This system has existed in New South Wales since 1866; in Tasmania since 1868; in Western Australia since 1893; in Norfolk Island since 1906; and in Queensland since 1910."

VII. League Petition Methods.

1. Both the League's petition and the present Bill demand (as shown) a revolutionary change in our law. As a matter of fair dealing, both the League card and the Bill should have stated clearly, precisely, and accurately the nature of the legislative changes desired. The League petitioners on the one hand, and legislators and the general public on the other hand, should have understood the proposed legislative changes in their true sense, in their full sense, and in the same sense.

2. Unfortunately, in these respects, both the League petition and its ballot-paper reflex are lamentably wanting herein. In what they say and in what they conceal both are so worded that they could not fail to confuse petitioners on the one hand, and Parliament and the general public on the other hand. In fact, it is a matter of sheer impossibility to understand either of them in a clear sense, in a true sense, in the same sense—I might almost say, in any sense: certainly in any sense that is capable of lucid expression in a single "Yes" or a single "No."

3. Let us take the Bill and the League's own and "only" ballot-paper in the Bill.

(*a.*) It purports to be a "referendum" Bill. It is no such thing: it is a vastly different and more objectionable thing—it is a plebiscite Bill on a matter of personal religious liberty and personal religious conscience. Herein Parliament and the public are misled. The Bill reflects even the League's incorrect use of plain terms of political science.

(*b.*) Part of the wording of both the League's petition and of the League's ballot-paper is hopelessly ambiguous.

(*c.*) Both the petition and the ballot-paper conceal a considerable number of facts which are essentially required for a clear and proper understanding of the educational changes which are proposed.

4. It will be useful to quote here an extract from the recent manifesto of the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand. They say in part :—

"*Six Issues in Three.*

"The ballot-paper in the Bill submits three highly complicated issues to the electors. It does not allow the elector to vote on them separately; he must combine the six separate and confused controversial issues, treat them as if they were one plain, simple issue, and vote a single 'Yes' or a single 'No' upon them all! As a matter of fact, the alleged 'three' issues contain no fewer than the six set down hereunder :—

"(*a.*) The Government to provide 'selected Bible lessons' :
"(*b.*) These lessons to be read 'within school hours' :
"(*c.*) The teacher to 'supervise' the reading :
"(*d.*) No sectarian teaching to be allowed :
"(*e.*) Right of entry to clergy 'for religious instruction' :
"(*f.*) Right of parent 'to withdraw his child from Bible-reading, or from religious instruction, or from both.'

"Some of these issues (as will be seen) are hopelessly ambiguous, misleading, or obscure. On each and every one of them (so far as they can be understood) opinion in New Zealand is profoundly divided. Yet the elector is denied the opportunity of expressing an opinion upon them separately. He must pretend to regard the six hopelessly obscure and polemical issues as if they were one clear, straightforward issue, admitting no other answer than a plain 'Yes' or a plain 'No.'"

VIII. What does it mean?

1. This ballot-paper provides for "selected Bible lessons." But in their agitation for the Bill the League proclaimed that it wanted "the Bible"—not lessons or extracts from the Bible. In its petition it demanded "Scripture books provided by the Education Department."

2. Genesis, Exodus, St. John's Gospel, and so on, are "Scripture books." Is it proposed to introduce "Scripture books" in this plain and direct sense of the term? The petition-card clearly suggests "Yes." The League's title—"The Bible" in State Schools League—plainly asserts that "the Bible" (that is, "the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments") into the State schools. Over and over again the League organizer (Canon Garland) has declared that the League wants "the Bible" in the schools. (See, for instance, the *Outlook*, 19th February, 1913; *New Zealand Herald*, 1st October, 1912.) And in the *Manawatu Daily Times* of the 17th December, 1912, he declared that "they" (the teachers) "were asked to teach the Bible just as they taught their other text-books." Rev. R. Wood (League organizer for Otago) speaks of the League campaign as "the battle for the Bible" (*Outlook*, 11th November, 1913). Canon Garland says the League demands that "the Bible should resume its place among the reading-books on which moral instruction is based" (*Lyttelton Times*, 9th November, 1912). Hundreds of such quotations could be given, declaring to petitioners, directly or indirectly, that "the Bible" is to be used as a text-book in the public schools.

Attacks on Opponents.

3. Great numbers of Christian people (clergy and laity) firmly believe in the Bible as part of education, but object to the League's particular scheme (which is the scheme of this Bill) as unjust and destructive of religious liberty and rights of conscience. Among these are Catholics, who alone have made vast sacrifices for biblical and religious education. All of these, and other conscientious objectors, are combined by League orators and writers under comprehensive terms of bitter and unjust invective. I mention these things here as matters highly calculated to prejudice our interests in the deliberations that may take place over the present "referendum Bill." I am prepared to submit hundreds of such evil and unmerited designations. Let these few suffice here: They are described as "hostile to the Bible" (*Outlook*, 25th November, 1913); "Romanists, atheists, and Unitarians." (*Outlook*, 27th May, 1913); "Secularists, atheists, and Roman Catholics" (Rev. Dr. Gibb, in *Dominion*, 18th August, 1913); a "combination" of "Rome and atheism" (matter supplied by the League to the *Outlook* and other papers, *e.g.*, *Church Gazette*, 1st March, 1913); "the anti-Bible party" (*e.g.*, *Dominion*, 18th March, 1914); *Outlook* (30th June, 1914). Dean Fitchett (a member of the League executive) describes opponents collectively as "a tatterdemalion crew, with whom Falstaff would not have marched through Coventry, but all very dear to Dr. Cleary" (*Outlook*, 24th June, 1913). The League organizer (Canon Garland) goes still further. He ranks the opponents of the League as herein fighting for the same cause as the demons of the nethermost abyss (Eph., vi, 12; Col., i, 13). "The principalities and power of darkness," said he at Mosgiel, "are fighting against the League" (quoted editorially by the *Otago Daily Times* of the 13th March, 1913). Nay, in a sermon to Anglicans at Gisborne, he promised a sentence to "depart" to eternal woe, "at the day of judgment," to hearers who could not see eye to eye with the League—"no matter how good our motives may have been"; and the words of doom were (he said) based upon the revealed "mind" of Christ, which "is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever" (*Gisborne Times*, 20th April, 1914). They are therefore applicable not alone to Anglicans, but to all who bear the Christian name.

4. Such are a few of the terms applied to honourable and conscientious opponents of the present measure, such as the Anglican Primate (now President of the League) was in 1905; such as the members of the Nelson Presbytery; such as that foremost Presbyterian Sunday-school

superintendent, Mr. John Caughley; such as men of such outstanding distinction in the Presbyterian Church as are Rev. Professor Hewitson, Rev. Dr. Erwin, ex-moderator Rev. A. Cameron, and large bodies of conscientious clergy and laity of various other faiths. The object of all this is quite clear: to lead League petitioners and members of your honourable House to think that this is a battle between the powers of darkness and the powers of light; between the Bible and the enemies of the Bible; between God and the enemies of God. That is one of the ways in which Christian men and women have been maligned, and earnest and trusting electors misled, by the exponents and organs of the League, into the support of a cause which they do not know.

5. In the campaign for this Bill the great demand was for "the Bible"—not for mere cuttings from the Bible. Indeed, in at least one official League publication, the term "open Bible" is used in this connection. On the other hand, Rev. Isaac Jolly (a member of the League executive) declared the whole Bible unfitted for children (*Ohinemuri Gazette*, 13th August, 1913), and the Rev. Mr. Clarkson (official League lecturer) said that it would be "insane" to put it unrestrictedly into the hands of children (*Poverty Bay Herald*, 5th June, 1913); and Bishop Averill (in an official League leaflet), and other League leaflets, demand not "the Bible," nor the "open Bible," nor "Scripture books," but mere extracts from the Bible or from Scripture books. And in a letter in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 24th May, 1913, Bishop Averill (a member of the League executive) seems willing (so long as he secures clerical right of entry) to accept from the Government even the sort of mutilated Bible lessons which he denounced in the Christchurch *Press* of the 2nd May, 1904, as an "emasculated caricature" of Scripture teaching.

6. Amidst all this discord of voices—"the Bible," "the open Bible," Bible extracts, and "emasculated caricatures" of the Bible—how is the bewildered League petitioner to know what precisely is meant (and how much Bible, or how little, or from what source) by the term "Scripture books"? Now, when the petitions have been signed, we learn (from the Referendum Bill) that the League wants not "the Bible," or "the open Bible," or "Scripture books," but only selected lessons or extracts from the Bible. But even these selections are to be kept from the public eye until the public have voted blindly upon them—unseen.

7. Two things are now luminously clear: (*a.*) The talk about "the Bible," the "open Bible," the "battle for the Bible," &c., was a mere party catch word, the sacred name of the sacred book being misused in this gravely misleading way for the purposes of a political campaign. "The Bible" was really at no time intended by the League to be used as a text-book in the public schools. (*b.*) For the same political campaign purpose the Nelson Presbytery, great numbers of God-loving Protestants, clergy and people, the whole Catholic body, Jews, &c., were held up by the League to public odium as "atheists" and enemies of God and His revealed Word.

An "Emasculated Caricature."

8. What sort of selected Scripture lessons would the Government of New Zealand be likely to provide in the event of the proposed educational changes becoming law? We can best surmise this from the uniform experience of the Australian Government Bible-extract States. In the following points all the Australian syllabuses and manuals of biblical extracts agree: (*a*) They are taken wholly, or almost wholly, from a sectarian version of the Bible (the Protestant Authorized Version); (*b*) they garble and mutilate the sacred text, flinging aside everything unacceptable to the League denominations—even the Virgin-birth of Christ being thus cast out in Queensland; and (*c*) they suppress the great body of narratives, texts, and incidents to which Catholics appeal in support of their religious faith and practice. By this process of mutilation, and by the introduction of sermon-headings and of prayer and praise in sectarian forms, the Australian lessons are made as sectarian as the Thirty-nine Articles or the Presbyterian Confession of faith. We might apply to each and any one of them the words that three prominent Leaguers applied to the League lessons of 1904. Rev. P. B. Fraser described them as "a garbled mutilation of the Scriptures and its teaching"; "a hash-up of the Bible"; "rip-and-tear theology"; "the only place for the text-book was the fire" (*Evening Star*, Dunedin, 2nd September, 1905; *Otago Daily Times*, 28th August and 2nd September, 1905). Archdeacon (now Bishop) Averill, a member of the League executive, said it was "an emasculated caricature" of Bible teaching (*Press*, 2nd May, 1904); and the Anglican Primate (now president of the League) described it as "making reflections upon the Almighty by rejecting parts of His teachings. A committee for the human improvement of the Bible," he added, "seems to me to be a rather improper thing for a clergyman to take part in" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th August, 1905). And he subjoined this wholesome truth, which applies with equal force to the scheme over which he now presides: "This scheme does not seem to me to lay the duty of the religious instruction upon the right shoulders. . . . I do think that the discharge of this duty rests upon ministers of religion." So, after all, the campaign, issuing in this Bill, resolves itself into a campaign to "mutilate," "caricature," "emasculate," and dishonour God's Holy Word! How many signatures would the League have got for its petition if these facts had been frankly placed before the public?

IX. "Supervising": What does it mean?

The League's petition-card and the ballot-paper in the Bill state that the teacher shall "supervise" the Scripture lessons. "Supervise," as applied to teaching, has several different *positive* meanings. It includes every varied sort of oversight, from the mere silent hearing of an appointed lesson up to the highest reach of skilled pedagogical exposition. Parliament and the public are not informed as to which positive meaning is intended, and the elector is left to guesswork and confusion.

X. "Sectarian" Teaching.

1. The League's card, and its reflex in the ballot-paper of the present Bill, forbids the teacher to give "sectarian" instruction. The League card, in addition, forbade "dogmatic" instruction

by the State teacher. Moreover, the ballot-paper in the Bill makes the following distinction for an obvious controversial purpose: The religious instruction to be imparted by the teacher is not described as "religious instruction"; that term is applied only to the denominational religious instruction given by the clergy under the right of entry. The very same scheme of State biblical teaching is called in Australian laws "departmental regulations and reports," &c., and in the literature of the League, "religious instruction," "general religious teaching," 'general religion," "common Christianity," &c. In regard to this matter, further reference will be made later on.

2. The term in the Bill, "no sectarian teaching," means (so far as it has any meaning) the same thing as "unsectarian," "undogmatic," "undenominational" religious teaching. The Bill plainly means that the State teacher is free to impart this sort of "teaching"—or rather, what he, or some or other educational authority, may be pleased to consider "unsectarian," &c., teaching. Moreover, the ballot-paper and the League assert there is such a thing as "unsectarian" or "undogmatic" teaching. This statement is seriously misleading. As a matter of fact, there is, and there can be, no such thing as "unsectarian," or "undogmatic," or "undenominational" biblical or "religious instruction." It is a mental fiction. It is a sectarian misuse of the terms "unsectarian," &c. The Sydney Orange organ, the *Watchman*, some time ago described itself as "unsectarian." Even so well-known an Anglican clergyman as Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A., describes the Church of England as "unsectarian" in his "Religious Instruction and How to Improve It" (London, 1903, p. 234). This will give an idea of the wide range of anti-Catholic and denominational teaching that is possible under a so-called "unsectarian" scheme of biblical lessons.

3. In the present connection "unsectarian" biblical teaching is intended to signify the "skeleton Christianity" (as Isaac Butt called it), or the residuum of Protestantism, that is arrived at by casting out of the Bible everything which the rival and antagonistic League denominations are not agreed about. It is what an official League pamphlet describes as "common Christian faith," or what the League of 1904 referred to when it said in an official pronouncement "that the Bible contains great truths which all Christian men now hold in common, and that it is possible to read it in a broad and unsectarian spirit" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904). This "common" Christianity is the abstract or "common" basis of English and Scottish Protestantism after they have flung aside their differences and arrived approximately at some sort of common denominator.

4. On the 29th June, 1910, a judgment bearing upon this subject was rendered by the Illinois Supreme Court (U.S.A.), by a majority of five to two. It was published in the *Illinois Official Reporter* of the 20th July, 1910, and was copied extensively in the United State Press (in *America*, for instance), and (among other journals of these countries) in the *New Zealand Tablet* of the 16th April, 1914. The judgment in question recites the many things which the pupils in public schools "cannot hear the Scriptures read without being instructed" in and "about which the various sects do not agree." And it declares that "any instruction on any one of these subjects is necessarily sectarian, because, while it may be consistent with the doctrine of one or many of the sects, it will be inconsistent with the doctrine of one or more of them."

5. But even that watered-down compromise would be "sectarian" and "denominational" to the Catholic, the Jew, and many others, just as (in Mr Balfour's words) from the viewpoint of the Jew, all Christian teaching is "sectarian" and "denominational," and, from the viewpoint of the Catholic, all Protestant teaching is "sectarian" and "denominational." Some years ago Dean Fitchett (now a member of the League executive) described "undenominationalism" (another name for "unsectarianism") as "anti-Anglicanism." And in the Dunedin Anglican Synod of 1901 he said "he could not see how there could be any undenominational teaching that was not denominational in relation to the Anglican Synod." Catholics, for their part, can never accept such a "compromise" on the Bible. Such "common" or "unsectarian" Christianity is, to them, intensely sectarian. There is no more use in quarrelling with them over this rooted conscientious conviction than there is in quarrelling with them over the colour of their hair or eyes.

XI. "Undogmatic Teaching."

1. Neither could the teacher's biblical lessons, under this Bill, be other than dogmatic. A glance at the "Australian" manuals shows that the system "prevailing" there contains a considerable mass of "dogmas" or "doctrines" concerning God, with dogmatic sermon-headings for many lessons. The Bible in Schools League of 1904 demanded the introduction of the biblical lessons on the dogmatic Reformed principle of "private judgment." (See pronouncement in *Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904.) The organizer of the present League called upon the Government to accept the "theological views" of the League in regard to the "referendum," and to reject the "theological views" thereon of another section of the community (*Dominion*, 27th May, 1914). Rev. Isaac Jolly (a member of the League executive) also demanded the introduction of biblical lessons into the schools on a Reformed dogmatic basis which he stated thus: "The fundamental principle of the Protestant Church was that the Word of God carried its own message to the heart, without any intermediary at all" (*Ohinemuri Gazette*, 13th August, 1913). This is, in effect, the "personal assurance that God is speaking to him," which is editorially described in the *Outlook* as "one of the cardinal principles of Protestantism" (9th June, 1914). Here we have not alone a dogmatic basis, but a *sectarian* dogmatic basis, for the scheme of the Bible extracts promoted by this Bill. Rev. Dr. Gibb (a League vice-president) warns teachers that they must be prepared either to teach religious dogma or to be considered unfit for the Public Service. Here are his words, at Invercargill, as reported in the *Southland Times* of the 25th June, 1914: "A great deal was made of the fact that a child might ask a teacher who Christ or God was. But if a

teacher could not tell a child who God was, and if he could not tell the child that God was the Creator of all that was, then he said that man had missed his vocation. Whatever he was fit for, he most certainly was not fit to be a teacher." Two further dogmatic bases for the biblical lessons are set forth in an official leaflet by the Bishop of Waiapu, where he says of the proposed Scripture extracts (*a*) that "the passages will not lose their 'inspiration' because separated from the context," and (*b*) that they will present "something of the facts contained in the record of God's revelation to man." In its issue of the 21st April, 1914, the *Outlook* (the chief League organ) editorially demanded, on the same dogmatic basis, the introduction of "this unique record of God's dealings with mankind as part of the ordinary school curriculum." Another member of the present League, Rev. P. B. Fraser, wrote that the selections approved by the League of 1905 consisted of "mutilated portions and scraps of Scripture presented under a strong dogmatic bias to the minds of the children," and that they were full of dogma" (*Otago Daily Times*, 22nd April, 1905). The author of "Mixed Education" (Dublin, 1859, pp. 152–153) quotes the Rev. F. F. French as testifying to the dogmatic character of the Irish Scripture extracts now in use in New South Wales. The Rev. Mr. French states that those (now) New South Wales books "teach the doctrines of grace"; the doctrine of "one only sacrifice for sins"; the doctrine of "justification by faith, *without works*"; and other specified doctrines to which a controversial turn is given, to this day, in the Reformed denominations. (The Queensland text-books also contain the dogma of "justification by faith, *with works*.") "No wonder," says the author of "Mixed Education" (p. 153), "that Dean Kennedy, whose schools are attended by more Catholics than Protestants, should declare, on oath, that 'the principles of the national system are the principles of the Reformation. . . .' No wonder that the sentiments of Dean Hoare, Dean Warburton, Archdeacon Stopford, and the Rev. Messrs. Frew and O'Regan, as stated before the House of Lords, in 1854, should be almost equally decided as to the Protestant character of the lesson-books and Scripture extracts." Here, again, the "Scripture extracts" are those which, long ago discarded in Ireland, are still in use in New South Wales.

2. It is, in fact, simply impossible to avoid dogma in teaching any subject whatsoever. The multiplication table is, for instance, a litany of dogmas. The axioms and theorems of Euclid are dogmas. At the centenary of the National Society in London, on the 23rd March, 1911, Mr. Balfour well remarked that you cannot even teach arithmetic to children unless "you teach them dogmatically. If you do not teach them dogmatically you do not teach them at all. It is" (he added) "the same with the so-called 'Cowper-Temple' religion" (the "unsectarian" and "undogmatic" religion type of the League, and of the present Bill) "that must be taught dogmatically or it will not be taught at all." "A teacher," says G. K. Chesterton, "who is not dogmatic is simply a teacher who is not teaching."

3. The Bill (and the League) therefore seriously mislead legislators and electors when they state or imply that the system of biblical instruction which they propose is "unsectarian" or "undogmatic" or "undenominational." Curiously enough, in the present Bill the term "dogmatic" is omitted from the ballot-paper, thus leaving the teacher free to give whatever may be interpreted as "dogmatic" religious instruction should the proposed educational changes become law. Yet Dr. Sprott (Anglican Bishop of Wellington, and a member of the League executive) describes that ballot-paper as "our question, and ours only" (*Auckland Star*, 8th July, 1914). In other words, the ballot-paper removes an interpretative restriction favouring religious liberty in a way, which restriction the League had put into its petition-card in order to secure petitioners' votes. The League's ballot-paper offers the League a State-guaranteed interpretative privilege which the League's petition-card expressly repudiated. Yet the League has, apparently, never consulted its petitioners in regard to this change in its platform.

XII. Clergy Visits.

1. The Bill provides for the right of entry of the clergy for "religious instruction" during school hours. The present Bible in State Schools League demands this. Previous organizations of the kind in New Zealand were vehemently opposed to it.

2. In its nature this provision constitutes the clergy State teachers for the time being, and makes the State schools denominational for a portion of their working-time. It is obviously of greatest advantage to the denominations that have most money and men. Presumably for this reason the right of entry of the clergy—to denominationalize the State schools system—has all along been favoured by Anglicans. They abandoned it temporarily, and by way of compromise, in 1904–5, chiefly on account of the vehement denunciations of the Rev. Dr. Gibb and the opposition of the Presbyterians and others. On the League platform the chief thing put forward has been "the Bible" in the schools—now reduced to mere "Bible extracts" in the schools. But Bishop Averill (a member of the League's executive) describes as "the main plank in the Bible in State Schools League platform the right of entry of clergy and accredited teachers of all recognized denominations, within school hours, for the purpose of giving definite religious instruction to their own children" (letter in *Otago Daily Times*, 24th May, 1913). In the *Nelson Mail* of the 22nd January, 1913, the Anglican Bishop of Nelson declared that he would not touch the Bible-in-schools movement if the right of entry were not added. A practically identical view is credited to Bishop Julius (a vice-president of the League) by Mr. C. J. Cooke (of the Schools Defence League) in the *Dominion* of the 8th April, 1914. The Right Rev. the Anglican Primate (Dr. Nevill) is president of the League. The Rev. G. Knowles Smith (late president of the Primitive Methodist Church) states that the Primate, when asked to accept the elimination of the right of entry of the clergy, declared that "the Act would be useless without it; that that was what they wanted, and for which they were endeavouring to secure our sympathy and co-operation" (*Otago Daily Times* report, quoted in *New Zealand Tablet* of the 28th November, 1912).

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

vigorous expression, through their foremost Bible-extracts champion, Rev. Dr. Gibb, at a meeting of the Council of the Churches held in Dunedin, and reported in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 17th February, 1903. For the Bible in schools Dr. Gibb said "he would fight strenuously and to the very end, but he would not fight more earnestly for that than he would against any proposal to introduce the priest into the schools of New Zealand. If ever the time came when an attempt should be made to use the schools of this colony as the English Education Act would use the schools at Home—for the purpose of proselytism for the propagation of the tenets of any sect—he would be found standing in the van of those who would resist that to the uttermost. . . . Bible in schools, he reiterated, was one thing; priests in school was another and a very different thing. They were equally united in their determination to obtain the one and to resist the other with all their power." Dr. Gibb is now vice-president of the League. And he favours in 1914 the "proselytism" and the denominationalizing of the public schools which he declared, in 1903, that he would resist "to the uttermost." These frequent and radical changes of policy, these deep mutual contradictions among League leaders, must seriously hamper the earnest and thoughtful petitioner desirous of knowing for what precisely the League stands at any part of its programme.

10. A word may perhaps be here permitted as regards the Catholic attitude towards the right of entry of the clergy during school hours. Speaking personally I would not object to it, provided that the rights of conscience of parents, teachers, and pupils were properly safeguarded. At present, however, I cannot see how this safeguarding is to be effected in single-roomed schools, which are about two-thirds of the entire number. The Rev. T. J. O'Donnell, of Wynyard, Tasmania, informs me that both the teacher's and the visiting clergy's religious instruction works very unsatisfactorily (as regards Catholics) in the twenty-six one-roomed schools in his parish. I am aware that there is a vast body of opinion against it—as far as my information goes, it is opposed by the greater majority of electors; and if this matter be referred to a plebiscite they should, in fairness, be afforded an opportunity of expressing a separate opinion on this separate issue.

XIII. The Conscience Clause.

1. The ballot-paper in the Bill states that "any parent shall have the right, if he chooses, to withdraw his child from Bible-reading, or from religious instruction, or from both." These mild-looking words give to the average elector but little idea of the cunning tyranny that is masked in this wretched conscience clause. It is nothing less than the notorious conscience clause devised by astute Irish proselytizers for the purpose of "weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery." The history of that odious Irish formula is told in "Mixed Education" (Dublin, 1859, pp. 75–201), and in O'Riordan's "Catholicity and Progress in Ireland" (London, 1905, second edition, pp. 438–452), and in "Liberty of Teaching" (Dublin, 1865), by Isaac Butt, the noted Irish Protestant statesman. People in this Dominion can have but little conception of the bitter sense of rankling wrong which that cunning measure of proselytism of the poor has burned into the memory of the Catholics of Ireland. And it is perhaps the feature that, more than any other, has embittered New South Wales Catholics against the system in operation there, and won for it, among them, this standing designation, "the proselytizing system." The Irish conscience clause was long ago abandoned in Ireland.

2. From the beginning the League has demanded or taken for granted this conscience clause, which when driven out of Ireland found its way, with other "undesirable immigrants," into New South Wales. But when seeking support for their still unpresented petition that League declared (on its petition-card) that it gave the parent "complete control of the child's religious instruction in the public school." (The first part of that "religious instruction" was officially described on the League's petition-card as reading "from Scripture books" under the teachers' supervision.) The conscience clause of the remaining League literature is the Irish clause of the Bill. As will presently be seen, it affords the parent anything but "complete control of the child's religious instruction in the public school." Here, for the second time, the ballot-paper of the Bill removes a restriction favouring religious liberty which the League had put upon itself in order to secure petitioners' votes; the ballot-paper offers the League a power which the League's own petition-card expressly repudiates. Yet Bishop Sprott calls that ballot-paper the League's own. The League has apparently never consulted its petitioners in regard to this radical departure from the conscience clause officially "described" in its petition.

3. The ballot-paper in the Bill secures for Government—not for the parent—"complete" *positive* control of the "religious instruction" and "general religious teaching" imparted by the State teacher (as it is called in Australian laws, departmental regulations, and reports). As in Australia so in the present Bill,—

(*a.*) The Government draws up and completely "controls" the scheme or syllabus of Bible lessons. In this matter the parent is not even consulted.

(*b.*) All children (no matter of what faith or unfaith) are required to attend the Government biblical lessons (or, as they are called in Australian law, "religious instruction" and "general religious teaching") unless specially and individually exempted.

(*c.*) The only relief afforded to objecting parents under the previous Bill and under the "system" prevailing in parts of Australia is purely negative, partial, and "incomplete." The Government merely offers a paltry permission to "withdraw his child." And to secure this contemptible "concession" the wretched parent must go through the humiliating form of setting down (presumably in writing, as in Australia) protests against the State religion. Yet every one knows of this frailty of human beings—how neglectful many parents are in writing; how many (even among educated people) would write a letter, so to speak, only at the point of the bayonet; and how unwilling timid and uneducated people are to submit their poor scrawls and bad spelling to cultured (and presumably critical) men and women of the teaching profession. The intent or effect of the Irish conscience clause of this Bill is to compel the children of all such

presumable objectors to accept the united teaching of the "common" or "fundamental" or "non-sectarian" biblical or "general religious instruction" of the present measure. For Catholics this is contrary to well-known Catholic principles, and it was condemned by the Holy See on the 14th January, 1841, in the course of an official communication to the Bishops of Ireland. Thus under a fair-seeming phrase the electors of this Dominion are asked to empower the Government to compel considerable bodies of children to receive in the State schools forms of biblical and religious instruction which their parents could not in conscience give to them in the home. Against that tricky and odious conscience clause we Catholics would exhaust every form of protest permitted to us by the moral law. It gives legal power to tamper with the consciences of children without either consulting or considering the wishes of the parents—such, for instance, as Catholic and Jewish parents, who, on account of their religious principles, must be presumed to be opposed to such biblical teaching as is proposed under this Bill. I am in a position to prove by overwhelming evidence that the Irish proselytizing conscience clause of this Bill has been used as an instrument of the most odious religious tyranny in the land where it was invented. The great Irish Protestant statesman, Isaac Butt, for instance, shows (from the returns of the Commissioners of National Education) that in the one year, 1862, "at least sixteen thousand children" (Catholic and Protestant) were being indoctrinated under this conscience clause in Ulster alone with religious instruction at known variance with that of their parents ("Liberty of Teaching," Dublin, 1865, pp. 14, 15, 24, and 128). This conscience clause has been well described as a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. According to the League somewhat similar conditions prevail in New South Wales. There is no evidence that in any case the wishes of the parents have been ascertained or considered. On the contrary, the clear presumption is that Catholic parents do not approve of their children there receiving instruction in the State religion, since it is contrary to oft-specified principles and laws of their Church, to which every true and loyal Catholic will be faithful. And no Catholic can knowingly permit his child to receive such instruction unless he has been, in effect, proselytized into practical acceptance of the views, system, creed, or scheme now advocated by the League in this Dominion. The conscience clause of this Bill is, then, a measure to utilize State officials, State schools, and State funds to undermine by an unworthy ruse the faith of various sections of the people in this Dominion.

(*d.*) For sufficiently obvious reasons even written protests against the Government religious instruction are no real protection to dissenters. Protests were no safeguard in Ireland. Pastoral letters of Archbishop Delany, of Hobart—and other published and unpublished correspondence of his which I am prepared to submit to your Committee—declare also that in Tasmania even written protests by parents do not avail to protect the consciences of Catholic children from being tampered with, and that complaints to his priests on this matter are frequent. Tampering with the faith of children is also asserted by Rev. T. J. O'Donnell, of Wynyard, in the same State (Tasmania). But there is no need to seek or to affirm such cases of proselytism or attempted proselytism. The radical objection to the Irish conscience clause in the Bill is this: that it provides a legal opportunity to compel children, *without the consent of their parents*, to receive biblical and "general religious instruction" (as it is styled in Australian law) which their parents could not conscientiously give them in their own homes. No real protection is therefore afforded to dissidents who are compelled, as in this Bill, to receive Government biblical instruction unless specially and individually exempted. There is only one conscience clause that offers some measure of protection to minorities—the conscience clause which admits to State biblical or religious instruction *only* those children whose parents in writing demand it. Why was the League's Irish-Australian conscience clause so grievously misdescribed in the League petition? Why are all the above-mentioned facts concealed both in the League petition and in the ballot-paper of the Bill? I am firmly convinced that very few signatures indeed would have been obtained for the League's petition had these vital matters been candidly and straightforwardly placed before the petitioners. The same remarks applied to the equally strange controversial concealments and economies of truth that mark the ballot-paper in the Bill.

XIV. Controversial Concealments, Contradictions, etc.

The confusion of the ballot-paper in this Bill becomes still worse confounded when we consider some of the controversial concealments, minimizings, and other economies of fact which mark the misleading and partly unintelligible reference proposals of the Bill. Let the following instances suffice:—

1. A distinction is made in the reference or ballot-paper of the Bill for an obvious controversial purpose. In Australian law, and in the League's own official publications, the Government biblical instruction conducted by the teacher is called "religious instruction," "general religious teaching," &c. In the ballot-paper it is referred to as merely the "reading" of "selected Bible lessons." The term "religious instruction" is applied only to the denominationalism taught by visiting clergy during school hours. The obvious purpose of this verbal distinction is to meet a controversial difficulty—to lead the unsuspecting voter to believe that the Government is not being pressed to relieve the League of part of the sacred duty of "religious instruction" which the Almighty has imposed not upon Governments, but upon parents and the Christian ministry. (Deuter., vi, 6–7; Matt. xxviii, 20; II Tim., iv, 2.)

2. In the League's petition-card "reading" from "Scripture books" under the "supervision" of the teacher is set down as the first part or feature of the system of religious instruction in State schools prevailing in Australia which the League wants to introduce in New Zealand. In the League's official publication, "Opinions of Experts," "religious instruction" by teachers is affirmed forty-five times by State officials as forming part and parcel of the "system of religious instruction" demanded by the League. In two or three other League publications this is affirmed some twelve or thirteen times. And yet in another publication of the League ("Notes

on the Australian System," by Rev. A. Don) the "religious instruction" so given is shown to be of a highly sectarian, dogmatic, and theological character. Indeed, one lesson is described by the Rev. A. Don as being given "in the manner of a first-class Bible teacher."

3. All this corresponds with the provisions of the law and the departmental regulations in the various Australian Bible-in-schools States. Thus section 7 of the New South Wales Education Act expressly provides for "general religious teaching" (by the teachers) as part of the school curriculum. The Report of the New South Wales Minister of Public Instruction for 1909 (p. 38) says that the "general religion" imparted by the Government teacher is a "foundation laid for further religious instruction." Western Australia has copied word for word the New South Wales provision for "general religious teaching" by the State teacher. The Queensland Act (1910) declares that its object is to provide "religious instruction" in the public schools, and in section 22A provision is expressly made for such "religious instruction"—the official margin of this section, the regulations, and Schedule XVIII all describe the Government biblical lessons as "religious instruction." The other Australian Bible-in-schools States have legislation and regulations which, in wording or in practical effect, amount to the same thing.

4. All this corresponds with the demands of the last as well as of the present Bible in Schools League. Thus the League of 1904 stated in an official pronouncement it wanted "simple unsectarian lessons" from the Bible, its leaders holding that "the Bible contains great truths which all Christian men now hold in common" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904). In other words, they demanded the really sectarian compromise styled "common Christianity." The Rev. J. Tait declared about the same time that "the Protestant Churches had a right to insist that the State should, for at least half an hour each day, provide religious instruction" (Christchurch *Press*, 2nd May, 1904). A precisely similar contention was put forward last year by Bishop Averill, then and now a member of the League executive. He said, "It is the duty of the State to include in its system of education provision for the training of the spiritual faculties, the emotions, the conscience, and the will, just as much as the mental," and one of his "reasons for seeking a change in our present education system" is this: "Because the majority are dissatisfied with the omission of Bible-reading and religious teaching from the school curriculum" (*Hawke's Bay Herald*, 19th June, 1913). See also the League's religious dogmas mentioned under Section XI of this evidence. The Right Rev. the Anglican Primate (Dr. Nevill) is now president of the League. In a verbatim report supplied to the *Otago Daily Times* of the 5th August, 1905, His Lordship said, "The terms 'Bible in schools' and 'religious instruction' must be used interchangeably, because the Bible was the sower of religion." A great mass of League and other testimony similar to that quoted above is ready for production on demand. Some of it is given in No. 5 of the Catholic Federation publications (pages 10 to 17), copies of which are herewith handed to your Committee. Judging by the demands of the League at the back of this Bill, the type of Scripture extracts contemplated would be such as is in use in some or other of the Bible-extracts States of Australia. A perusal of those in use there reveals the following: They are taken mainly or altogether from the Protestant Authorized Version. They are selected with a view to excluding all matters on which a group of Reformed denominations are not agreed. They contain a quantity of (mutilated) religious facts, religious doctrines, religious moral precepts, the Lord's Prayer, and other devotions in sectarian form, and they exclude the great mass of texts and incidents to which Catholics appeal in support of the doctrines and practices of their faith. The manuals contain paraphrases, reformed sermon-headings, &c., and are generally made as sectarian as they well can be.

A Change of Mind.

5. Under pressure of controversy two prominent League leaders wrongly denied that the League had adopted the Irish conscience clause or any particular form of conscience. So likewise, under stress of discussion, sundry League leaders denied that under their chosen "Australian" system, also embodied in the Bill, the Government sets up as a purveyor and teacher of "religious instruction" and "general religious teaching." Indeed, some of the leaders went so far as to declare, under the favoured "Australian" system, the Government biblical lessons are given merely as "literature" or as purely secular "morals" or "ethics" quite "devoid of religious significance," and without "application to any other world than the present one." The words last quoted are from a letter written by a "member of the League executive" in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 8th September, 1913.

6. Here again we find the League doing what follows: (*a*) Contradicting the plain facts of the "system of religious instruction in State schools prevailing in Australia," and demanded by the League; (*b*) contradicting the plain words of its own petition-card; (*c*) contradicting its other publications and the declaration of its own trusted leaders. Here again, for the fourth time, we find the League departing in a radical manner from the prayer of its petition, and apparently, as before, without consulting its petitioners. How in reason could any body of petitioners be other than hopelessly confused by these endless self-contradictions? How in reason could they know precisely what they were petitioning for, while not even the League executive knew it from day to day? The schedule to the Bill represents another verbal change, for an obvious controversial purpose. But surely, in a ballot-paper for popular use, there should be no misstatements; there should be no ambiguous expressions such as "sectarian," &c.; there should be no concealments of vital facts; plain words should be used in their plain workaday sense, and not altered in meaning so as to confuse electors or to suit the self-contradictions and lightning changes of any League or section of the community. As the ballot-paper stands it is a riddle which no man can read.

XV. The Cost.

Both the League petition and the present "referendum" Bill conceal one highly practical matter from the electors.

1. Biblical extracts, "religious instruction," and "general religious teaching" are to be provided by the Government to suit only one privileged class. These lessons are, admittedly, to be of such a kind that many people would object to them on grounds of religious conscience. Hence the conscience clause—*for children.*

2. Only one class of people can benefit by the Government biblical instruction: all must pay for the State compiling, State printing, State binding, State storage, State distribution, and State teaching of it. There is no conscience clause for objecting taxpayers. They must pay for teaching which they conscientiously reject, and from which they can derive no advantage. Herein the ballot-paper penalizes conscientious religious belief. It gives to one set of religious beliefs educational and financial privileges which it denies to all other religious beliefs.

3. The cost of the League's scheme has been estimated at from £100,000 to £120,000 a year. No opinion is here expressed as to the accuracy or otherwise of these estimates. The scheme does not necessarily involve additional taxation; it does necessarily mean at least a new application of existing taxation. The principle involved is not affected, whether the cost be £1,000 a year, or £20,000, or £120,000 a year. The Boston tea-tax was a small thing, but it led to the American Revolution. Had this unjust and unequal treatment of religious beliefs been frankly laid before the League petitioners it may be taken for granted that great numbers of them would never have signed the card; but, from beginning to end, they were misled by the great volume of cry from the League executive: "Same footing" for all! "Equal privileges" for all! "Equal opportunities" (Canon Garland's cry) "to all and special privileges to none" (Christchurch *Press*, 9th June and 25th August, 1913; *Otago Daily Times*, 14th June, 1913; *Hawke's Bay Herald*, 19th June, 1913; and numerous other papers and passages that can be quoted on demand). Such are some of the misrepresentations by which signatures were obtained for the League's petition.

XVI. Trusting the Teachers.

1. One of the most odious provisions of the Penal Code was this: that no one was permitted to exercise the office of teacher unless he professed the State religion. The scheme of the League and of its own and "only" ballot-paper is a proposed application to New Zealand of the principle underlying that old repressive legislation. The proposed new legislation would prevent any one in New Zealand holding a State teachership except, in effect, on religious tests devised by the League. In a word it is, in effect, a proposal to farm out the consciences of the State teachers to the League.

2. Till the present agitation all previous New Zealand schemes that I know of protected, in some measure, the consciences of objecting teachers. As late as 1904 the Bible in Schools League of that time said, in the course of a public manifesto, "A great deal is made of the teachers' difficulty. We have done our best to safeguard them in every way. A conscience clause means that we are unanimously and determinedly opposed to anything in the nature of religious tests being applied to them" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904). This declaration was signed by, among others, Rev. Dr. Gibb and Rev. (now Bishop) T. H. Sprott. The former is a vice-president of the present League; the latter a member of the League executive. And both are now "unanimously and determinedly opposed" to "safeguarding" the consciences of objecting teachers.

3. Now, apparently for the first time in New Zealand, the League and the League's Bill refuse honourably objecting teachers even the poor protection of a conscience clause. Nay, intimation has been plainly given that even a conscience clause will not be allowed to safeguard teachers. Here, for instance, is a statement made in a published letter by Mr. Braithwaite, an Otago League official: "To injure the League, he (Bishop Cleary) advocated a teachers' conscience clause; but, if it existed, no teacher would make use of it to bring himself into disrepute with parents and School Committees. And a teacher would stand a poor chance of being appointed if he were known to be against Scripture teaching, so that a teachers' conscience clause would not protect him nor do away with 'hypocrisy'" (*Otago Daily Times*, 20th May, 1913). Evidently the only protection for the teacher is to place him by law entirely outside the teaching of the proposed Scripture extracts.

4. The League—and the ballot-paper in the Bill—refuse to the teacher even the legal recognition that he has a conscience, and that his conscience may object. In fact, both the League and the Bill unite in not even supposing that the teacher or the taxpayer has a conscience. Yet for nearly two years past—and in our present petition—we have made it clear that Catholic teachers object, as a matter of religious conscience, to conducting the proposed biblical lessons. The grounds of their objection are set forth in No. 3 of the Catholic Federation publications, pages 4 to 7, copies of which are herewith laid before your Committee. These objections are doctrinal, doctrinal-moral, and disciplinary—that is, arising out of Church law and discipline. Catholics, for instance, may not use Bibles or biblical lessons unless these have the approval of the proper authority in their Church; they may not explain or interpret them otherwise than in accordance with Catholic principles; they may not join in—much less conduct—any scheme of "general religious instruction," or the League's "common" or "reduced" or "skeleton" Christianity; and by a decree of the Council of Trent the religious instruction of Catholic children must be carried out exclusively under the authority and supervision of the Catholic Church and not under that of any Government or of teachers of all faiths or of none. This decree is substantially violated by the League's conscience clause for children in the Bill. Under the conscience clause the Government compels all Catholic children not specially exempted to receive the Government's

"common" or "general religious instruction." This is a violation of the Catholic principle (based upon the Scriptures) that the Church—not the Government—shall direct and supervise the biblical and religious instruction of Catholic children.

Oppressing Teachers.

5. The doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church hereon are quite clear. Equally clear is the duty of the Government to protect those sacred rights of conscience of teachers and in the words of the League of 1904 to oppose "anything in the nature of religious tests being applied to them" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904). This declaration is signed by, among others, the Rev. Dr. Gibb (a vice-president of the League) and the Rev. (now Bishop) Sprott (a member of the League executive), both among the promoters of the present Bill. They are now "unanimously and determinedly in favour of a real form of religious tests for teachers," and equivalent tests are provided in the ballot-paper supplied by the League to the present Bill. Moreover, numerous members of that League affirm in direct, or equivalent, or implied terms that conscientiously objecting teachers persisting in their objection will be driven out of the Public Service, forced to resign, be considered unfit for the position, &c. See, for instance, the "New Zealand Journal of Education," November, 1912, p. 225; the *Lyttelton Times* of the 1st and 2nd January, 1913; *Otago Daily Times* of the 20th May, 1913; Dean Fitchett (a member of the League executive) in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 14th June, 1913; Rev. W. F. R. Fitchett in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 4th July, 1913; Rev. A. Millar (League publication secretary) in the *Waikato Times* of the 30th April, 1913; Canon Richards in the *Bay of Plenty Times* of the 27th June, 1913; the *Nation* (Orange Lodge organ) of the 10th February, 1913; and, among others, Rev. Dr. Gibb (a vice-president of the League) at Wanganui (*Wanganui Chronicle*, 1st August, 1913) and at Invercargill (*Southland Times*, 25th June, 1914). The ballot-paper supplied by the League to the present Bill provides, in effect, that the objecting teacher must either conform to the State religion or be driven out of the Public Service. The alternatives which the League and the Bill place before him are three—(*a*) Conformity with the State-edited State-Bible scheme or State religion; (*b*) acting a part or playing the hypocrite before the pupils; or (*c*) dismissal, as surely as if he were a convicted malefactor. Men with families will be sorely tempted to sell their souls for bread-and-butter. This is, in effect, the plea of a Board teacher similarly placed, as stated in the *Democrat* of the 23rd February, 1901: "But one must make a living somehow, so I personally comply with the terms of my agreement, and let conscience go hang." The Bill, in effect, farms out teachers' consciences to the League; it allows no one to occupy a teachership except on religious tests devised by the League; it puts a premium upon hypocrisy; it penalizes fidelity to conscience; it uses public funds, in effect, to bribe people into disloyalty to their faith; and it deprives a large and honourable body of men and women of rights of conscience which are accorded as a matter of course to the worst criminals in our prisons.

6. This serious oppression of conscience is concealed or glossed over in the League's ballot-paper in the Bill. It is concealed in the League's petition. It is seriously misrepresented in the League's declaration: "Trust the teachers"; "equal rights": "equal footing"; "equal opportunities to all and special privileges to none."

7. Had the League, in agitating for this Bill, frankly told the public how it proposed to oppress and persecute religious conviction in the teaching profession, it may be reasonably deemed very doubtful that it would have secured the signatures of any but a handful of violent extremists. It is due to Parliament and the public that these penal provisions against conscientious religious conviction—these State financial inducements to disloyalty to Church connection—should be frankly stated in the present Bill.

XVII. Majority Rule of Conscience.

1. The Bill now before Parliament interferes in the following purely personal matters of the purely personal conscience: "What views shall I hold regarding the Bible and 'religious instruction'? What views thereon shall I contribute to? What views thereon shall I teach?" Moreover, the Bill proposes to fling these personal matters of personal religious liberty and personal religious conscience into the area of political strife, to be decided by electoral majorities amidst the varied passions of an electoral contest.

2. No Parliament, League, or majority has the moral right to interfere between the private conscience and God, Who (in the words of the Presbyterian Confession of Faith) is "sole Lord of the conscience." In democracies such as ours the people are free to designate the persons who are to exercise the civil power, but on biblical and Christian principles the power or authority itself is "of God" and "ordained of God" (Rom. xiii, 1-5). His moral law binds Parliaments as well as individuals, majorities as well as minorities, to the eternal principles of justice and to that righteousness which "exalteth a nation" (Prov. xiv, 34, R.V.).

3. The measure now before Parliament is *ultra vires*—it oversteps the proper limits of the civil authority. It might, if placed upon the statute-book, create a "legal right" for an electoral majority to coerce the consciences of electoral minorities; it could never create a "moral" right or a right in justice to do so. Legal rights are only a fraction of human rights. The civil law rules only that part of us which comes to the surface in civil and social life. It has no right of interference or control, for instance, in the numerous things which concern the individual alone, and his personal relations with religious conscience, and with the Divine Law-giver at the back of religious conscience. The civil law is a social code. It is not a personal code to regulate or coerce the personal religious conscience.

Natural and Other Rights.

4. Legal rights may, at times, be moral wrongs; but, besides legal rights, there are also natural rights. These are so called because they belong to the nature of things. They existed before organized human society, before Parliaments, before electoral rolls. Such, for instance, are your natural rights to live and breathe (where not forfeited by crime), your natural rights to fair wages for fair work, to enjoy the proper fruit of your labour, and so on. But you have also the following, among other, natural rights: The right to obey the moral law; the right to practise and teach to your children the religion which you believe to be the true one; the right to freedom from compulsion to take part in biblical or religious teaching or religious worship which you believe to be erroneous; and, generally, you have a natural right to freedom from being coerced into doing anything which your conscience, even if in inculpable error, tells you is not morally allowable.

5. These rights arise out of the natural law. They receive their perfection from God's revealed law. Thus, for instance, St. Paul makes it clear that it is morally wrong to do (or to lure, bribe, or force others to do) that which conscience forbids (Rom. xiv, 14, 22). In connection with this text the Anglican Archbishop Whately (in his "Lessons on Morals") and the great Anglican Thomas Arnold (in his "Christian Life") declared that it is "sinful" and degrading to conscience for a teacher to teach against his conscience, or to teach what he does not believe, and that it is doubly sinful to tempt him to do so. Catholic principles and Catholic disciplinary laws, already specified, forbid Catholic teachers to conduct such a scheme of State biblical and "general religious instruction" as is proposed by the League and in the Bill now before the House. For like reasons Catholics cannot, in conscience, bear any part whatsoever of the cost of preparing that scheme or putting it into operation. In these matters we stand on the inviolable rights of the personal religious conscience forbidding us to do that which that religious conscience declares to us to be not morally allowable.

6. This inviolability of the personal religious conscience was strongly affirmed by the Bible in Schools League, 1904. They said, "We have concluded that the majority must rule when the common good is in question, provided always that the majority does not coerce the minority to violate its conscience, for it can never be for the common good that conscience should be violated" (*Otago Daily Times*, 25th May, 1904). This declaration was signed by, among others, the Rev. Dr. Gibb and the present Bishop of Wellington. It is a universally accepted Christian moral principle. It is a doctrine of true statesmanship. Parliaments or electoral majorities may violate these sacred religious liberties and rights of conscience. They have the *physical power:* they have not the *moral right.* Parliament is the guardian and trustee of these God-given rights of religion and conscience. It is its solemn duty to protect objecting Protestant and other taxpayers, teachers, and parents from the bitter wrongs which the League and the present Bill would inflict upon them. This is, in effect, a measure to put up our religious rights and liberties for sale by auction to the highest bidder of votes.

Minorities must suffer.

7. The present Bill is an acceptance of the exploded theory that "minorities must suffer"—nay, that they must suffer in those intimate personal relations between the individual and the Creator which are outside the domain of Parliaments or electoral majorities. It is more than significant that this old and tyrannous theory has found, time and again, a voice among the responsible officials of the Bible in the State Schools League. It was, for instance, stated, in practically the terms quoted above, by the Rev. Mr. Clarkson, an official League lecturer (*Poverty Bay Herald*, 5th June, 1913). It was set forth, in other terms, by the League's organizer (Canon Garland) when he called upon the Government to introduce a Referendum Bill, and thereby adopt certain "theological views" of one section of the people and reject certain "theological views" of another (and minority) section of the people (*Dominion*, 27th May, 1914). The principle of the oppression of minorities was expressed in bitter speech by another League official, Rev. Gray Dixon, when he declared in a published letter that this is an "anti-Romish State" (*Otago Daily Times*, 20th May, 1913), and that religious minorities should "not expect more than toleration" for their opinions (*Otago Daily Times*, 28th November, 1913). And yet, again, Dean Fitchett (a member of the League executive) declared that he "did not see what a Roman Catholic Bishop had to say in the matter" of the League scheme, which he misdescribed as being merely a scheme to "educate their children in their own way" (*Otago Daily Times*, 14th June, 1913). The present Referendum Bill is but another form of expression of the general League idea that minorities must suffer, even in their intimate personal consciences.

8. That, however, is the old, discarded cry of a discredited utilitarianism. Democracy raises the opposite cry: "Minorities must be safeguarded." Lord Acton is the historian of political democracy. In a lecture "On the Study of History," at Cambridge University in June, 1895, he declared that the "crown" of liberty was this: "The security of the weaker groups, and the liberty of conscience which, effectually secured, secures the rest." Mr. Sidney Webb is the historian of industrial democracy. He declares that the most important business of the twentieth century is "to provide not only for minorities, but for even quite small minorities." The Hon. Mr. Allen reminded the New Zealand Parliament on the 29th August, 1894, that "a large proportion of the multitude will be irresponsible" in the case of a referendum; that a reference to them would result in "tyranny and despotism" (*Hansard*, Vol. 85, p. 281). And if in purely secular politics such "tyranny and despotism" might take place, how much more if vexed questions of conscience were submitted to electors inflamed, in all probability, by appeals to the worst forms of sectarian rancour! We have already had ample premonition of this in the following constant and lamentable features of the League campaign; its vehement

denunciations of honourable and God-loving men and women who have dared to differ with it; its persistent misrepresentation of the beliefs, aims, words, and acts of opponents; its bitter and unwarranted personal attacks; and its never-ending appeal to those deplorable feelings of sectarian animosity which have made New South Wales a warning example to the whole of Australasia. These are strong statements. I am prepared to prove them in detail, and I invite thereon the freest cross-examination by those who are most interested in testing the truth or otherwise of my assertions.

A Conference.

9. Catholics, as is well known, can never in conscience accept the secular system as satisfactory for themselves. But we recognize the fact that large bodies of our Christian and other fellow-citizens can and do, in conscience, accept the system, relying upon the home and the Church for the religious training of their children, and we furthermore recognize that, in any proposed change, their conscientious convictions should receive fair and proper consideration. Unlike the League, we do not aim at the utter destruction of the secular phase of our system of public instruction. We aim at making that system truly national—truly suited to the conscientious as well as the intellectual requirements of all the people of the nation—secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious. We will resist to the utmost any and every attempt to force one cast-iron system of biblical or religious instruction upon the purses and the consciences of people so profoundly divided in religious belief as is the population of New Zealand.

10. Over and over again, in the Press and upon the platform, I have intimated the willingness of the Catholic leaders to meet all other interested parties in conference upon this subject, with only one proviso, the recognition of the proper equal rights of all before the law. Moreover, over and over again we have publicly declared that we are prepared to give fair and friendly consideration to any proposal whatsoever for religion in the school, so long as this principle of proper equality and rights before the law is conceded. There can be no real settlement of this question unless it is broad-based upon justice. And when God's Word comes into the schools it should come in God's good way of truth, and justice, and honour, and not by the path of bitter wrong traced out in the measure now before your honourable House.

XVIII. "Success" in New South Wales.

1. Roseate tales are told regarding the alleged "success" of this scheme in parts of Australia. This "success" is asserted more particularly of New South Wales, where the "system has existed" (says the League's petition-card) "since 1866." The story of "success" is built up in the manner favoured in the League's petition-card, and in its partial reflex the ballot-paper of the present so-called "referendum"—namely, by direct misstatement and by the suppression or concealment of even the most notorious evidence that tells in a contrary sense.

2. The "success" in New South Wales is asserted as the "success" of what the League in its petition-card describes as the "system of religious instruction in State schools prevailing" in that State. This means that the alleged "success" is from the viewpoint of religious principles and religious practice. Such "success" necessarily implies two things—(*a*) Negatively, there should be in it no departure from or violation of religious principles or practice; and (*b*) positively, that it has promoted religious faith and practice, above all, among the youth brought under the care of the education system in question. The burden of proof of all this falls naturally upon the shoulders of those who allege this "success" as a reason for extending that system to the Dominion of New Zealand. That proof has not been undertaken; it has not even been seriously attempted.

3. On the contrary, the League's failure to furnish such evidence of "success" is in itself a significant though negative confession of failure. Nay, in a positive way high-placed League officials have furnished us with evidence that in certain vital respects the system has been inimical to the common good in the oldest Bible-in-schools State.

4. Thus the Bible in Schools League of 1904 declared that the majority in any State has no moral right to "coerce the minority to violate its conscience, for," the League added, "it can never be for the common good that conscience should be violated." This sound principle of natural and Christian morality was signed by, among others, the Rev. Dr. Gibb (a vice-president of the present League) and by Bishop Sprott (a member of the League executive). Now, in its methods of violating conscience the "system of religious instruction in State schools prevailing" in New South Wales is the very same as that advocated by the League and embodied in the Bill now before Parliament. The New South Wales system violates the consciences of large bodies of objecting taxpayers; it in effect bribes numbers of teachers to do that which loyalty to conscience does not permit; it violates parental rights by the operation of the odious and tricky Irish proselytizing conscience clause; it violates the Crown rights of the Almighty Himself by enabling a certain number of parents and clergy to abdicate in part one of the most sacred duties of parents and the Christian ministry, and to force it upon the shoulders of State officials. There is no need to point out once more the gravity of these various forms of sin against conscience and of violation of God-given rights which are chargeable to the New South Wales system. They have been sufficiently dealt with in the previous parts of this evidence. Here in these violations of conscience we find the deadly permanent sin of the New South Wales system. The cause of religion can never be served by defiance of religious and religious-moral principles. In this fundamental respect the New South Wales system must be adjudged a radical failure.

"Opinions of Experts."

5. A certain amount of "evidence" has, however, been tendered by the League, purporting to assert the "success" of the system of State "religious instruction" prevailing in New South Wales and certain other parts of Australia. A study of this "evidence" soon reveals what a mockery, what a ludicrous delusion it is, as "proof" of the "success" of the system referred to.

6. The "evidence" in question appears in an official League publication entitled "Opinions of Experts." In it are expressed ninety-eight opinions. An ex-Governor of New South Wales is responsible for one, Ministers of Education and Inspectors (past or present) for eighteen, and school-teachers seventy-nine, of whom sixty come from New South Wales, the balance from Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia. The pamphlet opens with a letter from Mr. P. Board (now Director of Education, New South Wales). It is dated the 11th October, 1906, and appears as a reply to some unnamed "Right Rev. Sir," but the bulk of it has been lifted bodily from page 149 of an "Interim Report of the Commission of Primary Education, New South Wales," under date 1903. A lamentable feature of that official letter is the amazing manner in which the Commissioners' report has been garbled in the interests of the "system." Take, for instance, that part of Mr. Board's letter where he quotes from the report of one of their most experienced Inspectors. This Inspector wrote of the "benefits" derived from the New South Wales system in cases where the teachers dwell "with judicious force and impressiveness" upon "points of religion and morals." The evident implication was that no "benefits" accrued where this was not done by the teacher. The Inspector adds, "I believe that in about 50 per cent. of our schools these lessons have been so treated." Mr. Board suppresses this, and with it the implied official statement that, from the viewpoint of religion, the system of State "religious instruction" in New South Wales is not a "success," but a 50-per-cent. failure.

7. The reports quoted in the League's "Opinions of Experts" date from 1891 to 1912, and there are eight which bear no date. The majority—sixty-five—are dated 1908. Thirteen date from 1891 to 1907. There are sixty-five replies from teachers in New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, and Western Australia. The total number of State teachers in these States is 10,572 (Official Year-book for 1913). Thus only six teachers in every thousand in those States advanced any opinion upon the school systems there. The question was put as to whether the clergy visits to the schools caused friction. Out of the sixty-five teachers forty-three said "No"; the remainder (perhaps discreetly) did not reply. Only six to eight of the sixty-five asserted that the clergy visits were attended with good results; the remainder are (also perhaps discreetly) silent hereon. Six to eight teachers out of 10,572! And twelve teachers acknowledge their practice of giving religious instruction to children of various faiths (among whom Catholics are sometimes included) in the same class. Two circumstances tended, especially in New South Wales, to render frank expression of opinion by the teachers somewhat difficult: (*a*) The prohibition of criticism of the education system and its administration; and (*b*) the fact that the then Under-Secretary of Education in New South Wales, the Senior Inspector, and other high-placed officials were strong religionists of one particular faith, and ardent supporters of the New South Wales system of "religious instruction in State schools." Latest reports from Sydney indicate that there is only one Catholic Inspector in the whole of New South Wales. The collectively vast private-education systems there are intense evidence of dissatisfaction with the State system. According to the New South Wales Year-book for 1908 (p. 81 and following) one-third of the children in the cities attend private schools, one-fourth in the country towns, and only one-fourteenth in the rural districts, proving that it is only by its vast resources that the State system is able to retain its children. The intense dissatisfaction of Catholics with the State system in New South Wales is eloquently testified by the following facts: During the period 1883–1913, inclusive, their enrolment in the State schools increased by only 8,173; in the same period their enrolment in Catholic schools increased by 38,953 (from 11,556 to 50,509).

8. One of the outstanding features of the New South Wales system is the marked neglect of the legal opportunities offered to the clergy to visit the schools for "special religious instruction." This evidence of widespread unwillingness of the clergy to make sacrifices for the children is referred to with dismal regularity in the annual Year-Books, and in the departmental reports and in the Press. Statistically the clergy utilize, collectively, about one-tenth of their possible opportunities. They have been rated by Mr. Carmichael, Minister of Public Instruction (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th May, 1913); by Mr. Perry, Minister of Public Instruction; by a circular in which the Education Department found it necessary to remind the clergy that they had the right of entry. In their third annual report, and again in their thirty-first (1910), the Committee on Special Religious Instruction in Public Schools, in connection with the Anglican Diocese of Sydney, said, "The Committee are reluctantly compelled to avow their conviction that, unless a more lively and persistent interest in this work shall be shown by members of Synod in recess as well as in session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps even be finally abandoned." The thirty-first report adds: "More than ever is now required from the Churches, for less is being done by the State. 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" (Fifteenth Synod of the Diocese of Sydney, second session, 1910, p. 95). Much more evidence to the same general effect might easily be quoted. But the experience of New South Wales and of New Zealand demonstrate this: that the great bulk of the League clergy will refuse to undertake the work of the religious instruction in the schools under any system, whether it be the religious system prevailing in Australia or the secular system prevailing in New Zealand, and that system must indeed be, from the religious point of view, a rank failure when it will not move even great bodies of ministers of religion to make greater sacrifices for the cause of the little ones for whom Christ the Saviour shed His blood.

More "Success."

9. There is, unhappily, abundant evidence of another kind having reference to the alleged "success" of the New South Wales system which in substance is embodied in the "referendum" Bill. We have there the same dire clamour of League-denomination voices as here lamenting the widespread decay of vital religion among the people trained in the oldest League-type schools. Let a few brief samples of the available evidence hereon suffice for the present: (*a.*) A New South Wales Presbyterian clergyman (Rev. David J. Albert) declares in a letter to the *Outlook* (Dunedin) of the 28th October, 1913, that in New South Wales the Bible "has been cast out of the modern home." (*b.*) The *Auckland Star* of the 1st November, 1913, reports in part as follows a sermon by Canon Bathurst in the Anglican Cathedral, Bathurst, New South Wales: "He" (Canon Bathurst) "added that, after making the fullest possible allowance, the fact remained that the bulk of their people, who could with perfect ease or a little self-sacrifice get to church, simply did not do so. They had no time for religion. The census showed that an average of only two-thirds of a person in every Anglican household attended church. It was his deep-rooted conviction that the seat of the cancer which was to-day eating the root of all Christian zeal and effort was to be found in the homes of the people, in their so-called Christian life."

10. The *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 6th May, 1914, reports a deputation to the New South Wales Minister of Public Instruction, Mr. Carmichael. The deputation was introduced by Archdeacon Irvine (Anglican). According to the *Morning Herald* report he said that, "as citizens of New South Wales, the members of the committee saw the danger of the country becoming to a large extent materialistic. A headmaster of a certain school had told him that he had frequently received letters from parents telling him they did not desire that their boys should be taught anything that would not pay, and that subjects that would do nothing more than mould the boys' characters did not matter at all." The following further "proof" of the "success" of the New South Wales system is taken from a sermon recently preached in the Anglican Cathedral, Sydney, by the Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A. (Rector of Dulwich and Warden of Trinity Grammar School), quoted in the *Catholic Press* of the 23rd July, 1914: "The teachers," he said, "are neglecting to impart Scripture knowledge, or allowing it to be crowded out altogether." He quotes "the testimony of a first-class teacher of twenty years standing, who declares that the system in actual practice is worked in such a way that it means the lowering of national ideals, the serious diminution of Church membership in the future, with a consequent slackening of moral fibre in the whole community." "Already," says the Rev. G. Chambers, "we are beginning to notice the effect of the past thirty-four years under the present system of State education. The sanctions of religion are losing their hold over the people generally. Agnosticism and practical atheism are increasing, and men and women are becoming more and more indifferent to claims of Christ and the Church. Our boys are drifting from the Church. . . . An enormous reduction of Church members threaten us in the future by our present system of State education, with its inadequate facilities for religious instruction and its tendency to blot out religion altogether. The Church is face to face with the prospect of being a very small body in the future by its apathy in the matter of education, and by its failure to perceive that the future life of the Church depends on the children being efficiently taught the principles of the Christian faith." Is this any wonder after nearly fifty years of persistent "mutilating," "emasculating," and "caricaturing" of the Word of God—after nearly fifty years' training of youth under legislation which has been teaching them that religion and conscience are mere straws to be blown about by the gusty winds of election day?

11. These are mere samples of the testimony which, on demand, I am prepared to lay before your Committee as to the failure of the State religion in New South Wales. I offer just one consideration more. For over a quarter of a century I have interested myself in the manifestation of a curious phase of human folly—namely, that of organized political and politico-religious fanaticism. During nearly all that period I have perused the journals devoted to those strange movements in various parts of Australasia. For size, output, and unredeemed ferocity those of New South Wales easily take the palm in these southern lands. I do not assert that the education system there has either created or intensified this lamentable condition of things, but I want to know what it has done to mitigate it. And in every case we, who have hitherto been so happily free from the venom of sectarian rancour in our social and political life, would do well to take warning from New South Wales. We would likewise take warning from the deplorable efforts made during the past two years to foment sectarian distrust among fellow-citizens here. Above all, Parliament should give short shrift to a measure which would rend the population of this Dominion into opposing interests along lines of cleavage in religious belief. That way lies ruin. I speak now as a citizen that loves his adopted land as he loves that which gave him birth.

TUESDAY, 4TH AUGUST, 1914.

Right Rev. Bishop CLEARY examined. (No. 2.)

1. *Canon Garland.*] Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if the Bishop would be good enough to state the outlines of the method by which Roman Catholics would joyfully aid their Protestant fellow-citizens to secure biblical and religious instruction for their children in the public schools?—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that I have already indicated the lines on which we would be prepared to meet other parties interested in conference on this matter of the introduction of religious instruction into the State schools. Over and over again I have, as I said in my evidence, in the Press and upon the platform intimated the willingness of the Catholic leaders to meet all other interested parties in conference upon this subject, with only one proviso, the

recognition of the proper equal rights of all before the law. If the Bible in Schools League or other interested parties are willing to sit round a table with us and accept or recognize that principle of the equal rights of conscience of all we will gladly and joyfully meet them. And I believe, moreover, that if this principle is recognized—this democratic principle—that we could settle this question within forty-eight hours. I have one further answer to make in connection with this, which was given by me in Dunedin in May, 1913. In reply to a question put to me by a member of the Bible in Schools League as to whether the Roman Catholics had any scheme of their own I replied, "Any one undertaking such a scheme should first of all bear in mind that there were some fifty registered denominations in New Zealand. His first step would be to get representatives of these denominations around a table and thresh the matter out. This the League had failed or refused to do. The result was akin to that achieved by the tailors of Laputa. Instead of measuring a man for a suit in the customary way by actual contact, they did so at long range, taking his altitude and 'latitude' with a theodolite. The result was a hideous misfit. So was the scheme devised at long range by the League. It was a hopeless misfit, and was rejected by over forty religious denominations in the Dominion. There were four Catholic Bishops in New Zealand. They knew what kind of religious teaching suited the children of their own flocks. But they had the saving sense of humour. That was why it had never entered their heads, even in dreams, to play the part of the tailors of Laputa, to set up their theodolites and at long range to try to fit the forty or fifty Protestant denominations of New Zealand with a school religion. He believed that the denominations concerned should be allowed as free a hand as possible in this matter consistently with regard for those sacred rights and principles which others could never surrender. What these rights were he had already sufficiently explained. The League, when defeated, would probably do at last what they ought to have done at first—considered and consulted others; and when they eliminated from their proposals those which violated conscience and the moral law, then they would find all friends of religious education at their side, and a system would be evolved which would leave the schools secular for those who desired them secular, and religious on fair conditions for the rest."

2. I am afraid I have not grasped from the Bishop yet the outlines of the method by which Roman Catholics would joyfully aid their Protestant fellow-citizens in this matter. May I press the question. I do not want the reply which the Bishop gave about a conference. I did not ask about a conference. I asked the Bishop to state the outlines of the method by which Roman Catholics would joyfully aid their Protestant fellow-citizens to secure biblical and religious instruction for their children in the public schools. I submit that I have not received an answer to that question?—Mr. Chairman, I should like that the questioner, instead of putting the question in the same way as before, would precisely point out where my answer has failed to meet his question. If it has on any point failed to meet the question then I will be perfectly frank and meet it, but I do not know wherein my answer has failed. Let him indicate the precise point of failure. Does he want me to detail a scheme at the present time for the religious instruction of Catholic children, Mr. Chairman, or does he want me to evolve a scheme for the religious instruction of Protestant children? If for Catholic children, then I say it is a matter in which we Catholic Bishops are best entitled to formulate a scheme. If for Protestant children, my answer is already given. We will not have anything to do with drawing up any scheme and forcing it on Protestant children. We will say to those who are directly interested in providing education for Protestant children, "We give you the freest hand in our power. Bring in the New South Wales lessons if you like, or the Queensland lessons; bring in the scheme in force in Western Australia, or bring in any scheme that to you seems good; and so long as you respect the rights of conscience of others in the imparting of that scheme we will give it our sanction and approval, and will wish you God speed in carrying it out."

3. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Bishop has given a little fuller answer to my question. I gather from him—and I want His Lordship to correct me if I am wrong—that if we brought in a scheme by which the lessons to be agreed upon were for the use of non-Roman-Catholic children, then we should have the support of the Roman Catholic Church in that effort, provided, of course, the consciences of others were duly respected?—That is so.

4. Then you have answered my question. The next question I desire to ask is this: Is the Roman Catholic Church definitely opposed to the League's proposal for religious instruction in State schools?—The Roman Catholic Church is definitely opposed to the League's scheme of religious instruction in State schools.

5. Is the Roman Catholic Church irrevocably opposed to permitting the people of New Zealand to express their will by a direct vote at the ballot-box on that proposal or on any other dealing with the subject of religious instruction in State schools?—My answer to both those questions has already been given in my evidence in chief. We are irrevocably opposed to those debated questions of religion and conscience being decided by a plebiscite. The grounds of that objection have been stated sufficiently fully in the evidence to which I have referred. If Canon Garland wishes to enter any further into the grounds of that objection he is free to do so, and I will give him my answer. If he wishes me to extend the answers I have already given on this matter I shall be pleased to do so.

6. Is the Roman Catholic Church determined on continuing its policy of seeking State aid for its schools irrespective of whether there is religious instruction or no religious instruction added to the present system?—I might mention, Mr. Chairman, that this question has been answered by me a multitude of times on the public platform and through the public Press. If you will allow me I will read you one of my typical answers to this identical question. One of my answers was given in the Presbyterian *Outlook* of the 25th February, 1913, when I wrote as follows: "No amount of subsidy to Catholic schools would reconcile me to several important planks in the League's platform. I will mention only three of these: (*a.*) Subsidy or no subsidy,

I would protest even with my dying breath against the wrong which the League proposes to inflict upon the vast body of conscientiously objecting teachers requiring Catholics among them to violate specific and oft-specified principles and laws of their Church, and facing all such objectors with the following alternatives: Proselytism to League views, hypocrisy, or dismissal. (*b.*) No possible subsidy to Catholic schools would ever reconcile me to the League's conscience clause, which was devised in Ireland for the purpose of 'weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery.' . . . (*c.*) No possible subsidy to Catholic schools would reconcile me to the principle of deciding vexed questions of religion and conscience by a count of voters' heads." Well-meaning people of other faiths have frequently suggested that, as a matter of policy, Catholics should support the League, thus enormously strengthening our claim to a subsidy for the secular results achieved in our schools. To all such I have invariably replied, both publicly and in private, "What we Catholics gain herein we will not gain by subterfuge; what we lose we will not lose by an ignoble silence where sacred rights and principles are involved." The opinions expressed above are not mine alone—they are the view of the Catholic episcopate, clergy, and laity of New Zealand. Archdeacon Willis said lately in the *New Zealand Herald* that Catholics would accept the League platform if given grants for their schools. Archdeacon Willis should be willing to grant that we know our wants and views much better than the League orators and writers, by whom he has been in this matter misled. Just one thing more, and this is the direct answer to the question: We can never surrender our moral and natural right to our fair share of Catholic taxes for the secular (not religious) results achieved in our schools. But on numerous public occasions I have intimated, in substance, what follows: "Even apart from the question of such grants, Catholics would give fair and friendly consideration to any reasonable scheme laid before them based on equal treatment and freedom of conscience." That is the position we take up apart altogether from this question of grants. We will consider any proposal whatever that is submitted to us by the League, and we shall be glad to see even a partially successful scheme of religious instruction in State schools inaugurated by or for the League, we ourselves not foregoing, however, what we reckon to be our just and inalienable claim.

7. I submit that my question did not in any way relate to a correspondence with Archdeacon Willis with regard to the Roman Catholic Church supporting a scheme for State aid. My question was: Is the Roman Catholic Church determined on continuing its policy of seeking State aid for its schools irrespective of whether there is religious instruction or no religious instruction added to the present system? I am not referring to the League's proposal at all?—Mr. Chairman, that question has already been answered definitely. We can never surrender our moral and natural right to our fair share of Catholic taxes for the secular (not religious) results achieved in our schools. And in that respect we differ entirely and in principle from the demands of the League that the Government, through Government officials and at the Government expense, shall supply them with what the law in Australia calls "general religious instruction" suitable for themselves alone at the cost of the public pocket.

Canon Garland: The Bishop's answers have, to my mind, completely dealt with his sixty pages of statement, and I do not intend to pursue the examination, because I know how valuable the time of this Committee is.

Mr. Hanan: We do not want that—you must ask questions.

Canon Garland: May I submit that the Bishop was allowed to do more than answer my questions. However, I bow to whatever you instruct me.

The Chairman: I desire to know what you wish to ask in the way of questions. I cannot allow you to make a speech on it.

Canon Garland: I do not intend to make a speech, but I wish to say, at less length than the Bishop took to answer one of my questions, why I am not proceeding. The reason I am not proceeding is that the answers to my questions cover, in my judgment, the whole of the sixty pages of his statement, and I wish to save the time of the Committee.

Bishop Cleary: Mr. Chairman, I wish, on behalf of myself and on behalf of those I represent, to disassociate myself entirely from the reflection cast upon your fairness in regard to the answers given to those questions.

Canon Garland: I did not cast the least reflection upon your fairness, Mr. Chairman. I am absolutely satisfied with your fairness.

Professor Hunter: I wish to ask one or two questions.

Canon Garland: I understood from your official communication to me, Mr. Chairman, that there was only to be cross-examination by one representative from each side, and I take it there are only two sides in this matter—those for and against the Bill. I understood there was to be only one from each side, and I have not arranged for other people to come and ask questions.

The Chairman: I do not think there was any understanding to that effect.

Canon Garland: May I have the letter read?

The Chairman: The letter of the 31st July reads, "The Education Committee will meet on Tuesday, 4th August, at 10.30 a.m., for the cross-examination of the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary. Further evidence than cross-examination in connection with the Bible-in-schools petitions will not be taken until the evidence on the Education Bill is completed. This will necessitate the delay probably of about a fortnight. I will communicate the date of next meeting as early as possible."

Canon Garland: There was an earlier letter in which I was informed that it was the intention to receive witnesses, and asking if we had any witnesses to bring forward.

Mr. Hanan: I would call attention to the minutes. On the motion of Mr. Malcolm it was decided that interested parties be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses through the Chairman. At the same meeting Professor Hunter attended and expressed a similar desire. Then we resolved that interested bodies be allowed to cross-examine the other side through the Chairman.

Canon Garland: Might I have the letter read that was sent to me, because that fact was not communicated to me?

The Chairman: The letter of the 21st July reads, "The Education Committee will take evidence on Friday, 24th instant, at 10.30 a.m., when representatives of the Catholic Church and of the Defence League will be heard. Opportunity will be given for a representative of each side to cross-examine witnesses on the other side through the Chairman."

Canon Garland: May I have my reply read?

The Chairman: Your reply of the 22nd July reads, "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 21st instant informing me that the Education Committee will take evidence on Friday, 24th instant, at 10.30 a.m., when representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Defence League will be heard. I note that opportunity will be given for a representative of each side to cross-examine the witnesses on the other side through the Chairman. I shall make my best endeavours to comply with the request of the Committee to place our views in typewritten form before each member."

Mr. Hanan: It is stated in the minutes that Professor Hunter attended and asked to have the same right.

The Chairman: The question is whether Professor Hunter represented the other side.

Mr. Malcolm: Our idea was that interested parties should have the right.

Bishop Cleary: May I be permitted to point out that there are four parties to this dispute? There is, first, the Bible in Schools League; second, the Catholic Federation, which represents the Catholic bodies; third, the National Schools Defence League; and, fourth, the body of teachers.

Canon Garland: All I want to bring up is that I was not made acquainted with the decision of the Committee. I understood from the letter I received that there would only be one person cross-examining on each side, and in one of my letters I pointed out that there were two parties—those for and those against the Bill.

Professor Hunter: May I be allowed to say something?

The Chairman: I think not. We will hear Professor Hunter, but I propose to give Canon Garland the opportunity, if he wishes afterwards, of asking further questions.

Mr. Malcolm: Before we go on, Mr. Chairman, would you make it clear to Canon Garland that we do not wish any consideration for our time to prevent him from indulging in further cross-examination. There was a sentence in his statement which might produce that impression.

The Chairman: I have urged upon all witnesses to conserve our time, in view of the amount of work that the Committee have to get through.

8. *Professor Hunter* (to witness).] Am I right in saying that your objections to this scheme are based on the inherent injustice of it?—That is exactly the position. I have already, I think, sufficiently explained that Catholics are not opposed to Bible in schools. We are in favour of Bible in schools, and we are the only body of people in this Dominion who have made immense sacrifices in favour of it. I represent only one small portion of the Catholic body of this Dominion, yet in a little over three years the Catholic people of Auckland City alone have put into this cause of biblical and religious instruction in our schools £69,100. We are the only true Bible in Schools League, and we oppose this scheme of the Bible in State Schools League solely because of its injustice—first of all, injustice to objecting taxpayers, who would be compelled to bear a portion of the cost of the scheme; second, injustice to teachers—conscientiously objecting teachers—who would be compelled to impart the lessons under this scheme; and, thirdly, we object to what we call a most odious formula—that is, the Irish proselytizing conscience clause, and the practical compulsion of a certain number of the children to be instructed in these lessons without the consent of their parents, without even their parents being consulted or considered in the matter. These we consider grave injustices in the scheme of the Bible in State Schools League. As I have said in my principal evidence, if the League eliminates these objectionable features from its programme we will heartily join hand-in-hand with the League in order to help them to bring a measure of religious instruction into the public schools.

9. What is the position of Roman Catholic teachers in New South Wales? Can a convinced and conscientious Roman Catholic teacher give unsectarian general religious instruction, as required by law, in the public schools, and yet act in accordance with the principles and constitution of his Church?—I expected that question to be asked by the organizer of the Bible in State Schools League, and in consequence I prepared a statement on this matter.

10. *The Chairman:*] I hope it is a short one?—It is not, but I will ask permission to read a portion of it. The Church and "unsectarianism": We may here leave out of further consideration those Catholic teachers in New South Wales who impart "common" or "unsectarian" "general religious instruction" in good faith, through ignorance of Catholic principles and Catholic discipline bearing thereon. As stated, they have in so far and for the time being unconsciously become Protestant teachers imparting a "reduced" or "skeleton" form of Protestantism. Such a "common," or "reduced," or "skeleton," or "fundamental," or "unsectarian" biblical or religious teaching is wholly unacceptable to Catholics and contrary to Catholic teaching. No Catholic teacher may have act or part in propagating it. No Catholic parent may permit his child to be instructed in it. It was condemned for school use by the Irish Catholic Hierarchy in 1824; again at their general meetings of the 26th January, 1826, and the 12th February, 1840; by a papal rescript of the 16th January, 1841; by decrees of the Synod of Thurles in 1850; and by the Synod of the Province of Dublin in July, 1853 ("Mixed Education," Dublin, 1859, pp. 32, 194, 412, 413, 414; "Acta et Decreta" of the Maynooth National Synod of 1875, p. 331). It may be added that such "common" or "unsectarian" teaching is condemned by the unanimous voice of Catholic theologians. "Evidence of content": Here we have the overwhelming positive evidence of a presumption that no Catholic teacher or parent instructed hereon, and loyal to Catholic faith or conscience, can have act or part in the teaching of so-called "unsectarianism" of the League and of the Bill at present before Parliament. In view of this evidence we are bound to assume that no properly instructed Catholic teacher in

New South Wales, Queensland, &c., who is loyal to Catholic principles and Catholic conscience, can with peace of conscience set up as a teacher of such "unsectarian" or (as a League publication calls it) "common Christian faith." Among instructed Catholic teachers in New Zealand there is complete unanimity on this point. The same remark applies to Queensland. This was, in fact, admitted by even so ardent a Leaguer as the Hon. Mr. Barlow, who was Minister in charge of the Government Bible-extracts measure in the Queensland Parliament in 1910. He refused to entertain the idea of a conscience clause for teachers. Why? "At least 30 per cent.," said he, "of the teachers belong to a certain religious persuasion which is opposed to Bible-reading in State schools; if these teachers were exempted from giving the Scripture lessons the purpose of the referendum would be defeated" ("Debates," Vol. cvi, p. 2014). For similar reasons Canon Garland and the League in Queensland opposed a conscience clause for teachers; for similar reasons they now oppose it in New Zealand. They well know that no loyal and faithful teacher would, if left to his own conscience, have act or part in the so-called "non-sectarianism" of the present Bill. So, under the pretence of "liberty of conscience" and "equal rights," they want to force the Catholic teacher to be false to his faith, to teach a "general religion" condemned by his Church, and to sell his soul to the League for bread-and-butter. This is how the League "trusts the teachers" and provides "equal rights for all and special privileges for none." Then I give detailed evidence to show that there is profound dissatisfaction among the teachers in connection with this matter, and I go on to quote Bishop Gallagher and others on the question. Next I quote official testimony to show that some years ago the teachers' "general religious instruction" was deprived of any useful religious character in 50 per cent. of the schools. Then I quote the testimony of the Rev. Mr. Chambers (Warden of Trinity Grammar School, Sydney) that at the present time this "general religious instruction" is practically abandoned or rendered useless. Then I quote Archdeacon Irvine to a similar effect, and I go on to deal with the purely negative evidence.

Mr. Hanan: I would like that read.

Witness: This is what I say: Against the clear-cut, positive evidence of Catholic principles referred to above what evidence has the League to offer that the instructed and loyal Catholic conscience serenely accepts the "non-sectarian," "undogmatic," "common Christian faith" which is the residuum of Protestant teaching? Not one scrap of evidence whatever. (*a.*) We have no evidence whatever that any teacher imparting this "skeleton" Christianity is instructed in our Catholic principles and discipline bearing thereon, or (*b*) that he is loyal thereto, while (*c*), on the contrary, it has been made clear that no Catholic true to the principles and discipline of his faith can have act or part in the propaganda of such an "emasculated caricature" of God's revelation. As shown in my principal evidence, Mr. Board (now Director of Education) has shown himself, by the serious garbling of official testimony, by no means an impartial witness, and his statement that no protests have been lodged by Catholic teachers is at best but negative testimony, and even as such quite futile and of no effect. In the first place, such protests would hardly be encouraged by the well-known love of the high administrative officials for their system. In the second place, they would be obviously useless, if not imprudent. A protest to the Department would be met by some such reply as this: "We are here not to alter the law, but to administer it. You say your conscience does not permit you to teach this 'unsectarian general religion' required by the Act. We have bought your conscience in open market. Defy it and you and your children shall eat; obey it and you and they must starve. Take your choice." That is the choice that the League offers to Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, and other conscientiously objecting teachers. Disloyalty to conscience is rewarded with assured abundance; loyalty to conscience is penalized by hunger, by heavier monetary penalties than are visited upon the magsman and the coiner. And the League organizer tells confiding women that this is "freedom of conscience"; that this is "equal right to all" and "special privilege to none"; that those hearers of his who do not "trust the teachers" will be ordered at the day of judgment "to depart into the pit of Tophot" (*Gisborne Times*, 20th April, 1914).

11. *Professor Hunter.*] Is the Catholic Church in any way in alliance with the National Schools Defence League?—It is not, and by the very nature of their principles and ours it cannot be. We can no more identify ourselves with the object of the National Schools Defence League than oil can mingle with water. We stand for the essential union of religion and education in the school. We stand for an atmosphere of religion pervading the schools. We stand, not necessarily for the teaching of religion every moment in the schools, but for a religious "atmosphere" in the school—for religious principles running through and through the whole fibre and substance of education. The National Schools Defence League stands for the suppression of religious instruction during school hours; it stands for the divorce, so to speak, of religion from education. We can never join with them; we have never joined with them; and we shall never join with them. In the matter in dispute between us and the Bible in State Schools League we stand where we have ever stood, upon our own ground, not entangling ourselves in alliances with anybody, but nearest to the League and willing to join the League if they will only eliminate those unjust proposals of theirs, which we could never accept without surrendering sacred rights and principles which we believe God gave, which we have no right to surrender, and which no League has the right to take away.

12. Has the Bishop noticed that in the Bible in Schools League list of testimonials in favour of the New South Wales system it is stated that the Catholic children in one school were permitted to go out into the shelter-shed during the period of religious instruction? And, if so, what does he think would be the effect on the Roman Catholic children?—The purport of the question is that in New South Wales, according to the testimony published by the League, some Catholic children were permitted to go into the shelter-shed during the period of religious instruction. This is the case: so bitter is the feeling of Catholics against the system in New South Wales that

over vast areas of that country no priest will go into the State schools. There is, in fact, Church legislation covering a great part of New South Wales forbidding the priests to go into the State schools. Much as we love the children, much as we search them out, though many the sacrifices we make for them, in large areas of New South Wales the objection to the system is so fierce that no priest will set his foot inside a State school.

13. *The Chairman.*] By legislation, do you mean?—By our own Church legislation. I will quote a part of it, from legislation passed by Cardinal Moran. According to the official report of the Catholic Education Congress some years ago (1911) Cardinal Moran reaffirmed the diocesan law against the clergy teaching religion in the public schools. He said they should bring the children to a neighbouring church or house or elsewhere: "they must make it plain that there was no peace with the system so far as Catholics were concerned." He goes on to say, "The reports of the Education Department made it appear that they had paid nine hundred such visits last year. These were in the remote country districts where there were no Catholic schools, and where the children were obliged to attend State schools. The priests merely called at the schools to assemble the children for preparation for the sacraments, but did not actually teach them in the schoolroom, taking them to a neighbouring house, if available, or otherwise gathering them under a gum-tree." This is from page 31 of the report.

14. *Professor Hunter.*] What sort of influence does the Bishop think that that would have on the religious faith of the children—I mean, such incidents as I refer to in my question?—I think I can safely leave the answer to that question to the Committee to work out in their own minds. It would have an extremely detrimental effect upon the children in one way; it would naturally impress upon the children the profound objection that Catholics have to this system, and the intensely anti-Catholic nature of this system, because we Catholics look upon the system in New South Wales as a proselytizing system. That is its regular name there—the proselytizing system.

15. Does the Bishop think that if the League's scheme were adopted Catholic teachers who did remain in the State service would be placed at a great disadvantage in the matter of appointments?—They would be placed at a very obvious disadvantage. I have already referred in my principal evidence to the statement of a number of prominent League leaders that the teachers who refused to fall in with this scheme of Bible-extracts in State schools would be driven out of the Public Service, would be deemed unfit to remain in the Public Service, and so on. Moreover, it is obvious that when a Catholic applied for a position in a school the first question the School Committee would ask would be, Is he willing to teach these lessons? A Catholic, by the very principles and rules of his faith, cannot in conscience teach those "unsectarian" lessons, and he would be at once ruled out of Court. I have here in my hands a number of protests by Catholic teachers, and more are forthcoming. These are merely a selection. They all declare that as a matter of conscience they could not teach these lessons. I do not see myself how they could teach these "unsectarian" religious lessons with a safe conscience. You would put the Catholic teacher in the public schools, by the new scheme, in the position, already described in my principal evidence, of having either to violate his conscience or to go without bread-and-butter. A number of them have intimated that they will not violate their conscience—that they will sacrifice their positions sooner than adopt this scheme.

16. In the *Dominion* of the 14th July Canon Garland is reported to have said that in 1882 Roman Catholics "advocated a referendum in Switzerland, and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere." Will Bishop Cleary say if the facts are as stated by Canon Garland?—Would Canon Garland state if he was correctly reported? I should like him to do that before I give my answer. I have the report here. [Report shown to Canon Garland.]

Canon Garland: This is the statement as reported to have been made by me: "Mr. Massey had drawn attention to the fact that the principle of the referendum as suitable to such a matter had already been recognized by Roman Catholics, who had voted for it in the House on a former occasion." (That refers to the New Zealand House.) "Indeed, this had been done elsewhere, as, for instance, in Switzerland in 1882, when a referendum was taken which was regarded as the most notable in that country, both from the importance of the question voted on and from the large number of electors who went to the poll. It was taken as the result of a request in which Roman Catholics had joined, and upon which they united with orthodox Protestants and with religious people generally to vote as against the minority composed of German Radicals, free-thinkers, and socialists. The motto adopted by the Roman Catholics and orthodox Protestants throughout the whole of Switzerland was 'God in the schools.' It was opposed by a bogus cry against Roman Catholicism, and with a denunciation of the danger of clericalism. He asked, If it were right for Roman Catholics to demand and take part in a referendum under the cry 'God in the schools' in Switzerland in 1882, how could they find the principle of the referendum wrong in New Zealand in 1914? He did not mean for a moment that he supposed if the referendum were provided by Parliament that Roman Catholics would vote 'Yes.' He believed the greater majority of them would vote 'No,' but that did not affect the principle in question that in 1882 they advocated a referendum in Switzerland, and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere." That is a fair report of what I said.

Professor Hunter: I think I will leave my question as it is. It is perfectly obvious.

17. *The Chairman.*] The question asked is, Are the facts as stated by Canon Garland?—The facts are not as represented by Canon Garland. His statement is absolutely positive that Catholics advocated a referendum in Switzerland and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere. That statement is not in accordance with fact. I have here another and clearer statement on the question by Canon Garland—not Canon Garland speaking and being reported by a reporter, but Canon Garland

sitting in his chair and writing a document to appear in the *Outlook* of the 11th November, 1913—"The Case stated for a Referendum on the Bible in Schools." This is his statement: "The suitability of the referendum for settling the question of religious instruction was recognized in the following cases: Switzerland in 1882 took a referendum upon a proposal to remove religious instruction from the schools; a vast petition was drawn up; within a short time 180,995 signatures were appended (proportionately the signatures already available in New Zealand are greater); the referendum was taken, and since then the question has remained finally settled." That is an absolutely clear statement by Canon Garland, and that statement is reproduced in other terms in this statement of his which appears in the *Dominion* of the 14th July. I have dealt with this matter in the course of a letter to the Press, which I have here. I am prepared to read that part of it referring to Canon Garland's statement. There was no such issue in Switzerland as that of religious instruction in the schools. "The issue of the Swiss referendum of 1882 was, briefly, State (canton) rights against Federal (central Government) rights in the inspection and organization of education. (See, for instance, Boyd Winchester's 'Swiss Republic,' pp. 260–261; Ogg, 'The Governments of Europe,' p. 435; 'Annual Register' for 1882, p. 268.)" Those are only a selection of close on forty books on the referendum in Switzerland which I have read, and on this one point there is no division of opinion amongst them. Then I go on to say, "Switzerland has the referendum; New Zealand has not. Historically and constitutionally, as I can show, the Swiss referendum is essentially a form of substitute for the American veto. It enables electors to reject or approve certain classes of measures after they have been passed by Parliament. It has nothing whatever to do (as the League's proposed plebiscite has) with promoting future legislation. As stated, the issue of the Swiss referendum of 1882 was federal against cantonal (provincial) inspection, &c., of schools. This issue was, in its nature, purely a matter of political policy. There is no Catholic doctrine or principle which forbids a referendum on such an issue, whether in Switzerland or New Zealand. Many Swiss Catholics and 'orthodox' Protestants feared that the Federal Government's Radical majority, chiefly from the Protestant cantons, would drive religion out of the schools if they got control of them. But the issue of 'religious instruction in schools' was never placed before the electors. The League's scheme of 1914 is not a referendum. It does not submit to popular veto or approval measures passed by both Houses of Parliament. It is a mere plbeiscite for future ballot-box legislation over the head of Parliament. It also deals with questions of religion, religious conscience, and 'religious instruction.' The Swiss referendum of 1882 dealt with purely temporal matters of school inspection and school administration." Canon Garland's statement is contrary to fact. The Catholic people did not vote there upon this question of religious instruction in public schools, and there is no difference in the policy or discipline of the Catholic Church in Switzerland and in this country upon that subject. They would oppose the League plebiscite there as we oppose it here.

18. *Professor Hunter.*] Then your answer to my statement is that the statements made by Canon Garland are not correct?—That is so; they are contrary to fact.

19. I should like now to ask, Has the witness seen a League article by the Rev. Mr. Wood, an organizer of the Bible in Schools League, in the *Dominion* of the 30th July, charging the Roman Catholic Bishops with "lack of straightforwardness" in their campaign, and directing the attention of this Committee to the matter? If so, will the witness state his views on the League article in question?—I am glad this question has been brought up. I had meant to bring it up myself independently. The League article in question by the Rev. R. Wood has been published, by arrangement, by the League with a view of influencing the views and opinions of this Committee upon such evidence as I may give here and have already given. It is an attack of the most serious kind, and I will point out one part of it which makes an appeal practically to this Committee. It states, "This championing of secularism on the part of the Roman prelates ought to be considered very carefully by the parliamentary Committee at present sitting to hear evidence for and against the referendum on Bible in schools. It is the duty of that Committee and the duty of every member of Parliament to have an intelligent knowledge of what the Roman prelates have said in the past about our secular system of education, and if they do so they will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that there is a lack of straightforwardness in the propaganda of the Roman Bishops." Mr. Chairman, I need not point out the importance of a statement of that sort, and the palpable effort that it makes to influence the views of this Committee by pointing out certain things: first, that the Roman Bishops have made a number of serious statements reflecting upon the secular system; second, that we are doing all in our power to destroy this present system; and, third, that we are doing all in our power to maintain the present system. This refers to the evidence which I am giving here to-day; it covers a great part of the evidence mentioned here to-day; it tries to traverse it and to show that the evidence is false, that I am acting a part in this matter together with my fellow-Bishops, and that we are not straightforward in this matter. If this is not an attempt to influence the views of the Committee, then I do not know what such an attempt could be.

20. *The Chairman.*] I think you must confine yourself to the attack made here upon your evidence?—I will do so.

Mr. Hanan brought up the question of whether the publication of the League's letter was not a breach of privilege, in order that the matter may be dealt with afterwards.

Witness: May I point out that this letter refers to four points of my evidence, and that they are seriously misrepresented in this document with a view to influencing this Committee. It is an article "in reply to the Roman Catholic Bishops." It deals with matters of evidence which have been brought forward by me on behalf of the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand and the Catholic people of New Zealand, and it has been published by the League as an advertisement, by arrangement, in the *Dominion*. The article is no longer the Rev. Mr. Wood's publication; it

has been taken up officially by the League and published by the League, by arrangement, as an advertisement for the purpose of influencing this Committee. In the first place, the statement is made that strong language has been used by Catholic Bishops, and by me in particular, in regard to the secular system, and large quotations are made hereon. In the course of my evidence here I have given strong expressions of opinion in regard to the secular system, but I have also quoted much stronger expressions of opinion in regard to the secular system from members of the Bible in Schools League, some of whom have called it a system of "white heathenism," a system of "dogmatic secularism," "Godless," "the desolating blight of secularism," a system that "degrades morals," a system that is "a relic of barbarism," and so on. It is made to appear in this article as if we Catholics alone had spoken strongly against this system, whereas we have not spoken in language as strong as that used by the League. In the course of my evidence I have made it clear that we Catholics favour biblical and religious instruction in the schools, and are willing to meet the Bible in Schools League people in conference in order to arrive at a proper settlement of the matter. This particular publication now before the Committee states that we are not acting straightforwardly in this matter, but standing out to defend this secular system, and so on. I need not again refer to the statements made in regard to the conference, but I will go on to another part where it says that we are "root and branch opposed to this secular system." We are not root and branch opposed to it. We are opposed to it for our own people, but, as I have said in the course of my evidence, we are prepared at all times to leave the system secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious. This is stated in the course of my evidence: "We aim at making that system truly national—truly suited to the conscientious as well as the intellectual requirements of all the people of the nation—secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious." Canon Garland was here when that was read out, and yet a week later this statement is published by him that we are out and out for the maintenance of the present secular system and not acting straightforwardly in this matter. The statement has been made here that we are against the Bible in State schools. I have already pointed out that we are in favour of it on certain conditions. This was stated in the presence of Canon Garland, and yet a week afterwards he comes out and publishes this statement in the Press which was written by the League organizer in Otago, and which is brought forward here in Wellington for the purpose of influencing the deliberations of this Committee. Now, one thing more. In the course of my evidence I made indirect reference to the Nelson system. It comes under the heading "The Right of Entry." It reads, "A word may perhaps be here permitted as regards the Catholic attitude towards the right of entry of the clergy during school hours. Speaking personally, I would not object to it provided that the rights of conscience of parents, teachers, and pupils were properly safeguarded." Then I go on to speak of the difficulty of single-roomed schools, and so on. Yet here comes this statement published by the League as a League document in order to influence the views of the Committee, and it says, "The Nelson system as a solution has been held up to scorn by Dr. Cleary." That is the right of entry of the clergy nominally (and at best by legal fiction) before school hours—really and actually within school hours—and then a quotation is made from my pamphlet "Secular *versus* Religious Education," published in 1909. Now, I will point out to the Committee a piece of amazing misquotation. The League article quotes my words—"As regards the implied permission to teach about God and His law outside the hours devoted to the system, that provision serves only to emphasize the exclusion of God from the actual working of the system. Christians might conceivably have been permitted to do as much in Notre Dame, Paris, at the close of the revolutionists' worship of the Goddess of Reason. During school hours our law has put God out of calculation; it has excluded all doctrinal references to Him, or to moral duties towards Him or in Him, to the children's neighbours or themselves. It compels the earnest Christian teacher to check his best thoughts and muzzle his tongue and play a part. Bishop Neligan, of Auckland, described God as 'an extra' in our secular system. But 'extras' are provided for by the system; God is not. If He is brought into the working of the system He is brought in surreptitiously and as a stowaway, and all teaching regarding His law is as contraband as pipe-opium." Now, this is made by the League to appear that I am here holding up to contempt and scorn the Nelson system. Mr. Chairman, would you be kind enough to see if I made any reference whatever to the Nelson system in the paragraph? The words "the Nelson system" have been interpolated there, and if a man interpolated words in a will or a public document he would find himself in the dock. And this was published by the League a week after I had declared myself, in Canon Garland's hearing, as having no objection to the right of entry of clergy, even in the formal school hours, provided the rights of others were respected. There is no reference to the Nelson system in my statement quoted by the League. I will go further and say that from the beginning to the end of that pamphlet of mine there is not one solitary reference throughout to the Nelson system. I will go still further and say that in my long career as a journalist, and in the great amount of work done in connection with this movement, I have never published a statement regarding the Nelson system. There is only one mention made to Nelson in the whole of this pamphlet, and that is the reference to the old Nelson denominational system of education which existed in the days of the Provincial Parliaments. Canon Garland was here and heard my indirect reference to the Nelson system and the right of entry, and yet a week after he had heard it he published that as a League document in order to influence the views and deliberations of this Committee.

21. *Canon Garland.*] May I ask the Bishop where the words "Nelson system" occur, as suggested, by interpolation?—If you will come here I will show it to you. [Witness pointed to the words "the Nelson system as a solution has been held up to scorn by Dr. Cleary."]

22. May I point out that it has not been interpolated as a quotation from the Bishop's statement. It has been placed there as a heading. The writer, having stated his premises, now

seeks to prove them by His Lordship's words. He does not interpolate the words "the Nelson system" into the Bishop's mouth?—He declares that I myself made the statement in regard to the Nelson system, and then gives a statement which purports to be my statement in regard to the Nelson system, but in which the Nelson system is not even hinted at. That is a true case of interpolation. There are various ways of interpolating a statement: one is at the head or introduction of a quotation, another in the body, and another at the close of the quotation; and there is not one whit of difference in moral wickedness between the three. I wish to point out one thing more which makes this a more apparently deliberate and a more apparently reprehensible action. It is in the same pamphlet of mine from which he quoted, p. 167. Here is what I say: "In all cases in which the teachers decline to impart biblical instruction, &c. (as above), arrangements could no doubt be made for the same by volunteer or paid helpers at far less cost than Catholics would be willing to pay for the religious education of their children." Here you have my assertion of the right of entry, not alone before formal school hours or after formal school hours but during formal school hours, and he makes it appear that I am against the right of entry and scorn the right of entry even before formal school hours. Now, there is one further remark I have to make. This is the only one point of misrepresentation which I have brought up in connection with the League's propaganda, and it is a flagrant case; but it is nothing compared with the points I wish to bring out when I get Canon Garland under cross-examination. I have said in my statement, "We have already had ample premonition of this in the following constant and lamentable features of the League campaign: its vehement denunciations of honourable and God-loving men and women who have dared to differ with it; its persistent misrepresentation of the beliefs, aims, words, and acts of opponents; its bitter and unwarranted personal attacks; and its never-ending appeal to those deplorable feelings of sectarian animosity which have made New South Wales a warning example to the whole of Australasia. These are strong statements. I am prepared to prove them in detail, and I invite thereon the freest cross-examination by those who are most interested in testing the truth or otherwise of my assertions." When I get Canon Garland under cross-examination you and your Committee will get a vastly better insight into the methods—the lamentable methods—by which this League campaign is being carried on by Canon Garland, and then the Committee will be in a position to see who has been "lacking in straightforwardness" in their propaganda.

23. *Professor Hunter.*] You say you are prepared to attempt to decide this question by means of a conference. Am I right in thinking that representatives of those who uphold the present system would be invited to attend any such conference?—I have said in my principal evidence, Mr. Chairman, that we are prepared to attend a conference with only one proviso—namely, the recognition of the proper equal rights of all before the law—that is to say, that all interests should be represented. I have stated here in my principal evidence, furthermore, that, although we ourselves are entirely opposed to any other system for our children, we recognize the position of other faiths who believe in the system being entirely secular, and who rely upon the Church and the home doing the work of religious instruction. That is in the early part of my evidence. I have always taken it for granted that all conflicting interests would be represented in our proposed round-table conference, including those who represent the State Schools Defence League, and so long as the principle of proper equality of rights of Catholics and other people is recognized we Catholics would joyfully meet in conference and assent even to a temporary or partial solution of the question if it did not affect the religious rights or consciences of others. Yet we are represented by Canon Garland as being an anti-Bible party, an atheistic party, and so on. We Catholics are the only real Bible-in-schools party, and we are prepared to help the so-called Bible-in-schools party to get the Bible into the schools on conditions that will be fair to all users and supporters of the schools.

Canon Garland: I am anxious to ask a question which will allow me to draw attention to the fact that there is nothing in the article by the Rev. Robert Wood referring to the evidence of this Committee.

Mr. McCallum: I say there is. Read the statement. It is a deliberate attempt to influence this Committee.

Canon Garland: Here is the only statement referring to the Committee: "This championing of secularism on the part of the Roman prelates ought to be considered very carefully by the parliamentary Committee at present sitting to hear evidence for and against the referendum on Bible in schools. It is the duty of that Committee and the duty of every member of Parliament to have an intelligent knowledge of what the Roman prelates have said in the past about our secular system of education, and if they do so they will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that there is a lack of straightforwardness in the propaganda of the Roman Bishops, Father Roche, &c., at the present time." The extracts are not from evidence before this Committee at all, but are extracts from documents published outside this Committee and prior to its sitting.

Witness: May I point this out in answer to what the Canon says: The four points mentioned in this League document, on which we are accused of lack of straightforwardness, are points on which I have given evidence before this Committee. Moreover, this evidence is traversed by referring back to alleged previous statements of mine on these very same subjects. Yet, again, the purpose of doing this is openly declared—namely, to influence the deliberations of this Committee, and to show that in the evidence which I have given before the Committee, representing not alone myself but the other Bishops and the Catholic body in New Zealand, both they and I have been guilty of double-mindedness and lack of straightforwardness. That is where this document, accepted now as a League document, touches the deliberations of this Committee on a matter which has been brought before the Committee—on evidence which I have laid before the Committee in my principal statement.

Mr. McCallum: This is all matter for cross-examination. It is cleverly put in there to discount Bishop Cleary's evidence before the matter came before us. That is all good cross-examination, every bit of it. It is most improper it should be there, but it is proper for you to bring it up and confront Bishop Cleary with it.

Witness: May I point out that I and my fellow-Bishops are accused of playing a double part and not being straightforward with your Committee. I am prepared now to stand any amount of cross-examination by Canon Garland or by other members of the League in regard to our past and present declarations upon this subject, and to give him the fullest opportunity of testing whether we are straightforward in this matter or whether we are not; and when the proper time comes I will compare our fixity of principles and our fidelity to principles with the contradictions and the shifting of positions which have marked the League and the League's propaganda as long as I myself have been acquainted with the League's methods—from 1893 onwards.

Canon Garland: I regret if we have been guilty of a breach of privilege, because we would not deliberately do that. I am quite sure that when that was inserted we did not know that we were doing anything improper for a moment.

Mr. McCallum: We do not suggest that for a moment.

24. *Canon Garland.*] The only point I wish to make is that we did not comment there on the evidence given. It was on other statements that were made prior to this. As a matter of fact that article was actually written by Mr. Wood a week or more before this Committee sat. I should now like to ask Bishop Cleary a question arising out of a question which he has already answered. The Bishop said, if I understood him rightly, that the Roman Catholic Church is the only body which has spent money in biblical instruction?—My studied statement on the matter is that the Catholic Church is the only body which has made continuous and steadily increasing sacrifices for the instruction of children in religion in primary schools.

25. Does Bishop Cleary think that all the Sunday schools of all the other Churches represent no sacrifice of money, or labour, or energy—I refer to the buildings, and the teachers, and the material?—I recognize the work which is being done in the Sunday schools. Apart from this question and apart from my evidence I now recognize, and have recognized in the past, the work done in the Sunday schools by the people of other faiths as well as by our own. My answer referred exclusively to what is being done in the primary schools. I did not refer to Sunday-school work at all.

26. I am anxious to draw attention to the fact that it is not the Roman Catholic Church alone which cares for the religious welfare of the children, but the other Churches care in their own fashion—that is, in Sunday schools, the only opportunity that is available to them, they spend tens of thousands of pounds and an enormous amount of energy?—I was dealing exclusively with this question of what work is being done in the primary schools. The campaign that is going on at present, in regard to which you are seeking evidence here, is not a campaign in regard to Sunday schools—it is a campaign in regard to primary schools; and I think that in regard to these there has been, apart from the work of a small body of men, gross neglect by the great body of Bible-in-schools clergy. To prove that I have shown their great neglect of the opportunities which they have under the present Act, and I have quoted a parliamentary return of the 2nd November, 1903, pages 8 and 9. Another thing I have proved is this: that the clergy's work in New South Wales under the religious system has simply gone to pieces; that the schools, so far as the clergy are concerned, might almost be pagan schools, or, as one man said, they are resulting in materialism.

27. May I ask if His Lordship regards the Roman Catholic schools, which are under Roman Catholic control, as part of the State school system of this Dominion?—That question involves a distinction, and the distinction is so obvious a one that I think it might easily have occurred to Canon Garland. It is a public-school system in one sense—that we are doing work on the very same lines as the public schools, following the public-school programme in every detail, and being subject to public inspection. In that respect we are doing a public work and our schools are public schools. But officially they are not classified as public schools. That is the distinction.

28. What I want to get at is the fact that the other Churches outside the Roman Catholic Church do spend money for the religious instruction of their children, but they do not spend it by opening schools in opposition to the public-school system of the Dominion. May I ask the Bishop another question? He spoke of the Roman Catholic teachers in Australia as violating the principles of their faith by handling these Bible lessons. I for one cannot imagine such a thing, because of the immense numbers of Roman Catholic teachers who give these lessons. May I ask the Bishop if he has any evidence that his own Bishops in Australia have ordered the State-school teachers who are Roman Catholics not to continue violating their faith?—I do not exactly know what position the League organizer is taking up in connection with this question. I do not know, in the first place, whether he is questioning my statement that these so-called unsectarian Bible lessons are opposed to Catholic principles.

29. No; I accept that?—Now the question he puts is, Why do Catholics go into the schools in New South Wales?

30. I want Bishop Cleary's explanation of the fact that the Roman Catholic teachers do give these lessons, notwithstanding the fact that it is against the principles of their Church?—I have the answer to the question in this statement that I brought this morning. It sets out the whole thing clearly, and distinguishes those who know our principles and those who do not; those who know our principles and carry them out; those who know our principles and defy them—defy them because they are being practically bribed by public funds into infidelity or disloyalty to their faith. In my statement I say this: Catholics ignorant of Catholic principles and Catholic

ecclesiastical discipline on these subjects may no doubt join the teaching profession in New South Wales, Queensland, &c., in good faith. They may also conduct such miscalled "unsectarian" Scripture lessons in good faith, being unaware that they are doing what no Catholic instructed hereon and loyal to Catholic faith and conscience would dream of doing. A like remark applies to Catholics generally who enter the teaching profession in New South Wales or Queensland as some frogs enter wells or as some people enter matrimony, without sufficient thought or consideration of what the plunge may involve. Catholics well instructed on the matters mentioned above could not in conscience conduct the so-called "unsectarian" "general religious instruction" referred to. Then I say further over: The Catholic teacher who teaches it—this "unsectarian" instruction—is for the time false to Catholic principles, Catholic conscience, and Catholic ecclesiastical discipline. Owing to the substance or effect of past and present regulations, or to the well-known views of high-placed administrative officials, it is at present no easy matter to secure for publication expressions of opinion from Catholic or other objecting teachers at present in the employment of various Government Bible-extracts States of Australia. So far as Catholic teachers are concerned this is, however, not at all necessary, seeing that the Catholic position in regard to "unsectarianism," "common," "undogmatic," or "undenominational" "general religious instruction" is so clear and so emphatic. Outside and beyond this there are, however, sufficient indications of the discontent of conscience with which the system is viewed by Catholic teachers with some knowledge of and regard for the laws and principles of their Church that bear upon the sectarian "unsectarianism" and dogmatic "undogmatism" of the State religion. No educationist in Australia has, probably, so intimate a knowledge of the Catholic teachers' hearts of New South Wales as Bishop Gallagher of Goulburn, who is in constant touch with them. In a letter to me he declares that the Catholic teachers in his wide jurisdiction positively "hate the lessons" from those sectarian mutilations of the Scriptures which (devised by Carlile and Whately for the avowed purpose of proselytizing Irish Catholics) had to be banished from the national schools of that unhappy land. The position of such Catholic teachers is somewhat like the position of the League clergy. These clergy denounce the secular system as "pagan," "barbarous," "Godless," "dogmatically secular," and degrading to morals, yet for nearly forty years they have serenely sent their children to be brought up in the "paganism," "barbarism," "dogmatic secularism," and moral degradation of that system (see Catholic Federation series of publications, No. 4, pp. 2–3). Official testimony (quoted in my principal evidence) goes to show that some years ago the teachers' "general religious instruction" was deprived of any useful religious character in 50 per cent. of the schools. The testimony of Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A. (Warden of Trinity Grammar School, Sydney), shows that at the present time this "general religious instruction" is to a very considerable extent practically abandoned or rendered useless (Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, 20th July, 1914), and Archdeacon Irvine declared, in a deputation to the Minister of Education on religion in the schools, that "the members of the committee saw the danger of the country becoming to a large extent materialistic" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th May, 1914). Other evidence could easily be adduced to a like purport and effect. Information received by me shows what follows: (*a*) That, as stated, a certain number of Catholic teachers conduct the State biblical-extract lessons in good faith through being uninstructed or ill instructed in the Catholic laws and principles bearing upon the matter; (*b*) that others shirk the lessons as far as they dare, or make them as Catholic as they dare, or as perfunctory as they can, or turn them into "silent" lessons.

31. Perhaps Bishop Cleary would say why the Roman Catholic Bishops in Australia have not forbidden the Roman Catholic teachers in the State schools to give these lessons. The fact is that they do. Is the Bishop aware that Roman Catholics do not abstain from entering the service, but enter it as freely as any one else does?—I do not know whether Catholics enter as freely the Public Service as any one else; I do not know that the Bishops have refrained from condemning sectarian instruction in the State schools by Catholics; I do know that there is with us a tribunal called the tribunal of penance, before which the individual teacher, if he is a practical Catholic, presents himself periodically for personal direction; and I do know, furthermore, that if personal direction is asked or needed in this matter the priest in charge must give it, and his personal direction can only take one turn—"You cannot conduct these so-called 'unsectarian' religious lessons." But, Mr. Chairman, it is one thing to give a direction to a man with a family of six or seven children that he must either leave the Public Service or continue giving these lessons. It puts him upon the horns of a dilemma. He practically says to the teacher, "Get out of the service. Go without your bread-and-butter." And the man with the six or seven children will begin to think whether it is for him a lesser evil to disobey the law of the Church or to face the starvation of himself and his little ones. So you see the position in which the wretched law there puts the man. It penalizes him worse than it would penalize the magsman or the coiner. I need not ask the Committee if that is a fair position to put any teacher in—a position where he must either starve or go against his conscience. I will say more. If a law were passed in New Zealand to-morrow offering place and pay and position to Jews who would work on Saturday and eat pork there would be many Jews who would take the position and eat the pork. And that is no reflection upon the body of the Jewish people; it is merely a statement of the weakness and frailty of human nature. The law in New South Wales, in putting a similar alternative before Catholic teachers, counts not upon the fidelity to conscience of the great body of Catholics, but it counts upon the frailty of a certain number of them, and it invites them into the service on these conditions: "We buy your conscience in open market. You must do what we want you to, whether you obey your conscience or not." That is the position in which Catholic teachers are placed in New South Wales, and it is the position in which the League wishes to place every teacher in this Dominion, although it is known to the League that, I suppose, 90 per cent. of the certificated teachers of this Dominion do not want to teach these lessons.

32. The Bishop has drawn a picture of the unfortunate teacher with six or seven children falling before his spiritual director and being given a certain choice; but is the Bishop aware that teachers do not enter the service with six or seven children? The usual rule is to enter in youth?—I am more and more puzzled with the attitude of Canon Garland upon this matter. What is he driving at? Is he defending this sort of law which will compel people either to keep out of the Public Service or to violate their conscience? Is he defending a law which practically scores up "No Popery" over every school in the country, or "Papists not wanted here"? Is he defending that? If he is, let him speak out and say so. Or is he defending what St. Paul declares to be a grievous sin—that is, for a man to do that which he knows to be morally wrong? Is he defending that? He asks, Why do Catholic teachers enter the Public Service? Why did Captain Scott and his companions go to the South Pole? Why do men go into all sorts of hazardous undertakings—exploring, facing peril of wild beasts, and so on? Why are the volunteer soldiers of England ready to go far away and expose their lives for 4d. a day? The fact is just as I have stated, that if you hold out a bribe to men to be unfaithful to principle and conscience you will find plenty of men and plenty of women who will accept the bribe and compound with their conscience as best they can. The greater number, so far as I understand, of those Catholic teachers who go into the State schools in New South Wales are young girls, and it is in the heart of all such young girls that after a year or two they will be living in a cottage with roses around the windows. It is love's young dream. Very few of these probably expect that the time will come when they will have to decide between conscience and cash. They hope that, being merely assistant teachers and so on, they will be able to escape this hated duty of teaching an emasculated caricature of the Bible which the League wants. They hope also that if the time comes when they must teach they will be able to compound with their conscience, either by giving a silent lesson or by giving a perfunctory lesson or some other lesson, but always compounding with conscience; or they hope to escape, as the man who goes into battle hopes to escape; or if they come to the direct peril they hope to get around it and not face it squarely.

33. Will the Bishop tell me if he has ever heard of a Roman Catholic Archbishop saying that he saw no objection to the Roman Catholic teachers giving these lessons without implying that Archbishop's approval?—Will the Rev. Canon be good enough to quote the exact words of that Roman Catholic Bishop and give me the reference to them?

34. I cannot quote his exact words, but I believe that Archbishop Duhig, of Brisbane, when the system was introduced there, while protesting against it, gave something in the nature of a formal permission to Roman Catholic teachers to give these lessons to show that he accepted the situation, but not because he thereby approved of it?—I will only say that any Catholic Bishop dispensing a Catholic teacher to teach so-called unsectarian religious lessons would consciously or unconsciously display a double mind.

35. He is too good a man to do that?—And, being a good man, then he presumably did not do just that which I believe he would be incapable of doing. I had some time ago a communication from Archbishop Duhig, and I know that he was one of the few men who put up a determined fight against this scheme, which was carried in Queensland, not by a 75 per cent. majority of votes, but by about 26 per cent. of the voters. I know that he is still a determined opponent of it, and I know that the position of Catholic truths, and Catholic rights, and Catholic principles, and Catholic laws bearing upon so-called "unsectarian" religion remains even if a whole episcopate were to fail herein. I know that it is not in the power of any Bishop to set aside these laws of his Church; it is not in the power of any Bishop to give a dispensation to any man to teach this wretched "unsectarian" religion. It is not in the power of any Bishop in the Church to give such permission, and any such permission given is void and of no effect. There is a higher power in the Church—a higher power than a whole bench of Bishops. The higher power resides elsewhere, and our principles hereon are the same all the world over. We believe that God does not go backward in revealing himself but rather goes forward, and that the true faith is not to be discovered by hacking, and cutting, and flinging out of the Bible points upon which this or that or the other denomination are not agreed. We accept the whole Bible, and not this sectarian "unsectarian" compromise on it. I personally do not believe that Archbishop Duhig gave this permission, and before night falls I shall probably have a communication from him.

36. The Bishop spoke of the Roman Catholic clergy in New South Wales paying something like nine hundred visits last year, or in some recent year, and taking children out to neighbouring houses. May I ask him if he considers that our League is doing an unjust act towards his Church in obtaining a privilege which would allow nine hundred visits to be paid by his clergy to take the children out of school to give them their own religious instruction?—When I spoke of the injustice of the League's scheme I left entirely out of consideration this question of right of entry. At the same time I pointed out in my principal evidence here that this right of entry does not give, as alleged by the League, "equal opportunities to all." It gives a marked advantage to the creeds that have most money and most men.

37. I was only asking if we were doing an injustice to the Roman Catholic Church in New Zealand by seeking to obtain for it, in common with others, a privilege by which it could go nine hundred times to the State schools and take its own children out for religious instruction?—In dealing with the question of injustice I did not touch at all upon that, except as showing that it does not give equal opportunities. I did not at any time, and I do not now, say that that is an injustice. Much less did I say what was attributed to me by Canon Garland in a League leaflet that I regarded this right of entry in New South Wales as a revival of the penal code. That was Canon Garland's statement, not mine.

38. The Bishop spoke a good deal about a conference. I should have supposed that those anxious for a conference would call it. I should like to ask the Bishop why, if the Roman Catholic Bishops are so anxious for a conference on the subject, they have never called one with their friends of the National Schools Defence League, for instance, or with the Churches that are concerned?—I think it is a very fair proposition to assume that the people who are starting a campaign with a view to introducing the Bible into the schools would, if they wished to be fair all round, themselves be the parties to move in this matter, especially as they themselves are of the larger denominations. As they themselves profess a very great interest in this matter they would be naturally the persons to move in it. May I tell you, and Canon Garland through you, that I have moved in this matter? I have many times publicly suggested in newspaper correspondence, even with men of some prominence in the League, that it would be desirable to hold a conference, and I did so before Canon Garland came here—in the secular Press, in my own paper, the *Tablet*, when I was editing it, and at various times since. Only a few days ago I suggested to a reverend League gentleman, who is in this room just now, that I hoped within a short time to be sitting round a table with him to thresh this question out in a friendly way. We have done all we can in this matter to promote a conference. If the Canon wants a conference he can have it to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

39. I regret that the Bishop should have said of me that a statement I made was contrary to fact. If he had said that I evidently was mistaken I should not have bothered very much about it. I ask him if he is aware of this book, which he did not quote in his evidence in chief nor in his subsequent evidence, "The Referendum in Switzerland," by Simon Deploige, published in 1898 by Longman's. In it the writer says, "Of all the popular votes which have taken place since the introduction of the federal referendum that of the 26th November, 1882, is unquestionably the most notable, both from the importance of the question voted on and from the large number of electors who went to the polls. The people were called upon to approve a federal decree passed by the Chambers in pursuance of the terms of Article 27 of the Constitution. By that article 'the cantons shall make provision for elementary education, which must be adequate and placed exclusively under the direction of the civil authority. Such instruction shall be obligatory and in the public schools free of charge. The public schools must be so organized that they may be frequented by those belonging to all denominations without prejudice to their freedom of belief or of conscience. The Confederation shall take such measures as may seem necessary against cantons who do not fulfil their obligations in the matter.' . . . The lines upon which this law would be framed was clearly indicated by a Federal Councillor when called upon for an explanation from the platform. Elementary education would be made either non-sectarian or secular. The staff would be laymen, the subjects secular, the methods secular, the schoolhouses secular. Education would be secular down to the most minute details, even in the purely Catholic communes. The publication of the federal resolution was the signal for a general outcry in protest. 'God in the schools' was the motto adopted by Catholics and orthodox Protestants throughout the whole of Switzerland. A vast petition was organized within a short time, to which 180,995 signatures were appended. No demand for a referendum had ever been so strongly supported before. It is easy to imagine the energy with which the campaign was conducted up to the day of voting. The authors and partisans of the resolution used every means in their power to ensure success. They raised a bogus cry against Catholicism, denounced the danger of clericalism, and as a supreme argument represented the Jesuits as waiting to enter the country. It was all in vain. The common-sense of the country asserted itself, and could not be exploited as in 1874. All these intrigues were estimated at their real worth, and on the 26th November the federal resolution was rejected by 318,139 votes to 172,010. 'Catholics, Federalists, orthodox Protestants, and religious people generally united to vote "No."' The minority was composed of German Radicals, freethinkers, and socialists. The referendum on this occasion did good service for Switzerland. It checked the advance of anti-religious Radicalism at the very first step, and saved the country from the educational struggle and its deplorable consequences." Now I ask the Bishop if he still repeats his statement in view of what I have read—his statement that my statement as published was contrary to fact? Here is the book for him. Let him look at it himself. Did he never know of it?—I have heard those extracts read. I have not read the book. I have heard the statement of the Canon. He confirms my statement in every particular. His statement was that there was a referendum on a religious issue, on a question of conscience. There never was such a referendum. The question put to the electors never had in itself one reference to religious instruction in the schools. It had only the one reference. The question was, Should the central Government control the inspection and administration of schools, or should the cantonal Government control them? It was fought out on that.

40. His Lordship does me an injustice when he says that my statement was quite incorrect. He tries to water down the statement made regarding the action of the Roman Catholics in Switzerland. They adopted the cry of "God in the schools." They did not regard the subject of religious instruction as a side issue. If some one here wished our question put, "Are you in favour of an alteration in the secular education system?" we should not regard that as the right point at all. In the same way the men who carried this resolution carried it framed in their own language, but the people were too intelligent to be misled. They quite understood, as the historian shows here, that the real question was, Is religion to be continued in the schools, or is it to be dropped? —I have already answered the question. The authorities quoted by me show conclusively that this was purely a question of State rights *versus* federal rights. It was fought out as such. The religious question was not in issue; it was introduced as a party cry for party purposes, just as the Bible-in-schools party have for party purposes introduced the cry of "the open Bible" and "equal rights for all." There was no plebiscite in Switzerland to promote legislation on any subject, religious or non-religious, in 1882, and no referendum (but only a plebiscite) is proposed in New Zealand in 1914.

FRIDAY, 9TH OCTOBER, 1914.

Professor THOMAS ALEXANDER HUNTER examined. (No. 3.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy at Victoria College.

2. The Committee would be glad to hear what you have to say on the question of the Bible-in-schools petitions?—I have a statement from the National Schools Defence League which I desire to read to the Committee:—

SUMMARY OF THE CASE IN FAVOUR OF THE PETITION OF THE NEW ZEALAND NATIONAL SCHOOLS DEFENCE LEAGUE FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF THE PRESENT FREE, SECULAR, COMPULSORY SYSTEM OF EDUCATION, AND AGAINST THE PROPOSALS OF THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS LEAGUE.

We wish to put on record the fact that we had expected, in view of the importance of the issues involved, that the fullest possible inquiry would have been held. The present national system of education has had possession of the field for nearly forty years, and has conferred the greatest benefits on the people of this Dominion. The National Schools Defence League is not in any way opposed to religious education, but it represents tens of thousands of electors who feel that, if the present attack on the schools is successful, the day of peaceful, progressive educational work in the Dominion is over, and that instead of being united in the interests of the common welfare of the children the people will be sundered into sectarian factions fighting for their denominational interests. As it has been said that the New Zealand National School Defence League is a small minority of atheists and agnostics, we desire to put on record the names of the central executive: President—Mr. A. R. Atkinson; vice-presidents—Hon. George Fowlds, Messrs. R. McNab, T. M. Wilford, M.P., W. Hindmarsh, M.P., D. McLaren, Mrs. A. R. Atkinson, Mrs. S. Anderson, the Revs. Howard Elliott, Steele Craik (Auckland), Revs. T. A. Williams, I. Sarginson, W. J. Ashford, Saunders, C. Dallaston, J. H. Hinton, J. F. Jones, N. Kennedy (Dunedin), Rev. A. North (Napier), Rev. I. Archer (Invercargill), Rev. H. Cotton (Otaki), Rev. W. A. Evans, Rev. Dr. Hughes, Pastor Meyers (Wellington), Rev. E. H. Taylor (Thames), Rev. Van Staveren (Wellington), Messrs. H. Hill (Inspector of Schools, Napier), Robert Lee (Wellington), J. S. Tennant (Principal, Training College), W. Foster, D. Bedingfield, G. MacMorran, W. T. Grundy, J. C. Webb, J. Bary, C. Watson, H. A. Parkinson, D. Polson (Wellington), J. Caughley, E. U. Just (Christchurch), Miss Meyers, Miss England, and Miss Helyer (Wellington), Messrs. Mark Cohen (Dunedin), J. J. Ramsay (Alexandra), I. Hutcheson, R. Fletcher (Wellington), Mr. W. J. Speight (Auckland), Mr. F. P. Wilson, Professors MacMillan Brown, Chilton, and Hight (Christchurch), Professors Kirk, Laby, Von Zedlitz, and Hunter (Wellington); hon. secretary—Professor Mackenzie; hon. treasurer—Mr. C. J. Cooke.

This is a great crisis in the history of education in this country; it is an attempt to put back the hands of the educational clock for half a century, and consequently it would be well if all the citizens who wish to give evidence on this important issue could have been given every facility for so doing. The Defence League cannot agree that, as it is its petition that is before this Committee, it shall be given only two witnesses, while our opponents, the Bible in Schools League, have by the procedure adopted not only been relieved of the necessity of petitioning in favour of the revolutionary proposals they make, but have also been allowed to be represented by four witnesses at this inquiry. These are matters, however, that are not in our power to alter: they lie in the hands of this Committee and of Parliament. We shall endeavour to put the case for our petition as fully but as concisely as we can; but no two men can be expected to voice all the various objections of the different sections of the great mass of the people who are opposed to the platform of the Bible-in-schools party. Had we had opportunity for so doing we should have called witnesses from the following sections of the community:—

(1.) Those who have had actual experience of the working of the New South Wales system that this country is now asked to adopt. Many of these witnesses live in New Zealand, and could easily appear before the Committee. These witnesses include Professor Laby, Rev. D. C. Bates, Mrs. D. C. Bates, Inspector Hill (Hawke's Bay), Rev. Job, Messrs. Fisher (teacher, Blenheim), Cummings, Loten, Morris (ex-Australian teachers), Rev. Howard Elliott, and many others. In order that there might be no doubt in the minds of this Committee as to the failure of the New South Wales system of religious instruction in schools the Defence League was considering the proposal to bring witnesses from New South Wales itself.

(2.) Witnesses, lay and clerical, from within the combine of Churches that are agitating for this change. Many Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Methodists are strongly opposed to the proposals of the Bible in Schools League. Among the Anglican clergy we may mention such men as the Revs. Mr. Hobday and D. C. Bates, who have spoken strongly against the proposals, and to these may be added many more who remain silent merely because of a mistaken sense of loyalty to their Church. Many Presbyterian ministers are strongly opposed to the proposed scheme. These include such representative men as Rev. Dr. Erwin, Rev. Messrs. W. Hewitson, J. Chisholm, A. Cameron, J. H. Mackenzie (Nelson), J. M. Saunders, A. A. Murray, Walter McLean, F. W. Robertson, J. Miller Dodds, and others. A similar dissent is found among Methodists—Revs. Knowles Smith, Cotton, Cossum, Richards, Seamer, Ranston, Joughin, and others. In all these Churches the great mass of the laity is either apathetic or strongly opposed to the scheme.

(3.) Witnesses from the numerous denominations that have refused by overwhelming majorities to have anything to do with the scheme—Roman Catholic, Congrega-

tional, Baptist, Church of Christ, Seventh Day Adventists, Unitarian, &c. Many of these would tell the Committee of the great evils (incident to such a scheme) that they have seen in other lands.

(4.) Witnesses from the body of teachers who know best what the effect of the introduction of such a scheme will be. No Teachers' Institute has favoured the scheme. At least 85 per cent. of Teachers' Institutes, including the national organization, have declared emphatically against it. It is estimated that fully 80 to 85 per cent. of the teachers are opposed to the scheme.

(5.) Witnesses who would speak on behalf of the labour organization of New Zealand. These represent a part of the populace on which the compulsory clause of the Act bears with most force.

(6.) Witnesses from the body of educationists throughout New Zealand, including the staffs of University Colleges and the Inspectors of Schools.

(7.) Witnesses from the expert educationists of the Education Department, including the Inspector-General of Schools, the Editor of the *School Journal*, and the Department's Inspectors.

We respectfully submit our emphatic protest against large sections of the people not being heard on this question. It is impossible for any two men to represent all these diverse views, but as the Committee finds itself unable to hear them we shall do our best to put the case fully before you. We wish it to be clearly understood, however, by this Committee, by Parliament, and by the people of this country, that under the conditions imposed our case can be only very incompletely presented.

Secular Education—the Solution of the Educational Problem.

"Hence, in all communities where social and political freedom have found scope, the sentiment on behalf of the public schools definitely severed from ecclesiastical control and directed wholly by State officials finds increasing support. In such communities the Churches which have broken loose from older institutions cease to seek control over the week-day school and are content to maintain a hold over the family through voluntary effort in Sunday schools" (Professor J. J. Finlay). This sums up the whole educational advance along this line, and the movement in England has been typical of a similar movement all over the world. In England it was not till Mr. Foster's great Education Bill of 1870 was passed that public schools for the people really came into existence.

The English Example—New Zealand's Warning.

Foster's Bill: In 1870 this Bill was accepted as a compromise between the Nonconformists and the Anglicans, although educational stalwarts like Mr. Dale, of Birmingham, and Dr. Barrett, of Norwich, protested against it as a surrender of the Nonconformist principle. By this compromise what was called simple Bible lessons might be given at the option of the Boards in Board schools. But subsequent events showed that this compromise was not to be accepted as a final solution. The Anglicans were constant in their attack upon what they termed the colourless religious teaching in the Board schools and swift to make encroachments upon that system, until we are brought to Balfour's Voluntary Schools Bill, which, among other things, threw all denominational schools on the rates. The wrathful remonstrance of the people compelled the withdrawal of the Bill. But in 1902 the present Education Act was forced upon the people. This Act was the Bishops' Bill as formulated by them in convocation. By this Act denominational schools are supported by the rates, and the right of entry into such schools is given to the Churches controlling them, while their headships are closed to all who cannot accept the Anglican creed. As a result the country has for the last twelve years been rent by sectarian strife. Passive resisters have been summoned by scores of thousands, thousands have had their goods distrained, and hundreds have been imprisoned, some of them including ministers, three, four, and up to eight times. After such a hard and bitter experience it is little wonder that the feeling of the country is rapidly moving towards the secular system as the only way out. Within recent years manifestos in favour of the secular solution have been largely signed by both Nonconformist and Anglican ministers, while the Labour party and others are pledged to the secular system.

The Rev. Sir William Robertson Nicoll, the most representative Nonconformist divine and journalist of the present day in the British Empire, has said in the *British Weekly*: "The whole drift of Liberal opinion seems steadily settling in this direction [that of secular education]. It is the one solution of the problem. All the rest are makeshifts. We are quite willing to accept the penultimate solution of the problem if it can be arrived at. No doubt many earnest Nonconformists are still very much opposed to the abandonment of State religious instruction, and they are in all probability strong enough to enforce a temporary and not a lasting settlement. Be it so, but the temporary settlement will not give satisfaction, and there will be unrest till the inevitable goal [that of secular education] is attained." The late Drs. Dale and Parker were also satisfied that secular education was the only solution. Dr. Clifford, the eminent Baptist clergyman, has also given expression to similar views.

In New Zealand we have profited by the lamentable experience of England and have won through to the secular solution without serious set-back to our educational progress. The endeavour made by the first Parliament to endow religious sects fortunately failed, for the Queen vetoed the measure. In 1847 an Education Ordinance was passed by which power was given to the Government not only to establish and maintain schools, but to contribute to the support

of schools established by other bodies. Under this ordinance "religious education" was compulsory. In 1854 the control of education passed to the Provincial Councils, and in 1867 the Ordinance of 1847 was repealed.

In the discussion of 1854–55 Dr. Featherston said, "Considering the difficulties with which the question of education is in all countries surrounded—the differences of opinion which in every community exist in regard to it—and remembering how completely the action of the Home Government has been paralysed by the powerful influences brought to bear against every proposal it has ventured to make on the subject, I cannot but refer with feelings of the greatest satisfaction to the Act which you have passed, without a dissentient voice, for promoting the establishment of common schools on the secular principle, a scheme of education from which we may anticipate the happiest results. For while, on the one hand, the earnest—and I have no doubt conscientious—opposition offered to the scheme by the Churches of Rome and England has had the effect of eliciting a strong and general condemnation of the denominational system to which they adhere, on the other hand the warm manner in which it has been supported by the Ministers of the other Churches and by the large majority of the settlers, as proved by the petitions laid upon your table, affords a sufficient guarantee that the Act will not be permitted to remain a dead-letter, and justifies the expectation that henceforth common schools will spring up in every district where a few families are congregated."

The abolition of the provincial system of government in 1876 prepared the way for a national system of education, and in 1877 the Act was passed that gave New Zealand its present free, secular, and compulsory system of education. Attempts have been made to alter the system that excludes sectarian strife, but without success. In 1881 a Bill was introduced that aimed at reverting to the old system of religious teaching, but the father of the national system—Sir C. C. Bowen—strongly opposed the measure and it was defeated. The agitations of 1897 and 1905 soon came to an end, for neither of them aroused any enthusiasm among the great mass of the people. The present demand is far more extreme in its sectarianism and disregard of the rights of conscience than any previous demand in New Zealand, and we feel confident the people will have none of it.

In America as religious sects began to multiply the teaching of religion was taken out of the public schools, for these reasons: (*a*) That no religious sect might propagate its tenets through schools maintained by the taxes of all; (*b*) that the birthright of liberty of conscience should not be infringed; (*c*) that the cause of sound learning for all should not suffer at the hands of denominationalism; (*d*) that society might have in its midst at least one unifying organization.

There are, however, other reasons why the State primary education in New Zealand must be secular. There is the governmental reason that accounts for the absence of the teaching of religion in our public-schools curriculum and the presence of moral teaching. The State in this connection is committed to two basic principles—(1) The public education of youth; (2) the separation of Church and State.

The public education of youth is so sacred an obligation of the State that it makes it, first, free, that none—even the poorest—shall be unable to obtain it; second, complusory, that none—even the most careless and irresponsible—shall evade it. As a natural corollary, therefore, it follows that since all taxpayers are called upon to contribute their quota to the building and maintenance of the public school—since all are compelled to send their children to that school (or make such other provision for the education of their children as shall satisfy the State)—then the curriculum in the school must be such as will do no hurt to the national birthright of liberty of conscience in matters of religion. If religious teaching be introduced into the schools we negate the principle of separation of Church and State; on the other hand, to deny the right of existence to State schools that do not teach religion is to negate the principle of State education free and compulsory for all New Zealand youth. These two principles are basic in the present system of national education in this Dominion. To tamper with either principle spells disaster to the system.

Secondly, there is the democratic reason, for the State would suffer if it were attempted to teach religion (by whatever channel) in the public school. That school to-day is the great nursery for the propagation and growth of that oneness in society that is essential in a democracy—it would cease to be so the moment it began to teach religion. A public-school system can teach religion and survive only where there is a State religion (note, not a State Church, but a State religion) to teach. Professor John Dewey, in an article in the *Hibbert Journal* of July, 1908, states that Americans do not find it feasible or desirable to put upon the regular teachers the burden of teaching the subject that has the nature of religion. Nor does what he calls the alternative plan of parcelling out pupils among religious teachers drawn from their respective Churches and denominations meet with his approval. He protests against such a plan as likely to interfere with the infinitely significant religious work which the schools are doing in bringing together children of different nationalities, languages, and traditions and creeds; and thus promoting the social unity out of which in the end genuine religious unity must grow. The Rev. Ward Beecher endorsed this view. He said, "If in the spring you look along a level cultivated field where corn grew the previous year you will see ridges that remain. Now comes the plough to turn over the soil, and all the old hillocks go down and lie level again for the next crop. The common school is the plough that levels each generation of human life." All the children, irrespective of parentage and social inequality, have to come together and stand on a common level in the schoolhouse. The teacher does not call the roll by the parents' altitudes or the parents' creed, but by the alphabet. Their feet have to toe the same line; afterwards they may shoot their heads as high as they please.

Thirdly, there is the pedagogic reason. Religious education is undoubtedly the complement of all other education—intellectual, political, emotional, physical—but it does not follow that

religious education must find a place in the curriculum of the public primary school. There is a sound pedagogical reason for the inclusion of moral teaching in our syllabus and the exclusion of religious teaching. Paragraph 35, revised syllabus, reads: "The moral purpose should indeed dominate the spirit of the whole school life, and the influence of the school and its teachers upon the pupils should be such as is calculated to be a real factor in the formation of good character. . . . The experience of teachers will guide them as to the best time and manner in which to impart these lessons. It will probably be recognized that abstract moral teaching fails to excite any interest in the minds of children generally, and that it is best to enforce the principles of moral conduct by examples taken from history, biography, poetry, and fiction." The following extracts from Professor J. J. Finlay's book, "The School," are of value here. Speaking of the function of the school, he says, "We distinguish at the outset between schooling and education, because the large field of education includes every means by which the race seeks the higher purpose of existence. But the school is limited to immature beings who are only feeling their way in matters of conduct; ideals are only in process of growth; the youth's ethic is simple, his view of morals primitive; in days not far distant he would no doubt take flight—for the present he is content with the simplest fare. For the teacher also this is the wisest course. We defend this limitation of the onus of schooling from the point of view of the psychologist, for there is a subtle danger to the healthy development of children in the common attitude which brings either religious practice or ethical reflection too much into the focus of the child's attention. The writer has no desire to disparage the solicitude which the Churches and the moralists display on behalf of the young. But their error has been found in the neglect to study the child's nature. . . Those who exercise the healthiest influence over children—those, that is, who are most respected and beloved, whether teachers or parents—often hold themselves in reserve; they refrain from probing too intimately into the recesses of the childish heart; they abstain from exhortation, and rely upon suggestion rather than upon formal instruction."

Fourthly, there is the natural reason for not teaching religious truths in the public schools—there is no available text embodying the essential and elemental truths of religious experience that would be acceptable to the whole community. If any attempt be made to teach any given religious truth the majority of the community will not support it. Some of the majority will say too much is taught, some will say not enough is taught, some will say none of it should be taught. This is true of no other subject in such a degree as it is true of religion.

Finally, there is the religious reason. The public school is best promoting the interests of true religion by training the children to live religious lives (as they are trained), the honest straightforward life, the kindly deed and thought—these are the finest religious expressions of the child.

Result of Thirty-seven Years' Experience of the Secular System in New Zealand.

First: Because it is secular it can with justice be made compulsory on all to avail themselves of it. The fact is of the greatest importance to the State, since it is the children of the careless and irresponsible section of parents that will grow up to be the greatest menace socially, morally, and financially if the handicap of heredity and environment is not to a great extent defeated by a sound elementary education.

Secondly: It affords to the State an absolutely free choice of teachers, a fact of tremendous value to the State not only from the educational but also from the economic standpoint.

Thirdly: It has resulted in an almost complete cessation of sectarian strife. It is not going too far to say that the child brought up in New Zealand schools is ignorant of the meaning of the phrase "sectarian strife," and only comes to know it in after-years through the instrumentality of certain Churches and certain societies. The schools are free in the sense that there are neither social nor religious tests for teachers or pupils. The doors stand open equally to the Anglican and the Baptist, to the Jew and to the Gentile, to the rich and to the poor.

Fourthly: The system affords equal opportunity for all, and has been a unifying influence in our national life. It is equitable to all religious beliefs simply because it is neutral. It favours none, but stands for religions free from political interference and politics free from religious interference.

Fifthly: The absence of religious teaching from the primary-school curriculum has not led to evil results. Morally the people of New Zealand compare more than favourably with the people of other countries. The following figures are quoted from a pamphlet written by His Honour Sir Robert Stout, K.C.M.G., Chief Justice:—

Year.	Distinct Convicted Prisoners received into Gaol under Twenty Years of Age.	Proportion per 10,000 of Mean Population of all Ages.
1887	220	3·69
1892	140	2·18
1897	125	1·73
1902	109	1·37
1908	124	1·31
1909	98	1·01
1910	100	1·01
1911	85	0·83
1912	129	1·24

These figures deal with juvenile crime. Let us take prisoners of all ages received into gaol:—

Year.	Prisoners.	Proportion per 10,000 of Mean Population.
1887	2,639	44·25
1892	2,164	33·69
1897	1,884	25·84
1902	2,396	30·03
1907	3,091	33·63
1908	3,009	31·84
1909	3,159	32·51
1910	3,242	32·66
1911	2,877	28·35
1912	3,023	29·09

We may take serious crime during the five years ending 1912. Sentenced in the Supreme Court there were—

Year.	Prisoners.	Proportion per 10,000 of Mean Population.
1908	501	0·53
1909	514	0·53
1910	478	0·48
1911	403	0·40
1912	395	0·38

Or take another test, those in gaol on 31st December, in the six years—

Year.	Prisoners.
1907	847
1908	879
1909	949
1910	881
1911	873
1912	866

But for intermediate and habitual criminal sentences the numbers would no doubt have shown a far greater decrease.

In illegitimacy our rate has fallen:—

Year.	Illegitimate Births per 1,000 of Married Population.
1886	10·70
1906	9·72
1911	9·24

For every 100 births there were—

1900	4·63
1909	4·61
1910	4·47
1911	4·09
1912	4·28

Finally, judged by the only time-test of an educational system—the type of man that has been produced—who can say that the New Zealand system is in the least degree inferior to that of any Australian State? Men trained under our system have reached the highest positions in all walks of life, and have shown to the generations that come after a model of good citizenship.

Notwithstanding these facts officials and supporters of the Bible in Schools League do not scruple to traduce the present system and its effects, thus: "White heathenism" (Rev. I. Jolly, Auckland, December, 1913). "Relic of barbarism" (Rev. H. Robjohns, 14th December, 1913). "Your scholar comes out of your hands a barbarian" (Mr. George Flux). "It degrades morals" (Rev. Dr. Waddell). "National atheism" (Rev. I. Jolly, 14th October, 1913). "Religious instruction was abolished from the schools without the people being consulted, and some decades of purely secular education had had most deplorable results" (Bishop Averill, *Auckland Herald*, 7th July, 1914). "In New Zealand two generations have passed through our schools and the civic virtues of secularism have been taught, and with what results? Anarchy is reigning in many places through the waterside strike, and special constables and soldiers from our ships by baton and rifle are seeking to awe a crowd led by men who are saying that fire and slaughter may be necessary to them to reach their end" (Rev. R. Wood, League Organizer, *Outlook*, 11th November, 1913). I do not wish to pass any comment on the strike, but at the time of writing the reverend gentleman could surely not have known that most of the strike leaders were not New-Zealanders: that a fair proportion came from the educational paradise of New South Wales. How differently do the chaplains of the Forces speak of the conduct of the men in camp, which they describe as being better than any they have ever experienced before among such bodies of men! "He detested the present system with all his heart, and if he could not get religious instruction in any other way he would have his own school and demand a grant-in-aid" (Bishop Julius, Christchurch *Press*, 26th February, 1913). "If through ignorance and misunderstanding the present demand for a referendum be defeated or refused the

huge misfortune of a secular system is likely to be perpetuated for another half-century unless the Presbyterian Church arises in its might and decides to establish its own schools. In that case the plight of the forty-odd denominations whose cause has been so zealously championed by Bishop Cleary, Mr. Caughley, and others will be a sorry one" (*Outlook*, 27th May, 1913).

The Proposed Innovation.

The proposal is that a system similar to that in vogue in New South Wales should be introduced into New Zealand. It is pertinent, therefore, to inquire into the origin, history, and results of this system.

A Relic of a Church virtually established.

The principal point to note is that the New South Wales system, like the English system, is admittedly a compromise to get rid of the incubus of a denominational system that previously existed. In New South Wales, in 1825, the Church and School Corporation was set up for the religious instruction of the people and for the general education of the youth of the colony in the principles of the Church of England exclusively, and for this purpose it allowed one-seventh of the whole territory to be used by the Episcopalian clergy, with free access in the meantime to the colonial Treasury chest. The evils and abuses of this system soon opened the eyes of the people. Dr. J. D. Lang, in his "Historical and Statistical Account of New South Wales," says, "But the natural results of the denominational system, as they were progressively developed in the country, soon opened the eyes of many who had been either mistaken or deceived in the first instance to the real merits of the question. That system speedily exhibited a mere scramble on the part of the different ecclesiastical denominations of the colony for the largest shares respectively of the public funds. Education, instead of being pursued for its own sake and for that of the benefits and blessings which it would become the channel of imparting to the youth of the colony, became a mere matter of clerical patronage and a means of reducing the public instructors of youth to a condition of abject servility under the clergy of the different denominations. Under such a system general inefficiency was to be expected as the characteristic of the denominational schools, and general inefficiency was the actual result.

About 1848 the national system began, and existed side by side with the denominational system till 1866, the rivalry between them doing infinite harm to the cause of education. In this latter year Mr. (afterwards Sir Henry) Parkes introduced his Public Schools Act, which came into force in 1867. The Act set up a Council of Education to have control of the whole of education, but with power to give grants in aid to denominational schools. In 1862 the principle of State aid to the clergy was abandoned, but payments were continued to the clergy then in office during their lifetimes, and the Act of 1866 gave to every clergyman the right of entry into the schools for one hour a day to teach the tenets and dogma of his faith. The teacher was also required to give general religious teaching. The continued existence of some denominational schools left the problem still unsolved, and in 1880 was passed the Public Instruction Act that put an end to grants in aid, made the teachers Civil servants, and left only the teaching of religion as the legacy of the old system. New South Wales has not yet reached the position attained by New Zealand in 1867, when the Ordinance of 1847 was repealed.

The New South Wales System of Compulsory State-taught Religion

This system operates in four Australian States—New South Wales since 1880, Tasmania since 1885, Western Australia since 1893, and Queensland since 1910. In the four States the system is identical in all essentials, the only variations from the original New South Wales Public Instruction Act of 1880 being in the form of text-book for the Scripture lessons and in the time allotted both to the general religious teaching by the State teacher and to the special religious teaching by the clergy, and in the regulations governing the visits of the clergy. Both Victoria and South Australia have refused to adopt the scheme; both have declared against the proposals at the polls, South Australia by a three-to-one majority. The Victoria Parliament has twice thrown out a religious referendum Bill, although it contained a conscience clause for teachers. The proposals were carried in Queensland by 26 per cent. of the people on the roll.

That this system is the objective and platform of the Bible in Schools League is clear—(*a.*) From the petition-card of the said League, which reads, "Objective: System of religious instruction in State schools prevailing in Australia. This system has existed in New South Wales since 1866, in Tasmania since 1868, in Western Australia since 1893, in Norfolk Island since 1904, and in Queensland since 1910. (*b.*) From the repeated statements of the chief exponents of the League (Canon Garland has declared, "we desire the Australian system, the whole system, and nothing but the system"); and, despite its concealments, from the Religious Referendum Bill now before the House.

Description of the New South Wales System.

A fair analysis of the system discloses its gross sectarianism: General religious teaching from scripture-lesson books by the State teachers without the option of a conscience clause; special religious instruction by the clergy, or their representatives, in the distinctive tenets and dogmas of their Church in school hours; a form of conscience clause for parents for both the general and special religious instruction.

The Scripture-lesson Books: With the exception of Tasmania, where "teachers are requested to confine themselves to the narrative as taken from any version of the Bible they may possess" ("Course of Instruction for Primary Schools," p. 31), the lessons are given from text-books compiled by States for the purpose. These text-books vary in quality, but all are based on sectarian versions of the Bible.

The Irish Text-books: These are in use in New South Wales, and were the objective of the Bible in Schools League in New Zealand in 1897. They were first compiled under the supervision of Archbishop Whately for the Irish Board of Commissioners in the early thirties of last century, for voluntary use in the Irish schools, and after about twenty years were abandoned. As to the versions used the compiler says, "The translation has been made by a comparison of the authorized and Douay versions with the original. The language sometimes of the one and sometimes of the other has been adopted, and occasionally deviations have been made from both. On this point the translator feels that he would require more indulgence than is likely to be granted to him." Then follows this note: "The Commissioners offer these extracts from Scripture to the careful attention of teachers and children, not only as truth, but as truth recorded under the influence of inspiration." This, too, is significant in the present controversy: 'The Board of Commissioners of Education earnestly and unanimously recommend these lessons to be used in all schools receiving aid from them. They would rather trust to a simple recommendation than adopt any rule for their use even bordering upon compulsion, persuaded that if the book be not received willingly no compulsion will secure a cordial and beneficial use of it."

As to the plan of the four books—two on the Old Testament and two on the New Testament—in addition to direct translation in the language of Scripture there are numerous summaries and paraphrases in enclosed brackets; there are explanatory and therefore sectarian notes on nearly every page, and at the end of each lesson there are numerous questions: while dates are supplied for all the historical events in the lessons, the date of the Creation being given as 4004 B.C. As to the questions, the highly sectarian nature of some at least will be seen from a few quotations: "What is necessary to become Christ's disciple?" (p. 75, Book I, N.T.) "What is meant by the lost sheep, and by its being found?" (p. 81, Book I, N.T.) "Why cannot a man serve God and Mammon?" (p. 82, Book I, N.T.) "Where was Lazarus carried when he died?"(p. 82, Book I, N.T.) "What has the blood of Christ done for us?" (p. 86, Book I, N.T.) "How must we be justified?" (p. 86, Book I, N.T.) "Whom has God set forth as a propitiation?" (p. 86, Book I, N.T.) "Who is our advocate? and what is he more?" (p. 86, Book I, N.T.) "What encouragement had they to pray?" (p. 52, Book II, N.T.) "What reward for those who shall confess Christ before men?" (p. 64, Book II, N.T.) "What is reserved for him that denieth Christ?" (p. 64, Book II, N.T.) "What blaspheming is not to be forgiven?" (p. 64, Book II, N.T.) And so on. These questions have been selected at random.

Many of the lessons in these books are badly selected, and some are morally unfit for mixed classes of children. The Hon. A. H. Barlow, leader of the Queensland Legislative Council and the Minister in charge of the Education Amendment Bill of 1910, described the Irish text-books as the worst possible, and fit only for the flames. Here is a quotation from the Queensland *Hansard*, Vol. cvi, 1910, page 1813:—"Hon. C. F. Nielson: It is the Minister's suggestion that the people who compiled these four books in use in New South Wales were possessed of common-sense? Hon. A. H. Barlow: I do not think they were. Hon. C. F. Nielson: There could not be a worse selection. Hon. A. H. Barlow: I do not think there could" (p. 1813). Later he said that the Minister for Public Instruction was as much shocked at some of the lessons as he was. Evidently the Irish text-books are a glaring example of how not to do it; and yet these same lessons have existed unchanged for forty-eight years in the New South Wales system that we are now asked to copy. The Queensland Bible-lesson books are of a higher order, but these too are based upon a sectarian version of the Scriptures. The preface states, "and both in the Junior and the Senior course the Authorized Version has been mainly followed" (p. 5).

The Work of the Teachers.

It is "general and religious teaching." This is clear from the actual terms of the New South Wales Public Instruction Act, 1880: see section 7, where the work of the teacher is summed up as general and religious teaching as distinguished from dogmatical or polemical theology. In the West Australia Act, 1893, precisely the same terms describe the work of the teacher. In the Queensland Act, 1910, the teacher's work is referred to as religious instruction (section 22A). In Tasmania the entire course of Scripture lessons are on no account to be read by either pupil or teacher, but to be "graphically related" by the teacher (see pp. 6 and 31, "Course of Instruction for Primary Schools").

Mr. P. Board, Under-Secretary to the Public Instruction Board of New South Wales, said in 1905, "The religious teaching"—mark the words—"is placed on exactly the same footing as geography, grammar, or any other subject, and at the annual inspection of schools Scripture receives the same consideration as any other subject. In the junior classes, when children are unable to read, all lessons are given orally in the form of stories drawn from the authorized Scripture lessons on the Old and New Testament." This is really conclusive. Local advocates claim that with such Scripture-lesson books as are used in Queensland the teacher will only have to explain the meaning of words; but when those words are such words as faith, prayer, repentance, God, Christ, salvation, atonement, how can explanation of such highly sectarian and dogmatic words be given without teaching both religion and sectarian religion?

G. K. Chesterton, in his characteristic manner, put the matter clearly thus: "If Bible instruction is a success, then the Board-school instruction is a failure. If no child ever says of the Bible story, 'Please, teacher, did that really happen?' if no teacher ever feels impelled to tell the child a little of what he thinks himself about things so tremendous as the coming of the Cross and the mystery of the Jewish people, then something has gone wrong between pupil and teacher, and we are not educating at all. There really seems to be only three possibilities in connection with the matter, and they all have objections against them of the most ultimate and iron sort—objections of principle. Suppose a child says, 'Did Jesus really come out of the grave?' either

the teacher must answer him insincerely (and that is immorality), or he must answer him sincerely (and that is sectarian education), or he must refuse to answer him at all (and that is, first of all, bad manners and a sort of timid tyranny, and it is moreover gross and monstrous idolatry). It is something darker and more irrational than a religion—it is silence. The Bible is worshipped without being proclaimed. Its priests must not suffer even a reason for placing it beyond reason."

But if the State teachers do not teach religion, why a conscience clause for parents? Here is the tacit admission that the lessons taught may offend some consciences, and hence the escape offered by a conscience clause.

Then there is no conscience clause for teachers although they have to teach religion. Irrespective of his sacred rights of conscience, whether he believes the sectarian and religious lessons to be true or not, he is compelled to teach them as true—*i.e.*, in many cases he is to be compelled to act and speak a lie. It is well known that all creeds and no-creeds are represented in the ranks of the State teachers. Many have conscientious objections to any kind of State-taught religion by enforced taxation, believing that religion should ever be voluntary and free, the individual's own response of faith and love to his Divine Master: many are members of the Roman Catholic Church, and none of these could give the Scripture lessons of any of the four Australian States without being false to their own conscience and disloyal to their own Church; a few are Jews, and to a Jew practically the whole of New Testament lessons, with their assumption of the deity of Jesus Christ on every page, are not only untrue but blasphemy against the God of their fathers; and a few are agnostics, who could not honestly teach that the Scripture lessons are true. And yet all these classes of teachers, in flat denial of all their rights of conscience, must either outrage their own consciences or be forced out of the service! They are most unjustly and cruelly made to choose between their bread-and-butter and their conscience. And if under stress of family necessities they elect to sacrifice their conscience, and in many cases teach as true what they believe to be false, they remain in the service: *i.e.*, they teach under compulsion as true what if they were free they would teach as false, or as fables and myths. This is really putting a premium on hypocrisy. The moral effect upon the teacher may be imagined, and that such forced mechanical teaching irrespective of belief can be in the interests of morality or religion is beyond belief. Without doubt many of the stronger men would be driven out, while the weaker would remain. So the work of the teachers under this system may be fairly summed up as compulsory "general religious teaching" irrespective of belief or disbelief.

The Right of Entry for the Clergy in School Hours.

This means the using of the school machinery, with the compulsory attendance of the children, for the propagation of the distinctive tenets, dogmas, and catechisms of particular Churches. For these denominational classes the children are segregated according to the Church connection of their parents, which means that the pupils are divided into as many sects as there are Churches outside. The school playground becomes the battle-ground of the sects, and each pupil might just as well be labelled with the Church of his parents. It also means that the Churches emphasize their sectarian and denominational differences before the children; and that the State divides where, we contend, it should be its main business to unite.

Effect of Right of Entry.

There is evidence to show that the right of entry causes friction and interferes with the ordinary working of the school. We append the evidence of the Rev. Mona Jones, for the past nine and a half years minister of a leading Church at Newcastle, New South Wales. (It should be explained that under pressure from his Church he availed himself of the privilege of the right of entry for a year, when he abandoned it for reasons which he gives.) He says, "I do not believe in the system—(1.) Because it is opposed to Nonconformist principles. Having seen the working of the secular system in the United States for twenty-one years with such splendid results, I became more and more firmly fixed in the Nonconformist belief that the Church and State should be separate in religion. (2.) Because it (the right of entry) interferes unduly with the regular school-work. This is unquestionably a fact which cannot be denied by any man that has in any way carefully observed the working of the schools. (3.) Because it creates ill feeling among the ministers and the Churches, because of the tendency to predominance by those having the largest number of scholars in their class. (4.) Because, in many instances, it opens up before ministers the temptation of 'lamb-stealing,' to which some yield. When a minister is unable to take a class, either through principle or any other reason, the children of his Church would attend the lesson of another denomination, and would often be enticed and won by the prizes offered. Instances of this had come under his notice. Instances could easily be cited of ill feeling created between ministers because of the presence of the children of the Sunday school of one minister in the 'special' religious-instruction class when his Church did not conduct the same" (January, 1913). This evidence as to friction and ill feeling and "lamb-stealing" is supported in a circular issued in the name of Mr. W. Wilkins, secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on the 15th July, 1900.

Religious Instruction in Public Schools.

The following is a copy of the circular issued to all State schools in New South Wales for guidance in the matter of giving religious instruction in such schools. The italics in the second clause are inserted to add emphasis to the direction given, because some clergymen 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. Then ensue the instructions to the effect that such instruction may be given "to the children of any *one religious persuasion* by the

clergyman or other religious teacher of *such persuasion*. It will be your duty to see that no children are allowed to be present at the special religious instruction given by any clergyman or religious teacher except those registered as belonging to his persuasion." A saving clause allows the children of a different religious persuasion to attend such class provided the parents' consent is given. The opportunity for proselytism here will be obvious. Despite this explicit warning against proselytism, we have the witness of a teacher—A. E. Reay, of Auburn, New South Wales—as recently as the 6th November, 1908, to its nullity. He says, "On the occasion of the absence of one clergyman I have had no trouble through asking the other clergyman [present] to combine the two sections and instruct them."

Comparative Failure of the Right of Entry.

It should be known that the right of entry is largely a dead-letter in Australia. Only the Anglican Church seeks to avail itself of this right of entry in any sort of real fashion, and this Church frequently does the work through paid catechists.

It should be pointed out that the right of entry can only be properly worked by the big Church, with its network of organization and churches in every township. In 1904 the New South Wales Education Commissioners in their report referred to the comparative failure of the right of entry (p. 27). On several occasions the New South Wales Department of Public Instruction has issued circulars pointing out to the clergy their opportunities under the right of entry, lamenting their failure to use them. In New South Wales, under the Act, ministers may visit schools for one hour each school day, but on the basis of only one visit per school per week: the average visits paid during the last few years are barely over 10 per cent. of the possible. It is true that the figures for the last year show a marked increase, but that is simply through a trick of the pen. By a new regulation the minister who devotes his hour's visit to the instruction of three separate classes, giving a third of his hour to each, has the one visit recorded as three visits. To this unimpeachable testimony we may add that of the standing Committee of the Anglican Synod: "We are reluctantly compelled to avow the conviction that unless a more lively interest is taken in this work the work must languish and perhaps even be finally abandoned." In Queensland the pupils reached by the right of entry are but 25 per cent. of the whole.

Moral Failure of the New South Wales System.

Sectarian Bitterness.—Here is positive Australian evidence. Sir Harry Rawson, ex-Governor of New South Wales: "When I arrived in Sydney I found sectarian strife rife on both sides. There is no greater curse for a country than sectarian strife."

V. B. J. Lesina, M.L.A. (Queensland): "I was born, bred, and reared in New South Wales, where they have the system which it is proposed to introduce into Queensland, and I know the things which took place under that system, and the sectarian prejudices which it engendered. Hundreds and thousands of young workers are turned out under that system every year, and they are divided into various classes by the professors who inculcated their respective creeds. The instruction which the children have received in the State schools has led to the expression of the differences of creed outside. Even the trade-unions are becoming affected by it. Some of the unions are particularly yellow, some are verdantly green, and others again are purple-tinged. We do not want that kind of thing to be introduced into Queensland. At present all our people live together in splendid union and happy harmony. (*Hansard*, Vol. cv, p. 142–43.)

David Bowman, M.L.A. (leader of the Labour party, Queensland): "I do not think there is an honourable member is this Chamber who has watched the sectarian spirit in New South Wales but will admit that perhaps for sectarian spite it is the greatest example we have in Australia to-day." (*Hansard*, Vol. cv, p. 482.)

J. Rayne, M.L.A. (Queensland): "He and other members who had been taught in the New South Wales schools knew that there was no Christianity in the business at all." (*Hansard*, Vol. cvi, p. 1302.) Again: "I am a native of New South Wales, and I attended a school where this religious instruction was given. . . . I ask any member in this House who has attended the schools in New South Wales if that system of religious instruction has worked well there? Look at New South Wales and see the misery that is there. What do you want to cloud it over for? The sectarian strife that exists in New South Wales is something dreadful. . . . Why, New South Wales to-day will compare with any part of Great Britain, or with any part of the world for that, so far as narrow-mindedness and sectarianism are concerned, and it is this very system of religious instruction in schools that has brought it about." (*Hansard*, Vol. cv, p. 738.)

Hon. W. F. Taylor, M.L.C. (Queensland): "Can you find any country in the world where there is more religious bigotry and hatred than obtains in New South Wales? Why, at almost every political meeting in that State religious bigotry is manifested." (*Hansard*, Vol. cvi, p. 1980.)

E. M. Land, M.L.A.: "It does not matter what anybody says about New South Wales. My experience of the people of that State is that they admit that there has been a terrible lot of friction between different denominations there." (*Hansard*, Vol. cvi, p. 1261).

This sort of evidence from prominent politicians, with first-hand knowledge of New South Wales, could be multiplied at will.

The Sectarian Virus in Politics.

J. H. Coyne, M.L.A.: "I know from personal knowledge that the Act is working anything but smoothly in New South Wales, despite the fact that you can get pamphlets saying that it is. At a meeting of the Wentworth Protestant Political League, held in the Methodist Hall, Paddington,

Mr. W. H. Kelly, M.H.R., was elected unanimously as the selected Protestant candidate for Wentworth in the forthcoming Federal election.—Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, 26th January, 1910." (*Hansard*, Vol. cv, p. 731.)

J. Rayne, M.L.A.: "I am a native of a place not far from Sydney. . . . Well, I can tell you that I would sooner break stones on the road than be a public man in New South Wales. Unless a man is prepared to lend himself to all sectarian, miserable ideas, then this Parliament will be no place for him—if it becomes anything what it is in New South Wales. . . . I know what it has been. . . . Let any may go there in election time, or go there now, and in some of the districts you will see the people stand off from one another as if they belonged to different countries altogether." (*Hansard*, Vol. cv, p. 738.)

Hon. B. Fahey, M.L.C.: "Now, what is the result of religious teaching in New South Wales? At the last election sectarianism was positively so rampant that one clergyman stumped the country, addressed the electors, and said, 'You vote for that man and you vote for Rome; you vote for this man and you vote for good honest Protestantism.' That is in black and white in the journals of New South Wales. That is the result of religious teaching in the schools of New South Wales. Are they living in a free country there?" (*Hansard*, Vol. cvi, p. 1708.)

Queensland Evidence up to Date—The Present Position there.

H. F. Hardacre, M.L.A., writing on the 22nd June, 1914, says, "The adoption of the New South Wales system has largely increased and strengthened the demand for State aid to denominational schools, and made it logically and politically almost impossible to refuse it." Again: "The entrance of the 'system' has largely increased sectarian bitterness and strife in public and political life."

Edward G. Theodore, M.L.A. (Deputy Leader of the Opposition), writing on the 27th June, 1914, says, "It cannot truthfully be said that the system of religious teaching in the State schools of Queensland is generally accepted. A great many people look forward to the time when an opportunity will be given the people to vote on the question again. It seems almost certain that when the question is again put to the poll the people will favour a return to the old purely secular system. The working of the system of religious teaching in the schools has caused sectarian bitterness and strife, but it is difficult to say to what extent. The contention usually arises from the claims of certain sects for denominational aid as a concomitant of religious teaching in State schools, and from the treatment received by some children as a consequence of their not attending the religious lessons. There are numerous cases of friction between parents and teachers and parents and ministers regarding the religious instruction, chiefly in reference to the children who do not receive the instruction. In some cases of small schools these children have had to go outside, with nothing to do, while the religious lessons were being taught to the other children. It is beyond doubt that there is a much more pronounced demand from the Roman Catholics for aid for their schools, and for other privileges. Other denominations possessing schools of their own are also clamouring for aid for sectarian schools, which is chiefly responsible for the religious controversy, and, in some instances, sectarian bitterness in Queensland during the last two or three years. There are in Queensland 1,270 primary schools. Ministers availed themselves of the Religious Instruction Act to visit only 570 schools; 700 schools were not visited by ministers of religion during the year [1912]. There was a net enrolment of over 100,000 children. A monthly average of only about 27,000 attended the religious instruction, although ministers may visit the schools for an hour on any day or days stipulated by the School Committee. The individual visits averaged only twenty-five for the year."

Says another member of the Queensland Legislative Assembly, "It [the Act] has provided Roman Catholics with a lever which they will use in the future" (22nd June, 1914). Yet another member says, "Politicians in order to get party advantage may grant State aid to denominational schools."

Thus the easily accumulated evidence of leading public men on the spot goes to show that the affirmations of the advocates of the New South Wales system that that "system" is generally accepted—the Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Lutheran Churches in Queensland all opposed to the adoption of the "system" there—that it causes no friction, that it does not breed sectarian strife, have no more value than the fairy tales of a rich imagination. In addition to these evidences of its moral failure (for what breeds indifference, intolerance, and strife is not moral) we would adduce more positive evidence from New South Wales itself.

In 1902 the New South Wales Government appointed an Education Commission to investigate the educational systems of Europe, Britain, and America with a view to the improvement of its own system of education. Two years were devoted to the investigation, and in 1904 they presented their report. Referring to the New South Wales system of religious instruction the report of Mr. Knibbs says, "The present system is seriously defective in regard to its scheme of influencing the ideals of childhood, and yet in any true education the cultivation of noble ideas is of transcendent importance" (p. 28). Could anything be more damning than this? and from the lips of their chief educational specialist? Next the Commissioner proceeds to bury this much-lauded "system" in a very grave of unconscious contempt. He was profoundly impressed by the scheme of moral instruction in vogue in the State schools of France—a scheme which was awarded the "Grand Prix" by the International Jury of the "Exposition Universelle Internationale" of 1900. (The popular notion that the French State educational system is at bottom atheistic is contrary to all the facts.) Owing to the comparative failure of the "right of entry" the report recommends, on page 27, "It is desirable that definite instruction in ethics should be given as part of the general programme. For this purpose the scheme of France may well be taken as a model . . . There can be no doubt whatever of the high value of such a pro-

gramme." Then follows a table of French statistics relating to juvenile crime, showing how such crime had steadily diminished since the introduction of the scheme of moral instruction. More convincing evidence of the moral failure of the New South Wales "system" cannot be conceived. The system has so far failed as a moral factor that Commissioner Knibbs recommends the adoption of the French scheme of moral instruction!

The Evidence of Criminal Statistics: A Comparative Study—New South Wales and Victoria.

If fair comparison is to be made the local conditions must be practically the same. Such necessary similarity of conditions obtain in New South Wales and Victoria. For fifty years of her history Victoria was a constituent part of New South Wales. Both States have developed side by side under the same laws; both have had their much-talked-of birth-stains; both have one large city—Sydney has about 36 per cent. of the population of New South Wales, while Melbourne has about 47 per cent. of the population of Victoria. The only essential divergence is in the State system of national education, Victoria having adopted the "secular" system in 1873. Then let the comparative criminal statistics bear their witness.

Summary convictions per 10,000 of the population for ten years, 1901–10: Victoria, 222 per year; New South Wales, 323 per year, or 50 per cent. more than Victoria.

Superior Court convictions per 100,000 of the population for ten years, 1901–10: Victoria, 29 per year; New South Wales, 48 per year, or 60 per cent. more than Victoria.

Number in gaol per 10,000 of the population for ten years, 1901–10: Victoria, 7·8; New South Wales, 10·8, or 45 per cent. more than Victoria.

Convictions for drunkenness per 10,000 of the population for the years 1901–10: Victoria, 110 per year; New South Wales, 170 per year, or 59 per cent. more than Victoria. For 1912, New South Wales had increased to 206, and Archdeacon Boyce, in commenting upon the fact, said, "This increase denotes an increasing weakening of moral fibre and loss of self-restraint." New South Wales, too, was recently described as the most drunken State in the Commonwealth.

Illegitimacy: 1900–9 (ten-years period)—Victoria, 5·6 per 100 births, or 56 per 1,000 births; New South Wales, 6·9 per 100 births, or 69 per 1,000 births. (New Zealand for the same period is 4·5 and 45 respectively.) 1905–9 (five-years period)—Victoria, 5·6 per 100 births, or 56 per 1,000 births; New South Wales, 6·8 per 100 births, or 68 per 1,000 births. (New Zealand for the same period is 4·5 and 45 respectively.

Divorce (laws in both States give equal facilities): 1900–9 (ten-years period)—Victoria, average per year, 121, or 3·9 per 40,000 population; New South Wales, average per year, 218, or 5·8 per 40,000 population. 1904–9 (six-years period)—Victoria, average per year, 137, or 4·4 per 40,000 population; New South Wales, average per year, 210, or 5·6 per 40,000 population. 1909 (one year)—Victoria, 138, or 4·5 per 40,000 of population; New South Wales, 275, or 7·6 per 40,000 of population.

These statistics are taken from the official returns of the Commonwealth Year-book, the New South Wales Year-book, the Victorian Year-book, and the New Zealand Year-book. Further, there is not one particular kind of crime in which New South Wales has not the worst record. Thus the official returns are all in favour of Victoria, the State which has the secular system of national education, and all against New South Wales, with its religious teaching by the State. Moreover, for any class of crime New South Wales has the blackest record in Australasia, while New Zealand has one of the fairest.

Gentlemen, we claim to have fairly and sufficiently proved the moral failure of the New South Wales system. But to prevent misunderstanding it should not be inferred that the moral failure implies the moral impotence of Bible lessons. The reason lies in the viciousness of the method. Religious teaching which is mechanical, perfunctory, compulsory, and unjust has in it no moral value. That which does not come from the heart does not go to the heart. Another reason for the moral failure is in the necessarily diminished sense of responsibility of the home and the Church. When the civil authority arrogates to itself functions which do not belong to it the natural effect must be a weakened sense of responsibility on the part of those alone responsible, the home and the Church. This is borne out in this particular case by well-known facts. Take the following, *e.g.*: the population of New South Wales is, in round numbers, about 300,000 greater than Victoria, but Victoria has 576 more Sunday schools, 6,000 more Sunday-school teachers, and 60,000 more Sunday-school scholars than New South Wales.

Australian Teachers and the System.

Despite the above facts it is asserted that the teachers accept the "system" without protest and that they even speak well of it. In reply let certain facts be considered: (1.) The teachers in some of the States are born into the system. They have had experience of no other. (2.) The teachers are appointed directly by the Minister or the Governor, so they have not to run the gauntlet of Education Board and School Committee. This is a most important point. (3.) In the four States the teachers have to submit to restrictions and fetters which our New Zealand teachers would not tolerate for a moment. As we shall show from official sources, they are muzzled and bound hand and foot; *e.g.*, in none of the States are they allowed so much as to publicly comment, especially critically, either on the system or its administration, with the exception that in New South Wales they may dare to open their mouths if they can secure the permission of the Minister for Public Instruction; they must not actively take part in any sort of public meeting; they must do *nothing* to offend the opinions of their neighbours, &c. But more of this later. Says the Hon. B. Fahey, M.L.C. (Queensland), "Let me tell honourable members that if the teachers of New South Wales were permitted to express their views on the teaching of religion as it is now taught in that State, not 5 or 6 per cent. but 90 per cent. of those teachers would be opposed to it" (*Hansard*, Vol. cvi, p. 1768).

If we take the thirty-six pages of Australian evidence supplied by the Bible in Schools League we find there very few grains among a mass of chaff. It contains ninety-eight opinions of State-school teachers—ninety-eight out of a possible 10,163—not 1 per cent. Of these ninety-eight, only twenty-two refer to any moral improvement resulting from the "system," and of the twenty-two eight say "I think," or "I am of opinion, some moral benefit has accrued from the system"! And this is the overwhelming testimony of Australian teachers! This infinitesimal result in the light of the harsh and un-British restrictions imposed upon their free speech is its own best refutation. In passing, the witness of ex-Australian teachers now on the Dominion school staffs goes to show that the general religious teaching "is not taken very seriously by many teachers. Some transfer the compulsory burden to others less unwilling; some dodge it altogether. In fact, many of the teachers do not take it more seriously than do the clerics their 'right of entry.'"

The Terrible Condition of the Teachers—Not free Men—Denied Common Civic, Public, and Religious Rights.

Regulations under the Public Instruction Act of 1880.—"Department of Public Instruction, Sydney, 1st November, 1912.—No. 200. Nothing must ever be said or done by any teacher in a pupil's hearing or presence calculated to offend the religious views of that pupil or any other in the school or of the parents of any pupil." (N.B.—The teacher must give "general religious teaching," and yet that teaching must not offend the religious views of pupil or parent!) An old regulation prohibiting teachers from acting as correspondents to the Press, from acting as lay readers and local preachers, was superseded about November, 1912, by the following: "30. Teachers are to refrain from all action in public matters that will interfere with the welfare of the school under their charge or with their usefulness as teachers."

Regulations published in the Supplement to the Government Gazette *of 2nd February, 1911.*—"1. These regulations, except where otherwise provided, shall apply to all officers of the Public Service." (Thus teachers are included.) "21. An officer shall not—(*a*) Publicly comment upon the administration of any Department of the State, or (*b*) use for any other than for the discharge of his official duties information gained by or conveyed to him through his connection with the Public Service." "27. Except in the course of official duty no information concerning public business shall be given directly or indirectly by any officer without the express direction or permission of the Minister or the permanent head."

Queensland—The State Education Acts Amendment Act of 1910.—Regulations (to take effect from January, 1909):—

"17. School buildings towards the cost of which the State has contributed may, when not required for school purposes, be used for any lawful purpose other than the holding of religious services." (A similar regulation obtains in New South Wales—No. 17.)

"84. (*a.*) Teachers shall not take any office or perform any work which may interfere with the proper discharge of their duties to the Department or with the maintenance of amicable relations with their neighbours."

"85. Teachers shall not actively take part in public meetings for the discussion of political or sectarian topics; they shall refrain in such matters from conduct likely to offend any section of the community or to impair their own usefulness as teachers; they shall not actively take part in public meetings for the discussion of the merits of the State system of education or its administration; and they shall not officiate as ministers of religion or act as local correspondents of newspapers." (N.B.—A deputation of Methodist ministers waited on the Premier, the Hon. W. Kidston, in 1910, requesting permission for teachers who belonged to the Methodist Church to act as local preachers. The Minister's reply was that "it would be eminently undesirable.")

34. Inspectors: "He shall not take part in public discussions on political or religious topics, or upon the merits of the system of education."

West Australia.—Education Amendment Act of 1893.—Regulations:—

"71. Nor can they [the teachers] be permitted to take any office or appointment, whether honorary or paid, without the consent in writing of the Minister."

"77. A teacher shall not—(*a*) Publicly comment, verbally or in writing, upon the administration of any Department of the State; or (*b*) use for any purpose other than the discharge of his official duties information gained by or conveyed to him through his connection with the Public Service."

"128. The teacher must ascertain from parents the religious denominations of the children. A child, on notification of the parent, shall attend the class of the minister of another denomination." (N.B.—(*a*) The teacher's inquisition into the religion of the child, and (*b*) the obivous opportunity for proselytism.)

Tasmania.—Regulations:—

"160. Teachers of all ranks are required to abstain from participation in any public meetings or other gatherings on party, political, or sectarian topics, and generally to refrain from all action in such matters calculated to give offence to any section of the community or to impair their own usefulness as teachers. They must not take part in newspaper correspondence in regard to departmental matters."

The course of instruction for the primary schools: Bible lessons not read, but told:—

Page 6. "Infants: Bible stories should be told; on no account are they to be read to the children."

Page 31. For all classes "the prescribed Scripture stories should be graphically related by the teacher, and when possible the interest should be quickened by the use of suitable pictures. Teachers are required to confine themselves to the narrative as taken from any version of the Bible they may possess. On no account are they to inculcate any denominational views."

Thus the Acts and regulations demonstrate to the full the servile conditions of the teachers working under the New South Wales system of compulsory State-taught religion, and they supply an awful example of what to avoid. Let it be borne in mind that harsh regulations such as these are the inevitable corollary of the elevation of Civil servants into officials of religion, for nothing must be allowed in the conduct of the teacher outside the school which would give colour or weight to his religious views. Hence the talk about absence of friction and the silence of the teachers is beside the question, for if first of all you compel the teacher, under penalty of dismissal, to give "general religious teaching," and next effectually gag any spontaneous expression of his opinion of the "system," what can you expect? One should not mistake the silence of the cemetery for the silence of satisfaction.

The Injustice of the System.

Here we reach the crux of the whole question. It will be granted, if the system is unjust, that therefore it is immoral and irreligious. Our claim is that the system has injustice at the heart of it and in every part of it. It means a State-taught form of religion. It affirms the principle that it is the function of the State to teach religion. We emphatically deny that the civil authority is competent to teach religion either in school or church, and we deny it in the name of our common Christianity. We affirm the voluntary principle which is at the heart of New Testament teaching, according to which religion is voluntary and as free as the air we breathe. The only service enjoined there is free and therefore voluntary service, the individual's own response of faith and love. The State cannot teach religion without compulsion in some form, and we maintain that compulsion in religion is very anti-Christ. Granting the claim that the State is Christian, the State ceases to be Christian (*a*) when it teaches religion by enforced taxation, and (*b*) when it teaches religion without taking security that it is taught by those alone competent. Further, the history of the past proves that the State has never yet interfered with religion without injuring the cause it wished to serve (New South Wales, as has been proved, is no exception to this) and without riding roughshod over the most sacred rights and liberties of large sections of the people. The best service the State can render the cause of religion is to leave it severely alone. Is it not a fact that the Church has gained her finest victories not in dependence or alliance with the State, but in independence, if not defiance, of the State and when relying upon her own resources and the powers above her? If the State is to teach religion the pertinent question emerges, Whose religion? The reply of the Bible in Schools League is "Our religion"—*i.e.*, the sort of general religion upon which they, the denominations in the League, approve. This means that the general religion of a section is to be accepted by the State, labelled the "State religion," established and taught in the national schools, at the expense of all and in defiance of the rights of conscience of large sections and several Churches in the Dominion. It is simply the State endowment of a particular form of religion—*i.e.*, sectarian favours and privileges are to be granted to certain denominations. The gross injustice of this will soon appear: the form of religious creed belongs to a section; the schools belong to all, yet all are to be made to support what many on grounds of conscience cannot accept. Again, the State is asked to provide the sort of religion that is acceptable to some consciences only, and when the other set of consciences object they are tossed a conscience clause. The only right they have is the right to go without. And this is justice! Is it even the ordinary morality of the market-place and the street?

In equity and justice there are only two positions possible for a Christian State—to provide religious teaching for all consciences or for none; to accept and teach all creeds or none. Its choice, in equity, is restricted to these alternatives.

Under the secular system the State is strictly neutral, teaching no religion, and this, we contend, is the only known system that is just and equal in its operation. Hence the acceptance by the State of the scheme of the Bible in Schools League would be a denial of liberty and a violation of the sacred rights of conscience pertaining to every man irrespective of majorities or minorities. It would be a flagrant denial of the liberty to believe or disbelieve without the inquisition of the civil authority and without civil penalty. We would point out that this liberty to believe or disbelieve without suffering for conscience' sake is one of our most cherished rights as Christian citizens, and this right was fought and won for us by our fathers at the cost of untold suffering and blood. Are we to value lightly and to renounce at the bidding of the Bible in Schools League what our fathers secured so hardly? Rather let us hold fast to our heritage, resolved that the State shall not usurp the function of the home and the Church, and that the Church shall not usurp the function of the State, but that each shall be sovereign in its own domain. Surely it is not for the Churches to go cap in hand beseeching the State to do their own work, but that the Churches should be true to their divine mission and discharge their own high responsibilities. It will be recognized that our position argues not disregard for the children or disrespect for religion, but the contrary. We are where we are because of our regard for the Book of books, because of our respect for the children, and because of our belief that it is never right to do evil, to resort to injustice, in order that good may come.

Injustice of the Proposals of the Bible in Schools League and of those embodied in the Religious Instruction Referendum Bill.

Injustice No. 1.—The procedure adopted assumes that the present national system already stands condemned, and that the only question is, What is to take its place? This is far from being the case. Why was not the Bible in Schools League compelled to show cause for the revolutionary proposals it makes? The Bible in Schools League was not called on to petition the House in favour of its proposals; it is we who have been called in to petition in defence of a system that has worked well for thirty-seven years. The powers that be have been prepared to

accept the League's missing petition on trust. We wished to have the opportunity of scrutinizing the petition, for we desired to lead evidence to show the misrepresentation resorted to by the League's canvassers. I myself was asked to sign the League's card by a canvasser who repeatedly assured me that there was a conscience clause for teachers, and when I finally convinced her of her error, there was no sign of regret for her misrepresentation, but simply the significant "I see you will not sign it." On the back of one of our cards signed in Christchurch appear these words: "The wife of this man had signed a Bible in Schools League card for him without even asking him to consent to the act, being persuaded by the lady who called on her to do so." If the Committee will give us the opportunity we shall be glad to bring forward hundreds of witnesses who will testify to this kind of misrepresentation. Was the Bill introduced without petition so that we should have no opportunity of scrutinizing the petition? In this matter those responsible have not held the scales evenly between the Bible in School League and the National Schools Defence League.

Injustice No. 2.—It is proposed to use the power of the State to compel attendance at religious lessons. In one outburst of its enthusiasm the Presbyterian organ (the *Outlook*) let the cat out of the bag: "There are parents who never darken a church-door. The children do not find of their own accord their way to the Sunday school. Attendance there is voluntary. They do come to the day school, for their parents must send them; there only do they learn of God and Christ and the way to heaven." The parent, it is true, is to be offered an odious and unrighteous form of conscience clause. If the League and the Hon. James Allen do not wish to use compulsion, they will at once agree that only those children whose parents or guardians notify that they desire the religious lessons for their children shall attend the lessons, and that no parent shall be required to ask for exemption for his child. The onus of applying should be upon those for whose benefit special and favoured provision is made by the State.

Injustice No. 3.—It is proposed to compel teachers, who have entered the State service subject to no religious test, to give these religious lessons, and no provision is made for a conscience clause for them. The teachers will be compelled to give the lessons, honestly if they can, otherwise dishonestly and hypocritically, or leave the service. What generous alternatives for the enlightened twentieth century! Under this Bill the Minister of Education refuses to teachers what the Minister of Defence willingly grants to conscientious objectors under the Defence Act. Is it for the same reason as was urged in Queensland? One of the reasons given by the Hon. A. H. Barlow, the Minister in charge of the Bill in the Upper House, was, "At least 30 per cent. of the teachers belong to a certain religious persuasion which is opposed to Bible-teaching in State schools; if those teachers were exempted from giving the Scripture lessons the purpose of the referendum would be defeated." The reason for refusing a conscience clause is that the conscience clause is necessary! Further, the teacher who is a parent is given the conscience clause for his children but not for himself. He may exempt his children from attendance at the lessons that he himself is compelled to give. A Government that has been ungrudgingly praised for removing certain civil and political disabilities from State employees is asked to place on teachers a more serious disability than that ever suffered by any Civil servant in this country—the odious burden of a religious test. The late Professor Paulsen, the celebrated German moralist and educationist, has said, "No man should be interfered with in his calling as a teacher on account of his dissenting opinions, but only on the ground of pedagogical blunders." Both in 1897 and in 1905 the advocates of this change proposed to grant a conscience clause to teachers. Why not in 1914?

Injustice No. 4.—It is proposed to undermine the spirit of truthfulness that now exists between pupil and teacher, the very foundation of a moral education, and then the bulwark of democracy itself. "The preacher or the teacher," says Paulsen, "is not employed as a hireling to present correct views; it is his business to express his faith, his conviction, and his soul." None are quicker than children in detecting hypocrisy, and if Parliament proposes to make hypocrites of some of its teachers it would be better in the interests of morality that these schools should be closed. Expert pedagogical opinion the world over would endorse this view. Thus the London *Times*, which is certainly not against religious education, says, "There is something even worse than a merely secular education: that is an education where religion is taught perfunctorily and without an adequate sense of its importance. No one will desire that any teacher to whom the Bible has no religious value, or who does not accept the fundamental conceptions in which its message is based, should be made to use it in teaching others."

Injustice No. 5.—It is proposed that the State should classify its citizens and their children according to religious belief. In other words, it proposes to stir up the dying fires of sectarian zeal and bigotry. Ireland to-day affords an awful example of what such misdirected zeal and passion may produce. The ill feeling already engendered in New Zealand by this dispute is not inconsiderable. I need not, however, stress this point, for members of Parliament, naturally enough, have been the first to experience the vehemence of the passions that have already been aroused.

Injustice No. 6.—It is proposed to adopt the deliberately dishonest procedure of demanding from the people a single answer to many questions. Mr. Braithwaite, of the Dunedin Bible in Schools executive, has disclosed the reason for this immoral dodge. Many of the people who are strongly opposed to the "right of entry" desire Bible lessons in the schools. By combining the two issues and by shouting falsely "We want the Bible" the Bible in Schools League hopes to induce those people to vote for what they do not want in order to get what they do want. This is a remarkable distortion of the doctrine of "trust the people"; or is it a method by which we may "trust the people" without fearing that "tyranny of the multitude" that in 1894 Mr. Allen foresaw the introduction of the referendum would mean? "If the people give us what we want," says the Bible in Schools League, in effect, "it is the will of the people. If they take what they want it is the tyranny of the multitude."

To place the issues still more unfairly before the voters the present national system of education is not to be given a place on the ballot-paper. Why? It is treated in effect as if it were not. If the question is put to the people Parliament must see to it that the issues are fairly stated, thus: (1.) I vote for the national system of education, free, secular, and compulsory. (2.) I vote that the clergy be given the right of entry into the State schools during school-hours to give sectarian teaching. (3.) I vote that all State-school teachers be compelled (without a conscience clause) to give general religious teaching in State schools. Those who desire the Australian system could vote for (2) and (3).

Injustice No. 7.—It is proposed that the people should be asked to vote on the introduction into the schools of a religious text-book that they have not yet seen—that is not yet compiled. In 1904 the local opponents were fairer. In the preface of the Bible-in-schools Text-book (specimen lessons), as approved by the Wellington Bible in Schools Conference of that year, we find these words: "Inasmuch, however, as there exist but one or two copies of the text-book as adopted by the conference, it has been widely felt, not only by opponents but by friends of the movement as well, that it is necessary in some way to make the people who will have to vote on the question acquainted with its contents." If in 1904 this was necessary why not in 1914?

Injustice No. 8.—It is proposed to give the clergy power to appoint substitutes. This places the clergy above the headmasters, School Committees, and Education Boards. These will have no choice but to accept the clergy's nominees whether the latter be suitable or unsuitable. Is this done so that, as so frequently happens in New South Wales, the clergy may hand over the sacred privilege for which they are now fighting to ill-informed and poorly paid catechists?

Injustice No. 9.—It is proposed that children shall be segregated according to the religious beliefs of their parents. Can any one imagine a more cruel thing than to make the children, who belong to a denomination numerically weak, the "peculiar objects" of their playmates? The next thing will be a classification of children on the basis of the wealth or professions of their parents. Why should children be subjected to this refined form of persecution? Can it be in the interests of the children, of the State, of the Church, of morality, or of religion?

Injustice No. 10.—It is proposed that the expense of teaching this State form of religion shall be paid for by all, even by those who conscientiously object to the doctrines so promulgated. This was the cause of the "passive resistance" movement in England, and New-Zealanders would do well not to introduce it into this country. There can be no doubt that even among the advocates of the Bible-in-schools platform there is the feeling that if this scheme is introduced justice will demand that the denominations that cannot conscientiously accept the form of religion put into the schools shall be given denominational grants. The grants may be refused for a few years, but in the end justice must be done. The Rev. Dr. Bevan, for many years the leading Congregational minister in Australia, said, "If we have Bible-reading and Bible lessons in the schools given by the State I do not see how we can resist the claims of our Roman Catholic citizens. If we satisfy the Protestant conscience in this way we shall have to satisfy the Roman Catholic conscience also." No amount of special pleading can fairly escape this conclusion.

Injustice No. 11.—But overshadowing all these injustices there is the one that proposes to decide a matter of conscience by a mere counting of heads. That a question of conscience is involved is shown clearly by the presence of a conscience clause for parents and by the confession of the Bishop of Wellington that the real issue is the kind and method of the religious education of the children. Are we living in the Middle Ages or the twentieth century? For thirteen centuries the principle of majority rule in religion obtained in Europe. During all this period the dominant or majority church, with all the powers of State behind it, sought to impose its form of religion upon the minority. The inevitable result was persecution, conflict, and bloodshed that blasted not only the social and political but also the religious life of Europe. Fools, we are told, learn by their own experience; wise men by the experience of others. Which are New-Zealanders to be? While our armies are fighting for the principle that right ought to be might, Parliament is asked to accept the odious doctrine that might is right—against which we are now struggling. Parliament has the power but it has not the right, and experience has shown that ultimately the appeal to mere numbers is a two-edged sword. The day came when the Churches that championed it bitterly regretted their ill-advised advocacy of this principle. Does any one imagine that any religious body would urge the right of the majority in matters of religion unless it had nothing to lose? Would the combine of Churches advocate it now if the Roman Catholics were in the majority? Does the Anglican Church advocate it in regard to Welsh Disestablishment? Do the Protestants advocate it in Ireland? Of course not. These Churches in New Zealand have become possessed with the gambler's spirit, and are crying "Double or quits," to the degradation of morals and of religion.

The Rev. Mr. Patterson was struck on his arrival in this country with the fact that "clergymen in New Zealand seemed all political propagandists and talked nothing but politics." Now they wish Parliament to pass over the justice of their demands and let the people settle a religious issue under the most unfair conditions that these "political propagandists" have devised. If some Churches have so far forgotten their measuring-rod we feel confident that Parliament has not.

The present circumstances cannot fail to suggest the historic and dramatic occasion when was made the same demand that the constituted authorities should break their vows to see justice done and allow the crowd to decide the issue. Members of Parliament are being asked to play the part of Pilate. With all reverence we should adapt the words of Holy Writ. We hope it will never have to be recorded that "when the members of Parliament saw they could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, they took water and washed their hands before the multitude, saying, 'We are innocent of the destruction of this just system of national education. See ye to it.'"

It is a plebiscite that is demanded. If the Government, or Parliament, or the combine of Churches wishes to change our system of representative Government they should do so by means

of a Referendum Bill, and not by a side issue, as is now being attempted. We sincerely trust that in the interests of the State, or morals, and of religion, the Bill will be thrown out; but, if not, then we have every confidence that members of Parliament in the interests of fair play will take care—(1.) That the Bill is fairly described as a Plebiscite Bill. (2.) That the issues are divided and clearly stated in the way I have indicated. (3.) That the present national system is given its rightful place on the ballot-paper. (4.) That no ballot is taken until the proposed text-book has been compiled, and the electors have had reasonable opportunity of becoming acquainted with its contents. (5.) That provision is made for subsequent and regular plebiscites on this question, as is the case in the licensing poll. (6.) That in no case shall any individual—whether clerical or lay—be given the right to appoint a substitute to give lessons in State schools within school-hours. (7.) That a conscience clause for teachers is provided. (8.) That the right of entry is clearly defined; on what days and during what hours the clergy shall have this right; are all religions to be given the same facilities? Will the Mormons and the Hauhaus be given the right? (This is important, as we have many Native schools.) Will the Theosophists, the Star of the East, the Christadelphians, Restorationists, and others be given this right? (9.) That provision is made so that no one is compelled to pay taxes for the propagation of religious views to which he is conscientiously opposed. Members of Parliament should also realize that if the scheme is to be introduced it will be necessary—(1) to abolish all Education Boards and School Committees (see New South Wales); (2) to draw up a set of odious regulations to restrict the civil, political, and religious liberty of the teachers (see New South Wales).

The Nelson System—An Equitable Solution of the Problem

The political catch-cry of the Bible-in-schools party is that it wants the Bible in schools. Its struggle, it says, is a battle for the Bible. This is easily tested. Under what is known as the Nelson system the Rev. J. H. Mackenzie reports that 97 per cent. of the children attending the schools in the Town of Nelson are given Bible lessons; Rev. I. K. McIntyre reports that about 94 per cent. of the children attending eight of the Dunedin schools are given Bible lessons; Rev. J. A. Asher reports that over 90 per cent. of the children attending the schools of Napier are given Bible lessons; Mr. J. D. Watson reports that 98 per cent. of the children attending the school at Waipawa are given Bible lessons; Mr. Holmes reports that over 90 per cent. of the children attending the school at Havelock North are given Bible lessons; and similarly in other places clergymen and others have ceased political agitation and thrown themselves enthusiastically into this work. It is true that some Education Boards and School Committees have refused to grant the necessary facilities, but a clause in the Education Bill now before Parliament would remove that obstacle.

The following are the essential features of the Nelson system: (1.) On one or more mornings in the week the school opens half an hour later than usual, provided the legal minimum of four hours per day for secular instruction is not encroached upon. (2.) During this period or periods the schools may be used by the clergy or accredited representatives who are willing to give, jointly or severally, as they may arrange, Bible lessons to those children whose parents so desire.

This system has obvious advantages over the most unjust one suggested by the Bible in Schools League. (1.) It is purely voluntary, both for pupil and for teachers. (2.) The State takes no part in teaching religion, and is required to contribute nothing towards the cost of the work. (3.) The system is fair to all, and has been shown to be effective.

If a clause were inserted in the Education Bill carefully defining the Nelson system and stating the extent of the privileges granted, and if the operation of the system did not depend on the sanction of School Committees or Boards, the so-called religious difficulty in our schools would be permanently solved without any danger to the integrity of the national system. Such a system would effectually test the sincerity of those who are asking that they may be allowed the opportunity of giving Bible lessons to children, and would do injustice to no one.

We claim that our evidence has shown that for the State the secular solution is the only just one short of the wasteful and inefficient method of denominational schools; that the morality of the Dominion is a testimony to the sound basis of our educational system; that the New South Wales system of religious instruction has been a signal failure; that the proposals of the Bible in Schools League are most unjust in almost every particular, and that the Nelson system provides a fair and adequate method of giving Bible lessons to the children of those parents who desire it for their children. Whatever defects there may be in our national system of primary education, the system stands as a lasting monument to the sagacity, liberality, and Christian tolerance of the political leaders of the past. Any Parliament or party that wrecks it by the introduction of sectarian differences will go down to posterity as foolish, narrow-minded, and intolerant, and will provide for many years to come their own ignominious memorial in the bitter sectarian quarrels that must ensue.

3. *Canon Garland.*] In your statement, Professor Hunter, you quoted the opinions of certain members of the Queensland Parliament in the year 1910. Would you please tell me, for instance, what you know about Mr. Lesina?—I do not know anything about any of the gentlemen except those statements of theirs.

4. Are you aware that Mr. Lesina came over to this country as agent for the liquor party as against the Prohibition party?—No.

5. Are you aware that they dispensed with his services?—No. I can say that I am not acquainted with any of those men who have been quoted.

6. Are you aware that he was expelled from the Labour party?—No.

7. Are you aware that he was rejected by the electors?—No.

8. Have you read the record in the police proceedings in regard to Mr. Lesina in the Queensland *Hansard*?—No, I have not.

Mr. Statham: Mr. Chairman, I must object to the questions being put in that form. It is a most unfair thing to besmirch the character of this gentleman by asking questions which are full of inference. If Canon Garland is going to give evidence on the point that will be a different matter.

Mr. Sidey: He is only asking the question of the witness whether he knew of the gentleman.

The Chairman: I think Canon Garland is within his rights in asking such questions.

Mr. Statham: Canon Garland is not alleging that this gentleman is guilty of any of those things.

Mr. McCallum: He is laying the foundation for his own evidence. Later on he may give that evidence, and he has a right to put those questions now in order to lay the foundation.

9. *Canon Garland* (to witness).] May I ask if you have quoted all the statements that were made and reported in *Hansard* in rebuttal of those statements?—No.

10. You are aware, I presume, that Parliament by its vote of, I think, something like two to one showed that they did not accept any of those statements as a reason for refusing to introduce religious instruction?—No, I am not aware of that.

11. May I put it another way: that notwithstanding the statements of your friends here Parliament passed the Religious Instruction Act which those statements tried to prevent?—After the referendum.

12. You are aware of the fact?—Yes, I am aware that after the referendum taken by the people, by which 26 per cent. of the electors voted for the proposal, Parliament, being tied by the granting of the plebiscite, passed the Bill.

13. While those statements were made they carried so little weight with Parliament and with the people that they received no attention, and the verdict of both the people and Parliament was to the contrary. Would you tell me the date when those statements were made?—I cannot give the date offhand, but I think it was in 1910.

14. It was in 1910 they made the statements after the people had declared their will?—That is so. I believe that is true.

15. So it means that Parliament treated those statements of members with so little attention that they gave legislative effect to the will of the people notwithstanding those statements?—No, I do not think that. Parliament passed the Referendum Bill, a referendum was held, and 26 per cent. of the people voted for the proposal. Some of the members of Parliament were not satisfied that it was a good thing to do, but the majority of the members thought they were bound by the decision of the 26 per cent. of votes cast at the poll in favour of the proposal.

16. It is clear that Parliament did introduce religious instruction notwithstanding those statements by Mr. Lesina and others whom you have quoted?—Yes, undoubtedly.

17. In your statement you referred to Mr. Chesterton?—Yes.

18. You quote him as against us. Are you aware of his particular views on the subject of religious instruction in schools?—There is his statement here, yes.

19. That is not his whole statement. He is an ardent advocate of State aid to denominational schools?—I should not be surprised at that.

20. You are aware of that?—No.

21. He argues in favour of a definite religious teaching being given, but condemns the present system as incomplete because it is not definite enough: he goes further than we do?—In a different road.

22. I want to come to that famous circular that you quoted which has been published in your leaflets during the public controversy, and I really want to get to the bottom of it. If I remember rightly I think you said it was issued in 1909?—No, I did not.

23. You said in your statement, "This evidence as to friction and ill feeling and 'lamb-stealing' is supported in a circular issued in the name of Mr. W. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on 15th July, 1900"?—That is right.

24. Would you mind telling me your authority for saying it was so issued?—You had better let me produce the document. I have not got it here, but I will produce it to the Committee. The position is really this: that this document was reissued in 1900 from the Education Office. The objection you raised was that this man was dead. The man was dead at the time it was sent out, but it was a standing circular with the Department that was sent out. The only way to solve that will be to lay the document before the Committee, and I will do so next sitting-day.

25. Are you aware that the present Director of Education failed to identify the document?—No, I am not. I am aware of the fact that we have written to him asking him about it, and have got no reply.

26. I have received a cable from him, but perhaps it would not be fair to read it?—I have seen the cable, but I have not seen the cable you sent.

27. I will read it [cable handed to witness]?—But this says the circular was doubtless issued. He has not identified it, but says it was doubtless issued.

28. Doubtless issued long ago, but not in 1900?—The date when the issue came to us was 1900.

29. You received it in 1900?—From the office. It was dated at the head 1900.

30. From the Department?—Yes. I will get the circular.

31. You and your League went to a good deal of pains to gain information from Australia about the working of the system?—We have taken a little trouble, but not nearly so much as we would like.

32. You wrote, in fact, a number of letters to try and get some information?—Yes, we have sent some letters for information.

33. And I notice in your statement in one or two places you do not give the names of the members of Parliament—you only say that "another member wrote"?—Yes. The reason for

that is that those members did not want their names mentioned because of the fact that they are frightened that reprisals might be made on them.

34. Then may I conclude that you have published all the replies you have received?—No, I cannot say that—I do not know. I am not the organizer.

35. Was not Professor McKenzie over in Australia a couple of years ago?—I do not know.

36. Would you recognize this circular as sent out by your organization [circular signed by T. A. Williams and John Caughley, dated 20th July, 1914, handed to witness]?—Yes, that has been sent out by us. The petitions have been presented to Parliament.

37. Your organization did make inquiries, doubtless, in Australia, from what you have shown in evidence?—Yes.

38. And you have indicated that you have not published all the members' names because they are afraid of reprisals?—Yes, I understand that is so.

39. Have you received any others?—I could not say.

40. Has your organization?—I could not say definitely. Mr. Williams is not here, but I could find out.

41. What is your office?—My office is simply that of acting-president for the time being.

42. Would you be surprised to hear that you have not been furnished with all the replies received in response to your inquiries in Australia?—I should not be surprised to hear that they are not all quoted here.

43. Would you mind reading the letter that Mr. Williams sent to Australia asking for information [letter handed to witness]?—It reads:—

"DEAR SIR,— "Baptist Manse, Sydenham, Christchurch, N.Z., 29th May, 1914.

"Doubtless you are aware that the Bible-in-schools party, led by Canon Garland, is agitating in New Zealand for the adoption of the Queensland system of religious instruction in State schools. The party would have us believe that that system is generally accepted, and works without friction and sectarian influence wherever it has been adopted. So if you would kindly give me your opinion and experience of the working of the system in Queensland in the form of answers to the ensuing questions I should be greatly obliged.

"1. Is the system generally accepted as an equitable and final solution of the question?

"2. Has the working of the system tended to cause sectarian bitterness and strife?

"3. What is the attitude of the State teachers towards their own compulsory 'general religious' teaching? Have any conscientious teachers been forced out of the schools?

"4. Have there been instances of friction—(*a*) Between ministers and School Committees, (*b*) between objecting parents and teachers, (*c*) or in any other respect?

"5. Is there a growing public opinion that State Protestant religious teaching in State schools should, in equity, be followed by grants in aid to denominational schools, and to Roman Catholic schools in particular?

"6. Is there any other point you would care to mention?

"I realize that I am presuming somewhat in troubling you, but if you could let me have your reply without undue delay I should be greatly obliged. If you would have any objection to the public use of your name your feeling would be scrupulously respected. Thanking you in anticipation, I beg to remain, yours sincerely,

"T. A. WILLIAMS,
"Baptist Minister."

44. You are satisfied that that document was sent out by your organizer?—Yes, certainly.

45. Have you been made aware of this reply which was addressed to him?—I may have seen the reply, but I could not say. I have seen so many.

46. Would you mind reading the contents?—The letter reads:—

"100–108 Queen Street, Brisbane, 18th June, 1914.

"Rev. T. A. Williams, Baptist Minister, Sydenham, Christchurch, New Zealand.

"DEAR SIR,—

"In reply to your inquiry of the 29th ultimo, reply to which has been delayed owing to my absence from town, I have pleasure in stating that the Bible in State schools system referred to, as adopted in Queensland, is generally accepted by the public and by the various Churches, with the exception of the Roman Catholic. It is now over three years since the Bill was passed. It took about a year to get the necessary books prepared, but since the introduction the experience has been that the system works without the slightest friction. During a recent visit to the Dominion I formed the impression that the Queensland system was not really understood in New Zealand. The Department of Education have prepared two text-books for the use of junior and senior divisions. These books were compiled by a committee of the most experienced school-teachers and Inspectors, including some of the Roman Catholic faith, and they have been admitted to be an improvement on the text-book used in New South Wales, which was drawn up and adopted many years ago. The text-books include some of the finest literary passages in Holy Writ, and the essential points on which all Christians are agreed. These books are read in the usual course in the school, and the teacher simply asks questions to ascertain if the scholar understands the passage read. Nothing in the nature of dogma or sectarian interpretation is permitted. Where circumstances permit ministers or other duly accredited religious instructors are allowed to enter the schools during fixed hours and give special religious instruction. This provision is availed of in the larger centres of population only, but in the sparsely settled districts where no special religious training is available the school text-book is the only religious teaching which the children receive, and without such simple instruction they would grow up in entire ignorance of the great facts of common Christianity. As regards our Roman Catholic friends, they have been agitating for many years for State endowment for their schools. On a percentage basis this body is about

twice as large in Queensland as it is in New Zealand, but as far as I can judge from public opinion there is not the slightest chance of our State reverting to the denominational system, and the Roman Catholic religious teachers have the same opportunity as any other Church in giving instruction in the State schools.

"Referring to your questions in their order I have to state—

"(1.) The system is generally accepted as a fair and equitable way of meeting what the majority of our people believed to be a weakness in our previous system. In the referendum which was taken on the matter before the Bill was introduced the principle was affirmed by a majority of over seventeen thousand, and if a referendum was again taken I am confident that it would be reaffirmed by a much larger majority.

"(2.) During the debate when the Bill was before the House, and the discussion in the Press at the same time, stress was laid on the point that the introduction of the system would cause sectarian bitterness and strife. The actual results of experience have shown that there was no foundation for such fears, and some of those who were opposed to the system now frankly admit that they were mistaken.

"(3) and (4). Personally I have not heard of any friction arising *re* your questions (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and from a general talk which I had with the Under-Secretary some three months ago I understand that the whole scheme is working very smoothly. The attitude of the teachers, many of whom are Roman Catholics, is friendly. No teachers have been called upon to resign for this cause. I am not aware of any friction between religious teachers and School Committees. There can be no trouble between parents and teachers, as under the conscience clause no child is compelled to attend special religious instruction against the wishes of the parent.

"(5.) In my opinion there is not a growing public opinion in favour of giving the denominational grant, the trend being in the opposite direction. The Roman Catholics have the same opportunity as other religious bodies in our State schools. Under our system of State school scholarships any boy or girl under fourteen years of age who is able to secure over 50 per cent. of examination marks is entitled to a State scholarship, and during recent years, and before the present system of Bible-teaching was introduced, it was decided that these State-school scholarships would be available in any public grammar school or other high school approved by the State, controlled by any denomination, and in many cases the holders of State-school scholarships have elected to go to institutions controlled by the Roman Catholic Church. I believe that in this direction we have gone as far as possible.

"I will be pleased to give you any further information, and I have no objection to my name being used.

"The State has been my home for thirty-five years. I have visited nearly every part, and I have just returned from an extended tour in the far north and extreme north-west, covering over five thousand miles, in the course of which, along with the Home Secretary, I have been present at the inspection of schools, and have met teachers and ministers of various Churches. While other matters of local interest were brought up by deputations of School Committees, in not a single instance was the slightest adverse criticism made on the working of the Bible in State schools system.

"Yours sincerely,

"JAMES ALLEN,

"M.L.A. for Kurelpa (one of the metropolitan electorates)."

47. That letter, addressed to Mr. Williams, your secretary, has not found its way into your evidence?—No, certainly not.

48. You were not anxious to let the public know about it?—No, I was giving evidence of friction.

49. I can quite understand that?—What we are giving here is evidence of friction. That is not evidence of friction; that is evidence of smooth running. I have no doubt you could get the evidence of a lot of people in Queensland who think it is running smoothly, and a lot who believe it is running with friction. We have given the evidence of those who think it is running with friction.

50. In starting out and making inquiries in order to direct the public on such a matter as this you think it quite fair to conceal from the public the fact that you received evidence that shows your fears are groundless?—It is not a question of whether I think it is right. The position is that we got a large amount of evidence. We are not supporting the case for the Bible in schools. We have evidence from certain people who are in favour of Bible in schools and the evidence of certain people who are against it. It would be just as reasonable to ask us to call you as a witness for our case. We are presenting our side of the case.

51. Now, to come to the other circular that you issued signed by the same gentleman, that was addressed, I understand, to a number of ministers of religion in New Zealand?—Yes.

52. It is dated the 20th July, 1914. Would you mind reading it?—You are cross-examining—I am not. If you ask me to read it I will do so.

53. Would you mind telling us how many replies you received to the circular?—I cannot. The replies are still coming in. As far as I know nearly a hundred replies have been received, and all that have been received so far are before the House; but this matter has been worked by the organizer, who is in Christchurch.

54. And I presume you have put in the replies that are not favourable?—If they were petitions to the House they would be put in, as you will see if you read the document. I will read it for you. It states,—

"DEAR SIR,— "Christchurch, 20th July, 1914.

"A large and ever-increasing number of ministers are opposed to the platform of the Bible in State Schools (and Right of Entry and Compulsion of Teachers) League. Yet Parliament

is being persuaded that nearly all Protestant ministers are in favour of the scheme. Silence is taken as assent. We therefore respectfully urge that it is the duty of all ministers who are opposed to the scheme to prevent misconception and to state the position fairly by declaring their position. The League very promptly announces the divergence of any minister or teacher from the position of opposition to the League expressed by the body or Church to which he belongs. This circular is being sent to a large number of Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational ministers. We hope you will sign your name opposite all or any of the objections on the adjoining page which represent your grounds of objections. If you wish to add any other objection please do so. If you wish to state objections in a different form from those set out please arrange them in a similar way. All you send must be on one sheet of paper, on one side of it, and signed below. Please return the declaration in the enclosed stamped envelope by return mail. The declarations will be presented to Parliament in the form received, so that each minister speaks only as he wishes.

"Rev. T. A. WILLIAMS (Baptist).
"JOHN CAUGHLEY, M.A.,
"Elder, St. Andrew's, Christchurch."

"To the Hon. the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled, the petition of the undersigned humbly showeth:—

"1. That while in favour of any proper and fair method of providing religious instruction for the children of New Zealand, I am opposed to the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill on the following grounds:—

"(*a.*) That it provides for the right of entry to give sectarian teaching in State schools.

"(*b.*) That it would cause the Word of God to be taught under compulsion by State teachers.

"(*c.*) That many taxpayers would have to pay towards a form of religious instruction opposed to their religious beliefs.

"(*d.*) That it proposes to decide a religious matter involving acute differences of belief by a majority vote irrespective of justice.

"(*e.*) That the proposed form of ballot-paper is unfair, since electors would have to vote for two issues or none, though they might favour Bible-reading and not right of entry.

"2. Your petitioner therefore prays that Parliament will so act as to prevent any of the above injustices proposed in the above Bill.

"Signature: (Rev.)
"Address: ."

Signature.

55. Are you aware that you have received intimations from several ministers of religion in response to that circular that they are favourable to the Bible in schools?—I should not be a bit surprised.

56. How many replies have you received?—They are still coming in. As far as I know, I think eighty-six have been put before the House, and I believe there are about seven or eight members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church whose petitions have not yet been presented.

57. In your statement you say "The Presbyterian, the Congregational, and the Lutheran Churches in Queensland all opposed the adoption of the 'system' there." I think you are mistaken in that?—I am quite content to be corrected. I wish it to be understood that I am appearing for the executive, and I am not cognizant of the truth of all the statements, and if you can show me I am wrong I am willing to admit it.

58. If you will look at the first paragraph of this circular, which is the decision of the Presbyterian Church of Australia in 1908, and issued by the Moderator of Australia, you will see your statement is not correct [circular handed to witness]?—That seems to me to be quite an authentic document, and it would show that the Presbyterian Church was not against it, and to that extent the statement I have read is not correct.

59. If you altered your statement and said that some Presbyterian ministers were opposed to it you would be right?—I am quite prepared to do that after seeing the circular. In view of that I quite see the document shows that officially the Presbyterian Church accepts it.

60. In your statement you speak of the Education Commissioners in New South Wales, and you say, "They were profoundly impressed by the scheme of moral instruction in vogue in the State schools of France." You further say, "The system has so far failed as a moral factor that the Commissioners recommend the adoption of the French scheme of moral instruction." The Commissioners reported separately?—Yes, it should be "Commissioner." I am aware of the fact that the men reported separately. It is Mr. Knibbs's report we are referring to.

61. Then are you aware that his fellow-Commissioner, of equal weight with himself, gave as his report—"It will suffice to say that our own State seems to have made the best attempt at solving the difficulty of religious instruction in schools by the facilities it gives clergymen and accredited teachers under clause 17 of the Public Instruction Act, and by the excellent general Scriptural instruction contained in the Irish National Scripture-books which are still in daily use"?—I understood the other Commissioner had reported differently on this one point. I should like to quote the whole of it. It states, "The teaching of religion has no place in the regular programme of the French school, and it does not appear that there exists any special provision for dogmatic or general instruction in the subject. The existence of God is assumed, and reverence to His name inculcated. One's personal views on the value of religious teaching to children of public-school age need not be intruded here. It will suffice to say that our own State

seems to have made the best attempt at solving the difficulty of religious instruction in schools by the facilities it gives clergymen and accredited teachers under clause 17 of the Public Instruction Act, and by the excellent general Scriptural instruction contained in the Irish National Scripture-books which are still in daily use. The moral and civic side of the school instruction in France is strongly emphasized."

62. Then you are aware, I presume, that Mr. Knibbs's recommendation was not adopted by his Department or the Government?—Yes, I understand that is so.

63. And that since his recommendation there has been no alteration made in the system of religious instruction?—No fundamental alteration, so far as I know.

64. In other words, you admit that the Department and the Government of New South Wales adopted Mr. Turner's report?—No, I do not admit that; but they did not follow out Mr. Knibbs's report.

65. You quote the New South Wales books a great deal?—Yes.

66. Do you understand and does your League understand that the League I represent is not asking for the New South Wales books?—I suppose if the Education Department accepted the New South Wales books you would accept them.

67. But I am not answering questions?—I understand that you are leaving it to the Education Department of New Zealand to draw up the book.

68. Yes?—And they might draw up the New South Wales book.

69. Are you aware that we have over and over again explicitly and definitely stated that we do not favour the New South Wales books?—I must say that I did not know that was your view.

70. Would you accept it that it is our view?—The idea I have of your view is that you want the New South Wales system, the whole system, and nothing but the system.

71. I do not attribute bad feeling to you on this point, but you have left out in that comment the most important part of what I said, whoever your authority was, and that is that we are not asking for all the details or any particular detail of the Australian system—we are asking for the principle of the Australian system?—I was not aware how far you went in the details. I understood you were leaving the question of the text-book to the Education Department absolutely.

72. Are you aware that we have stated over and over again our preference for a book such as the Queensland book rather than the New South Wales book?—I do not know. I will accept that from you. I cannot say I knew that was your view.

73. In your statement, under the heading of "The Scripture-lesson Books," you say. "With the exception of Tasmania, where teachers are requested to confine themselves to the narrative as taken from any version of the Bible they may possess ('The Course of Instruction for Primary Schools'), the lessons are given from text-books compiled by States for the purpose." Are you not aware that in Tasmania and Australia there is no text-book?—I believe that is true. I believe that statement is inaccurate. In all places that have adopted text-books, these books were drawn up by the State. That is the intention of the clause.

74. You also quote such things as the texts, and you speak of them as of a highly sectarian nature as some at least will be seen from a few quotations?—Yes.

75. Where is the sectarianism in the sentence "Our Blessed Lord"? "Why cannot a man serve God and Mammon"?—I think the sectarianism comes in if you ask what conception of God you are going to take. You raise the question whether it is the Unitarian or Trinitarian conception of God.

76. That is your interpretation of this as a sectarian question?—Where the sectarianism might arise.

77. Coming back to your statement, you mentioned where the system operated, and you spoke of dates, and you said they were not of importance, and, if I caught you rightly, you said that the system existed in some places before it became law?—No, I do not think so. The point is this: if you take Tasmania, as far as I can find out, the Education Act of 1885 placed religious education on what we may call a legal basis, and there is no reference in that Act to a preceding Act, so I cannot tell exactly when it originated. I accept your statement if you say it originated in 1868.

78. Your figures would be correct if they read—"The system operates since 1866 in New South Wales, 1868 in Tasmania, 1893 in Western Australia, and 1910 in Queensland"?—I quite accept that.

79. You quoted several American authorities as opposed to the question of Bible in schools?—Yes.

80. Are you aware that there is a very strong movement there similar to the League I represent to get the Bible restored to all schools in America?—I should not be surprised.

81. In your pamphlet you quote the regulations in New South Wales?—And Queensland, West Australia, and Tasmania.

82. Are you aware that the Queensland regulations were in existence for thirty years before religious instruction was restored?—All those regulations in Queensland?

83. I do not say all of them, but those regulations referring to what are called teachers' disabilities?—I think you ought to ask me a question about some of those we have quoted.

84. Regulation 85 reads, "Teachers shall not actively take part in public meetings." Are you aware that that regulation, in substance, but with verbal alterations, has been in force in Queensland since the early eighties?—No, I am not aware of that, but I would like to know what you mean by "verbal alterations."

85. That regulation substantially has been in existence for over thirty years?—No, I was not aware of that.

86. Are you aware that a teacher from Queensland visiting New Zealand expressly stated that in public?—No, I was not aware of that.

87. Then with regard to your interpretation of the New South Wales regulations, what authority have you for saying that they are interpreted in such a drastic fashion?—What statement of mine are you now referring to?

88. Where you say in regard to the regulations that the New Zealand teachers would not accept such a dreadful state of things?—My point is simply this: if those regulations had been in force in New Zealand at the present time and this question had come up, neither Mr. John Caughley, Mr. William Foster, nor any other teachers in New Zealand would have been entitled to open their mouths on this question; and whatever may be the case with people who have not had any greater measure of freedom, I believe I am right in saying that I do not believe the teachers would be content to rest under a system of that kind. I do not think Parliament would be content to put them under a system of that kind.

89. Have you seen published statements from teachers in New South Wales to the effect that the interpretation you have put on the New South Wales regulations is purely imaginary?—No, I have not seen the statements, but I have the regulations, which are quite sufficient for me.

90. You mentioned Sir Robertson Nicoll, and you quoted him as one of your friends in supporting your point of view?—Yes.

91. Have you seen the pamphlet issued by the executive committee of which he is a member, in 1910, in which he advocates practically the very things that this League is advocating?—No, I have not seen that pamphlet, but I have here a Press Association cablegram of the 12th February, 1914, which says, "The Rev. Sir W. Robertson Nicoll, editor of the *British Weekly*, the well-known Nonconformist journal, in a letter to the Press, states that he doubts whether the Nonconformists would adopt the suggestions of Dr. Frodsham (formerly Anglican Bishop of North Queensland) regarding the problem of religious instruction in State schools." That is, the Queensland system.

92. You also quoted Professor Finlay?—Yes.

93. Are you aware that Professor Finlay, at pages 111 and 112 of his book, from which you quoted, speaks of "the demand for right of entry into the public school seems justified," and otherwise in his book advocates almost the system which we are advocating, except that he goes a good deal further?—No, I am not aware of that. I was aware that Professor Finlay is in favour of religious teaching, but I also notice that after the lines you have marked he states, "But if a suggestion may here be attempted, I would urge that in place of right of entry the parent should demand a right of substitution. For the proper venue for religious instruction is not the public school, with the Anglican teaching one group in Room X, and the Catholic another group in Room Y; the church building, the house of God itself, is the fit place of assembly for teaching the distinctive doctrines which the Church holds dear. And the clergyman himself is the fittest teacher, not the public-school teacher who, in these unhappy controversies, finds his allegiance divided between Church and State. It would surely not be difficult for the law to recognize attendance once or more during the school week in church buildings.

94. How do you approve of Professor Finlay's idea of going much further than we propose to go?—I have yet to be shown that he proposes to go further than you go.

95. Are you not aware that we are not asking for the right of substitution, which means taking the children away into the church?—I am aware you are not asking for that right.

96. Then Professor Finlay does go further than we propose?—I am not prepared to say that that is going further.

97. Not taking the children into church?—I am not prepared to say that is going further.

98. He speaks of the clergyman as being the fittest teacher, not the public-school teacher. Do you not understand that that is exactly the position we take up? We are asking that the clergyman give the definite religious teaching, and the public-school teacher to take the reading-lesson from the Scripture-lesson book?—He says, "Not the public-school teacher." There is a relative clause: "who, in these unhappy controversies, finds his allegiance divided between Church and State." That is the very thing we are contending.

99. Do you not accept our statement that we believe we are asking the teachers not to teach religion?—I accept your statement that you believe you are not asking it, but I do not believe the statement that you are not asking it. That is my point.

100. I notice you quoted a good many figures in regard to criminal statistics?—Yes.

101. Do you really expect people to accept bare figures as evidence of an increase or decrease of crime as a test of morality?—It depends on the figures.

102. Would you mind explaining?—Well, on the way in which the figures are quoted, on the way in which they are arranged, and on the source from which the figures come—all problems which lie at the basis of statistics.

103. On the other hand, you would not accept figures unless you knew all about them?—Of their source, and the way they are arranged.

104. You said that some temperance association stated that New South Wales was the most drunken State in Australia?—It was cabled to New Zealand.

105. Would you accept that as true?—In conjunction with the other evidence I have here I should think it was probable.

106. And if the Commissioner of Police, who knows the facts better than a temperance organization, which may be prejudiced, stated that it was not true, you would still maintain that the statement was true?—I would like to know what knowledge he has of the other States.

107. You would think his knowledge not so good as your own?—No. You asked me whether I would accept his view, and I say I would want to know whether that Police Commissioner, in making a comparative statement, has any knowledge of the other State.

108. You quoted Victoria as having the same birth-stains as New South Wales?—Yes.

109. You believe that?—Yes.

110. Then you are not aware that out of about the first 1,015 arrivals in New South Wales in 1788 there were 742 unfortunate convicts, and that in Victoria there was not a single convict

across the border?—Are you not referring to the time when there was no border, when the two States were one?

111. No, no matter whether it was called Victoria or New South Wales, there never was in that country any convict settlement or any convicts in any appreciable degree: are you not aware of that?—No, my information is to the contrary.

112. You know Dr. Fitchett is an accepted historian on the subject?—I have read other historians.

113. You will not produce a greater one than Dr. Fitchett?—That is a matter of opinion.

114. Did you know that the *Argus* and the *Age*, leading newspapers in Melbourne, and newspapers which also support your point of view on education, speak in the strongest possible language about the number of crimes in Victoria and the inadequacy of the police and their failure to bring the criminals to justice? I think your figures should be multiplied by ten. For instance, this is an extract from the *Argus*, Melbourne, of the 8th January, 1913: "With, say, only 10 or 20 or 30 per cent. of the more serious crimes shected home to the perpetrators, there is naturally a strong disposition on the part of criminals to try their luck. In Victoria, for example, the chances against detection must be about as four to one." Are you aware that is the opinion of one of the leading newspapers?—I should not be surprised if that were the opinion of every leading newspaper in every big town in the world.

WEDNESDAY, 14TH OCTOBER, 1914.

JOHN CAUGHLEY, M.A., examined. (No. 4.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What is your position?—Headmaster of the West Christchurch District High School.

2. And whom do you represent before the Committee?—The New Zealand Educational Institute.

3. Are you instructed to appear for that Institute?—Yes. I will read the official minute: "Mr. Grundy moved, Mr. Lamb seconded, That Mr. Caughley be asked to represent the Institute before the Committee of the House on the Bible-in-schools Referendum Bill. Agreed to." I also wish to read the resolutions passed at the Institute giving authority to support this. First, there was one at New Plymouth the year before last, as follows: "That the N.Z.E.I., believing that the present secular system of education is the only just system of national education, is opposed to the Bible-in-schools movement." Remit 60: "That in the interest of education it is desirable that the Institute should take steps to combat the attempt to introduce Bible-teaching in schools." "By leave of the Institute Miss Chaplin moved remit 55 in the following form: 'That the N.Z.E.I., while recognizing the value of Bible-teaching and of religion, is opposed to the Bible in Schools League's programme.' Seconded by Mr. Evans." Then there was an amendment moved by Mr. Templar, which was negatived by forty-two to seven, and Miss Chaplin's resolution was carried by forty-two to seven. Then, at a meeting on the 29th July last this resolution was carried: "Mr. Caughley moved, Mr. Burns seconded, That the N.Z.E.I., while recognizing the value of Bible-teaching and of religion, is opposed to the Bible in Schools League's programme, and, representing 95 per cent. of the certificated teachers of New Zealand, appeals to Parliament against the unjust proposal of a body of petitioners to compel teachers to give religious instruction to which some object in conscience and for which the parents require a conscience clause. Carried on division by twenty-seven to four."

The Bill before the Committee would make possible one of the most revolutionary changes in our educational system in the relation of the State to religion and in the constitution of our legislative system. Yet it is proposed that Parliament should, without dealing with the merits or demerits of the changes proposed, pass the whole question over to the decision of the individual voter, who would vote on impulse, on sentiment, on religious prejudice, but who would certainly not be able to examine the issues involved nor appreciate the constitutional and educational questions which, even if put before him, would be outside the powers of the average elector. He would be appealed to to support the Bible, to give the Bible to the children, and he would see little else in this revolution.

With every desire to be brief, therefore, it is my duty to make before this Committee, and thus before Parliament, a full statement of matters of the most fundamental importance concerning the welfare of education, the up-bringing of the children of the Dominion, the true interests of religion and of the Bible, in whose interests, it is alleged, this movement is made. It is also my duty respectfully to urge on the Legislature to put to the fullest test the proposals and the claims of the League which has originated this agitation. The questions which I will raise are ones which in the midst of an election, and of a referendum heated by religious passion, will be entirely overlooked. Yet these questions are such that surely no body responsible for the education of the children can afford to allow to go by the board by mechanically handing over the whole matter to the irresponsible decision of individual electors to whom these vital matters would be non-existent.

In order to save time I propose, with the permission of the Committee, to read the main statements herein given, passing over where possible the details of the supporting arguments and quotations given in proof or in support. The whole of the statement herein given is, however, the undivided evidence which I place before you.

With regard to quotations, I wish to explain that I do not claim that the person quoted supports the whole of the opinions I am bringing forward, or that the person quoted may not oppose my position on other points. I merely claim that the quotation in each case is in harmony,

both in letter and in spirit, with the particular point in connection with which I cite it. I shall throughout refer to the Bible in Schools League as "the League."

A Revolutionary Proposal.

Though a number of radical and even revolutionary changes in our State Constitution would be made by the Bill, and made only on assumption instead of by parliamentary enactment, the Bill deals specifically with the present system of education. The proposals of the Bible in State Schools League, as outlined in the Bill and expounded by an accredited spokesman of that League, form a direct twofold challenge to the present secular basis of our education system. Nothing would account for the present sectarian upheaval, the denominational excitement, the indirect attempt to alter the Constitution, the combination of denominations for political action, unless there were alleged to be some great and glaring disastrous defect in our present system. No mere detail, or slight defect or minor reform would justify the excitement aroused by the organizers of the Bible in Schools League in the interests of their movement. The alleged defect seems to be of such an extraordinary character that it requires for its remedy a machinery so abnormal that the ordinary means of legislation by which such great developments of our educational system have hitherto been made are declared to be ineffective.

This apparently formidable challenge to the secular nature of our system may be dealt with from two points of view, which will, I think, cover the main arguments raised in support of the Bill and its proposals: (1) Our secular system is charged with such a failure to meet the needs of the moral nature of the children that positive deterioration of character results; (2) the Bible in State Schools League offers a scheme of religious instruction which would materially improve the character and morality of the children. It must surely be admitted that unless the Bible in Schools League can clearly maintain the above two positions they have no justification for seeking to alter the system, and, above all, to arouse such sectarian divisions and suggest such extraordinary legislative means to bring about a change. My defence of the secular basis of State education will be made in answer to the charge (1) above; my criticism of the proposed scheme will be a reply to the claim in (2).

Secularism.

The mere name "secular" has been very extensively used in an unjustifiable way to brand the system as an objectionable one. A secular system is not a secularist system. It is not anti-religious even in spirit. It is merely an abstention from the teaching of religious subjects owing to the State's inability to give such teaching on the same fair and equitable footing as it gives instruction in non-religious subjects. It is sectarianism, not secularism, that limits the State's teaching to non-religious or secular subjects. Archbishop Temple, when headmaster of Rugby, said, "Secular schools would not be irreligious. I am by no means sure that they would not be more religious. . . . I respect the feeling that makes England shrink from secular schools, but I cannot reverence what is so mere a sentiment." Dr. Parker, the great divine, said, "As a Nonconformist I believe that no education can be complete which does not include thorough religious training, but . . as a citizen I deny that it is the business of the State to furnish a complete education. . . . Thus I would not exclude religion, I simply would not include it." (*Times*, 18/10/94.) Dr. Fairbairn, the leader in the Congregational Church, said, "The secular may be non-ecclesiastical, but it is not, and need not be, anti-religious. The State is to me a body little competent to legislate in religion." (*Daily News*, 11/1/07.) Similar views have been expressed by such eminent men as Dr. Clifford, Charles Kingsley, Hon. J. Chamberlain, Lords Rosebery and Morley, Sir H. Campbell-Bannerman, Principal Henderson, Rev. J. H. Jowett, Rev. S. Hocking, Rev. R. J. Campbell, Bishop Mitchinson, and a number of Anglican vicars in England. Finally, 557 Protestant ministers of Great Britain issued a manifesto in which they declared—"We, the undersigned Christian clergy and ministers, desire to make clear the grounds upon which we support the 'secular solution' of the education question. Religion should not be taught in the public elementary schools in school-hours nor at the public expense. . . . We consider it (religion) to be of vital importance, and we hold that education in the truest sense is impossible without it. But we hold equally strongly that it is not the function of the State to impart such teaching. We hold that it is contrary to the principles of justice and righteousness, either that Catholics should be forced to pay rates in support of Protestant teaching, or that Protestants should be forced to pay rates for Catholic teaching, or that freethinkers or rationalists should be forced to pay rates in support of any religious teaching whatever. The only solution is that no religion should be taught at the public expense. . . . The attempt would be fatal to the best interests of religion itself. . . . So far from the secular solution endangering or enfeebling religion, we believe that its direct effect would be to awaken the Churches to a sense of the duty and responsibility which are theirs and theirs alone."

In New Zealand the supporters of the secular system of State education include large bodies of Christian people, a large number of Protestant ministers, and a large proportion of the very denominations which are officially supporting the Bible in Schools League. Surely these are not to be branded as secularists, as enemies of the Bible, as those who would forbid the children of New Zealand to have the Bible. We cannot fairly be branded as secularists because we oppose the method or system put forward by any league. On such grounds Luther, Knox, Wesley, the Puritans, and the Covenanters could have been called secularists. We advocate religious instruction under proper methods, by just means, and under the proper auspices, but we oppose the League's proposals.

It is not of choice but of necessity that the State teaches only non-religious subjects. It cannot put into the schools of *all* the people any form of religious instruction that can be utilized

by only *some* of the people. Neither can the State justly force any teacher to give religious instruction contrary to the principles of the Church to which he belongs. Rev. R. J. Porter, who moved the Bible-in-schools resolution at the Presbyterian Assembly, 1912, declared, "It is entirely the fault of the Churches of New Zealand that the Bible has not been introduced into the public schools long ago. For many years the Churches had been divided on the matter, but now they were united." This is an admission that sectarian differences, not secularism, prevented the Bible being taught in the schools. Those differences have not been removed. Rev. R. J. Porter says the Churches are now united. He means *the* Churches—*our Churches;* until *our* differences were settled and *our* principles satisfied or abandoned the children must go without the Bible. For forty-three years *our* differences "banished the Bible from the schools." *We* "robbed the children of their heritage," because *we* had not found a scheme to suit *our* views. Now *we* four Churches are united in at least an official way the problem is solved. The principles of other Churches may not stand in the way as *ours* did. To use Rev. R. J. Porter's own words, the desire of other Churches to have their principles satisfied is "an exasperating thing," "a little political consideration that would come in to attract attention."

That the secular system was not set up in 1877 in any spirit of antagonism or even of indifference to religion may be seen by reviewing the names of the men who framed the Act of 1877. They had all been brought up and taught under the religious-instruction-in-schools system, and would, if anything, be strongly prejudiced in its favour. They were not secularists. They saw the inevitable need of a truly national system was that nothing of a sectarian nature should be introduced into the State schools. They knew that the State could teach arithmetic, writing, geography, drawing, &c., in a way that could be utilized by children of all classes without any distinctions of creed or denomination. They knew that the State could not so give even the simplest form of religious instruction, and therefore justly decided that no religious instruction of any kind could be undertaken with justice to all. Surely this is the very opposite of a secularist attitude! It is the highest form of regard for religious equality and justice. Yet our system, thus freed by necessity from sectarian distinctions, is called "Godless, atheistic, secularistic, materialistic, and its supporters are described as enemies of the open Bible, of the children, and of religion." It is said that we regard the Bible as a leprous thing that must be kept out of the schools at all costs; that it may be read in the gaols but not in the schools; that "dogmatic secularism is taught in the schools" (Canon Garland). The Presbyterian ***Outlook*** declared that the opponents of the proposed scheme were either (1) agnostics, (2) Roman Catholics, or (3) a few malcontents who find fault with anything and everything." It will thus be seen that an entirely unwarranted and unjust use has been made of the mere name "secular." The name has been distorted and supporters of the present non-sectarian system maligned simply because they oppose the policy of the Bible in State Schools League, which also stands for right of entry to give sectarian instruction in school-hours, for compulsory teaching of religion, for denial of conscience to teachers, and for religion by majority-rule."

A Practical Test.

Next it is urged against our present system that it ignores the most essential element in education—*i.e.*, religious education. This begs the question, which will be examined presently, that the only religious instruction is specific instruction given in set lessons at a particular time of the day distinct from all other instruction. Meanwhile, however, we press the point that if the above charge be true, then, with such an essential factor missing, the education of our children must suffer throughout. The child's nature is a complete whole. It cannot be cut into sections. The child cannot be one kind of being at one time and another at another. A radical defect in the child's training will show throughout. Therefore, if the most essential part of the child's nature is neglected or wrongly provided for, his education will show defects throughout. Now, can those who declare that our system has so serious a defect show that, even in a slight degree, the general education of our children does not compare more than favourably with that of any country of equal resources and state of development? If they cannot they must confess that this essential element is at present in some adequate way supplied to our children either in the schools or out of them.

As stated above, the charge really supposes that only specific, direct, set religious instruction will meet the needs of the child's moral nature. This is another form of the charge that there is no moral instruction given in our schools, or that it is insufficient, or that it is on a wrong basis. Now, we reply that the necessary character element is given in our schools, and it is as closely related to religion and the Bible as the State can justly make it. The children receive their moral training through their teachers, who are men and women of high moral character, and as a general rule Christian men and women. They train the children in the most powerful way by their personal influence as well as by direct moral teaching. This goes on all day and every day, and the influence and teaching are derived from Christian ideals and principles which the teachers themselves have assimilated. This is in accord with the soundest educational principles, based on a true appreciation of child nature and development; principles which would be absolutely negated by the kind of religious instruction proposed in the Bill before the Committee. This will be proved later.

The greatest emphasis is now laid on oral teaching as distinguished from text-book teaching, and especially from mechanical text-book teaching. The teacher must assimilate a wide range of matter, take a much wider survey of the subject, know the underlying principles and the scientific explanation and basis of what he teaches. But he does not lay all this before his class. The teacher becomes the living book, far more powerful than any printed book. The more abstruse the basis of what he has to teach the more necessary is this kind of teaching. Nowhere is it more necessary than in character-training. The teacher is always training character, using

any incident of any lesson freely and naturally, any occurrence in school, or in play, or in outside affairs which will give a more living concrete illustration to what he wishes to teach.

As has been stated, the Bible, being the basis of all the contentions of the sects, cannot fairly be introduced into the State schools as a basis of instruction; but, apart from this, it is necessary to note that the claim that we must directly use the Bible for all training of character is a relic of the bygone days when all subjects were taught in a logical, formal, mechanical, abstract way; when every subject was started on the rules and principles, and definitions, and laws, and children were required to learn by heart what they did not understand—in short, the old cram system, which has given way to the present more natural way. One exponent of the proposed scheme declared that children "take in" theology more readily than adults do. Probably they do. *Canon Lyttelton*, D.D., Headmaster of Eton, though an advocate of religious education of a natural type, says in his book, "The Corner Stone of Education" (page 239), "We quarrel unceasingly about the religious education in our elementary schools, forgetting that whatever it is it will be too weak to counteract the endless evils of home neglect." Bishop Julius, of Christchurch, an advocate of the scheme of religious instruction proposed in the Bill, said in a public meeting, "Undenominational religious teaching was not religious teaching nor anything like it." Mr. Holmes, ex Senior Inspector of Primary Schools, England, says in his book, "What is and What might be" (page 99), "There are thousands of teachers whose personal influence is a partial antidote to the numbing poison that is being distilled slowly but surely from the daily Scripture lesson." He quotes another Inspector, who says, "It presents religion to them in a form which they instinctively reject, accepting it at first under compulsion, but turning from it at last with deep-seated weariness and permanent distaste. The boy who says, when he leaves school, 'If this is religion I will have no more of it,' is acting in obedience to a healthy impulse." Both these men are ardent advocates of a free, unrestricted, voluntary form of religious instruction, but they heartily denounce mechanical teaching of the "greatest of all great matters." Holmes speaks of children who have been the "victims of upwards of two thousand 'Scripture lessons' by the time they leave school." The style of lesson advocated in the Bill before you is even more mechanical than those thus denounced.

These are advocates of the need for religious instruction, yet they show unmistakably that any mechanical teaching of the form set out for the teacher in the proposed Bill may not only fail to do good but has done positive harm. This is not the fault of the Bible or of religion, but of wrong methods and conditions. Of all the schemes that have been devised the scheme proposed for the teachers of New Zealand by this Bill is by far the most mechanical and barren. Though we do not in our present system thus offer the children the shadow without the substance of religious instruction, we do claim that we meet the growing needs of the child's character, and that by the type of boys and girls our system produces our claim is largely justified.

The charge of secularism in the sense given by the Bible in Schools League rebounds on their own system. If our present instruction is anti-Bible, anti-religious, if it is dogmatic secularism, if it does not teach morality nor provide for the spiritual and moral nature of the child, then even under the proposed scheme there would be just that kind of instruction for at least twenty-one hours a week out of twenty-five. The blighting effects of secularism would be on the children, and only the present alleged defective methods of moral training would be operating. Those who advocate religious instruction in schools must advocate that the religious instruction shall continue as required throughout the whole of the school day. The child's nature does not alter as soon as the Bible lesson is over. Inspector Holmes, above quoted, says, "Far from wishing to limit its religious activities to the first forty minutes of the day, I hold that it should be actively religious throughout every minute of the school session; that whatever it does it should do all to the glory of God." This would require, however, a denominational school. The League propose to shut off in a watertight compartment of the first half-hour of the day what is calls religious instruction, and then for the rest of the day this religious element is not required. All educationists would denounce this artificial distinction. Geography or drawing cannot go on all day, but character-building does; and if religious instruction is confined to one lesson, what is to become of character during the rest of the day?—just what goes on now: what is called "morality without religion"—dogmatic secularism.

The Best Moral Text-book.

But the League says that if we claim to teach morality, why not use the best moral text-book; why not go to the source of Christian morality, the Bible; why not place in the children's hands the best text-book in the world on morality? This may look sound, but, apart from the now much-discredited teaching from text-books in primary schools, there is the point that educational principles, in harmony with the child-nature, principles that are proved sound in the teaching of every other subject, are opposed to this claim for the final text-book. When a teacher teaches geography or nature-study he does not put into the child's hands the most complete, the most exhaustive, the most fundamental text-book on these subjects. When he teaches history he does not give the child the historic documents, the constitutional principles, and the history-book that surpasses all other books on history. When he teaches drawing he does not give the child the finest book on perspective and on the principles of optics which are the authority for these principles. These books are for the teacher; he cannot know too much of them even for the simplest form of teaching. He makes them his own, and in the light of his mature and wide study, as one who knows the end from the beginning, he deals in the concrete, the actual, the practical, with the children, keeping within the range of the child's present experience. The book which gives the last word, the sum total, the highest perfection of knowledge on any subject would be the worst to teach children from, particularly when the teacher is forbidden to do more than hear it read.

The report of the Conference on Scripture-teaching in Secondary Schools, 1913, at which papers were read by Canon Masterman, Professor Peake, Canon Holland, Dr. Headlam, and others is a protest from beginning to end against mechanical teaching of Scripture and the limitation of the subject to a few books of the Bible. All these go to show that if the teacher did use the Bible in the class he should be infinitely more a teacher, an interpreter, than in any other lesson. Yet the proposed scheme actually requires that a teacher when using this Book, the final word on morality and religion, with the most profound of all topics, the relation of the soul of man to God, shall be less a teacher than when teaching any other subject—that is, he is to teach the Bible without teaching religion, and yet, in some way or other, supply the spiritual needs of the children.

The Bible without Religion.

The above extraordinary task set for the teacher violates another great educational principle. After the teacher has conducted a Bible lesson without being a teacher, a clergyman is to come along (perhaps) and teach what the lesson was really intended to convey. This is as if one teacher took a book on chemistry, or the best text-book on geography or history, without teaching geography or chemistry or history. The teacher must conduct a reading-lesson different from any other reading-lesson he ever takes in school. Then, a day or two after, a visiting instructor comes, who does not know the children, who has not heard the lesson read, who is less a teacher than the one who was forbidden really to teach the lesson, and in one lesson the latter is to reveal the true spirit of the four reading-lessons previously given. But he may if he chooses—and he most likely would—deal with matter quite different from what was mechanically read without real explanation. He may cram the children with abstruse dogmas or abstract definitions. Or he may not come at all, and the undeveloped lessons may drift away. Would any sane person propose to teach a secular subject in this way? Yet this is the proposed method of giving religious instruction, the greatest of all great subjects. Words would fail any School Inspector if he found such procedure with the meanest subject on the syllabus. Yet many misguided people seem to think that as long as there is religious instruction, at least in appearance, matters are sure to be going on satisfactorily.

Literature.

The official organizer of the League, and other exponents of its scheme, vie with each other in declaring how little a teacher is to teach when giving Bible lessons, but no two of them agree as to what the teacher really is to do. They even contradict each other. However, they all call for the introduction of the Bible as literature, as the well of English undefiled, as the greatest classic in English literature, as the interpreter of history and of all other literature. Yet even a pupil-teacher would be roundly condemned if he dealt with the simplest piece of childish poetry in the way that the League prescribes for teaching the greatest of all classics. Literature is the embodiment of the thoughts of a great mind. It ceases to be literature if it is not so read and used. A work of art is but a daub of colour or a maze of lines unless the message of the artist is in a fair measure comprehended. The Bible, given by inspiration of God, God's word to man, ceases to be His word if it is not used as such. It ceases to have any moral authority and spiritual sanction unless it is so regarded. It ceases even to be literature if it ignores the Author's message. Yet here are a few of the sayings of some of the foremost leaders of the League: Canon Garland says the class is to read the Bible like any other book. Rev. T. Tait says it is to be read like a play of Shakespeare. At the same time they say we must have the Bible in the school to give Divine sanction and authority to the moral precepts already taught, a sanction without which, the League declares, that morality is valueless.

We are to read the Bible like any other book. This is an impossibility. The Bible is like no other book. It came to us like no other book. Its contents and its teachings, its claims and its authority, are like those of no other book. Its Author is like no other author. How can that which is like no other, not merely in degree, but in kind in a unique way, be treated like any other book without destroying its very essence, the very purpose for which the League claims to want it read? Worse still, the League would have the teacher put the Bible far below the level of the commonest school text-book by forbidding him to see that the children get from the Bible the only teaching it was ever intended to give—viz., religious teaching—by forbidding him to see that the children get the only thought that the Bible was ever intended to convey. Rev. J. McKenzie, secretary of the Bible in Schools League, said that the teacher was to read the Bible like any other book. At a later date he told his congregation, "You cannot read the Bible like any other book. You must read it prayerfully and with the help of the Holy Spirit." And a few weeks later, in an address at Timaru, he said that he would have no objection to an agnostic giving a Bible lesson. If the League really meant that it was as literature it wants the Bible in schools, their plan would, if carried out, effectively kill the essential literary value of the Bible. Let any one read the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, the 23rd Psalm, the Sermon on the Mount, and if he treats it as literature is taken in school at other times he will just as surely teach religion—the thing the League says he must not do. If the League were candid it would not try to introduce under one guise a Book which they plainly want to see used in another guise. Would there be this ecclesiastical agitation, this clamour to Parliament, this proposed revolution of the Constitution, in order to put a classic into the schools? If the Bible were not the Word of God there would be no claim to make it the basis for altering the dreadful secularism of our schools, for it too would be a secular book. Yet if it is treated like any other book it is secularized—the Bible secularized at the instance of the supposed champions of the Bible. In the League's pamphlet "Opinions of Experts" (page 11) we find one ingenious expert stating that "General religious instruction is imparted as secular instruction." The Bible teaching is given

as secular instruction. The shifts to which the supporters of this system are put should make us wonder.

The same people decree that the Bible is to be used as a secular book, but that its introduction is to break down the secular system; that this secularized Bible must be introduced into the schools because it is the final authority and ground of all true religion; that the Bible should be recognized by a Christian State which is to forbid its teachers to teach the religion of the Bible; that it is the only authority for morality because it is the Divine revelation to man, but it is to be treated on a lower level than a play of Shakespeare; that the finest literature in the English language is to be treated as a string of words and phrases, while the essential spirit that makes it literature must be most studiously avoided, even tabooed.

The theological gymnastics attempted by the League advocates in their vain endeavours to show that they want the Bible as the Word of God and foundation of religion, and at the same time that it is to be used as a secular book, are somewhat interesting. Only a few can be given:—Canon Garland (*Outlook*, 11/11/13): "Even the Scripture lessons under the supervision of the State-school teachers would be 'secular,' inasmuch as they would teach no denominational or dogmatic religion, but simply be confined to the literary and moral aspects." Rev. P. B. Fraser (Presbyterian) (*Otago Daily Times*, 22/4/05): "This League casts the Bible out as a Divine book and Divine law and brings it in as a text-book of morality. We have never made any separation of its doctrine from its morality, and never conceived that we should live to see a Christian Church begging the State to permit it to place a non-religious morality into its schools. We always thought that was the peculiar province of freethought associations." Rev. John McKenzie (Presbyterian) (*Outlook*, 28/10/13):- "Religious instruction in the public schools is an absolute necessity as a foundation of morality." Bishop Sprott (League Paper, 1/7/13): "Doubtless the Bible contains much excellent moral teaching, but morality and even religion are not dependent upon the Bible." Bishop Averill (*Hawke's Bay Herald*, 19/6/13): "The simplest questions on the why and wherefore of your moral teaching reveals to you at once that your lips must be closed unless you can point the inquirer to the religious sanction for morality." Rev. R. Waddell (Editorial, *Outlook*, 11/11/13; reprint from *Outlook*, 7/11/96): "That is our case then—(1) We have shown that the State must, in the interests of good citizenship, teach morality in the schools; (2) that morality needs for its efficiency and force religious sanction and inspiration; (3) that these sanctions and inspirations can best be given by the Bible." Rev. I. Jolly (Ex-Moderator, Presbyterian Church) (*Ohinemuri Gazette*, 13/8/13): "The teacher's business was to see that the children read the lesson and understood it from a dictionary point of view." Bishop Neville has declared that the terms "Bible-in-schools" and "religious instruction" are synonymous

Restore the Bible.

This further cry is really a demand to restore denominational schools under the State. Nowhere in the world is religious instruction given by the State without having State denominational schools. Germany, England, Scotland, Switzerland, Russia, and the States of Australia where the League's system operates are proofs of this. In New South Wales several Churches are provided with the kind of religious instruction they want at the cost of the State. Any other branch of the Christian Church to which this system is repugnant is refused the kind of religious instruction they want, at the cost of the State. Thus the State schools are truly denominational schools as if it provided separately for some denominations, instead of by a system which suits several combined, since it discriminates between the denominations. The only possible way for the State to give religious instruction without creating denominational schools would be by the finding of a system that would satisfy all denominations. That has never been found. The Commission report of 1863 quoted above shows that in the Auckland Province the Board had no power to prescribe religious instruction. In Wellington the Act expressly prohibited religious instruction being given in any school maintained wholly or in part by money raised under the powers of the Act. In Auckland, Wellington, and Nelson there was permitted a practice almost identical with the present Nelson system. In Otago and Southland it was expressly stipulated that the doctrines taught must not be at variance with those commonly known as "evangelical Protestant doctrines." Yet those who clamour for the alleged restoration of the Bible to the schools tell us that parents in New Zealand were robbed of their children's heritage, and that a great unrest was created. Even under the Provincial Government as above described there was no official religious instruction in two-thirds of New Zealand. Concerning Canterbury, the Commission shows that the parents were careless or ignorant of distinctive points of Christian doctrine, and were so anxious to secure for their children the benefit of a generally useful education that they sent their children to the school where the instruction was most efficient, regardless of the denomination under which the school was conducted. That is why they keep to the present efficient State schools until stirred up by ecclesiastical zealots.

The Battle for the Bible.

This is the League's description of its campaign. In Queensland it was "Vote for God and the Bible." It talks of little else but the Bible, though it stands for a great deal more than the Bible, and for much that is contrary to the Bible. The great part of the League's membership was secured by asking people only if they wanted the Bible read in the schools. Canvassers who worked whole streets did not mention the right of entry. The great cry has been for the Bible. One would really think that this was a heathen country into which the Bible had never been permitted to enter, and that some wicked people were preventing New-Zealanders from reading it; that parents were prohibited by law from reading it to their children; that there were no Sunday schools, and that the Bible could be read only in the gaols. It should be cause for wonder that all

the clamour and excitement was to force some State officials to make a pretence of performing the divinely imposed and solemnly accepted duty of many parents, who were belying their vows at baptism.

Wonderful to relate, these enthusiasts for Bible-reading by proxy show by the utterances of their official leaders that they themselves would banish the Bible from the schools if they could not get sectarian dogmatic instruction in also. The Bible in Schools League would keep the Bible out of the schools, would leave it for the gaols, would rob the children of their heritage, would ban the greatest English classic, would exclude the only basis for moral teaching, would leave the children under the blight of dogmatic secularism—the Bible League would do all this if they could not get in also the right to give denominational, dogmatic religious teaching into these State institutions, with the compulsory clauses of the Act, to save them the trouble of gathering the children on a Sunday for that purpose.

Bishop Julius said, "I wouldn't give my little finger for the liberty of giving undenominational teaching" (Christchurch *Press*, 27/7/14). The Bible-teaching to be given by the State teacher, we are assured, must be undenominational. For that Bishop Julius would not give his little finger. Canon Garland declared that they insisted on "the scheme, the whole scheme, and nothing by the scheme" (*Lyttelton Times*, 11/10/12). Bishop Sadlier declared that if it were not for the right of entry he would not touch the movement (see *Nelson Mail*, 22/1/13). The Bible could remain under ban unless sectarianism is introduced with it.

The Bible in National Life.

Another alleged reason for the introduction of the Bible into State schools is its past influence on the English nation. But this begs the question as to whether it was Bible in the schools that had an influence. The Bible's greatest influence was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the influence of schools was small. It was the reading of the Bible by adults and their teaching of their children that gave the Bible its influence. It was the people's book—almost their only book. They spoke in Bible language, and as the "Cottar's Saturday Night" shows it was from "scenes like these" that old Scotia's glory springs. This is passing away now in England and Scotland, and, as Canon Lyttelton, Headmaster of Eton, says, "There is no remedy for this evil except in the homes" ("The Corner-stone of Education").

State-given religious instruction actually intensifies this decay of home religion, as in the case of New South Wales. The people lean on the broken reed of official, whittled-down secularized reading of the Bible without religion, by a teacher compelled to attempt the duty which only the parent and the Church can carry out. The Bible-teaching thus given is as much like the real thing which so profoundly influenced British national life as workhouse fare is like the home dinner given at the family table. The children ask for bread, and the parent turns them over to the State, who gives them a stone.

Ex-Inspector Holmes says of this kind of Bible-teaching, "The question of religious education in elementary schools has long been the centre of a perfect whirlwind of controversial talk. The greater part of this talk is, to speak plainly, blatant cant. . . . Not one in a hundred has ever been present in an elementary school while religious instruction has been given. The Bishops of the Established Church wax eloquent in the House of Lords over the wickedness of a Godless education and the virtue of 'definite dogmatic teaching,' but it may be doubted if there is a Bishop in the House who has in recent years sat out a Scripture lesson in a Church of England school. It would be well if all who talked publicly about religious education could be sentenced to devote a month to the personal study of religious instruction as it is ordinarily given in elementary schools. At the end of the month they would be wiser and sadder men, and in future would talk less about religious education and think more." Again, "In most elementary schools religion is taught on an elaborate syllabus which is imposed on the teacher by an external authority, and which therefore tends to destroy his freedom and his interest in the work. . . . But what of the child's emotional faculties? Will not the beauty of the Gospel stories, will not the sublimity of the Old Testament poetry make their own appeal? They might do so, but what chance have they? I do not suggest that the religious instruction . . . is always formal and mechanical. There are teachers who can break through the toils of the system. But the net result of giving formal and mechanical instruction in the greatest of all great matters is to depress the spiritual vitality of the children of England to a point which threatens the extinction of the spiritual life of the nation" ("What is and What might be"). The scheme offered to New Zealand is even more formal and mechanical than the one thus denounced by a believer in religious instruction of the right kind.

At a meeting of Headmasters' Conference, held at Eton, a discussion took place on the teaching of the Bible in schools. Rev. Dr. Flecker (Dean Close School, Cheltenham) said that many honest and good men disliked the Scripture hour more than any other teaching they had to do. He could speak as to the depth of the ignorance of Scripture of boys who came to the public schools. He was quite certain that the state of things was far worse than it was a quarter of a century ago (*Weekly Times*, 30/12/10).

Eucational Authorities.

The League often quotes educationists who urge the necessity for religious education. But it does not state the method by which this education should be given. Senior-Inspector Holmes could no doubt be quoted as an advocate of religious education, yet he condemns in the most scathing terms the type of religious instruction of which the League's method is an extreme example. As a matter of theory it might be stated that religious instruction should be given in the schools, but religious instruction under unjust conditions is a moral impossibility or else a

moral contradiction. What might be possible is completely barred by our sectarian differences. It should be noted that the educationists generally quoted speak in countries where, as a natural result of State religious education, there are State-aided denominational schools. Bishop Gore, of Oxford, stated in the London *Times* that no system including religious education could be truly national unless it satisfied types of religious conscience. This is an impossibility without denominational schools, if justice is to be done.

Religion not neglected.

We claim that where the State leaves religion and religious instruction to the proper agencies those agencies are most active and make a more effective effort to meet their responsibilities; further, that wherever the State takes a direct hand in religious work it deadens religion, and cramps its free voluntary nature by the restrictions that are necessarily imposed. All the church returns and reports, as well as the State year-books, show that in Victoria, where the State does not meddle in religion, there is a far higher level of religious activity, a keener sense of responsibility, and that the spiritual needs of both adults and children are better responded to than is the case in New South Wales, where the people depend on the State to give religious instruction. In church attendance, Sabbath observance, missionary activity, and contributions for religious purposes Victoria is far in advance of New South Wales. With about 300,000 fewer population than New South Wales, Victoria has some thousands of Sunday-school scholars more than New South Wales. In New Zealand we have as high a proportion of Sunday scholars as any country in the world. In 1909, when Rev. J. H. Jupp compiled the last published Dominion Sunday-school returns, we had over 10,000 Sunday-school teachers, or one for every sixteen pupils on the State-school roll. One person in every six of the whole population was connected with a Sunday school. In the State primary schools in 1909 there were 135,000 children, and in the Protestant Sunday schools there were 121,000, in round numbers. The Presbyterian proportion of the primary-school roll in 1913 was about 43,700, and in the Presbyterian Sunday schools there were in the same year 37,000 scholars. Yet Rev. Mann, ex-president of the New Zealand Methodist Conference, publicly declared that "four-fifths of the children of New Zealand are growing up without religion and without a knowledge of God and of the Bible."

If half the zeal, organization, and money were put into Sunday-school work that is being put into this paltry scheme there would be even a larger proportion of children in our Sunday schools under real religious instruction by people who are anxious to give it. It was recently declared that the music of the Christchurch Cathedral cost £1,000 per year. This is more than the annual income of all the Sunday schools of that denomination in Christchurch. Yet this denomination is the leader of the cry that the children's religious education is neglected.

By Its Fruit.

Surely those who are making all this stir should prove that our system, which leaves the whole duty and privilege of religious instruction to the home and the Church, is thereby doing an injury to the children, and that deterioration of character results. We welcome any fair test. Can the League show that we do worse by our children than those States that have adopted the League's or any other system of State-given religious instruction? Vain attempts have been made by Bible-in-schools advocates to show that crime, and especially juvenile crime, was increasing in New Zealand. The Chief Justice and others have completely disproved such slanders on our children and such libels on our schools and Churches. The late Honourable R. J. Seddon, in 1905, when similar charges were made in support of State religious instruction, called them libellous, and declared that, though he venerated the Bible, he was confident that the State school was not the place where is should be taught.

The Rev. W. Keay, of Auckland, declared that since the State religious instruction was introduced into New South Wales in 1885 the number of convictions for crime had fallen from 20,740 to 11,361 in 1912, and claimed amid applause that this was the result of State religious instruction. As a matter of fact, the number of summary convictions alone in 1910 was 63,671. He also declared that the closing of thirty-seven gaols in New South Wales spoke well for the moral effect of the New South Wales system. The fact is that in the New South Wales Year-book, 1909–10, page 418, we read, "The various gaol establishments have been graded with a view to concentration. As a result of this grading a large number of establishments have been closed, their population being removed to other centres." We find also that, even after the thirty-seven gaols were closed for this reason, New South Wales still had thirty-one gaols to Victoria's eighteen, and that in 1911 New South Wales had seventy-one people in gaol per 10,000 of population to Victoria's sixty. Another leader of the League declared that a good test of the moral tone of two communities was the percentage of convictions to arrests. In Victoria the proportion of convictions by juries is 60 per cent., but in New South Wales it is 56 per cent. The editor of the *New Zealand Methodist* declared that the birth-rate was a good test of the moral tone, and pointed to the slightly higher birth-rate in New South Wales than in New Zealand. He omitted to state that New South Wales has over 50 per cent. more illegitimate births to each 1,000 unmarried women, and that he was counting illegitimacy as an evidence of the moral tone. The pure birth-rate of New Zealand is higher than that of New South Wales. Many have declared that the adoption of secular education in France resulted in a large increase of juvenile crime. This was done by taking the results in the first three or four years after the change was made, which was really a count against the old system. The Royal Commission on Education of New South Wales, 1904, on page 150, Chapter xv, in the midst of a glowing eulogy of the French system of moral instruction on a secular basis, gives abundant proof of a remarkable reduction in juvenile crime in France after the new system was well established. This report was compiled by the Common-

wealth Statistician, and effectively exposes the methods adopted to discredit non-religious moral instruction. Though this has been on record for ten years, New Zealand advocates of State religious instruction still put forth the old distortion of facts regarding France. In fact, every attempt has utterly failed to discredit the division of labour whereby the State keeps to secular subjects and the home and Church have the religious field entirely to themselves.

We did not first raise this question about the results of the two systems. The League did that, and by so doing they not only showed the weakness of their case in attack, but caused an inevitable turning of the attack on their own vaunted system which is to set things right. Victoria and New South Wales furnish an admirable basis for comparison, since in almost every respect their conditions are remarkably alike. The two respects in which this similarity has been challenged are —first, the sparcity of population in New South Wales. This objection has no force when we remember that except for our four large towns almost the whole of the population of New South Wales is concentrated in the eastern division, and further that it is where population is densest that crime is commonest. The second objection is the influence of convict settlements. This is also removed when we know that the dispersal of convicts from New South Wales and Tasmania to Victoria during the great Victorian gold rushes fairly equalized this convict influence. Blair's History of Australia states that Victoria ultimately suffered as much from the convict element as did New South Wales. Many of the worst convicts died in prison; many had no descendants; very few were women; many were not really criminals; many were hired out to farmers and reformed. But, whatever the effect, Victoria had its full share.

The outstanding difference in reference to the question in hand is that for over fifty years New South Wales has relied largely on a State-given travesty of religious instruction of its children; but in Victoria the State for fifty years has, like New Zealand, refused to meddle in religious instruction, and this work has been left entirely to the only agencies capable of attending to it. If what I have stated above is correct regarding the useless, unscriptural scheme of secularized Bible instruction, we would expect that this compulsory, restricted, despiritualized Scripture instruction was ineffective as a moral factor in New South Wales. Every piece of evidence obtainable bears out this expectation, when we compare Victoria, where all religious instruction is untrammelled and free in spirit. As stated above, every kind of religious activity is strikingly higher than in New South Wales, and as a result the moral condition of the people is correspondingly higher.

Taking the average for the years 1901 to 1910, we find that, on a population basis, New South Wales has 50 per cent. more summary convictions than Victoria, 60 per cent. more Supreme Court convictions for serious crime, 80 per cent. more divorces, 23 per cent. more illegitimate births, 45 per cent. more people in gaol, and 59 per cent. more drunkenness. In the period drunkenness decreased in Victoria from 135 to 97 per 10,000, while in the same period New South Wales drunks increased from 110 to 175 per 10,000. In 1912, New South Wales had a record of 206 per 10,000. (In comparing the two States with regard to drunkenness I have counted every person arrested for drunkenness in Victoria as having been convicted.) The above perfectly fair test shows that in Victoria, where the State leaves religion to the proper agencies, the children are better served. That the proper agencies rise to the occasion has already been shown. Later evidence will be given of the delusiveness of the New South Wales system. Meanwhile, on what grounds can the League urge us to follow the example of New South Wales rather than to keep on our present path with Victoria?

The instruction proposed by the League is to be partly given by the teachers and partly (perhaps) by visiting clergymen. Regarding the text-book to be used, Bishop Cleary has already shown that teachers who hold, and keep to, the views expressed by Bishops Nevill and Averill, and Rev. P. B. Fraser, would be forced to use a book which would be "an emasculated caricature of the Bible," "a mutilation of the inspired Word of God," framed by a "committee for the human improvement of a Divine revelation," and thus they would have in many cases to act in direct violation of the specific doctrines of their faith. Apart from that, we are told on all sides that the teacher is not to teach, and must not teach, religion. This is to support the refusal of a conscience clause to teachers. This is a most important point.

The Bill says that the teacher is not to give any sectarian teaching. Is it then maintained that the teaching of religion is confined to sectarian teaching? Webster says that "Religion is the outward act or form by which men indicate their recognition of the existence of a God or gods having power over their destiny, to whom obedience, service, and honour are due." The Standard Dictionary says that "Religion is a belief binding the spiritual nature of a man to a supernatural being on whom he is conscious he is dependent." Now, it is to meet just the requirements of these definitions of religion that the League demands that the Bible is to be read in the schools. Yet the reading of it for this purpose would not, they say, be teaching religion. There is no sectarian matter mentioned in these definitions, yet they define religion. The Bible says that "Pure religion and undefiled is to visit the widow and the fatherless and to keep oneself upspotted from the world." And again, "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" And Jesus said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart . . . and thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets." Where is the sectarian teaching in any of these? And yet do they not sum up in each case the whole requirements of religion? Yet the League argues that if a teacher is not teaching sectarian doctrines he is not teaching religion.

In all cases of dispute we are referred to Australia to see the nature of the system. It will be found that the teachers' work is described in almost exactly the same way in the Australian States as it is described in this Bill. They all say what the teacher is not to teach. The New South Wales Act merely forbids him to teach "dogmatic or polemical theology." The West Australian Act is the same. The Queensland Act forbids him to teach "the distinctive tenets

or doctrines of any denomination." The Bill before you says he is not to give "sectarian teaching." In effect they all exclude merely what the League's scheme would exclude. Is there no religion outside dogmatical, polemical, sectarian tenets and doctrines? All else is left to the teacher.

Rev. A. Don published a description of what he describes as "typical" lessons given under this system in New South Wales. His report was hailed with joy by the League, yet it cleary proves that the teachers were teaching religion. Bishop Cleary has described Rev. A. Don's report, which describes what are really typical Sunday-school lessons. In fact, Rev. A. Don concludes by saying that "This lesson was given in the manner of a first-rate Bible-class teacher." Do we understand that a first-rate Bible-class teacher does not teach religion? Moreover, the New South Wales Royal Commission above referred to quotes the words of "one of the most experienced Inspectors" whose report is given as representative. Note what this Inspector includes in "reading the Bible like any other book." He says, "In cases where teachers deal with the books as they would with ordinary class-books, giving an intelligent exposition of the subject-matter of the lessons, testing by examination to what extent the pupils comprehend its scope and meaning, and dwelling with judicious force and impressiveness upon such points of religion and morals as these lessons inculcate, there can be no doubt whatever of the benefits accruing." Then follows a sentence which the Bible in Schools League omits from its pamphlet when quoting this Inspector: "I believe that in about 50 per cent. of our schools these lessons have been so treated." Apply the Inspector's description to some of the matter of these reading-books, or to any of a number of the lessons in the Queensland Scripture books, or to any of a number of passages that would be included in any such book, and no sane man could declare that the teacher was not teaching religion.* Here are a few that put the matter beyond dispute, though almost any passage might be taken. Book I, page 40, gives "In the law is no man justified with God, because the just shall live by faith." Page 44, "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation but to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished." Or take the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, from the Queensland text-book, containing, "He was wounded for our transgressions; He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed," and matter of a similar character. Picture a teacher giving, as the Inspector says, an "intelligent exposition" of this matter; "testing to what extent the pupils understand its scope and meaning"; "dwelling on such points of religion and morals as these lessons inculcate"; and then ask whether he would not be teaching religion. The same would be true of the 23rd Psalm, the 1st chapter of St. John, the Lord's Prayer, the Sermon on the Mount, and so on. Yet the Inspector says that it is "in cases" where this is done that benefit accrues. That is, where religion is taught by the teacher benefit accrues, and where the teacher does not teach religion benefit does not accrue. This is an intelligent view; but why does the League here try to make out that the teacher is not teaching religion when this plain contradiction is before them? Why also is the last sentence deleted, which shows that even on a liberal estimate the lessons only in half the schools are so given that benefit accrues, and that is because the teacher teaches religion?

Then, the questions in the New South Wales text-book show what may come under the teacher's work even when dogmatical or polemical theology" or "sectarian teaching" is excluded. Here are a few of the questions: "What reward is there for those that shall confess Christ before men? What is reserved for him that denieth Christ? What is necessary to become Christ's disciple? Can we be justified by the law before God? Why not? How must we be justified? For what did the Son of Man come?" and so on.

It has been replied that the New Zealand scheme does not include the New South Wales books nor all the details of the Australian system. But the above arise necessarily out of any scheme of Bible in schools, simply because the Bible is a book of religion and nothing else. And surely the League does not contend that the presence or absence of religion in a Scripture lesson is a mere detail.

This matter has such a vital relation to the teacher's position with regard to the absence of a conscience clause that we propose a test to the League. We will take the descriptions of the teacher's work as given by Canon Garland, Bishop Sedgwick, and Rev. T. Tait respectively. "The teacher merely saw that the children understood the subject as intelligently as they understood ordinary lessons in the curriculum" (*Lyttelton Times*, 21/8/12). "The teacher is to deal with the Bible-reading exactly as he would with any other lesson-book" (*Lyttelton Times*). "The teacher would treat the lesson just as he would any other passage of English literature" (Christchurch *Press*, 21/4/12). Let any teacher come before this Committee and give a specimen lesson from some of the ordinary school-books, and then, as above stated, deal with some of the Scriptural passages from the Queensland Scripture-lesson Book in exactly the same way, so that the children would understand the latter as well as the former. The decision as to whether the teacher was teaching religion would, we maintain, be sufficiently convincing. This test was offered repeatedly to a teacher at our annual meeting, but he wisely declined. Yet if it can be done some of them should do it. We would choose some of the test lessons and the League could choose some.

Can any teacher give an intelligent lesson from a geography, or history, or science book without teaching geography, or history, or science? If a teacher used a book on socialism and said he saw that the children read it as literature, and that they understood it as well as any other passage of English, would he not be teaching socialism? Just as surely the Bible cannot be intelligently read and explained without teaching religion.

* In the pamphlet referred to above there are no fewer than nine alterations from the original as given in the Royal Commission report, every one of which alterations is in favour of the League's attitude.

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

as 'visited' even if it received only one visit in ten weeks or so. Also it is 'visited' if a minister of only one denomination visits to teach eighty children out of three hundred." The average visits in New South Wales are as follows: Anglican visits, one per school in five weeks; Methodist visits, one per school in fourteen weeks; Presbyterian visits, one per school in seventeen weeks; all other denominations together, one per school in twenty-five weeks. Another report of the same Synod says, "The committee are reluctantly compelled to avow the conviction that unless a more lively and persistent interest is taken in this work (the right-of-entry work) by members of the Synod, in recess as well as in session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps even finally be abandoned." This represents the opinion of the Anglican Church, which pays four thousand more visits per year than all the other denominations put together. Rev. D. C. Bates, Anglican minister, and formerly a teacher in New South Wales, said at the Synod at Wellington that the system of religious instruction is stale, flat, and dead.

Even of the visits paid a large number are not paid by ministers, but by lay helpers who are called on to teach what the teacher is forbidden to teach. Further, some visits are counted as two or three visits if the visitor divides his hour between two or three rooms. The last returns from New South Wales show that with the exception of two denominations the number of visits paid in 1913 were less than those paid the previous year. In the face of this general criticism of the general neglect by the ministers to show their faith in this system we have the remarkable statement by the organizer of the League that "nearly all, practically all the ministers visit the schools"; and, concerning the value of the visits, "What shall we say of the ministers' visits? Well, the only complaint is that they do not get enough of them." (Address on "Up-to-date Facts" in Queen's Theatre, Christchurch). I wish to make it clear that a minister is permitted to make one visit of one hour, but he may divide that time up and give four quarter-hour lessons, and in the past that has been put down as four visits

It is worthy of note that, to meet the discrepancy in the record of visits caused by those who counted one visit as two or three, the Director of Education actually instructed teachers of New South Wales, in a circular issued on the 13th June, 1913, that for the future all visits were to be thus recorded. Then, at the end of the year the annual report joyfully records that "there is a very considerable increase in the number of visits." No mention was made of the new count which would enable actual visits to be multiplied by two or three. The League published the report here also without explanation. Further, in some States one visit to a class of three denominations mixed is given. That counts as three visits—that is, if sixty Anglican children and one Presbyterian and one Methodist child are permitted to attend, that lesson would be recorded as three visits. That is Regulation 126 in the West Australian Regulations.

Thus numerous official and even friendly reports show conclusively that even ministers show very little enthusiasm for or appreciation of this vaunted scheme, concerning which we are told that all the evidence is in its favour. And if this is the case with ordained ministers specially called to do this work, what can be expected of the teacher who is compelled to do it by Act of Parliament? In the majority of cases the ministers' visits are like those of the angels. Yet they are supposed to come in and give that divine element of denominational teaching without which Bishop Julius would not give his little finger for the system. It is little wonder that we hear the following description of the New South Wales teachers' work by Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A., Rector of Dulwich Hill, and Warden of Trinity Grammar School, Sydney. In a sermon preached in the Anglican Cathedral on the 19th July, 1914, and reported fully in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, this gentleman spoke of the "general religious instruction which is supposed to be given by the State teachers in the public schools," and said, "The general religious instruction in the public schools is often relegated in the time-table to the worst part of the day, or perhaps on the Friday afternoon, which is often devoted to sport. The marks awarded for Scripture knowledge are only half of what are given for other main subjects. Thus the departmental estimate of religion is just half that of any other main subject. Is it any wonder that the teachers are neglecting to impart Scripture knowledge or allowing it to be crowded out altogether?" He also said, "Already we are beginning to notice the effect of the past thirty-four years of the present system of State education. The sanctions of religion are losing their hold over the people generally."

The Royal Commission Report of New South Wales, before quoted, says, regarding the New South Wales system, "The present system is seriously defective in regard to its scheme of influencing the ideals of childhood, and yet in any true education the cultivation of noble ideals is of transcendent importance" (page 28). In the whole of the exhaustive report there is scarcely a line of commendation of the New South Wales scheme. But we find such remarks as the following: "Much may be said for the French system, which aims at bringing about the close association of all children during the period of primary education, so that natural sympathy and respect shall tend to annihilate sectarian bigotry." Again, "France has endeavoured to make the substitution (of purely ethical teaching for religious instruction in schools), depending, however, on an antecedent and more or less definite idea of God as the fundamental basis for the system" (page 27). Again, "For this purpose the scheme may well be taken as a model" (page 27), following another reference to the small number of visits by the clergy. And in the final section, recommending a scheme for New South Wales, we read, "A scheme for ethical instruction on very similar lines to the French, which is at once noble and, as regards religious differences, neutral, is much to be desired" (page 157, Chapter XV). This suggested scheme for New South Wales covers about forty-seven lines of small print. Three lines refer to the smallness of the number of the clergymen's visits. Three lines suggest sending them a circular calling their attention to the provisions of the Act, and inviting them to co-operate in the moral-religious education of the people. Thirty-nine lines deal with the suggested form of the French system. Not one word of reference is made to the Scripture lessons by the teachers.

Concerning the value of the ministers' teaching the report says, "Opinions are divided as to the efficiency of the religious instruction given by clergymen under such conditions as are above indicated. The aggregation of children of different ages in a single class for common instruction in religion by a clergyman, however, is obviously a most imperfect scheme, and no doubt has much to do with the relatively small extent to which the provision is utilized" (page 27).

I have not quoted a single opponent of the League's scheme. Every quotation is strictly official or from a friendly source. Yet even this part of what could be quoted is sufficient to dispose of the League's widely repeated assertion that all the evidence supports their scheme. It would be difficult to find any scheme in the world so fully condemned by impartial evidence. Yet we are told it is needed to regenerate the youth of New Zealand. It would be difficult to find a greater travesty of religion than that urged by the Bible in State Schools League. Even the best "evidence" which the League has been able to collect from the accumulations of the past twenty years consists almost entirely of negative statements as to what the scheme does not do—no friction, no religion, &c. This was shown in Professor Hunter's analysis of the League's valued pamphlet of "Opinions of Experts." A scheme whose best selected commendations relate to what it does not do can be of little value as a moral factor in a community. It is sad to find in a Christian community a number of people who ignorantly advocate the use of the Bible and of religious teaching in the schools by any method, good or bad, provided they get it in somehow. Yet of all books the Bible should be the most carefully and reverently used, and of all influences none should be so reverently and justly urged as that of religion. Inspector Holmes's remarks, already quoted, should make people pause before they act as if the Bible can be put into schools much as a horse-shoe is hung over a door.

Teachers and the public generally are amazed that our system of education, and the neutrality of the State in religion, and the rights of conscience, and the normal processes of legislation should be attacked by a body of such a character as the League. We can scarcely conceive Parliament allowing the attack to proceed on the present lines without the most complete testing of the nature of the League and its claims. The League claims to have the signatures of some 150,000 people. These are not all electors. The League's card does not even require them to be electors. The cards are not petition-cards. They are not addressed to Parliament. They have not been presented to Parliament. They are simply members' cards. They have been signed by hundreds of young people in their teens. Hundreds did not know what they signed for, and have since signed the opposing cards. Hundreds do not know that they signed approval of the right of entry. Many would have refused to sign had they known that there was no conscience for teachers. Yet this number of cards is used to impress Parliament and overawe members. Worst of all, it is used as a ground for the right of the League to determine the nature of the ballot-paper. If the League will submit their cards to the scrutiny of this Committee evidence will be forthcoming of the correctness of the statements given above. The valid number of *bona fide* electors whose opinion is correctly represented by those cards would form a striking contrast with the 150,000 so often quoted. The scrutiny of the only petition the League has yet submitted to Parliament has given ample proof of the way in which the League secures an appearance of support. (This refers to the petition from Palmerston North.)

In spite of this extraordinary state of things this League claims to frame the ballot-paper and to determine how the issues are to be submitted to the electors. Six hundred thousand electors are to be forced to vote on a vague question, with multiple and conflicting issues, at the behest of perhaps one-tenth of the electors. The purpose of this subversion of Parliament is obvious. The League, which has gained nearly all its supporters on the plea for the Bible, dare not, in spite of its cry of "Trust the people," trust the electors with a clear vote on the Bible-reading and a separate vote on the sectarian dogmatic teaching of the right of entry. They dare not trust even their enrolled members with a fair, clear vote on Bible in schools, for a very large proportion of their members would vote solidly against the right of entry. Dr. J. Gibb, in 1903, declared "Bible in schools was one thing; priest in schools was another, and a very different thing. They (Nonconformists) were equally united in their determination to obtain the one and to resist the other with all their power" (*Otago Daily Times*, 17/2/03).

Thousands of Nonconformists and others are not prepared to surrender this principle as Dr. Gibb has since done. Yet the League, the champion of democracy, the denier of the right of a Parliament elected by the people to alter its ballot-paper, or even to safeguard liberties, the League which calls on members to place votes before conscience—this League dare not trust even its own members with a separate vote on the right of entry, or on whether the teacher should have a conscience clause, which the elector is competent to confer on parents.

That this is not merely a supposed danger is evidenced by the experience of Queensland. Of 260,000 enrolled electors, 121,000 did not vote Of those who voted on five other questions submitted simultaneously, 30,000 did not vote on the Bible-in-schools question. Of those who voted an abnormal number made their double-issue ballot-paper invalid. The number of valid votes recorded was less than half the number of electors on the roll, and 26·8 per cent. of the electors, who could with more or less strain on their convictions take the right of entry as well as the Bible in schools, carried the day. Can we, on demand of an unknown number of electors, submit the education system and the liberties of large sections of the community to a method such as this—for a poll in which almost every vote would be cast according to sectarian considerations? It should be noted that in Queensland one denomination could have provided the 26·8 per cent. which carried the referendum.

It must be emphasized that the sectarian religious teaching of the right of entry would be made part and parcel of our national education really at the demand of only one denomination—from the Presbyterian side. The Presbyterian *Outlook*, the leading official advocate of the Bible in schools, contained a leading article on the absolute necessity of keeping the right of entry

tightly attached to the Bible-in-schools part of the proposal. It concluded thus: "The present movement only becomes possible with the co-operation and assistance of the Anglican Church. . . . That assistance has been given, and is maintained, on the distinct understanding that the complete platform of the League be submitted by way of referendum to the electors as an undivided whole. From the standpoint of the Anglican Church the right of entry is the all-important thing. . . . Any attempt to divide the issue would amount to the disfranchisement of the whole body of the Anglicans, who cannot consistently vote on one issue unless it is made contingent on the other. . . . All suggestions (*re* dividing the issues), however plausible they may appear and from whatever source they emanate, must be sternly resisted." This attitude of the Anglican Church has been repeatedly confirmed by public declarations from Canon Garland, Bishop Julius, Bishop Sadlier, and others, and by the *Church News*, the official organ of the Anglican Diocese of Christchurch.

The Church News (official organ of the Anglican Church Diocese of Christchurch: 1st August, 1914; page 2, bottom of second column, leading article): "The chief danger besetting the Referendum Bill is not that it may be thrown out, but that the issue may be divided or another one added. We ask for a definite question on a complete scheme, the use of Bible-reading in schools and the right of entry. There may be an attempt to put these two issues separately as alternatives. If so there will be a sufficient majority for neither. Or, again, the Nelson system may be added as an alternative issue and lead to no result. These or some such alterations will be suggested, and we need to make it clear wherever influence can be brought to bear that our claim is for a referendum on the issue as defined in the Bill and on no other." It is of no concern to the League that thousands of other electors, including Nonconformists, who do not reverse like Dr. Gibb, would be disfranchised by the submission of the double-issue ballot-paper.

The unrighteous nature of this "distinct understanding" is exactly indicated in the League's official manifesto published in the Christchurch *Press*, 9th May, 1914, and in every centre of the Dominion. In section 7 we read that if the League's scheme is successful the Roman Catholic Church in its demand for State aid "is effectually prevented in the latter case from forming with any other Church a combination which could obtain State aid. Practically all the Churches . . . have definitely dropped the policy of State aid for their schools, preferring to support the national system when it includes the system advocated by the League." Thus the question of which Churches shall capture the national system for the kind of religious instruction they desire is merely a contingency depending on ecclesiastical combines, made effective by a clever form of ballot, any alterations to which the *Outlook* says must be "sternly resisted" "from whatever source they emanate," even if they emanate from Parliament. The representatives of 600,000 electors must not alter the ballot-paper framed by perhaps 50,000, in reality by the officials of the Churches concerned.

Further, in section 21 of the manifesto the League, in its endeavour to prevent Bible in schools under the Nelson system, if legalized, declares that that system would most decidedly favour State aid, because it could not be accepted by the Roman Catholic Church. Yet the scheme which the League wishes to introduce into the national schools is far more repugnant to the Roman Catholic Church than is the Nelson system. Therefore the League's scheme would favour State aid even more decidedly. The Roman Catholics would take up exactly the same attitude as Bishop Julius, who said, "I detest the present system with all my heart, and if I cannot get religious instruction in any other way I will have my own school and demand grant-in-aid" (Christchurch *Press*, February, 1913). He claims the right to decide whether an approved form of religious instruction will satisfy his views. Bishop Julius, at the Synod (Report in the Christchurch *Press*, 15/10/13): "An attempt has been made to offer us the so-called Nelson system. We will have none of it. Undenominational teaching is not Christian teaching, nor anything like it. For practical purposes it is about as effective as the teaching of mechanical engineering by rule-of-thumb." Dean Fitchett said, "Suppose the Nelson system were made legal and part of our system, the schools would then become impossible for the Roman Catholics, and their claims for grants would become irresistible. . . . The State would have taken a side, and the Catholics could not be refused their grants" (Dunedin *Star*, 14/6/13). Similarly if the League's scheme were made legal and part of our system, claims for grants would become irresistible under the still more repugnant scheme. The State would have taken a side, but the League manifesto relies on the political combine of the Churches which are to get what they ask for, to prevent the compensation which they admit would, on grounds of justice, be irresistible. Under such auspices we are asked to put the Word of God into the schools so that the children may learn "to do justice and to love mercy"; "to love thy neighbour as thyself"; to "do unto others as you would have them do to you."

The Teachers' Conscience Clause.

I have to put before you a special resolution of the New Zealand Educational Institute. The religious nature of the proposed Scripture lessons is past argument. In fifty-eight places in the League's publications the teachers' lesson is referred to as "religious instruction." The exclusion of sectarian teaching makes it more religious rather than less. The religious nature of the lessons is admitted by the conscience clause for parents. All claims for the introduction of the Word of God into the regular school curriculum would be nullified if the lessons were not religious lessons. Yet the League refuses to consider the granting of a conscience clause to teachers. Now, most emphatically we deny the authority of the League to determine this question. We deny the preposterous claim of the League to say that if the question is submitted to a vote the League will exclude from the ballot-paper the question of the teachers' conscience. We most emphatically deny that the teachers' conscience is of less concern than the parents'. The teacher would actually have to give the lessons, while the parent would only have to permit them. We, the teachers

of New Zealand, confidently appeal to Parliament, the protector of our liberties both as citizens and as public servants, to declare that there shall be no teaching in State schools which would, by compulsion, impose on a public servant a religious lesson of a kind or under conditions that would be an offence to his religious beliefs. We state most solemnly that it would not be an agnostic teacher whose conscience would be most offended by this teaching. It would be many of our finest men and women whose religious convictions are the deepest. There is scarcely a man or woman in the Dominion who would not emphatically endorse the vindication of our rights of conscience by Parliament, the only tribunal to which we can look for justice. We appeal unto Cæsar. We press the appeal most earnestly at this stage because the experience of Queensland shows that once the Referendum Bill passed from the House to the poll the issues were finally sealed if the vote were favourable.

The last sentence in clause 6 of the Bill now before the House has a sinister significance from the effects of its counterpart in Queensland. From the moment the *Gazette* statement of the poll was laid on the table of the House a dumb Parliament was tied to every jot and tittle of the ballot-paper. The League officials sat by the Minister in charge of the empowering Bill, and all amendments were referred to them. Every amendment, however reasonable, was guillotined in Committee. In the Upper House the Hon. Mr. Barlow, in charge of the empowering Bill, placed it before the Council in Committee on a Wednesday afternoon, and announced that the Bill would be reported to the Speaker on the following day at 5 p.m. "without amendments," and it was done. Every attempt to safeguard liberty or to secure justice, even to secure a conscience clause for teachers, to which Mr. Barlow had pledged himself, were rejected because they were "not so nominated in the bond." Shylock himself was not more flinty in his cry "I will have my bond" than was the Bible in Schools League. They clung to that gazetted return, which was held to express the will of the people—really the befogged will of 26·8 per cent. of the people. Portia's appeal of mercy addressed to Shylock fell on a nature less obdurate than did any appeal, not for mercy but for bare justice, fall on the heart of the Bible in Schools League. To every plea it was replied in effect, "It is not so nominated in the bond"—*i.e.*, in the schedule of the Bill containing the obscure, double-issue ballot-paper. The attitude of the New Zealand League before the referendum may be taken as evidence of what their attitude would be afterwards if they had even 26 per cent. of votes to rest on. The *Outlook*, concerning any attempts to modify the Bill now before the House as before quoted, says, "All suggestions, however plausible they may appear, and from whatever course they emanate, must be sternly resisted."

We confidently place this matter of the teachers' rights of conscience in the hands of Parliament, even if it is "sternly resisted" by a League which would crush conscience with the Bible. The Hon. Mr. Barlow, who carried through the Upper House in Queensland the Act carrying the referendum into effect, declared that "the only remedy when Parliament interferes with conscience is to suffer."

There have been put forward for teachers several objections of a minor nature. They cannot fairly be regarded as the ground of the widespread and deeply rooted objection of the teaching profession to the League's scheme. The number of subjects on the syllabus, the appointment of teachers, and the like all have some relation to the question, but the fundamental objections are that the scheme is inherently weak, formal, stale, flat, and dead; that it is not only almost farcical in the methods of teaching proposed, but it is a serious and dangerous travesty of religion such as is denounced by Inspector Holmes; that it lulls the public conscience into the belief that the religious training is being attended to, and causes a slackening of really effective means of religious teaching; that the use of the Bible as a secular book would defeat the purpose for which the League demands its introduction; that the glaring injustice of the scheme, as disclosed even by the League's manifesto, condemns it forever as an instrument for moral and religious influence in the alleged interests of the Bible, whose universal demand is that we shall not only be just but more than just; that the compulsion of teachers to teach the Scriptures is in violent opposition to the whole spirit of the Scriptures themselves; that the Bible from end to end places on the parent and those specially called to teach the Scriptures, and on them alone, the duty and privilege of the religious training of the children; that the whole spirit of the Bible is in opposition to the delegation of his duty, far less the compulsion of any one to spread the knowledge of the Word of God; that no self-constituted body has the right to set up a new legislative procedure not legally constitutional and to tie the hands of half the electors by a form of ballot-paper framed confessedly in the interests of one denomination, which seeks to secure enfranchisement at the cost of the disenfranchisement of others; that if our educational system requires radical alteration this shall be done by a body that will go fully into all the resulting issues that are involved, instead of passively allowing a proposal which fairly bristles with educational problems of vital importance, with constitutional questions of a revolutionary character, with questions of religious and civil liberty that have not hitherto been settled or even raised in New Zealand, passively allowing all this to be thrown into a plebiscite in which these questions will not even be realized, and in which the irresponsible individual voter will be actuated mostly by his sectarial leanings and appealed to purely on the question of the Bible—as if there were no other means on earth by which the Bible could be taught than as a piece of secular literature by teachers who are forced to do it but are treated as if they of all the people in New Zealand had no conscience; that, finally, we hold that there are ample existing means for the religious training of the children by agencies acting under the free spiritual, voluntary conditions which alone should be employed.

As a Sunday-school teacher of twenty years' experience I have no hesitation in declaring that one hour of Sunday-school teaching by a devoted Christian teacher, even if he is an amateur, is worth twenty hours of the officialized, restricted, formal, compulsory instruction demanded by this Bill; that if the Churches put half the organization, time, money, and men into these agencies

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.

23. In your statement you say, "This is the League's description of its campaign. In Queensland it was 'Vote for God and the Bible.' It talks of little else but the Bible, though it stands for a great deal more than the Bible, and for much that is contrary to the Bible." What is your authority for that assertion?—My authority is the Queensland *Hansard* reports. It was stated by a member of Parliament that those placards were put up in the booths where the people voted.

24. Your statement would be more correct if it said that a member of the Queensland Parliament said so-and-so?—I do not mind if you put it like that, for all the distinction is worth.

25. You quote me as saying that we insisted on the scheme, the whole scheme, and nothing but the scheme. Are you not aware that I have said over and over again that, while we are asking for the Australian system as a whole, we are not asking for every detail of it—we leave the details to be settled by New Zealand according to its own desires?—I am quite aware of that fact, and I am quite aware of the fact that each detail the League drops is where they come up against opposition. In order to maintain the League's position they will have to declare that whether or not religion is to be taught during the Bible lesson is a detail.

26. In regard to that quotation, you now admit that I have over and over again made that statement?—I did not attempt to quote all the remarks you have said in New Zealand on this question.

27. You refer to the Rev. Dr. Flecker, and you say, "He could speak as to the depth of the ignorance of Scripture of boys who came to the public schools." What is the meaning of "public school" there?—What we would call a secondary school. They have come from the elementary school in which religious instruction has been given, and that gentleman points out that there is just as great a state of ignorance with the children under religious instruction as the League attempts to point out with our children in New Zealand.

28. In your statement you draw comparisons between Victoria and New South Wales, and you give some figures about Sunday-school teachers. Would you mind stating the authority from which you give those figures?—You will find it in what is called "The World Sunday-school Work," published by the Sunday-school Union of the World. You can get it at any of the Bible depots.

29. Assuming that those figures are correct, which I do not assume, how do you explain this extraordinary fact that if there is such satisfaction with the religious work in Victoria as compared with New South Wales, all the Churches in Victoria except the Roman Catholic Church and, I suppose, the Seventh Day Adventists, are combined as strongly as we are here to get the same thing that we are struggling for: how do you explain that?—I do not explain it—I deny it. I make a tremendous distinction between the members of Churches combining and the official courts of the Church. I could show you that on no fewer than eight different occasions various efforts at getting the secular system in Victoria changed have been defeated.

30. You take exception to my use of the word "Churches" and attempt to correct me by saying the official courts of the Church. Are you not aware that those official courts speak for the Churches, as, for example, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia?—I am glad you mentioned that. To take a concrete example, the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand declared in favour of your scheme. I am a member of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church, of which there are about seven hundred or eight hundred members, and that question has not been put to us. The congregation were not asked, and yet we are pledged to it as a part of the Presbyterian people of New Zealand. That is why I distinguish.

31. You are aware that the Churches in Victoria, exclusive of the Roman Catholic Church and the Seventh Day Adventists, speaking through the proper channels, have declared themselves in favour of the proposal which we are making here, and are asking for what we are asking?—I object to your interpolation of the words that they are speaking through the proper channels. We have no evidence that they have spoken through the proper channels any more than I have about my congregation.

32. I cannot proceed with the examination if you are going to raise small points like that?—I am not going to answer a question without you make it clear what the meaning of the question is. I am not going to accept questions which contain assumptions which are not contained in the answers.

33. Here is an official document of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, showing how they are committed to it. Are you aware, for instance, that the Presbyterian Church of Australia, sitting in its Assembly last month, passed the following resolution: "Assembly reiterates its profound sense importance biblical instruction in public schools of those States where this privilege is granted, and urges all ministers in those States to take full advantage of this opportunity, conscious as Assembly is of the value of such work. At the same time it would encourage all its faithful people in other States to persevere in efforts to obtain similar privileges, so that in every school in Commonwealth the Word of God may be taught and Christian instruction given. Carried unanimously." That is signed by the official convener of the Assembly. Are you aware of that?—Yes, and I am also aware that that has been used to try to cover the decisions of other branches of the Presbyterian Church in Australia which have expressed adverse opinions to this system.

34. Will you state one of them?—Queensland. In the Queensland *Hansard*, Vol. cvii, 1910, page 2073, Mr. Beirne said, "I made the statement that a majority of Presbyterian ministers of Queensland are against the Bill. That statement was contradicted by the Hon. Angus Gibson and the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, but, although I had the most ample proof for the statement I made, and although these honourable gentlemen knew it, and although the Rev. G. E. Rowe and Archdeacon Garland knew it, still Mr. Rowe had had the audacity to make this statement in his sermon last Sunday, entitled 'The Duty of Protestants.' This is what Mr. Rowe said, as

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 hansardized 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.

42. Are you aware that all of those ecclesiastical assemblies are constituted of at least an equal number of laymen to the ministers of religion, and in many cases double the number of laymen?—I also know that in the majority of cases the laymen are outvoted by the clergy and many propositions are turned down in that way.

43. Are you aware that all those Church courts are constituted of an equal number of the laity with the ministers, and in some instances a greater number of laity?—I would say the laity are represented, but I would not say they are of equal number. I have known cases where they are not. In the Presbyterian Assembly which met here last November there was not an equal number of laymen.

44. That is not my point?—You said "the ecclesiastical court."

45. As the court is constituted it is the fault of those laymen if they are not present? Is it not a fact that the courts are constituted of an equal number of laity?—I do not know even if that is so. I would not agree that that is even so.

46. In your statement you use the phrase "Victoria and New South Wales furnish an admirable basis for comparison, since, in almost every respect, their conditions are remarkably alike." Would you regard as one of the respects in which they are remarkably alike the fact that the territory of New South Wales is nearly four times greater than Victoria?—Yes, I will explain my point with regard to that. The eastern division of New South Wales extends up to, I think, the 149th meridian, and the statistics of New South Wales show that in the western division there are only eighteen thousand people living, with the exception of the four large towns of Bourke, Cobar, Deniliquin, and Broken Hill. I know also that between 78 and 80 per cent. of the people live in populations of five hundred and over. The point I wish to show is that for all practical purposes the population of New South Wales is confined almost entirely to the one division, where the population is very dense.

47. You also made this statement: "New South Wales has over 50 per cent. more illegitimate births to each 1,000 unmarried women." Do you take the figures of illegitimacy as a proof of morality or otherwise?—The editor of the *Methodist Times* raised that as a proof of morality of New South Wales, and I refuted it.

48. You do not take the figures, then, of the number of actual illegitimate births as a proof of morality or immorality?—I certainly think they are one of the evidences. They are quite unmistakable, and quite good evidence of the morality of any country.

49. If that is so, how do you, in using your figures, bring in the use of preventatives and other things which would reduce the illegitimate birth-rate?—I take it for granted that, where the birth-rate as shown by the statistics is so great as it is in New South Wales, they know just as much about preventatives with that class of people in the country as in a country where the birth-rate is low.

50. Is it not possible that a high rate of illegitimacy may actually be a proof of a higher morality than a low rate of illegitimacy?—No, I would not admit that.

51. Well, supposing then that in a country there was such a knowledge of preventatives that the illegitimate rate was kept down in consequence, would you say that proved that there was a higher state of morality?—If you prove that the Victorian people show such a great knowledge of preventatives that they reduce the illegitimate birth-rate, then I will admit the force of your contention.

52. You make a good deal of use of criminal statistics. Why is it, when you quote Victoria and New South Wales, you leave out altogether any reference to Tasmania?—Because the Government Statisticians of New South Wales, and also Victoria, lay it down as a principle of statistics that in comparing you must take countries with equal conditions. Now, the conditions in Tasmania are so vastly different from those of Victoria and New South Wales that a comparison would not hold. Tasmania is a scattered small district—the whole population could almost be put into Sydney—and if you look in the Year-book, the condition which Canon Garland himself quoted in another respect supports me in this respect—*i.e.*, that you must not make a comparison where the conditions are not similar. The conditions of life in Tasmania are such that a comparison with Victoria and Australia would not hold.

53. You have shown practically that figures cannot be taken purely by themselves?—No, I did not say that. What I say is that figures can be taken by themselves if they are based on proper conditions, and I base them on proper conditions for New South Wales and Victoria; but they could not be based on proper conditions for Tasmania. They do not hold with Tasmania, but they hold with Victoria and New South Wales.

54. You are expressing an opinion, not facts?—It is quite open to you to controvert it.

55. In regard to convictions for drunkenness, the Commonwealth Year-book for 1911 gives the percentage in New South Wales as 167 per 10,000, Victoria 56 per 10,000, and Tasmania at 38?—That is quite possible.

56. You accept that?—Yes.

57. In your statement you refer to a pamphlet and you say, "Then follows a sentence which the Bible in Schools League omits from its pamphlet when quoting the Inspector." Would you show me in the pamphlet where we are quoting the Inspector?—The pamphlet says, "The following extracts from the report of one of our most experienced Inspectors may be taken as representing the true value of the lessons."

58. If you look at the heading of that statement you will see it says "From the Under-Secretary"?—Yes.

59. And it is signed by him?—Yes.

60. You do not question our honesty in producing that as we received it?—You mean every word of it is given as produced to you by the statistician. Is there no error?

61. There may be printers' errors?—Would you call the omission of two important words printers' errors? I have a copy of the original that Mr. Board issued, and the word "general,"

in front of "religious instruction," is omitted, and in the next line, where it reads that the Act provides for what is called religious instruction you have omitted the word "special." May I point out that they were underlined in Mr. Board's letter.

62. You want to suggest that we have made the omission from the Inspector's statement when you say we have printed it with the exception of those two words, which I claim was distinctly an accident?—Knowing that those words had been left out I really assumed that other alterations had occurred in a similar way.

63. Do you think it is quite fair in your statement and elsewhere to suggest that we have deleted a sentence?—I am quite prepared to accept your statement.

64. When you yourself have just said that you were in possession of a copy supplied to you, and that you looked at the document we published and you could find only two words left out, is it fair to come before this Committee with a statement published throughout the length of the land suggesting that we have cut out of the Inspector's report a quotation that was never supplied to us?—That would be unjust to you to state that you had done that. You say that was the only alteration, but I might explain that portion of it which has been omitted or altered was done by Mr. Board and not by the Bible in Schools League. As the question has been raised I will read the report in order to show that these official testimonials are not always what they appear to be. A large part of that statement of Mr. Board's is taken from the New South Wales Royal Commission report of 1904. It reads, "The general religious teaching in the State schools of New South Wales is placed on exactly the same footing as any other subject. So far is this true that at the customary annual inspection of the schools failure of a class to reach the departmental standard in 'Scripture' would be regarded under the system of the State as evidence against the efficiency of the teacher." Here is the way Mr. Board puts it: "This religious teaching is placed on exactly the same footing as geography, grammar, or any other subject, and at the annual inspection of schools Scripture receives the same consideration as any other subject. In the junior classes, when children are unable to read." He has omitted the words "Failure of a class to reach the departmental standard in 'Scripture' would be regarded under the system of the State as evidence against the efficiency of the teacher." Then, the Royal Commission report reads, "Just as success would tell in his favour in that respect. In the junior classes, when children are unable to read, all lessons are given orally in the form of lectures, and generally cover a complete course of Old and New Testament history." In Mr. Board's version we have, "All lessons are given orally in the form of stories drawn from the authorized Scripture lessons on the Old and New Testaments." Further on in the Commission report we have, "All teachers, irrespective of the denomination to which they belong, are required to teach these Scripture lessons, and the Commissioners are informed that in no case has any refusal to do so taken place, nor has there, so far as they are aware, ever been a complaint that the lessons have been otherwise than reverently given." In Mr. Board's version it reads, "Nor has any complaint been made to the Department that the lessons have been ridiculed or made light of." Then, continuing on, we get this statement: "The following extracts from the report of one of the most experienced Inspectors may be taken as representing the departmental conception of the value of the lessons." In Mr. Board's version he says, "The following extracts from the report of one of our most experienced Inspectors may be taken as representing the true value of the lessons." Then there is an omission of this sentence from Mr. Board's version: "I believe that in about 50 per cent. of our schools these lessons have been so treated." Then, continuing on, the report says, "It is rare that a teacher of special religious instruction desires to visit more than once a week." Mr. Board's version is, "As a rule, no teacher of special religious instruction visits more than once a week." Then the report goes on, "It must be admitted that the clergy of 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 State schools are concerned, largely confined to the general religious instruction above referred to." This is omitted from Mr. Board's letter. Then following that statement of the Inspector there is the omission of those two words "general" and "special," which we may say makes not inconsiderable the difference between teachers' instruction and the ministers'.

65. You know that Mr. Board is senior officer of the Department and Mr. Knibbs was only a special officer appointed to make the inquiry?—Yes.

66. Do you not think a permanent official who is responsible to his Minister, and through the Minister to Parliament, is justified in giving what he did? He summed up the whole thing from his own point of view. The only part where he made reference to this report is where he says, "The following extracts from the report of one of our most experienced Inspectors." He never once referred to the Commissioner's report nor to Mr. Knibbs's singular opinions?—I am surprised to hear that you condone it in that way. Although it is not put in inverted commas it is a verbatim continuous extract from this report. In nine cases where it has been modified it has been modified in making the system look more favourable than it otherwise would do to the people of New Zealand, and it has been modified to show the teachers of New Zealand what the system it like. The omission at the end of the Inspector's statement is quite unmistakable. If Mr. Board wished to give his own opinion he should have given it, and not have missed out a number of parts which would not appeal well to the people of New Zealand.

67. Are you not able to see the distinction of the difference between Mr. Knibbs's own personal opinion and the official opinion by which the Department is bound? He may have chosen to save himself the trouble of quotations but not misusing the quotations?—It would have saved him a great deal of trouble if he had taken it as it was.

68. Do you not recognize the distinction between Mr. Knibbs's personal opinions and the departmental opinion over the signature of the proper officer?—No, I would not agree that the

opinion of a departmental officer is superior to the opinion of a Commissioner appointed by the House to report on this matter.

69. The opinion of Mr. Knibbs was not the opinion of the Commissioners—are you aware of that?—Who were the other Commissioners?

70. The other Commissioner was Mr. Turner?—You said "Commissioners."

71. Yes, I said that distinctly?—Will you show me where Mr. Turner's opinion is contradictory to Mr. Knibbs's?

72. You know in the report both Commissioners signed this statement: "Each Commissioner is responsible only for the facts and conclusions set forth in the chapters written by himself, and is not responsible for those appearing in the chapters written by his fellow-Commissioner"?—I am quite well aware of that. I want to point out this fact—that if there is nothing in Mr. Turner's report which contradicts Mr. Knibbs's I think we are at liberty to say that in the joint commission he acquiesces with the opinion of his colleague.

73. That is a matter of opinion?—They were jointly named in the order from the Legislature to draw up the report.

74. And failed to send in a joint report except in the chapter from which I have read. The opinion becomes not the opinion of the Commissioners but the opinion of Mr. Knibbs and Mr. Turner respectively. Are you aware that Mr. Turner reported at page 73 as follows: "Moral teaching—It will suffice to say that our own State seems to have made the best attempt at solving the difficulty of religious instruction in schools by the facilities it gives clergymen and accredited teachers under clause 17 of the Public Instruction Act, and by the excellent general Scriptural instruction contained in the Irish National Scripture-books which are still in daily use"?—I am aware of that. I will read what goes before it: "Moral teaching—The teaching of religion has no place in the regular programme of the French school, and it does not appear that there exists any special provision for dogmatic or general instruction in the subject. The existence of God is assumed, and reverence to His name in inculcated. One's personal views on the value of religious teaching to children of public-school age need not be intruded here."

75. Do you remember hearing of an educational conference held in 1904 following upon that report?—No.

76. It was held on the 5th April, 1904, by the Department of Public Instruction in New South Wales, and was a conference of Inspectors, teachers, departmental officers, and prominent educationists presided over by the Minister of Education, and His Excellency the Governor and His Eminence Cardinal Moran were present?—No.

77. The whole question of education, including religious instruction, was discussed at that conference?—I am not aware of the conference at all. I object to questions of this nature. You ask me whether I am aware a certain conference was held, and then the matter drops. I said that I am not aware of it. These apparent admissions of various things are being brought out with no object whatever. I do not see how they can bear on the question at all.

78. As one who has studied the subject I was really surprised you did not know of it. The conference went into the whole question. Did you ever hear of any alteration being made in the system of religious instruction in New South Wales in consequence of Mr. Knibbs's report?—No.

79. Would you be surprised to know that the departmental statement dated the 29th September, 1913, is as follows: "Dear sir, I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant relative to the recommendations made by the Education Commissioners as to the system of ethical instruction in this State, and in reply I have to inform you that no alteration in the system of ethical or religious instruction in this State has been made as a result of Mr. Knibbs's recommendation"?—That is addressed to Canon Garland, and I would like to see a letter in which that is a reply to. I would point out that there have been conferences held all over Australia in connection with education, and no change has been made. Would you give me the date of that conference?

80. The 5th April, 1904, and the proceedings were published by the Government Printer?—As you have asked me the question, am I aware of the fact that no changes were made, I say that does not in the least whit detract from the correctness or even the wisdom of the remarks made by Mr. Knibbs. We never find that any Commission report is adopted either *in toto* or in part after it has been given. Mr. Knibbs did not make any radical suggestions with regard to the system except with regard to the introduction of the French ethical system. That was not introduced as a result of his report. Mr. Knibbs records facts and observations on the question of religious instruction, and whether the report was adopted afterwards seems to me immaterial.

81. In your statement you say, "Mr. Carmichael, Minister of Public Instruction, said in 1913, 'The clergy were not taking advantage of their opportunities,'" &c. Do you happen to have your authority for that?—That appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 7th May, 1913.

82. Did you take that to refer to the primary schools, similar schools with which we are dealing with in New Zealand?—Yes.

83. You are not aware he was not referring to primary schools but only to high schools?—I am positive that it does refer to primary schools. It says, "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." Mr. Hole also asked that the system be applied to high schools, but Mr. Carmichael said he was not prepared to extend the system.

84. May I read the newspaper report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 6th May, 1913: "Archdeacon Irvine, in introducing the deputation, said that by reason of recent alterations to certain public schools they had become high schools, and there was no provision in the present

Act to give religious instruction in the high schools. He came as a member of the Committee and as a citizen to discuss the matter with the responsible Minister. High schools were public schools within the meaning of the Act, as no fees were charged, and if the Act mentioned public schools he thought it was undesirable to make a technical distinction. It was an evasion of the rights of the Churches. As citizens of New South Wales, the members of the Committee saw the danger of the country becoming, to a large extent, materialistic. A headmaster of a certain school had told him that he had frequently received letters from parents telling him they did not desire that their boys should be taught anything that would not pay; and that subjects that would do nothing more than mould the boys' characters did not matter at all. Archdeacon Boyce said that in consequence of schools being made high schools, classes which had been receiving religious instruction were not quite shut out from the clergy, who were prevented from having access to these schools." The deputation went there on the subject of gaining access to high schools, which they regarded themselves as denied—high schools which a month before had been primary schools?—I recognize all that, but it does not touch the point I raised. The newspaper report says, "Mr. Carmichael gave no promise as to modifying the present syllabus in the direction desired by Mr. Hole, and contended that the clergy were not taking advantage of their opportunities. If he paid a visit to certain schools where there were resident clergy near, he was of opinion that he should find that many had not availed themselves of the opportunity to visit the schools in order to give religious instruction. So that 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." In the beginning when I gave the quotation I quoted it with regard to a specific point, and the point on which I quoted Mr. Carmichael was, that the clergy neglected their opportunities to pay visits to the schools. Canon Garland evidently wishes to show that this criticism of the neglect of the clergy to pay visits applies to secondary schools, but it also applies to primary schools.

85. I did not catch your reading the beginning of Mr. Carmichael's remarks where they referred to the high schools. He said, "There had been no alteration made in the rights and privileges formerly enjoyed—they had been conserved with regard to the high schools. In all high schools of the State the Committee might carry out religious instruction, because instructions had been given in order to allow it. If he paid a visit to certain schools where there were resident clergy near he was of opinion that he should find that many had not availed themselves of the opportunity to visit the schools in order to give religious instruction." My construction is that when he speaks of schools in the second instance he is referring to exactly the same when referring to high schools. That was the object of the deputation. Then you left out what he said at the end—"He had just received a report from the Inspectors who had inquired into the giving of religious instruction, and it was quite satisfactory"?—Giving religious instruction where?

86. Well, I did not say where?—I wish to reply to that, because this point ought to be made clear. The Rev. Mr. Chambers, whom I quoted, preached a sermon in the Anglican church, and I will give evidence that he refuted the point you are pressing on me.

87. I wish to make this point clear that Mr. Carmichael was referring to the question of whether they had the right to go into the high schools or not, and that he turned round and said "I have given instructions, and my complaint is that you are not going in"?—That is not the meaning, because in that statement of Mr. Chambers's, who is a Rector and ought to know, he says distinctly that they have no right to give religious instruction in those schools.

88. On the 6th September, 1913, I received a letter from one of the speakers at that deputation: would you like to read it?—I am quite willing to hear you read it.

89. It is from Mr. James Hole, organizing secretary, and a member of the Committee that went to the Minister. He wrote, "The Archbishop of Sydney has instructed me to give you what information I can with regard to our work of religious instruction in order that you may be in a better position to combat the absurd statements that seem to be going the round of New Zealand. The mail leaves for Wellington at 10.30 this morning, so it will be impossible for me at this stage to enter very fully into the matter. The Church of England in New South Wales is not in the slightest degree dissatisfied with the system of religious instruction in force here. I cannot conceive that any member of our Church would wish for its alteration. Some may wish for denominational schools, but they do not wish the public schools to be Godless. What we have to be dissatisfied with is the support given by the Church people to the Committee appointed by Synod to carry on the work committed to their care. The members of the deputation that waited upon the Minister of Public Instruction in May last did not complain of the system. They had noted that, owing to the multiplicity of subjects in the new curriculum, the State teachers were inclined to give less time to the teaching of Scripture than was the case under the old syllabus. This teaching is provided for by Clause VII, which enacts that secular instruction shall be held to include general religious teaching. Clause XVII, under which the clergy and other authorized teachers give special dogmatic and definite religious instruction, remains the same as when you were at St. James's. By administrative action, at the beginning of the year, about a dozen superior public schools were converted into high schools, and in pursuance of an opinion given by a former Attorney-General entrance to these schools was denied us. One of the principal objects of the deputation was to get the embargo removed, and I am pleased to say the concession was granted even before the date of the interview"?—I have seen that letter before. In answer to the statement you have made, I wish to point out that when you get a response to a letter a great deal depends on the letter that went over, and those two replies you have referred to came back to New Zealand as a reply to a public statement which I myself made in the papers when I quoted some reports of the Anglican Synod. I merely quoted one point that the Anglican Synod said—"We are reluctantly compelled to avow the conviction that

unless a more lively and persistent interest is taken in this work (the right-of-entry work) by members of the synod, in recess as well as session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps even finally be abandoned." Then a letter went over asking whether the people were dissatisfied with the system, and they said no, they wanted it extended to the high schools.

90. When was that report made?—That was in 1892, but it was requoted last year. I have extracts of a similar nature from the synod report of 1911 and others. The report of 1911 contains these words: "There are some 462 public schools in this diocese, and little more than half that number receive regular religious instruction from the Church." I want to clear up this point about high schools and primary schools. Here is part of a sermon delivered by the Rev. G. A. Chambers: "Further, the general religious instruction which is supposed to be given by the State teachers in the public school in the reading of Holy Scripture is altogether left out of the high schools, so that the high-school syllabus is absolutely secular."

91. Here is what Mr. Hole says with regard to the debate: "With regard to the debate that is said to have taken place in synod during its last session, I can assure you it was of no great importance or I should have a more vivid recollection of what occurred. The usual report and balance-sheet were presented by our Committee, and the opportunity was taken to press upon members the urgent claims of the work. If anything was said against the system it was by some irresponsible person who knew little or nothing about the matter, and who, if opportunity offers, will at the ensuing session probably say the same things. I cannot remember that anything of the sort happened, and I am supported in this by others to whom I have spoken. The reports which have been forwarded will supply all the information you require regarding figures. Referring to your request for particulars about definite parishes, you are well aware that there are in the remote districts of New South Wales parishes which could be cited as examples and used as illustrations with more force than any that can be referred to in the Sydney Diocese. For your information I give a couple (out of many) instances, which will go to show how difficult the work of religious instruction is even in this diocese. First, take the parish of Picton. This is about fifty miles from end to end, and has within its borders no less than twenty-one schools. There are only two clergymen, one of whom resides at the extremity of the parish in the mining district of Yerranderie. He is able to teach only one or two of the schools, and the remainder are left to the care of the Rector. Then, take the typical city parish of St. Michael's, Surry Hills, one of the slum districts of Sydney. Here are three very large schools with an aggregate average attendance of nearly three thousand children. There are, at the best of times, only two clergy working in the parish—oftentimes there is but one: and the problem is how to overtake the work of special religious instruction." In speaking of the number of parishes and the number of visits paid, were you aware there were such typical parishes as I have cited, and that the same thing would apply to other churches equally with the Church of England?—Yes, I am aware there are such parishes as that, and I am aware that the Anglican Synod, with all the information in their possession, said in 1882 that unless a more lively and persistent interest is taken in this work by members of the synod, in recess as well as in session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps finally be abandoned." It was a quotation from a previous synod report.

92. Are you not aware that the work was not the work of visiting schools, but that of raising money to pay for extra teachers? In your statement you interpolate the right-of-entry work, and it is not right-of-entry work?—Is it religious teachers' work?

93. No, the work of raising money to find extra teachers?—Is not that right-of-entry work?

94. No, the work that the Committee does is not to go into the schools, but the finding of money at the rate of £600 a year to pay men and women to go into the schools where the clergy cannot. Are you not mistaken when you say it refers to the right-of-entry work?—I have no evidence of that.

95. In your statement you seek to reduce the value of the records made by the Department. Are you not aware that the Department in its official report submitted to Parliament in 1913 states emphatically that the number of visits made by visiting religious teachers during the year shows a very considerable increase?—Yes, I am quite aware of that, because the lessons are now counted as visits. I will read the circular which gives the effect to that. It reads, "Department of Public Instruction.—Memorandum to Teachers.—Method of recording the number of special religious visits given in the public schools: Discrepancies between the number of religious visits recorded in the quarterly returns as compared with the annual returns disclose the fact that there is no uniform practice in recording these visits. It has been decided, therefore, to substitute the word 'lessons' for the word 'visits' on the returns, and, pending the issue of the next supply of forms, you are instructed to make the necessary alteration. If instead of visiting a school on successive days the special religious teacher finds it more expedient to give successive lessons in a school (or in separate departments of the same school) on the same day, such successive lessons should be counted as separate lessons. If, however, boys and girls of separate departments are taught in one class, the lesson not exceeding the hour specified under section 17 of the Public Instruction Act, such lesson should be counted as one, and not as a separate lesson to each department.—P. BOARD, Director of Education, 13/6/13." The effect of that is that any one who goes there for an hour and gives three lessons—that it put down as three visits.

96. I understood you said before that he gave four lessons?—Yes, he could give four quarter-hour lessons, or three twenty-minute lessons, or two of thirty minutes.

97. Have you anything to support your supposition that they do that?—It says so—"Discrepancies between the number of religious visits recorded." The only other way to record a visit would be that one visit should be recorded as one visit. Could you suggest any way they could get three lessons in such a way?

98. Are you aware of one solitary case in which a man visited four classes in the hour and it was counted as four visits?—No, but I wish to emphasize this: "If, instead of visiting a school on successive days, the special religious teacher finds it more expedient to give successive lessons in a school (or in separate departments of the same school) on the same day, such successive lessons should be counted as separate lessons." Provided he does not exceed an hour's instruction. Where would the discrepancy be if that practice had not been in vogue?

99. The discrepancy arose in a very simple way. There were a great many instances in which ministers' visits were never recorded at all by the Department or by the minister—they were taken so much as a matter of course—and there were discrepancies between the teachers' quarterly reports sent in and the annual returns?—I would point out that this is a discrepancy in the method of recording visits. There could not be discrepancies about the visits not recorded at all.

100. Now to come to Mr. Chambers: he is dissatisfied with the teaching system?—I quoted him as saying, "The general religious instruction which is supposed to be given by the State teachers in the public school in the reading of Holy Scripture is altogether left out of the high schools, so that the high school syllabus is absolutely secular."

101. You are not aware that Mr. Chambers is a strong supporter of the system in New South Wales?—That is immaterial to my point. Would you say he was satisfied with the system? He says, "Already we are beginning to notice the effect of the past thirty-four years, under the present system of State education. The sanctions of religion are losing their hold over the people generally. Agnosticism and practical atheism are increasing, and men and women are becoming more and more indifferent to the claims of Christ and the Church. Our boys are drifting from the Church. They have been educated in an atmosphere apart from the Church, and according to a system that seeks rather the culture of the intellect than the development of character and personality." Would you take that as evidence of an endorsement of the system?

102. Would you take this as evidence of dissatisfaction: "The Rectory, Dulwich Hill, Sydney, N.S.W., 17th August, 1914.—The Rev. Canon Garland.—Rev. and dear sir—My attention having been drawn to the fact that a sermon on 'The Church and Education,' preached by me in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on the 19th July last is being used to favour the exclusion of the Bible from State schools, I should like to say that the object of the sermon was quite the contrary. It was to emphasize the value of the Bible as an integral and absolutely necessary part of any system of education, and to plead for a truer observance of our present Act. The fault, whether intentional or unintentional, here lies with the administration of the Act, and that was what I tried to point out. I am a firm believer in having the Bible read in State schools as part of the ordinary curriculum, and in allowing the clergy to impart special Church teaching to the children during school-hours. This is the law in New South Wales, and is largely availed of and generally appreciated by the parents of the scholars. My desire is for more of the Bible in our schools as the only sure means of building up and developing the character of our future citizens.—I am, &c., G. A. CHAMBERS, M.A., Rector of Dulwich Hill, Warden of Trinity Grammar School, Sydney"?—I always find remarkable discrepancies when they are on the other side preaching and when they send information to New Zealand. There is every contradiction between the report of his sermon and the letter quoted there. I do not attempt to reconcile the two statements. That is what he said in his sermon, and he roundly condemns the results of the system which in a letter he now writes he is evidently supporting.

103. Mr. Chambers states very clearly that his object was to improve the working of the system and not to destroy it?—He said he is in favour of State aid to denominational schools.

104. In your statement you quote from the Presbyterian *Outlook* this phrase, "From the standpoint of the Anglican Church the right of entry is the all-important thing." That appeared in the *Outlook* of the 10th March, 1914?—Was it not earlier than that?

105. There is a long leading article, and it reads, "That assistance and co-operation has been given and is maintained on the distinct understanding that the complete platform of the League be submitted by way of referendum to the electors as an undivided whole. From the standpoint of the Anglican Church the right of entry by the clergy is the all-important thing, just as, from the Presbyterian and Methodist standpoint, the emphasis is placed upon the lessons given by the school-teachers. And any attempt to divide the issue would amount to the disenfranchisement of the whole body of the Anglicans, who cannot consistently vote for the one issue unless it is made contingent on the other." Have I read correctly?—Yes. In my statement you will notice where I left anything out I put in a series of dots to indicate that. I was only dealing with the Anglican Church's attitude.

106. But why did you not quote what the *Outlook* said in a subsequent issue on the very point on the 27th March, 1914?—I am aware of that.

107. It states, "In a note on the work of the League a fortnight since, when discussing the agitation on foot to divide the issue to be placed before the electors by way of referendum, we made the statement that from the point of view of the Anglican Church 'the right of entry is the all-important thing' "?—I have read that.

108. Was it fair to give the idea to this Committee that the Presbyterian *Outlook* had stated from the point of view of the Anglican Church the right of entry is the all-important thing when the *Outlook* had equally clearly said that the Anglican Church's attitude was just as keen about Bible lessons as about ministers' visits?—I will explain the difference. I consider it is perfectly fair, because I find that the *Outlook* whenever it gets itself into a hole is perfectly ready to turn a somersault next week. The point is, it says, "It has been pointed out to us." I want to know who pointed it out to him. I know the editor got into hot water because he "let the cat out of the bag."

109. In your statement you say, "In Queensland the League officials sat by the Minister in charge of the Empowering Bill, and all amendments were referred to them." How do you know—were you in the House at the time?—If I had time I would turn up the record in the Queensland *Hansard* where one of the members, in the middle of his speech, pointed out that the Minister sends away his responsible officer to the back of the room, and there are the Bible in Schools League's officials sitting alongside the Minister, to whom all amendments were referred.

110. Do you not see the difference in stating what would make it appear that you have absolute proof that the League officials did sit alongside the Minister and in stating that in *Hansard* Mr. So-and-so made such a statement?—I do not see any difference between that and your quoting a book after you have read it and quoting it as an authority. If you will disprove my statement then I will be prepared to make a modification.

111. You believe everything you see in *Hansard?*—It has to be submitted to proof.

112. You say you do not see any difference in stating it as a positive fact that the League officials were there and in stating that in *Hansard* Mr. So-and-so made the statement?—No, I do not when I rely on *Hansard* as a perfectly true record of what was said.

FRIDAY, 16TH OCTOBER, 1914.

JOHN CAUGHLEY, M.A., further examined. (No. 5.)

1. *Canon Garland.*] At the time of that resolution of the teachers in New Plymouth, Mr. Caughley, you were present?—Yes.

2. And you used your influence according to what you believed to be right to its fullest extent with your collegues in the profession to convince them that what you believed was the right course?—That would not be the whole truth with regard to the Teachers' Institute in general. The procedure was this: a notice of motion in opposition to the Bible-in-schools programme was carried at the Canterbury District Provincial Institute, and a similar one was carried at the Auckland Institute. Those were then put on the order paper for the year, and every teacher in New Zealand had a separate copy given to him of those two notices of motion in the *Journal of Education*, which every member receives. Every individual teacher in New Zealand had an opportunity of attending his own district Institute and speaking for or against that motion. I was only one delegate from a provincial Institute. Not one district Institute in New Zealand negatived the resolution we put forward. With two exceptions they all supported the resolution opposing the League's proposal. That was the only opportunity I had of speaking on the question. They unanimously asked me to speak on the matter, and then they came to a decision and carried by a very large majority the resolution opposing the League's proposal. That was the extent of my influence. I spoke in my own district Institute in Canterbury.

3. You considered it your duty to influence the teachers as much as you possibly could against these proposals of ours, which you consider wrong?—I cannot gather the drift of the question. I considered it my duty when at the Canterbury District Institute to take part in the discussion, and I did so. Because I was present at New Plymouth you seem to think that the resolution was carried by my influence.

4. No, I did not mean that?—It was stated at one of your meetings that I had used my influence at the Canterbury District Institute, and that I spoke as a member of the Institute at New Plymouth. I would not have spoken there, as I was in the chair, unless I had been called on to do so.

5. You consider it your duty as an honest and honourable man to do everything you can in a legitimate way to influence your colleagues against our movement?—Oh, certainly.

6. Well, in doing that have you been able to put before the teachers whom you can influence any resolutions from other teachers' associations in any part of the Empire to a similar effect adverse to religious instruction in State schools?—No, we did not take that phase of the question into consideration, but how it affected New Zealand, and we dealt with it from a New Zealand point of view.

7. Have you ever heard of any teachers' association in the British Empire passing a similar resolution?—I know the Teachers' Institute in Queensland, through their official paper, expressed deep regret that they had not put up a more determined opposition against the Bible-in-schools programme in Queensland.

8. Do you know of any teachers' association in any other part where opposition has been shown similar to that in New Zealand?—I do not know of any campaign similar to this in any other part of the world.

9. Perhaps you are not aware there has been such a campaign in South Africa. Are you aware there were two teachers' institutes, as we call them, in South Africa?—I have no doubt there were.

10. I have here the Report of the Select Committee on the Religious Instruction in Schools Draft Ordinance, together with minutes of proceedings, dated 1913. Mr. John Justin Godfrey Carson, in his evidence on page 11, said he was president of the Teachers' Association of the Cape Province. Then, in his answer on page 18 he says, "I should like you to remember specially that eight years ago the Teachers' Association, not because the clergy were finding out these difficulties about preparation for confirmation or anything else, passed these resolutions in favour of Bible instruction, and thus showed that their spirit was in favour of doing something—that they recognized the need. No action arose out of that, but now they are being presented with a syllabus and more or less told to take it. I suppose it is possibly human nature that if a man is told to do a thing he is more liable to see objections to doing so." Then, in ques-

tion 222 he is asked, "Do you agree that Bible-teaching is desired, and also the syllabus" (which I may explain included dogmatic catechism), "and are the teachers agreeable to teach it, though they do wish to teach the Catechism?" and he replied "Yes." Were you aware of that action of the Teachers' Association in South Africa?—I am not aware of it, but in order to express an opinion I would have to go into the surrounding circumstances and know what the campaign was and how this gentleman acted. It says there that the teachers, when they are told they must do a thing, would only in human nature object to do a thing which they would otherwise voluntarily do. I have been teaching the Bible for twenty years, but I object to be told that I am forced to do it.

11. When you used your influence with the teachers you were not aware of the fact that the Teachers' Association of South Africa had passed a resolution favouring religious teaching in schools?—Yes, of some kind or other.

12. Then, in addition to that Teachers' Association, they have another called the "Zuid-Afrikaanse Ouderwigzers Unie," meaning the "Under-Teachers' Union," of which Mr. Paul Johannes Roos is president. He was asked, "Will you please tell the Committee what resolutions have been passed by your association in connection with the question of religious instruction in schools?" And he answered, "It is simply this: in the year 1905 we passed our first resolution, as you will find on page 26 of the Commission's report. As far back as 1905 the Z.A.O.U. passed a resolution in favour of making Bible history one of the subjects in the curriculum. Since then we have at practically every Conference—it was not done last year, and I think not in the previous year—but for the rest we have practically every year been coming back to that question and reaffirming that resolution, feeling that there is not enough done in the way of religious instruction, and that more must be done." Were you in a position to inform the teachers whom you influenced that this second association of teachers in South Africa had also passed a resolution favouring some form of religious instruction in the curriculum?—No, I was not in a position to do so. We did not need any resolution from South Africa to tell us whether we have a conscience and whether our conscience rights are being violated. We did not need anything from South Africa to examine into this system—we formed our own opinion. It would not have been material to our discussion.

13. It would not have been material to your discussion that teachers in another part of the Empire passed resolutions advocating religious instruction in schools?—No. Because the religious instruction, for all I know, is in denominational schools. We do not know the conditions.

14. When you were advising the teachers I suppose you recommended them to read one of the standard works on this subject: did you advise them to study Professor Sadler's book on this subject?—I did not. I would like to point out the latent inference that is in every question put to me. It is made to appear that my influence was the preponderating influence, and that they did not have any opinions of their own. I pointed out in my evidence that authorities, and one in particular, recommended that in the case of denominational schools there should be State aid towards religious instruction. What would be the use of quoting authorities dealing with religious education of one type in connection with a system which is of a totally different type?

15. You think there ought to be an equivalent given to denominational schools if any form of religious instruction is imparted into the State schools?—I take it that it is the natural attitude for the State to take up. If they give religious instruction in State schools they must give an equivalent to such schools which cannot accept it.

16. Coming back to Professor Sadler's book, in the introduction he says, "But so far as Great Britain is concerned the Committee are impressed by the earnest conviction with which so large a number of the teachers, and especially of the women teachers, both in our elementary and our secondary schools, speak of the power of the religious lessons to inspire a high moral ideal and to touch the springs of conduct. We are assured by our investigators and by some of those who have given oral evidence that the withdrawal of the religious lessons from the schools (and in a still higher degree the prohibition of acts of common worship) would be regarded by multitudes of teachers as a calamity, hurtful (as they believe) to the children, injurious (as they know) to their own spiritual life." Were you aware of that opinion of Professor Sadler's about the attitude of the teachers of Great Britain?—Yes, I am aware of that, which proves that those teachers are teaching in denominational Church schools, and their opinions with regard to religious instruction could not possibly apply to the system we are dealing with in New Zealand. I put in my evidence the opinion of Senior Inspector Holmes, who speaks with regard to the same thing, and he says, "But the net result of giving formal and mechanical instruction in the greatest of all great matters is to depress the spiritual vitality of the children of England to a point which threatens the extinction of the spiritual life of the nation."

17. Was not Inspector Holmes referring to the method and not to the thing itself?—It is the method in New Zealand we are opposing—it is not the religious instruction in general.

18. Do you remember a cablegram which appeared in the newspapers of the Dominion on the 7th February last, which read, "A considerable proportion of the National Union of Teachers favour a solution of the religious-education question on lines similar to the New South Wales system"?—I heard of that; and, in spite of that fact the New Zealand Educational Institute, by seven to one, opposed the League's proposal, I have heard it stated by League supporters that a large number of teachers in New Zealand support the League's programme.

19. Do you know the book, "The Religious Question in Public Education," by Riley, Sadler, and Jackson?—No, I do not know that.

20. The sub-title of the book is, "A Critical Examination of Schemes representing various Points of View," and it says, "The editors agree that undenominational teaching can never embrace the whole of an ideal religious education for a child. The sense of membership in

an historic body of believers (a sense which under favourable conditions of temperament and of intellectual affinity deepens into a conviction of personal allegiance) is one of the privileges which religious training may impart. But, except perhaps as a general counsel for the guidance of life, such allegiance cannot be inculcated by a form of teaching which is bound to be neutral in its outlook upon different forms of religious belief. On the other hand, one of the editors believes that undenominational teaching given with sincerity and reverence becomes the expression of the underlying unity of all real religious experience, and that in schools attended by children belonging to many different faiths it is the right means of fostering a religious attitude of mind, which is one necessary factor in a liberal and character-forming education. Provided, therefore, that such undenominational teaching is supplemented by other kinds of religious instruction in accordance with parental preference, he regards its claim to a preferential place in the curriculum of council schools as valid, and as justified by the fact that it has been found to help in giving spiritual unity to the school's corporate life. The other two editors agree with him in desiring that some simple act of common worship should form part of the daily work of every elementary and secondary school, but they differ from him in their judgment of the value of undenominational religious teaching as distinct from united worship." You were not aware of the opinions of those eminent educationists?—Is that the whole question? It is not for me to speak on your procedure, but it seems incorporating a great deal of your evidence in a question to me. I am not aware of that statement, and I would point out again that it is not criticism in direct reference to the religious instruction proposed in New Zealand. You are advocating religious instruction in countries where, if any denominations object, they can have Church schools of their own and get State aid. I would like to know whether the New South Wales system is reviewed by that eminent authority. He evidently knows all the grand systems of religious instruction in the world.

21. There is nothing in the index about it?—It is remarkable it is not known by such an eminent authority. You have not read the resolution which I presented from the New Plymouth Institute. You will find the first words of it will show that we are in accord with those eminent authorities with regard to the value of the Bible and religious instruction, but we are opposed to the method proposed by the Bible in Schools League.

22. That resolution leaves out one thing which would bring them into agreement with those authorities. If you had said you believed in religious instruction in school-hours we would have met you?—If any scheme is brought up we give our opinion on that

23. In the *New Zealand Journal of Education* of the 15th February, 1913, the editorial states, "That a great majority of the teachers of the Dominion are opposed to the programme of the Bible in Schools League is clearly evident from the result of the vote—forty-two to seven. If the advocates of the New South Wales system wish to secure the support of the teachers of New Zealand they must first give them a Dominion scheme of appointments and promotion. The fact that teachers in the Australian States are Civil servants and beyond the reach of persecution by petty parochial bodies makes all the difference in the working of the scheme, and this difference is not, we feel sure, fully appreciated by those outside the ranks of the teaching service." How far would you agree with that idea that they wish to secure a Dominion scheme of appointments and promotion?—I can explain the leader, although I did not write it myself. The editor laid down the principle that merits or demerits of the Bible-in-schools question was not to be discussed in the *Journal*, and therefore he did not refer to all the sectarian questions that might arise. He made that reference because at the same time we were carrying on a campaign for universal promotion in New Zealand, and that would be an extra objection. The absence of a general scheme of promotion and appointments would be an extra objection, but that is only a minor point, and we would not let that count to anything like the extent we would count the interest of religion and education. The editor took up a very minor point because he had restricted or cut out in the columns of the *Journal* all religious aspects of the question. He was pressing the need of a colonial scale of salaries.

24. Was it not subsequent to this editorial?—You asked me to what extent I agreed with the opinions, and I have given an explanation in order to show how I can agree with them.

25. Without any reservation here expressed by the editor he states explicitly, "They must first give them a Dominion scheme of appointments and promotion"?—Yes; then after that you would have to give about ten other things as well.

26. Not in that editorial?—I have explained why they are not there.

27. The *Journal* for November, 1913, puts the membership of the union at 4,105, and it says, "And yet the membership of the Institute has not quite reached the 3,000 mark." Is that the right number?—There are pupil-teachers and uncertificated teachers. When I stated there were 95 per cent. of the teachers members I got my figures from the Treasurer. There are pupil-teachers and uncertificated teachers who have not been trained, and they are not eligible for membership by law.

28. The editor again does not make any qualifications; he simply states that the number of teachers in the primary schools of the Dominion, exclusive of those employed in the secondary departments of district high schools, is—men, 1,555; women, 2,550: total, 4,105: and yet the membership of the Institute has not quite reached the 3,000 mark. Is that right or wrong?—He is correct, but he was speaking to people who knew the conditions. You do not. Many uncertificated teachers are debarred by law from belonging to the Institute.

29. But whether certificated or not they are teachers, and one-fourth of those 4,000 are not represented in the Institute?—Yes, and a large portion of the 1,000 could not be represented even if they wished it. The interpretation clause of the Education Act defines "teacher," and we have no power over that at all.

30. If forty-two to seven voted in the conference against us, that would represent about six-sevenths of the members of the Institute—2,570?—It could not, because some of those members

who voted on behalf of the Bible in Schools League's proposal came from districts where 90 per cent. of the teachers were opposed to the principle.

31. Of course some teachers who voted for it came from districts where the teachers were in favour of it?—I said that those who voted on behalf of the Bible in Schools League's proposal came from districts where a very large majority of the teachers were opposed to the League. I ask you to name any Institute in New Zealand where any teacher who voted against the Bible in Schools League's programme came from a district where the majority were against the proposal.

32. That is, if we take the voting as given, forty-two to seven, there was one-fourth who were opposed to that resolution?—No; you are ignorant of the conditions under which our delegates are appointed. Every district Institute gets one member on the Council for a certain minimum number of members—say forty. Then they get another representative on the Council for, say, fifty. Then they get still a third representative for a larger number, and above a certain number they do not get any extra representatives at all. The representation is not a basis for your argument.

33. Then are we to take it that those figures, forty-two to seven, are not the representative opinions of the members of the Institute unless explanations are given?—They are representative to an even greater extent than the figures show when full explanations are given.

34. Have you ever heard it stated that the Institute does not represent the opinions of the members of the Institute?—Yes, Mr. de Berry said that, and he was asked to justify it in the Institute, but he would not.

35. He did not choose to do it where he was?—You can put it that way. It is very usual to say those things at Bible-in-school meetings.

36. Then there is one teacher you know of who said the Institute did not express the opinions of those members who were outside the Institute?—Yes, Mr. de Berry was a living example of it, because he voted for the Bible-in-schools proposal at that meeting, and he did not represent the district he came from.

37. That the resolution of the Institute does not represent the opinions of the teachers outside the Institute has been stated by several teachers?—You have put another word in since. You did not say "outside" before.

38. Yes, I did?—Nobody would ever pretend to speak on behalf of the people who were outside the Institute.

39. Mr. Flamank, who is not a member of the Institute, wrote in the Dunedin *Times* of the 8th May last as follows: "The resolution actually passed by the Institute and recorded in its minutes is 'that the N.Z.E.I., while recognizing the value of the Bible-teaching and religion, is opposed to the Bible in Schools League's programme.' The N.Z.E.I. herein expresses the opinion of its 2,725 members who elected it, and does not pretend to voice the opinions of those teachers who are not members. On no occasion has the Institute said that the majority of teachers are opposed to the League's programme, although it might have said so with truth." You are aware that prominent teachers have said that the Institute does not speak for the teachers who are outside the Institute?—Prominent teachers have not said so.

40. Mr. Flamank has said so. He said, "It does not pretend to voice the opinions of those teachers who are not members"?—But it does. We do pretend, and we claim and assert that we represent them, and when we presented that resolution to the Minister we claimed to represent the teachers.

41. Mr. Flamank says, "The Institute does not pretend to voice the opinions of those teachers who are not members"?—That is another matter. We do not pretend to represent the opinions of those who are not members, but we do represent the opinions of those who are members.

42. You know that some teachers question whether the Institute is representative of the spirit of the teachers of the Dominion?—I have often heard that said when a certain member could not carry a resolution proposed. I think I know who said that. When a man cannot get a thing carried that he wants carried he says the body is not competent to deal with it.

43. Mr. Duggan is a prominent teacher in the profession?—I thought it was he.

44. He is reported in the *Hawke's Bay Herald* as saying, "Speaking of the personnel of the conference, he said the attitude of the majority did not reflect the spirit of the teachers of the Dominion. The majority of delegates were pleased to talk ideals, being satisfied in their enjoyment of good schools and salaries. There was, therefore, something wrong in the matter of representation, for which a remedy would have to be found." He is not speaking of the Bible in schools, but how far the Institute is representative?—Yes, I knew it was Mr. Duggan whom you were going to refer to. He was advocating at that meeting in Auckland one of the most firebrand proposals he could bring forward. He wanted to form a trades-union and for us to go out on strike, and all sorts of things, and because he could not get the resolution carried he said the Institute did not represent the teaching profession.

45. But he made the statement?—You could get plenty of statements like that, but I would not like to father them.

46. In the *New Zealand Journal of Education* for May, 1914, a well-known teacher, "Pen-nib," writes, "I think I am correct in saying that at any ballot for the election of representatives not more than one-third of those qualified to vote exercise their vote, and the greatest delinquents are the country teachers, who complain that they are not represented, that the personnel of the N.Z.E.I. is not representative of the great body of lower-salaried teachers"?—Do you mean that the small proportion of ballot-papers sent in is evidence of not representing the opinion?

47. No; you are aware that the writer, who is known to be a prominent teacher, has expressed his opinion, "I think I am correct in saying that at any ballot for the election of representatives not more than one-third of those qualified to vote exercise their vote, and the greatest delinquents are the country teachers"?—I am aware that was said, but it does not bear the construction given here. The point is this: every teacher gets a voting-paper sent to him, and all he has to do is to mark it off and return it. If he does not exercise his vote that is his own lookout, but it would not be any evidence that the Institute did not represent the opinion of the teachers. It only shows that certain teachers do not exercise their franchise in electing delegates.

48. Mr. James K. Law is a head teacher, and in April, 1904, he wrote in the *New Zealand Journal of Education* as follows: "The N.Z.E.I. in conference assembled is not, in my opinion, nor for many years has it been, representative of the opinion of a great majority of the profession. The average salary of its members is far above the average salary of members of the profession; it is composed largely of men either in the highest positions or looking forward to attain to these, and in this matter it is, in my opinion, moved largely by self-interest. Those who have read Karl Marx on the distribution of wealth will appreciate the insidious influence of this motive." Did you know of that?—I know he said that, and I know he said it in connection with the salaries matter, and the point is this: if those high-salaried teachers have a predominating influence as delegates, how is it that whereas four-fifths of the teachers in our Institute are low-salaried ones they repose such confidence in those men? If they did not have confidence in them they would not elect them.

49. Here is another statement I have, which is written by Mr. Cron, head teacher of Kakanui. Although he signs the letter under a *nom de plume* he has given me permission to mention his name. Speaking of the Institute he says, "It simply does not express the opinion of the 2,725 members who elected it. It expressed the opinion of the forty or fifty members that assembled at Christmas-time to deliberate upon affairs relating to their profession. Personally I do not know—doubtless Mr. Flamank does—whether or not these forty or fifty were unanimous or not. I would like Mr. Flamank's assurance in respect to this. The forty or fifty were not omniscient; they could not see into the interior of the heads of the 2,725 members who elected them. They did not know all the opinions of these 2,725. They knew the opinions of some, and this is all they knew. No step was taken to ascertain the opinions of these 2,725. How, then, can he claim—how can any one claim—that these 2,725 thought the same of the omniscient forty?" You are aware he wrote that?—Yes, I am, and it is absolutely incorrect that no steps were taken to ascertain the opinions of the 2,725. I will explain how steps were taken to ascertain the opinions. There is no single item of business except a notice of motion brought before the annual meeting of the Institute which has not been previously discussed twice in every district Institute in New Zealand. Many of those have branch Institutes, and not only that, but every individual member of the Institute down to the last one gets the *Journal of Education* with the full order paper. They are invited to sectional meetings to go and give their opinions, and after those opinions have been given they elect delegates to send to the Institute to represent them. I undertake to say there is not a corporate body in New Zealand which has expressed an opinion of the Bible-in-schools question which has consulted every member of the body to the extent that the Institute has done. As a member of the Presbyterian Church, I have not had a voice on this question as a member of the congregation. All the other members of the congregation have never been asked as a congregation what they think of this question at all, and yet we are all committed to it. I only had an opportunity of speaking on the matter as an elder.

50. I was not asking you about your own congregation. I have received this morning a copy of a letter which I will ask permission to read to give you an opportunity of explaining it. It reads as follows:—

"Christchurch, 15th October, 1914.

"To the Chairman of the Parliamentary Education Committee.

"DEAR SIR,—

"I understand that Mr. J. Caughley, in giving evidence before the parliamentary Committee, said something to the effect that the congregation of the Church he attended had not been consulted on the question of the Bible-in-schools movement. In reply to that I have to say that if Mr. Caughley is referring to the congregation of which I have been a minister for years—St. Andrew's, Christchurch—I point out that the opinion of St. Andrew's congregation was given in the usual Presbyterian way, through the Session of Elders, elected by the members of the congregation, and representing them, and sitting with the minister as a Church court. I further state that no member of the session except Mr. Caughley has opposed the proposal.

"Yours faithfully,

"JOHN MACKENZIE.

"G. M. Thomson, Esq., Chairman, Education Committee, Wellington.

"P.S.—It is fair to say that Mr. Caughley was not present at the meeting of session at which the decision was arrived at. At the subsequent meeting he indicated his dissent from the decision of the session.—J.M."

If Mr. Mackenzie is speaking the truth you had an opportunity of expressing your views in the court of your own congregation?—There is more to add to that. I told you a minute ago that I had an opportunity as an elder of doing so, but not as a member of the congregation. No notice of motion was given at the sessional meeting that this matter was to be brought up. At the same hour as the discussion I was conducting a Sunday-school teachers' meeting in another part of the town, and when I heard the resolution had been brought up I afterwards objected, because the congregation had not been consulted. I held the floor till the session agreed that

this resolution which you are putting before the Committee was agreed to be taken as the personal opinion of the members of the session, and not of the members of the congregation. More than my dissent was recorded, because it was ordered to be recorded that it represented the individual opinions of the session members and not of the congregation.

51. Is it the custom within your knowledge to consult the congregations of the Presbyterian Church on such questions as Bible in schools, Sabbath observation, prohibition, and kindred questions?—That has often been done—they have often been consulted on questions such as that, but my submission was that we were not consulted on this particular matter, and at the session afterwards I objected to the minute. They agreed that they were giving their opinion as a session, and I insisted on that being recorded before I sat down.

52. In the *Post* of the 1st August, 1914, at a meeting of the New Zealand Educational Institute you are reported as saying, "I may say that I have put the Bible into the hands of more children in the way of religious instruction than Canon Garland has ever done." Is that a correct statement?—I would not say absolutely. I said "I think I have done."

53. The *New Zealand Times* reports you still more strongly: "He had no hesitation in saying that he had been the means of placing the Bible in the hands of more children than Canon Garland. (Hear, hear.)" Which of those is the correct report?—I really could not say at this distance.

54. But you did say something to that effect?—Yes, and I was speaking personally as a teacher actually teaching children.

55. I want to know how many Bibles you knew I had placed in the hands of children?—I did not say "Bibles." I said "Bible-teaching." I meant giving the children religious instruction.

56. How do you know how many children I have given religious instruction to?—Because I have been told by other ministers I have met in New Zealand that I have taught more children religious instruction than any one else they have come across.

57. It is not what people said to you, but what you said of me. How did you know what I have done?—I took you as an average minister.

58. Did you know I have taught tens of thousands of children religious instruction in my career, which has reached its silver jubilee only this month?—I am quite content to let it stand.

59. *Professor Hunter.*] You represent the New Zealand Educational Institute?—I do.

60. Are you an honorary or a paid officer of the Institute in this matter?—Entirely honorary.

61. You quoted a statement from Archbishop Temple when he was Headmaster of Rugby that secular schools would not be irreligious. Do you know what age the author was when he made that statement?—I took the opportunity of looking up the Archbishop's age. It was said he was a youth when he made that statement, and I find he was an immature youth of forty-five when he made that statement.

62. You mentioned the New South Wales Commissioners in your evidence. Could you give us any idea of the relative standing of Mr. Knibbs and Mr. Board in regard to educational matters?—I find that Mr. Knibbs, who compiled two-thirds of the Commission's report, had been a primary-school teacher, secondary-school teacher, lecturer on mathematics and physics; recognized as a particularly able man; a member of the executive of the Australasian Association of Science; selected by Parliament to tour the world and report on education throughout the world; of the Royal Commission report he compiled he did the whole of the Religion and Moral section; Commonwealth Statistician, and therefore well suited to collect and sift evidence. Mr. Board is not an educationist, but only an executive officer of the Department. He is of no weight in educational matters, but most obliging to give information when letters are sent for any information that is desired.

63. Have you seen a statement made by Canon Garland and several of the League supporters that the League charge the school-teachers as being unfit to give Bible lessons?—The circular I have here reads, "The League regrets that statements are being made to the effect that the teachers of New Zealand cannot be trusted to give these lessons, it being said that the teachers will impart their particular 'isms,' and that so many of them are unbelievers that the children reading lessons under their supervision will become atheists, and also that there are so many teachers of 'uncertain' character that the whole profession is not worthy of being trusted with the Scripture lessons. The League officially and without a shadow of reservation or hesitation repudiates this charge made by its opponents, and states at all its meetings and in every possible direction that it is prepared absolutely and unreservedly to trust the teachers of New Zealand." We regarded the publication of the Bible in Schools League's circular as a direct insult to the teachers of New Zealand. It is the first time in the history of New Zealand that any statement has been published that so many of the teachers are of uncertain character that the whole of the profession is not worthy of being trusted with the teaching of Scripture lessons. Any one who published a statement like that would be ridiculed from one end of the country to the other, but the Bible in schools League publishes it, well knowing that our reputation can look after itself.

64. What experience have you had in connection with the religious education of children?—I could give a list. I have been a Sunday-school teacher for twenty years, Sunday-school Superintendent of four different Sunday schools; I have been lecturer at a Sunday-school conference on my holidays on seven different occasions at different centres in New Zealand; I have conducted Sunday-school teachers' training-classes in my leisure time for four years; I am a member of the Youth Committee of the Presbyterian Church; I was editor for five or six years of the Sunday-school Teachers' column in the *Outlook*; I was editor for some time in connection with Layman's missionary movement in Christchurch; I have acted for ten or fifteen years as lay preacher for the Baptist and Congregational Churches; I have conducted the anniversary services of pretty nearly every Nonconformist Church in Christchurch; and I am an elder of the Presbyterian Church.

65. I would like to know whether the Churches are usually enthusiastic in regard to Sunday-school work?—There is an awakening in that respect, but all those who are keenly interested admit the fact that there is such a great amount of real neglect with regard to Sunday-school work that there is not really the attention being given to it by the Church that ought to be given. Mr. Jupp has reported that he often found considerable deadness and apathy in regard to Sunday-school work.

66. Have the Sunday schools kept pace with the day schools in the method of equipment and teaching?—Not by a great deal. You could hardly expect that. The Sunday school is generally a building which has been pushed to the back of a church; the children are mixed up in one big room, where one class can hear the teaching of the other class and the equipment is poor. The average income of the Presbyterian Sunday schools in New Zealand is somewhere about £7 a year, which would not provide a liberal equipment.

67. Do you think it would be in the interests of the children if the money being employed in the present campaign could be devoted to Sunday schools?—I think that would be of great benefit. I doubt if there is one paid agent now working in New Zealand solely in connection with Sunday-school work. There are no official organizers, lecturers, or travelling agents scouring New Zealand with regard to Sunday-school activity.

68. If the proposal of the Bible in Schools League were put into effect, do you think many of our best teachers would be driven out of the service?—I know personally that several teachers have told me they would have to retire from the profession if they were compelled to give Bible lessons as prescribed by the Bill, as they would be in direct opposition to the principles of the Church to which they belong.

69. Do you think the sectarian influence in the matter of the appointment of teachers would be increased if the proposal were carried?—There is a certain amount of religious influence with regard to Committees, and if the religious element is imported into the school I fail to see how that would not be intensified. I could produce a letter from Mr. Adams, in which he said that when religious instruction was given in the early days there were "ructions."

70. Is it true that our Education Act shuts God out of the schools or the Bible out of the schools?—No, that is not true. In the *School Journal* any extract from any book in which the name of God is used the name is not cut out. There is no restriction of that kind in any way.

71. What, in your opinion, would be the effect of the right of entry on the organization and discipline of the schools?—That would have to be speculative. It would cause a certain amount of trouble. Supposing an Anglican Minister came and took ten or twenty children out of Standard II and ten out of Standard IV, the other children would have to be left to go on with certain work or else mark time while the others were out.

72. Do you know how many one-roomed schools there are in New Zealand?—The Education report of 1914 states that the sole-teacher schools have increased from 1,370 to 1,432. That is the minimum number, because in some two-teacher schools there would be only one room.

73. Do you think that grave difficulty would arise in regard to religious lessons, particularly by the ministers, in those schools?—If the minister of one denomination came to a one-roomed school—I do not know what their practice is—they would have to take the other children outside or they would be within hearing of certain things they should not hear, and if we adopted the Australian regulations they would use books which they should not use. The regulation says the books have to be locked up after the lesson in case other children should come across them. There would be a difficulty.

74. Bearing in mind the varying ages of the children, do you think it pedagogically feasible for any clergy to teach all the children in that school?—It is very difficult to instruct children of seven and eight years of age with those of fourteen. In most Sunday schools I have been connected with I have tried not to have all the children of the school mixed together.

Rev. DANIEL CROSS BATES examined. (No. 6.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A Church of England clergyman and a Civil servant.

2. You wish to make a statement before the Committee in regard to the question of the Bible-in-schools referendum?—Yes. With regard to the question before the Committee, I desire to say that I am entirely disinterested and hold independent views. I have had nearly seven years' experience (1891–98) as an Anglican clergyman in New South Wales, and, taking great interest in religious instruction, I was diligent in giving lessons in the public schools. The New South Wales system provides a Scripture text-book and allows ministers of all denominations one hour per day for religious instruction, which has come to mean one lesson per week wherever it is in vogue. The Government provides the Irish text-book as part of a school equipment, but though I made earnest inquiries I personally never knew a teacher who used it. I pointed out to them that the Act provided that it should be used, but I am of the firm opinion that, within the range of my knowledge and experience, this regulation was entirely and systematically ignored. Last June when I was in Sydney I asked an Anglican clergyman about its use, but he was not even aware of its existence. The books were stored away all the time in the cupboards, kept under lock and key, for fear of infecting children of other persuasions or offering occasion for mockery and ill usage. The right of entry for a minister or an accredited lay teacher of any denomination is usually highly commended in public by Church dignitaries, but it is nevertheless very widely neglected in practice. Statistical returns prove that from one year's end to another a vast number of the children of the various denominations are not given special religious instruction in the week-days, and that a vast number of the schools are unvisited. Every synod I attended bore testimony to the importance of religious instruction, but the general tenor of the reports, year

after year, showed a most undesirable state of affairs, the Bishops entreating the clergy "to neither neglect nor despise the advantages which the State Act gave them." On the whole I regard the system as a failure and a reproach to the Churches themselves. The Sydney Diocese has undoubtedly the best organization for religious instruction; much of the work, especially in the City of Sydney, however, has been done by poorly paid lay teachers. In the 1913 synod the committee's report showed an average of £60 per annum for lay teachers, and that for want of the necessary funds they were unable either to augment the staff or "the meagre salaries paid those faithful workers." These have, I find, been the conditions all along, for in the 1900 synod report I find there were six lady teachers receiving salaries of £50, £50 16s. 8d., £30, £32 10s., £23, and £18 respectively; three male teachers receiving £75, £77 10s., and £120: an average for each teacher of £1 per week, or £52 14s. 8d. per annum. In 1910 the committee in its 31st report to synod stated that the words of the third annual report, of 1882, which was signed by Dean Cowper, were still after eighteen years "appropriate to the present time." That report read thus: "The committee are reluctantly compelled to avow their conviction that unless a more lively and more persistent interest in this work shall be shown by members of the synod, in recess as well as in session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps be finally abandoned." With regard to general instruction in religion and the text-book, the committee complains that the "time formerly given by State teachers to general religious instruction is now to a large extent devoted to the teaching of history, civics, and morals." Extra pressure and a special call must have been made, for the returns of clerical visitors are "more complete than they have been for several years"; still, "in some schools it must reluctantly be assumed that no special religious instruction is given, for the rectors of twenty parishes have failed after repeated applications to furnish any information." This must be no inconsiderable proportion of the parishes of that archdiocese. Scripture examinations are held by the State School Inspectors in their usual rounds, but as very few marks are—so teachers assure me given, the preparation was, in my time at least, and so far as my experience went, absolutely neglected by the teachers, and the results a farce—a whole class of children being asked the most wide and simple general questions, such as who was Moses, Samson, or Solomon. The lay teachers work hard, going from school to school, and it is possible for any one of them to put up a record of hundreds of visits in a year. I am told that by a new regulation four classes taken (say) in a large school in a single visit, occupying about an hour, can be counted as four distinct visits. In any case the boasted 57,321 visits of last year for all the ministers and lay teachers of New South Wales do not represent so much as they seem for the thousands of public schools in that State.

On page 21 of the Bible-in-schools pamphlet giving "expert opinions" from New South Wales is the following curious and dubious testimonial to the system there in vogue: "Cleveland State School, N.S.W.: If clergymen could only be persuaded to take advantage of the special provision of our Public Instruction Act I believe incalculable benefit would be conferred on the rising generation. Only one—a Congregationalist—really attends to this work regularly and punctually.—21st July, 1908.—J. CONLON." On page 36 of the same publication W. Reynolds, signing himself "Major," writing from the Central State School, Hobart, Tasmania, on the 3rd November, 1908, says, "Very few Roman Catholics attend our school, but they are allowed to sit under the shelter-shed supervised by a teacher." This reminds one of the pitiful scenes witnessed in Ireland, where little Roman Catholic children are often kept shivering outside in the sleet and snow while Protestant ministers give lessons in the schools.

I think New South Wales must have been raked with a small-tooth comb to get the few favourable opinions published by the League: a Queensland member of Parliament said that 90 per cent. of the teachers are against it. I myself have reason to believe that the vast majority of the teachers of the State schools would for many reasons rather be without either general or special religious instruction in the State schools. In my opinion they look upon the subject as an outside one, and the ministers merely privileged intruders. Teachers are now discouraged from expressing their opinions on matters affecting school-work, and it would lay any one giving an honestly adverse opinion open to severe reprimand, if not dismissal, and certainly to positive misunderstanding or persecution. The system is in possession in New South Wales, and, as all religions are naturally conservative and aggressively tenacious of any privilege, however neglected, common prudence makes men afraid to run hostile to clerical interests, and few wish to court unpopularity. The school should not be regarded as the recruiting-ground for adherents of the Church any more than for itinerant showmen or lecturers on even art, science, or politics.

The teaching of Scripture in the schools seems to be no more successful in the schools of South Africa than I found it in New South Wales, for the Education Commissioners for the Cape of Good Hope for 1912, in a report presented to the South African Parliament, say "The law provides for Bible-teaching in school-hours, but in one large school, Calvinia, this is not done, and there is grave reason to doubt whether the law regarding religious instruction is complied with" (page 21). "It is more than possible that in very large numbers of our public schools no attempt at all is made to teach the Bible" (page 21). The Commissioners quote from evidence given before them: "The fact of the matter is that the children are not being taught religion." "Religious knowledge is at a very low ebb amongst our children." The Commissioners add, "In our opinion it is impossible to deny this" (page 21). "The widespread ignorance of the Scriptures, amounting to something like paganization of the people" (page 22).

The Scripture text-books are not used in the high schools of New South Wales, and the whole system of religious education there is confessed as a failure by many. I told this plainly to the Anglican Synod, and warned the clergy against trusting to such a broken reed. If only the effort put forth by this League had then been devoted to the Sunday schools much good would have resulted. If I am not mistaken, I heard the organizer of the League say in this room on

Tuesday, the 4th August, that thousands and tens of thousands are spent yearly on Protestant Sunday schools in this country. Permit me to say that, in my humble opinion, that is very wide of the mark. I believe the Sunday schools have, as a rule, to be entirely self-supporting—nay, more, their poor contributions are often drawn upon for missions and other objects. I deplore having to say this, but I feel bound to do so in the interests of truth and true progress, and because my opposition has been aroused to this misguided and misleading League. We must never forget that mere theological learning does not mean true religion, or Pope Alexander VI and King Henry VIII, Defender of the Faith, had been paragons of virtue. The Church must look to itself for spiritual awakening, and not political effort or forcing its sacred books and ministers into the schools. I used as a boy to go to school on Saturday mornings, and I would rather the children were made to go to church and Sunday school than invade the ordinary time now so much needed for the syllabus. I hardly think that the Government would make the children attend these and thus get extra instruction in religion. They have, however, more right to do this than break into the present school curriculum. In Germany during the last six months of a primary education children are compelled to attend lectures in the churches instead of in the school, and I notice that Professor J. J. Findlay, who was here the other day, on page 112 of his book, "The School," says, "I would urge that in place of the right of entry the parent should demand the right of substitution, for the proper venue for religious instruction is not the public school, with the Anglican teaching one group in room X and the Catholic another group in room Y: the Church building, the house of God itself, is the fit place of assembly for teaching the distinctive doctrines which the Church holds dear, and the clergyman himself is the fittest teacher. It would surely not be difficult for the law to recognize 'attendance' once or more a week in church buildings." Germany has also had the Bible in State schools for generations, and the result has been that, passing through secular channels, Scripture knowledge has for many become merely a subject for criticism. If here teachers who do not believe in the Bible are likewise forced to teach it, we must expect a similar growth of indifference and secularism. Since the Reformation in Germany religious education has been one of the main instruments for the propagation and continuance of political and military despotism as well as clerical intolerance. The article on "Education" in the Encyclopædia Britannica (11th edition) says, "The sixteenth century was not ripe for real intellectual freedom, and Protestantism, having placed its revolt on the right of private judgment, soon produced a number of conflicting theological systems vying with each other in narrowness and rigidity, which, as Paulson says, 'Nearly stifled the intellectual life of the German people.'" Ancient and Oriental ideas with regard to women still flourish in Germany, and German culture and humanitarianism owe nothing to religious education in secular schools. Germans themselves have told me that the school Bibles are always thumbed and open at passages capable of sexual inference or immoral construction. There is at present in Germany a widespread and determined effort being made to get Bible-teaching and clerical control out of the schools, societies having been formed for that object; and I am confident that if the Bible-in-schools programme is carried out here it will result in continual unrest and opposition.

Let us, however, return to New South Wales. Teachers not infrequently have their programmes upset by the irregularity and unpunctuality of visiting teachers of religion, and in one-roomed schools, numbers—fifteen hundred or more, as mentioned in the Queensland Parliament, 1910—pupils not attending the classes have to be sent out of doors while instruction is being imparted. The clergy and casual teachers are, as a class, so far as my experience and knowledge serve, poor disciplinarians and mostly untrained as teachers. I have heard of their classes becoming regular bedlams and the school staff having to stay in the room to preserve order. I believe that a prominent Divine, a vice-president of the League, Dr. Gibb, once said he had tried teaching Scripture knowledge in our public schools, but he wanted the power of the "taws" if he were expected to keep order. I personally found very few clergy of the so-called "free Churches" availed themselves of their privileges of teaching in the public schools of New South Wales, and I understood that as a rule they did not recognize it as having much value. Only in two of my parishes after I had entered on the duties did two other Protestant ministers—a Methodist and a Presbyterian, these being prevailed upon by the headmasters, one a Methodist and the other a Presbyterian—commence to take classes, and I must confess that the children occasionally changed their religion with more lightness of heart than we probably appreciated. After coming to this country over sixteen years ago I spoke against the Bible-in-schools movement in the Dunedin Synod under the present Primate, and I was then treated with a courtesy and fairness which was in marked contrast to the spirit that prevailed in the Wellington Synod the other day when I expressed similar views. Another speaker on this occasion (the Rev. R. H. Hobday, M.A.) also met with considerable opposition and deliberate interruption. I afterwards received a letter from him, which briefly embodies his views, and, with his permission, I now desire to read it to the Committee.

"My Dear Bates,— "The Vicarage, Brooklyn, 20th July, 1914.

"I have been intending to write to you before this to let you know how glad I was that you spoke up as you did in synod when the motion *re* Bible in schools came on, especially as you were able to speak from some years' experience of the practical working of the New South Wales system in New South Wales itself. As I tried to argue in synod, when I could get a word in, a system based upon a wrong principle cannot be expected to produce good results, and I think that it is wrong in principle for us to attempt to capture the machinery of the State schools to teach what we and the parents have failed to teach.

"The object of a Christian population in making laws should surely be to see that those laws were more and more Christlike in character, but not to make laws that more so-called Christians might be created thereby—Christians are not to be made in that way. Experience has

proved this method to be wrong and futile—*e.g.*, the persecution of heretics, Acts of Uniformity, Test Acts, &c. It is quite evident that the Bible in Schools League is the result of a compromise. Many if not all Anglicans dislike the idea of undenominational Bible-teaching, as witness the utterances of Bishop Julius, Bishop Sadlier, and many members of our own synod in the past, as I verified by consulting back numbers of the *Chronicle*. Of course, this is only consistent with our Article XX, which expressly declares that 'the Church'—not any bare majority—'hath power to decree rites or ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith,' and is 'a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ.' On the other hand, it is equally obvious that the other members of the 'combine' are opposed to the right of entry, the very reason why the Baptists, Congregationalists, &c., will not join the League. Now, for us to join any League which admits the power of the people by mere counting of heads to dictate in religious matters is to my mind an altogether unwarrantable abrogation of the Church's teaching function and for the Church to help various sects to get what we believe to be wrong—*i.e.*, undenominational Bible-teaching—and for those sects to help us to get what they believe to be wrong in the hope of each side getting something which they think to be right seems to me to be an altogether immoral proceeding, a lowering of the standard of truth on both sides, a doing of evil in the hope that good may come. All honour, I say, to Professor Hewitson, Erwin, Cameron, Chisholm, &c., who stood against it in the Dunedin Presbyterian Assembly. As I pointed out too, undenominational teaching is impossible in practice. If a child asks a single intelligent question—*e.g.*, 'Did Jesus Christ really rise from the dead?' the teacher either must answer sincerely, which is at once dogmatic instruction one way or the other; or insincerely, which is wicked and immoral; or not at all, which is tyranny, bad education, and a tacit worship of the Bible as a fetish, a mysterious thing above all reason and inquiry.

"It is argued that no education is complete without religious education of some sort, but it is not the State's business to give a complete education. It provides an elementary education and says to the parent, 'Complete it as you like, but at your own expense. You have no right to make other people pay for the instruction of your children in your own particular views on theological or transcendental questions.' Otherwise a Mormon would have an absolute right to demand that his children be taught at the State's expense the virtues of polygamy, or the Peculiar People the sinfulness of calling in a doctor in case of illness. Put the case round the other way: Are Protestants content to let a Roman Catholic majority teach their religion in peace in any country where Roman Catholics are in the majority? Certainly not. They send missioners, Bible-teachers, &c., to Italy, Spain and Portugal, and Ireland to wean the people from their popish ways! Take, again, the case of the cablegram sent recently by religious leaders of Wellington sympathizing with the Carsonites in Ulster, presumably not because they were mere rebels, but were a religious minority fighting against the tyranny of a religious majority. Why then are religious minorities not entitled to similar sympathy here? If only the question could really be set before the people fairly and squarely so that they could see it apart from mere sentimental attachment to the Bible there would be no doubt of the issue at all. But from the very beginning of the struggle all discussion among us has been burked in a spirit worthy of the Inquisition, as shown the other day in the attempt made beforehand to prevent any discussion in synod and make it appear that it was a layman's movement by practically forbidding clergy to speak, and again in the frequent efforts in synod itself to prevent me from finishing my speech, the gross unfairness of allowing Garland to speak for well over an hour on anything he liked quite irrelevant to the motion, and the very unfair treatment meted out to yourself because you, using Garland's own figures, wanted to show synod how they bore out your contention of the uselessness of the system in New South Wales; and, above all, the disgraceful malicious personal attack on you in your absence afterwards in open synod before strangers. The days of persecution, it would seem, are not yet over, but I do not believe that General Synod has any power to muzzle us from expressing an opinion on matter of such very serious import—the Bishop admitted this in his synod address last year. If the Bible in Schools League's cause were sound at heart they ought to welcome the very fullest discussion of it. But I think that not only synod but the whole nation has a right to know that there is not a united body of Anglicans in favour of the League's proposal. Did you know that I myself was asked quite unexpectedly to present a petition from Anglicans in the diocese to synod against the proposal? As the proposed petition was only thought of on the Saturday before synod, I had to inform those that asked me that there was really no time to get it properly in order, with signatures, &c., otherwise I should have been very glad to present it for them. But, still, I quite fail to see why my remarks were irrelevant and ruled out of order, and others present, judging from the newspaper reports, I know hold the same view as I do. However, 'magna est veritas et prævalebit.'

"Yours very sincerely,

"R. H. HOBDAY."

I regard the introduction of the Bible and Clergy in State Schools League's programme as unnecessary and inexpedient for this country, as well as inadvisable for the clergy themselves, who are, as a rule, very poorly paid and have already plenty of scope for their energies. They will get no extra remuneration for even the out-of-pocket expenses involved in the work of State-school teaching, and from what I know the work itself will, as a rule, prove highly unsatisfactory, and show little if any benefit to compensate for dangers which may be easily recognized. In confirmation of this the Sydney Synod Report of 1911, page 128, says, "It is quite impossible to expect the clergy to do more than they are doing. Each rector has more than he can cope with in his parochial work." And again, with regard to the school religious teaching of the Church in general, and the state of religion in New South Wales, the report continues, "Whilst the Public Instruction Act makes liberal provision for the Churches to give religious instruction, the Churches for the more part are unable to avail themselves of it; and this, coupled with the

fact that the curriculum of the schools allows for only the very barest minimum of Scripture-teaching, makes it clear that a most unsatisfactory condition exists in this regard, tending to develop the growing irreligion of our nominal Christian community."

This country has for a long time had a splendid educational system, which has been thoroughly approved of by the country. There is, I am sure, less sectarian strife, more Church observance, better morals, and less crime than in New South Wales. The introduction of different religious sects into school life would not only inconvenience the usual routine work of the school, but foster dissension even amongst the children, especially in country places and one-roomed schools. This Dominion has happily been free from such religious discord as has taken place in the history of New South Wales. In 1825 a Royal Charter assigned one-seventh of the whole territory exclusively to the clergy of the Church of England for their own religious and educational purposes. A "Church and School Corporation" was set up under it, and in its day was responsible for shameful inefficiency and extravagance. What lands they disposed of were afterwards dealt with and titles issued by the Governor in Council under what is known as "The Church Act," but nearly all the "Church and School waste lands" had been resumed by the Crown when in 1862 State aid was finally restricted for life to those previously in receipt of it. In 1866 Sir Henry Parkes brought in his Education Bill, which, though it continued assistance to denominational schools, offered one hour per day to any clergyman for religious instruction in the tenets of his faith, provided four hours were available for secular instruction. Several denominational schools came under the Act, but others stood out, and there was much rivalry between the denominational and the State schools, the Church of England authorities asserting that the State sent its best teachers to compete in places where such schools existed; but the strangest confession of jealousy appears in the proceedings of synod at Sydney, 1879, page 60, where it is stated that the "feeling was prevalent among teachers in Church of England schools that religious instruction given by clergymen in a public school in his district is detrimental to the Church of England school." The same line of argument would now place such teaching in competition with the Sunday schools—where, by the way, I do not regard the teaching as very efficient. On the 31st December, 1882, all grants to denominational schools ceased, and all the Church of England primary schools were voluntarily converted into State schools. The proviso for one hour per day for religious instruction was then in force, and may constitute a vested interest and a plausible claim for the continuance of the system in New South Wales. A clergyman who wrote "Australia in 1866," page 230, states, "The much-vexed question, State aid to religion, which continues to agitate the minds of the people of New South Wales, the only one of the Australian Colonies, including Tasmania and New Zealand, where State aid threatens to be permanent, in consequence of the 'Church and School lands' appropriated by the British Government, is one of those questions amenable to law, to reason, and to Scripture. Many of the arguments in favour of State aid may be right, and many of the arguments against it may be right."

A strong conviction has of late years been formed in my own mind that State interference in religion, beyond recognition of the civil rights of religious corporations and the freedom of the individual member, is altogether pernicious. The State should not, to my mind, favour any particular religious body or group above others, nor should it hinder any person or persosn whose views and practices are not dangerous to the common weal. The Church represents a spiritual life, a social element such as existed before even a line of the New Testament was written, when even the Creeds were guarded as secret symbols of inner fellowship. The forcing of sacred Scriptures into secular channels is, in my opinion, utterly foreign to the true spirit of Christianity, which exists as a life in the atmosphere of the Church and the Christian home, and this provides the stimulus and preserves the ideal of Christian manhood and womanhood. This movement for enforcing of State-selected Bible lessons in the public schools under Government supervision I regard as reactionary, placing it on the same lines as a perfunctory Mohammedan recitative of the Koran, or the gabbling of the Vedas by the Buddhist. The times have altered, and, though in our youth we were taught that the whole Bible alone contained the very words of God Himself, modern biblical criticism in the Church itself has at least shown us we have no such verbally infallible Book or Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture.

The clergy and people hold different views of inspiration among themselves, and "heresy hunts" are even now not unknown. Those who reverence the Scriptures can surely have no sympathy with that phase of Christianity which makes the Word of God of none effect and the Bible itself the battle standard of contentious bigotry. Shallow sentiment must no longer sway the passions or guide our destiny in these enlightened days; conduct, and not any League compromise or undenominational creed, must be the watchword of the future. Pressure has been exercised to bring the Anglican clergy into submission to a temporary and seeming unity to the League's programme. They have been told that the question was decided for them by General Synod, which has supreme control in their Church. That synod and sections of other corresponding bodies of other faiths had mutually pledged themselves to each other to get both the Bible extracts and the right of entry for the clergy into the public schools of New Zealand. These two things, it must be distinctly understood, stand or fall together, and the organizer of the League has asserted in synod that members of Parliament even have not now to discuss their scheme concerning Bible and clergy, but merely the plebiscite proposal as embodied in the Bill itself before the Legislature.

This League programme is, I believe, a rope of sand which will not stand examination, much less endure the strain of an election contest. Anglicans at Home will not tolerate undenominational Christianity at any price, and here the Church has, as a rule, been against Bible portions or scraps and stood for the entry of the clergy. Presbyterians want Bible selections in the schools, but are, I believe, still mostly against the right of entry. Methodists are divided,

and, though the Salvation Army may possibly give a block vote for the League, yet they make a strange and rather explosive mixture with Anglo-Catholicism. Other denominations have repudiated the League scheme and State interference in religion. The League must nevertheless be recognized as a society, in conflict with others, seeking by political influence to obtain its own ends even by going beyond Parliament to the people. The claims of the League, however, surely cannot be admitted by this House without careful scrutiny, for, speaking of such societies, a modern writer says, "In the nature of things they are more powerful than individuals; the relative disinterestedness they claim from their members may and often will lead to methods and claims which cannot be justified; the higher their object the greater danger there is of their outstepping the bounds of justice in their desire to promote it; and the greater need, therefore, of Government recognition and control." Listen for a moment to the petulant cries and revolutionary threats on Monday night, 27th July, where Canon Garland is reported to have said, "The question of the day involved the very bedrock of their Government. Was Parliament an autocrat? Were members of Parliament to impose their will on an unwilling people, whose views they were afraid to face? The people had the right under the British Constitution of saying the last and final word. Members of Parliament were there not to impose their will, but to give expressions of the will of their masters who employed them—the people. Some people and some members of Parliament were claiming that last word, and it was too absurd." And again, "There might be dust thrown in the eyes of members of Parliament, but he was waiting for the gentle breeze of the general elections, and he thought that would clear the eyes of some of those honourable gentlemen, even if the breeze did not develop into such a gale that it would sweep out those who were afraid to trust the people and sought to dictate to their masters, and replace them with men more in accord with British ideas of self-government."

With regard to the programme of the Bible and Clergy in State Schools League, I understand that people have been deprived of business support through failure to sign this ticket. It is also common knowledge that the dignity of Parliament has been outraged by members being threatened with pledged opposition in a so-called "League of earnestness," which binds itself to oppose every member of this honourable House of Representatives of the whole nation assembled in Parliament who may exercise his vote according to the dictates of his conscience, the results of the investigation of this Committee and the united deliberations of the whole body, and go against the Bill. Deplorable as are the dissensions in families, the present discord in Christian Churches, and the introduction of bigoted partiality into business affairs, I regard these as nothing compared with the evils that may arise from the importation of the persecuting spirit into Parliament and the elections of this Dominion. In confirmation of this there appeared in the *Evening Post* of the 13th October, 1914, a copy of a letter reported to have been issued by the Bible in Schools League. It reads thus: "MY DEAR FELLOW-WORKER,—Mr. —— informs me that owing to pressure of business he cannot stand for ——. He desires me to express his thanks for the honour which we did him and wishes us every success. We are looking for another candidate, and I shall be very glad to have any suggestion from you on this point. Meanwhile we are continuing to educate our followers not to vote for any candidate who will not allow the people the right of voting on our matter. The moral effect of a large number of electors sacrificing their franchise would be far-reaching in its influence. That may be the only way left for us to show our protest against the autocratic action of any member of Parliament. Such a member imposes his own views on those constituents who voted and worked for him, believing he would represent their views. Many would not have voted for a member if they had imagined he would have become an active agent on behalf of Romans and secularists in his refusal to allow the people—his employers—a right to vote.—Yours sincerely, DAVID J. GARLAND, Organizing Secretary."

The plebiscite itself, differing as it does from the referendum, offers a very questionable precedent for democratic legislation, especially where religious sentiment is concerned, and presents a new field of operation for the opportunist and the agitator. It is true a plebiscite was held in Queensland, where 26 per cent. of the people interested themselves in this question of Bible and clergy in schools and carried it by a very small majority, but 74 per cent. of the electors were either actively opposed or indifferent to it. But permit me to remind you, gentlemen, that the plebiscite is not, and never has been, part of the British Constitution. To my mind neither social nor economic questions, much less matters of faith and feeling, should be submitted to the ballot to be decided by the direct and absolute rule of the masses. Treating the nation arbitrarily as so many heads (like a disconnected and unrelated heap of sand) may be the method of the "leveller," but not of modern Liberal statesmanship which recognizes unions, groups of opinions, or free corporations within the State. "The cardinal fact which faces us to-day," says a modern writer, "is the religious heterogeneity of the modern State. Toleration has not yet produced all its fruits; perhaps it is nowhere quite complete. Still, it is clear that the old idea of a uniform State religion has departed. The homogeneous policy of the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century has vanished like the shadow of a dream, although some of its results still survive. So far, indeed, as this ideal has vitality now, it takes the vague form of undenominational Christianity, which so many would like to establish in the schools" (Rev. J. N. Figgis, "Churches in the Modern State," p. 113). The residuum of Protestant belief known as "undenominationalism" is even more detested at Home than in this country, for the English *Guardian*, reviewing "Il Santo," by Dr. Fogazzaro, said, "We find vacant unbelief in plenty in the tepid, false belief of those who are neither for God or for His enemies and in the blank indifference of our own working classes. The Church of Italy suffered sorely from many plagues, but she has been spared undenominationalism."

In conclusion, gentlemen, I would like to say that to the best of my knowledge and ability I have tried truly and fairly to show you that the New South Wales system has proved unsatisfactory, that the League scheme is inexpedient for the people of New Zealand, and that this so-called

Referendum or Plebiscite Bill, as it stands, is a surrender of the rights and privileges of Parliament, offering a precedent for mob rule.

3. *Mr. Caughley.*] In your evidence, Mr. Bates, you referred to complaints in the synod. Have you read the synod report, especially the one commencing "The committee are reluctantly compelled to allow the conviction that unless a more lively and persistent interest is taken in this work by members of the synod, in recess as well as in session, and by members of the Church at large, the work itself must languish, perhaps even finally be abandoned": you remember that?—Yes.

4. Was it your impression in attending the synod that that complaint in particular referred to the collecting of money to pay lay teachers or in regard to the efforts of the clergy themselves?—The committee deals with the efforts of the clergy and catechists both, and they deal more with the clergy than the laity. There are more clergy attending the schools than catechists, and the committee's report every time deals with both, and to say it was only for raising money would be to draw a red-herring across the track.

5. *Canon Garland.*] You consider yourself a fair representative of the clergy of the Church of England?—I do.

6. You are engaged in a secular calling at present?—I have been engaged in a secular calling, the same as you.

7. I am not a Civil servant?—No, you are not a Civil servant, but you are an agitator.

8. I ask, Mr. Chairman, is it fair for that to go on record?—I am sorry if Canon Garland objects to that term. I hold the same license as a clergyman and officiate in the same way as he does, and because I have been forced to earn my living in another way through ill health and through the services I rendered to my country in South Africa, I feel bound to answer it in the best way I can to defend myself from his imputation.

9. I had no intention whatever of making any imputation. I wanted to try and show that owing to your being engaged in secular pursuits you are not representing the opinion of the clergy of the Church of England on this subject?—As much as you. You are earning your living outside, the same as I am.

10. That is a matter of opinion. I have here the Sydney Diocesan Directory of 1914, published by authority. It says, "Report of the Special Religious Instruction in Public Schools, submitted to Synod, 1913." You are aware of that?—It is apparently based on the synod report. I have seen the report itself. I would like to compare it with the actual synod report which I have. That is not a synod report. This is a publication that is made for outsiders—a *résume* of what was actually put to synod. What I have is the real thing—the report put in before the synod.

11. This is the official Diocesan Directory of the Synod, Sydney [produced]?—I am aware of that.

12. Are you acquainted with Archdeacon Gunther?—I was.

13. Can you tell the Committee anything about him?—He was Vicar of Parramatta, and died a couple of years ago.

14. I had a letter from him dated last month?—I thought he was dead. Well, I think he has retired.

15. This is the letter he writes: "I claim, as a clergyman of nearly fifty years——" ?—I do not think that is my evidence. I give my knowledge and experience, and I am not going to have Canon Garland ringing this kind of rebutting evidence on to me.

16. I am trying to show that you do not represent the opinion of such clergymen as Archdeacon Gunther?—I decline to answer that question, because Canon Garland is bringing in evidence for his own side, and if he brings in evidence I should have an opportunity of questioning him on it. It is not my evidence.

17. Are you acquainted with the present Primate of Sydney?—No.

18. Would you be surprised to know that he differs with your opinion?—My experience was far wider and longer than the present Archbishop: he was only appointed a year or two ago.

19. You quoted from the Sydney Synod of some years ago, but you did not quote the latest opinion of that synod. This is the resolution as passed by the synod on the 1st of this month: "That in the opinion of this synod the great importance of imparting religious instruction to the young in public schools, now spread so widely throughout the diocese, renders it necessary that some more effectual steps should be taken for imparting such instruction at the times sanctioned by the Public Schools Act"?—I do not take that in as part of my evidence.

20. May I say that why I do not proceed with the examination is because I cannot get from Mr. Bates the facts?—I have given my experience, and I stated what I know. You can examine me on that and not bring in fresh evidence. It is not straightforward.

21. In your statement you say, "The Church has, as a rule, been against Bible portions or scraps and stood for the 'entry of the clergy.'" You mean the Church of England?—The Church of England in New Zealand.

22. Are you aware that every synod in New Zealand except one has supported Bible-teaching by the teachers only?—I am quite aware that the General Synod has passed a resolution almost unanimously, and that other synods have passed resolutions. I was present at the Dunedin Synod when it was passed without discussion, and the same thing was attempted here. I am aware of that, but the synod does not mean the whole Church—in fact, it does not represent the whole. Mr. Hobday has mentioned that, and those resolutions have been sent round to the different parishes. Some have thrown them out, and the synod men are sometimes elected in an extraordinary way. The parishes very often do not elect them at all. It is often a hole-and-corner meeting, and then when they neglect to appoint them the Diocesan Standing Committee appoints some one else who lives in the town to do it. It is not truly a representative body of the Church of England, and if this question goes to the vote I think it will be found out.

23. Are you aware that the General Synod and every synod of the Church of England in New Zealand except one a few years ago supported the scheme of Bible lessons, and it remained so until what you call scraps, and which did not include the entry of clergy, Parliament took action but refused to accept that scheme?—This is an opinion that answers you. It reads: "The Anglican Primate (Dr. Nevill) is president of the Bible in Schools League. He spoke of the former League's 'emasculated caricature' of Bible-teaching in the following terms: 'I cannot but hesitate to be a party to any scheme which may seem to be making reflections upon the Almighty by rejecting parts of His teachings. A committee for the human improvement of a Divine revelation seems to me to be a rather improper thing for a clergyman to take part in. If you cut the Bible into minute fragments, and say, in effect, that the Almighty and the All-wise was quite wrong in putting this or that before the people; if you say that this or that teaching is not fitting for the majority of mankind to have any knowledge of—I say that such an attitude seems to me to be a reflection on the Divine wisdom; and I for my part cannot be a party to any such chopping-up of the Bible into bits. That, then, is one reason. I must also candidly lay before you another reason which does weigh with me, and that is that this scheme does not seem to me to lay the duty of religious instruction upon the right shoulders. . . . I do think that the discharge of this duty rests upon the ministers of religion, whose lives have been spent, for the most part, in the study (and I hope and trust and believe, also for the most part, in the exemplification) of the teachings of the Divine Book.'" I am not aware that the synod did stand for the Bible only. This is dealing with what the Bishop advocated. He was against it, and spoke against it in the synod. That is concerning the Bishop, and he represents the Church if I do not.

24. Notwithstanding the personal opinion of the Primate which you read, are you not aware that the General Synod, of which he is president, passed a resolution accepting the Bible lessons without ministers' visits, as did every synod except the Dunedin Synod?—Give me proof of that and I will acknowledge it.

MONDAY, 19TH OCTOBER, 1914.

Rev. DANIEL CROSS BATES further examined. (No. 7.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I understand you wish to make a statement before being examined?—Yes. Before my further cross-examination I wish to repudiate the document presented as evidence to me by Canon Garland last Friday entitled "Report of the Special Religious Instruction in Public Schools, submitted to Synod, 1913." It was, as I surmised at the time, a special plea for monetary support for lay teachers to take the place of Anglican clergy in the State schools in the diocese of Sydney. It does not, I find, contain the quotations made by Mr. Caughley and myself, and it is not what is purports to be; but I beg to submit for your inspection the genuine reports of the Synods of Sydney for 1910 and 1913. I have read scores of references such as I have quoted in my main evidence which bear out my statements, and I have copied out many of them. I desire also to ask that if, through Canon Garland's methods of cross-examination, it was incorporated into my evidence, it may now be expunged.

2. *Professor Hunter.*] I would like to know whom you represent at this inquiry?—I came as an independent witness, but I represent a large body of the Anglican community, although I do not agree with this Bible-in-schools programme.

3. You say you come as an independent witness and you represent a large body of the Anglican community, but you do not mean you represent them officially?—No. I do this entirely on my own initiative, to speak the truth on the matter for the good of the country, and that stands before the clerical interest that is represented in this Bible in Schools League.

4. What is your actual standing in the Anglican Church at the present moment?—I hold permission to officiate in the Anglican Church in an honorary way, and have the same license that is held by Canon Garland.

5. Are you a member of the National Schools Defence League?—No, I am not. I do not wish to commit myself to everything that might be said by a society in opposition to the proposal. I have kept out of the controversy. In fact, my vicar did not know my views on the matter until last Advent, when he asked me to preach a sermon prescribed for the Bible in schools. I did not wish to be an active opponent in this matter until I saw the methods that were being pursued.

6. Is it true as far as your knowledge goes that only Roman Catholics and secularists oppose the Bible in Schools League's scheme?—So far from that being the case, I have met more people who are opposed to this scheme than otherwise in the Churches themselves.

7. Could you tell us whether the members of the Church of England in any number to your knowledge oppose this actual scheme that is before the Committee?—Yes, there are thousands, and I have seen the signatures of many people who have petitioned the House against it, and they are thorough Church of England Christian people.

8. You are prepared to say that there are thousands of members of the Church of England in New Zealand who are opposed to this scheme?—I am, certainly.

9. What actual experience have you had of the working of the New South Wales scheme?—Nearly seven years' diligent work, going three and four times a week to the schools, and devoting in populous districts the whole of the morning to the work. I was allowed to take a class for three-quarters of an hour, and then another. I divided the big schools in Lambton. I was the only minister doing that work in the parish, and I had three very large public schools in the district, which was a poor mining district.

10. That went on for seven years?—Yes, all the time I was in New South Wales I diligently went to the public schools, but I did more in that parish, because it was a very largely populated district.

11. You said in your statement that you had never seen the New South Wales text-book used in the schools or known any teacher to use it?—Within the range of my knowledge and experience I never saw or heard of a teacher using it while I was in the district. I knew one or two who said they had tried the book and found it impossible to use it. I need not, perhaps, go into all the reasons they gave me for that, but it was a badly printed book, badly set out, and put in a way that would not commend the Scriptures to the children. I have once seen on a wall time-table a Scripture lesson and I asked about it, but they did not give the Scripture lessons out of that book.

12. Have you seen the New South Wales text-books?—Yes, I have seen them and have often asked the teachers about them.

13. What is your opinion of them as text-books?—They are very poor indeed. By the Church of England in New Zealand and others there was a great demand that they should be brought over here in 1896, but the people, I think, did not know what they were asking for any more than they do now.

14. You say that that opinion of the text-book is held by a large number of the teachers in New South Wales. If that is so, can you account for the fact that as far as we can find out no attempt has been made to alter or improve that text-book?—There has been such indifference on the subject that it was not done; but I find in the synod report of New South Wales, Fourth Synod, 1877, that it was resolved, on the motion of W. J. Foster, "That no system of education can be complete without the Bible; that the Bible should be read from and recognized as God's word in every State school in the colony, and that the Scripture lessons now authorized are no proper or sufficient substitute for it." That was a condemnation of the text-book in the Anglican Synod, and as far as I know it has never been repealed. That is the only evidence I have seen of dissatisfaction with the book. As I said before, the people are too indifferent on the subject.

15. You know of no other case in New South Wales in which there was an attempt made to improve upon the text-book?—No, not to my knowledge.

16. In your evidence you made what I thought to be a rather serious statement. You led the Committee to understand that at the last Anglican Synod meeting in Wellington there was an attempt made to prevent free discussion on this subject. When put in that bald way are you prepared to accept that?—Yes, quite. A private meeting was held of members of the synod in the morning when the matter came up. Canon Garland addressed the clergy, beseeching them not to speak, but to make it appear as a layman's question only. I did not know of that until noon when going home to lunch, and I made up my mind to speak that afternoon. In the synod I was subjected to deliberate interruption, and without nearly so much latitude as Canon Garland was allowed afterwards. I was interrupted and they thought to silence me.

17. *Mr. Hanan.*] What was said?—I cannot tell you the exact words, but over and over again interruptions were made to tell me to speak nearer to the point. I have notes of the address I made, and Mr. Hobday himself has also in a letter he wrote to me shown he was interrupted, and the Press reports of the synod also show the same.

18. Were you howled down?—Not exactly howled down, but I was constantly interrupted.

19. By whom?—By members of the synod. They appealed to the chair, and the Bishop told me to speak to the point, as I was doing.

20. Was there any uproar?—The motion before the synod was, they said, not about the Bible in schools, but about the Plebiscite Bill that was to be brought before Parliament. Mr. Hobday and I were told not to discuss the general thing about the Bible in schools at all, but that it was only a question of congratulating the Government on the League's programme, which had been endorsed, it was said, by 144,000 electors. This was carried without amendment in the synod. But Canon Garland rebutted what I had said, and I afterwards raised a point of order as a personal explanation, because he had given me a direct contradiction, and I was endeavouring on his own figures to show and prove that he was wrong. I also stated my experience in New South Wales and what he had called into question, and I was set down by the Bishop on a point of order raised by Canon Garland and Mr. Hadfield. I had also seen him signalling to Mr. Shirtcliffe and others at the meeting to stop me on the point of order while I was speaking. Another thing is that some days afterwards a gross personal attack was made upon me in the synod on account of what I had said there. I need hardly say it was the most blackguardly thing I know of in any synod, and I suffered through it. I submit the order paper showing the question of Bible and clergy in schools was raised by the motion.

21. *Professor Hunter.*] Were you present when Canon Garland made his speech in the synod?—Yes.

22. I would like to read these two cablegrams: "Director Education, Sydney: Statement published that Wilkins, Secretary Education Council, July, nineteen hundred, issued circular against ministers proselytizing in visiting classes. Please cable date Wilkins's death, date circular referred to, and its purport.—CANON GARLAND." The reply is 7th July: "Mr. Wilkins retired eighteen eighty-four, died eighteen ninety-two; could not therefore have issued circular referred to by you, which cannot be identified.—P. BOARD, Director of Education, Sydney, N.S.W." Would you look at the cables and say if those were the cables that were read as far as your knowledge goes?—Yes, those were the identical cables that were read in the synod.

23. Would you be surprised to hear that in the reply Canon Garland got were words to the effect "doubtless the circular was issued." Were those words read out by Canon Garland?—It would be so surprising to believe that he would keep those words back when showing up a mythical document to that synod that I would say that no other illustration could bring it out but that found in the Acts of the Apostles of Ananias and Sapphira, who, to win a popular approval,

kept back what they intended to offer. I would look upon that as a fraud worked upon your Defence League, but if Canon Garland knew it had been issued and true the mysterious leaflet was, on the other hand, a mean and impudent fraud worked upon the synod. Canon Garland read the cable itself and then threw it on the table.

24. *Canon Garland.*] May I put in the original cable, and also the copy from which I actually read in the synod that day? Here is the original that I threw on the table [handed to witness]?—It reads, "Mr. Wilkins retired 1884, died 1892, could not therefore have issued circular referred to by you, which cannot be identified." I think they are the same—on examination they are identical.

Professor Hunter: I would like to see the original cable you showed me the other day.

Canon Garland: I will put in the original cable. It reads, "Sydney, 14/7/14.—Canon Garland, Wellington.—Could not identify circular from information given in your cable last week, as Wilkins died in ninety-two. Circular printed in Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued, but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong. Original not traceable now, but evidently issued by Council of Education between sixty-six and seventy-nine, before existing Act passed. No record of any such circular since eighty. Table thirty-six has no connection with Wilkins's circular."

25. *Professor Hunter.*] In view of the cablegrams you have seen, is it not a fact that the cablegram that Canon Garland read in the synod was a copy of the telegram that he actually received, the orginal of which he has placed before the Committee?—Yes, that is the one he read, and the newspaper report was a correct one. If he knew that that circular had been issued he led us to believe it was non-existent. He led us to believe it was a mythical document in his speech, and I thought from that a fraud had in some way been worked upon your side.

26. *Canon Garland.*] I take it you withdraw any suggestion that I deliberately misrepresented the matter?—Oh, yes; that was founded on the assumption that you had that in your possession which you possessed a week afterwards.

27. So that you were quite wrong in your assumption?—Yes, but if you had known——

28. I did not know?—Then I withdraw; it does not apply.

29. *Professor Hunter.*] Do you think that a teacher could give these simple Scriptural lessons without raising religious and sectarian issues?—No, I do not think so, and in that connection I would like to quote a statement of Dr. Gore, Bishop of Oxford, in which he says, "The only way to give 'simple Bible teaching' of any kind is to teach dogmatically. I defy any one to teach the end of the 'Sermon on the Mount' or the parable of the sheep and the goats with any degree of reality, or in such a way as to make any impression on the child's mind without teaching that Jesus of Nazareth, who spoke those words, came to be Lord and final judge of all men in their secret as well as their public lives; and for my part I cannot conceive teaching a child this without explaining why one man could make this stupendous claim over the human race."

Rev. GEORGE SAMUEL COOK examined. (No. 8.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Methodist minister stationed at Thorndon, Wellington, and superintendent of Thorndon circuit.

2. Do you appear at the request of the Conference?—No, but I represent the declared policy of the conference.

3. You wish to make a statement to the Committee in regard to the Bible-in-schools referendum?—Yes. A member of your Committee a few days ago asked me in a friendly fashion why the Methodists allowed themselves to be dragged at the chariot-wheels of the Church of England in supporting the Bible in Schools League and its appeal for a referendum. In face of this question, asked in all seriousness, I think it necessary to preface any evidence by making clear that the Methodist Church supports the platform of the League as a result of long-established convictions and experience and careful and independent inquiry with which the Church of England had nothing to do.

Policy of Methodist Church.

Before 1910 (in which year separation was accomplished) the bulk of the Methodists of New Zealand belonged to the Methodist Church of Australasia under the Australian General Conference, which has always been pledged to Bible lessons in schools. The following is an extract from the Book of Methodist Laws, 1908, section 7, paragraph 441: "The Conference urges all people in those States where Bible-reading has been excluded from the State schools to give any movement for its reintroduction their warmest support." This spells unreserved approval of the Australian system, as this was the only system of Bible-reading in operation in Australasia, and in 1908 the Queensland agitation was at its height and the Victorian movement well to the front. Under the basis of union of the Methodist and Primitive Methodist Churches of New Zealand in 1913, which formed the Methodist Church of New Zealand, the Australasian Book of Laws was adopted by the newly constructed church, without alteration so far as this declaration of policy was concerned.

The Australasian General Conference in 1910 at Adelaide, which granted the New Zealand Church its independence, passed the following resolution: "That the Conference records its profound satisfaction at the result of the recent referendum in Queensland on the subject of Bible lessons in State schools, and earnestly hopes that equal success may attend the similar efforts in the Dominion of New Zealand and in the Australasian States in which the Bible is excluded from primary education." There were twenty-four representatives from New Zealand present at this Conference, twelve ministers and twelve laymen. In 1911 the larger of the two Methodist Churches of New Zealand set up a strong committee to inquire into the working of religious instruction

in the Australian State schools. This committee corresponded with leading Methodists and Presbyterians in the Australian States where the system of Scripture lessons was in operation, and also the New South Wales Board of Education and the Organizing Secretary of the Queensland Bible in Schools League, Canon Garland. I hand in the correspondence, which I understand omits nothing received. (See Appendix A.) The evidence supplied to the committee showed that the system had always given general satisfaction wherever tried, that difficulties had not arisen through right of entry or from teachers, that proselytism was unknown; that there was hostility on the part of the Roman Catholic heirarchy, but that no serious attempt had ever been made to alter the system. The Rev. G. Rowe, ex-president of the Queensland and West Australian Conferences, wrote saying, "I trust our Church in New Zealand will go for the system. Don't be afraid of 'bogies.' No real difficulty arises in practical working. There is no parallel to the Old Country, and it is outside the question to raise the Old Country difficulties." The committee reported to the New Zealand Conference of 1912, and the Australian system was heartily endorsed.

At the first conference of the United Churches constituting the Methodist Church for New Zealand, held in Wellington in 1913, there was a spirited debate on the question, and the Bible in Schools League platform was adopted by 115 to 26 votes. Only one speaker advocated the secular system in this debate. At the Dunedin Annual Conference in March last there was a discussion of a little over half an hour, and the platform of the League, and a resolution to work for the referendum, was reaffirmed by a vote of ninety-five to fourteen. No speaker in the minority advocated the secular system. Our conferences are constituted of equal numbers of ministers and laymen. The question has also been submitted to our local Church courts throughout the Dominion, and the Church policy endorsed in most cases with unanimity or large majorities. In these meetings there are from fifteen to thirty lay representatives to every minister. It is worth noting that the Queensland Bible in States Schools League was founded in 1890 by the Revs. Osborne Lilley and Dr. Youngman (Methodists), Rev. J. F. McSwayne (Presbyterian), and Rev. William Whale (Baptist), and that the organizing secretary of the movement in Victoria is a Methodist minister. It is probable, on account of our itinerary system, that Methodist ministers are better acquainted with the working of the system in each of the States in which it is established than the more stationary ministry of other Churches. I have never met any non-Roman-Catholic minister in New South Wales who did not approve the system. In New South Wales the question is regularly asked at our quarterly Church meetings as to what public schools there are in the circuit and whether they are regularly visited by the ministers. I have advocated the New South Wales system as the best solution of the question for the past fourteen years in New Zealand. It gives the Roman Catholic priest, or myself, or any religious teacher of any denomination the same right of entry as it grants to the Anglican, and I am not justified in asking for more. I have had an excellent opportunity of seeing the system in operation, as I was born in New South Wales, attended the State schools as a pupil, and afterwards sent my own boy to them. I have two brothers who are State school-teachers in New South Wales, one with twenty-four years, another with seventeen years' experience; and I have correspondence regularly with them both, and have kept in touch with the inner working of the New South Wales methods. I have been a New-Zealander for fifteen years, have served on School Committees in the Dominion, and have a son who is a State school-teacher. In 1909 I spent three months in New South Wales, visited the schools again, spent a good deal of time with school-teachers, and made special inquiry concerning the working of the Scripture lessons under the new syllabus which prevailed since 1905.

Experience as a Pupil.

Allow me to go back to my own experience as a pupil. The New South Wales system of Scripture lessons was instituted in 1866. I began my school life in 1869, so that my memory practically covers the working of the system. I attended three primary schools, and the three teachers from whom I received nearly all my Scripture lessons were Presbyterian, Roman Catholic, and agnostic respectively. I was not taught any of their personal doctrines, but received the Scripture lessons in a clear and interesting fashion. I would place them in the following order as teachers of these lessons: The Roman Catholic first, agnostic second, and Presbyterian a good third. Amongst the visiting ministers there was one especially whom I remember who gave us series of addresses on the Lord's Prayer. These lessons occupied from thirty to forty minutes, and as soon as the minister left the teacher served out slates, on which we were ordered to fill in the hour by writing down as much of the lesson as we remembered. He never asked any questions, but he looked over the slates when finished, and this acted as a check on mind-wandering during the lesson. This was done by the Roman Catholic teacher, who was a prominent figure at Church functions, and visited regularly by the priest. Ministers' visits were always cordially welcomed in my experience. In my case I received more benefit from the teacher's Scripture lessons than from the minister's teaching, but both sets of lessons were helpful, and I have never known a teacher who did not consider the ministers' visits a help to the school. There were no Roman Catholic schools in the localities where I attended school. Roman Catholic parents did not take advantage of the conscience clause in these localities. A few others did so, but the children suffered no persecution on that account. The lessons by teachers or ministers do not create sectarian strife. The children become accustomed in their school life to the fact that they belong to different denominations, and would no more dream of fighting over these lessons than over any other. There was considerable fighting in the schools of my boyhood between one locality and another and over personal grievances, but, although I went to and from school with Roman Catholic children, we did not fight over religion. The coming into touch with one another on the part of the ministers who give the lessons tells against sectarian strife. Denominational loyalty is not destroyed.

Right of Entry.

So far as the ministers' visits are concerned, the complaint on the part of teachers is that they do not get more of these, and the strong statements of those whose aim it is to speed up tardy workers are proofs of the value of the visits and the interest in the matter. With a scattered population, and with some of the parishes undermanned, it is often physically impossible to visit all the schools, but a greater number of the children are reached than is generally realized, because most of the visiting is done in the eastern section of the State, where the bulk of the children are. To say that it has become a dead-letter is an assertion contradicted by all the facts. This work has never been so vigorously carried out as at present. The number of visits for 1912 totalled 52,883, and for 1913, 57,321. Mr. Caughley has attempted to show that this increase is only apparent, and that it is due to a direction from the Department that if a minister takes two classes in a school in one day that these shall be counted as two visits. But Mr. Caughley does not know that this is simply making a definite regulation of what was previously a common practice. The view has been taken by teachers that if a minister takes one class in a school, and another on the following day, and two visits are counted to him, then he should also be credited with two visits if he does the double duty on one day. If a doctor visits two patients in a boardinghouse on the same day he counts it as two visits. The picture of a minister giving four lessons in an hour is a characteristic stroke of genius! It is safe to say that such a rapid ecclesiastical performance will never be seen outside Mr. Caughley's imagination. The departmental report would not be likely to state that the number of visits during the year shows a very considerable increase if such was not the case, and the increase was not confined to last year. In 1909 the visits numbered 35,676, and in 1912 52,883. The most apparently damaging statement was made by the Government Statistician some years ago, that "the visits by all the denominations taken together numbered only a little more than 10 per cent. of the opportunities afforded." The Rev. C. Prescott, Principal of Newington College, Sydney, makes the following comment: "This is, however, less startling than it appears, inasmuch as it is open to religious teachers to claim one hour a day. It is obvious that no minister of a Church could possibly give that time." Let it be remembered also that the population is so scattered in the greater part of New South Wales that of 2,679 schools in 1912 there were 1,512 with an average attendance of less than thirty, although the Department spent £5,859 in providing conveyances to bring children to school in sparsely settled districts.

In the New South Wales *Public Instruction Gazette* of 1913, which contains a *résumé* of Inspectors' reports for 1912, the following remarks may be noted. Senior Inspector Thomas (Moss Vale district): "The teachers' efforts are well supported by the local clergy and accredited lay teachers." Inspector Lynch, M.A. (Bega district): "Special religious instruction is given by most of the religious denominations. Many of the smaller schools are beyond the reach of such visits." Inspector Campling (Broken Hill district): "During the year visits from the clergy have been frequent and beneficial." Inspector Reay (Tamworth): "The authorized special religious instruction is carried out in many schools in the district by visiting clergymen and teachers." "It is interesting to note that the Jews maintain a staff of teachers in Sydney to visit the public schools." (New South Wales Year-book, 1913.)

Although Roman Catholic parents take advantage largely of the conscience clause, there are very many who do not do so, especially in localities where there are no Roman Catholic schools. I know one teacher who had one instance only in sixteen years in four country schools of a parent asking for exemption, although over two hundred Roman Catholic children passed through his hands. Teachers and Inspectors are confident, many enthusiastic, concerning the moral value of the lessons. As far as the implanting of an actual knowledge of Scripture in the child's mind is concerned, a New South Wales teacher affirms that the school-teacher has three advantages over the Sunday-school teacher: (1) In the power to get discipline, which the Sunday-school teacher cannot always secure; (2) in knowledge of the child and how to approach the child mind; (3) because he is teaching for definite examination results. To say that a text-book of selected lessons is a mutilation of the Bible carries with it a very wide condemnation. Sunday schools teach from selected and graded lessons. Parents who read the Bible in the home select portions suitable for the children. Ministers and Churches do likewise for their congregations.

Although there are a larger proportion of Roman Catholic teachers in New South Wales than in our Dominion, and I know of one Jew teacher in New South Wales, I never heard that the teacher's conscience was violated by giving these lessons until I came to New Zealand. It is affirmed by Bishop Cleary that no Roman Catholic can teach these lessons unless badly trained in the faith, or disloyal to the Church, or being tempted by lucrative consideration, and the weakness of human nature. He has stated also that a teacher had informed Bishop Gallagher, of Gouldburn, in New South Wales, that Roman Catholic teachers hated the lessons, shirked them when they could, and if compelled to give them made them as Roman Catholic in tendency as possible.

In the first place, the profession of teaching in New South Wales, as in New Zealand, is not a lucrative one, and it is an undeserved reflection on an able and conscientious body of men and women, and the Roman Catholic conscience, to say that they can be bought so cheaply in a prosperous country like New South Wales. It is a plain fact to those who know that these teachers come from good Roman Catholic families that they are to the front in the functions of their Churches in their respective localities, mixing with the best Roman Catholics, and not in any way under the ban of the Church. I have never heard of Roman Catholic bishops in New South Wales taking the position towards the teachers as laid down by Bishop Cleary, and, judging by the very large number of Roman Catholics entering schools as teachers, this holds good throughout the State. I am told on good authority of facilities to enter the service being provided by the Church. The majority of State schools in New South Wales are single-teacher schools (1,512

out of 2,769 in 1912, with average attendance under thirty). The method of training teachers for these schools is as follows: Candidates are prepared in district schools for the first teachers' examination. Those who pass are sent to selected single-teacher schools to receive a course of practical training, and are then passed on to the training college in Sydney to complete their training. The Yass Convent School makes a special feature of coaching candidates for the entrance examination, and in the last report of the school in the Yass *Tribune* took great credit for success in this direction. Eight out of nine of those sent up passed the examination. Yass is one of the principal centres in Bishop Gallagher's diocese. Is a convent school likely to train disloyal Catholics? The majority of teachers entering the Department from this district, especially for small schools, are Roman Catholics. And these are not lucrative positions. A teacher of one of the small training-schools informs me that six out of seven of the young teachers sent to him were Roman Catholics. Of twelve who went to another of these schools in the district, eight were Roman Catholics; and of a total of forty-five, thirty-five were Roman Catholics. This teacher has never heard of one Roman Catholic teacher who had refused to give Scripture lessons.

Regarding the statement made by the teacher to Bishop Gallagher, it is not credible that the Roman Catholic teachers should make a practice of shirking the lessons or of teaching Roman Catholic doctrines without attracting notice on the part of the many who are jealously watchful for these things. I fear that the statement must be attributed to the weakness of human nature.

The Number of Children attending Sunday Schools in New Zealand.

I am surprised to hear that Mr. Caughley, with his many years of Sunday-school experience, should not be aware of the great number of children in New Zealand outside the Sunday schools in the large centres, and of the wide country districts where there are no Sunday schools. This is indicated by New Zealand figures for 1911. There were 161,648 children on the State-school rolls (exclusive of denominational schools) and 130,136 children on the Sunday-school rolls. Children under five years of age are to be found in large numbers in Sunday-school primary departments, and young men's and young women's Bible classes are also included in the Sunday-school rolls. Twenty per cent., probably, of those who attend the Sunday schools are outside the State-school ages. If these were deducted it would leave about 104,000 of the State-school children who are on the Sunday-school rolls. But Sunday-school rolls are not purged as carefully as State-school rolls, so that numbers are on the rolls who do not attend the schools. The average attendance at the State schools is nearly 90 per cent. I know of a city Sunday school in Wellington where the average attendance for the year was 46 per cent., and in a great number of schools the average is under 60 per cent. Taking all these facts into consideration it is apparent that at least 70,000 children in New Zealand are outside the Sunday schools, and a large proportion of the remainder are very irregularly instructed. For these reasons all those who are interested in Sunday-school work should be heart and soul with us in the effort to bring Bible-teaching into the State schools, where it would reach those who are not touched by the Sunday schools.

To any one who knows the two States, Mr. Caughley's statement that Victoria and New South Wales are similar in climate, geography, history, and industries is amazing. In the first place, Victoria has never been affected to the same extent by drought. In good seasons New South Wales contains half the sheep in Australia (including Tasmania), and about four times as many as Victoria. In one year of the last Australian drought there was a loss of over fifteen million sheep, and the natural increase, in New South Wales, more than the whole number of sheep in Victoria, which, owing to its better rainfall, was not affected to the same extent, comparatively. The disruption of its greatest industry by drought, and lack of steady employment, has a demoralizing effect on the character of thousands of people in the larger towns as well in the country in New South Wales, which is not paralleled in Victoria, owing to the different conditions. This great pastoral industry creates an army of wandering workers, in a thirsty monotonous land, especially exposed to drink temptations owing to the conditions of their lives. Wagga, for example, the headquarters of the bush unions in New South Wales, is a town about the size of Masterton. It contains thirty-six hotels, twenty-one in the principal street, and three at one corner, side by side. Another great hindrance in the work of the schools from the moral side, complained of by teachers in New South Wales, is the large rabbit-trapping industry. It is demoralizing to have children, especially girls, spending all their spare hours from school in trapping rabbits, and being kept from school, knocking them on the head, and skinning and cleaning them. There is nothing to parallel this in Victoria, owing to the smaller pastoral area and closer settlement.

Victoria was not affected by the convict settlement in any parallel fashion to New South Wales; convicts were never sent to Victoria. None were sent to Australia after 1840, and Faulkner's house (the first house in Melbourne) was built in 1835. For forty-seven years prior to this convicts were poured into New South Wales, and settlements were created of ticket-of-leave men and ex-convicts, which left an abiding impression on many districts, especially Sydney. The same permanent influences were not created in Victoria by such convicts as were attracted by gold rushes. These were mostly birds of passage. The gold-mining in Victoria assumed the character of deep-lead workings and quartz-mining, on a very much larger scale than in New South Wales. This class of mine-working was not attractive to ex-convicts, but it drew into these mining centres large numbers of Welsh, Cornish, and Scottish miners, making a strong Puritan element; this is plain to anyone who is acquainted with Ballarat, for example, as compared with New South Wales goldfields. They have never had a rum currency in Melbourne as they once had in Sydney. Victorians pride themselves on their comparative freedom from the evil forces created by a convict population.

Different conditions of life and population would account for the greater apparent success of Sunday-school work in Victoria than in New South Wales. On account of the configuration of the country and its being only a little more than one-fourth the size of New South Wales, it has been possible to do organizing work from Melbourne with very much greater success than from Sydney. The Victorian Sunday School Union has therefore been able to keep agents with vans at work in the country districts, organizing bush schools. This has been assisted by the larger elements interested in this kind of work which have been found in Victoria from the beginning of its history. The Churches behind this Sunday-school work are united in the Bible in State Schools League of that State in opposition to the secular system.

There is provision for religious teaching in Victoria under the regulations of the Education Act outside school hours. When I went to live in Melbourne and sent my child to the State school, on his return from school on the second day he brought a note from the master asking me if I desired him to stay for religious teaching. The schoolmaster took the initiative in this matter.

I have no knowledge of any proselytism through teachers or ministers' lessons in New South Wales schools, although I have heard of isolated cases in denominational schools. Figures given in the New South Wales Year-book, 1913, page 12, indicate the stability of the Churches:—

	Of population.	
	1891.	1911.
Church of England	45·32	45·46
Roman Catholic	25·85	25·54
Methodist Church	10·13	9·37
Presbyterian Church	9·86	11·33
Other Protestants	0·87	3·37

In view of the fears expressed by Bishop Cleary and others that under the proposed system the smaller denominations would be preyed upon by the larger, the last figures in this list are very conclusive. They have flourished in New South Wales. The smaller denominations have not fared so well under secularism in New Zealand, the figures being (New Zealand Year-book) 7·79 for 1891, and 6·53 for 1911.

In conclusion, I have seen the New South Wales system in operation, and in most of the conditions of life and population to be found in New Zealand. In the dairying districts of the coast, on the goldfields, in the farming districts on the coast and tableland, and the wide pastoral areas of the interior, and working smoothly and satisfactorily under all these conditions. All the discords brought together and played upon by our opponents are strangely different from the harmony which actually obtains in New South Wales. The only serious objection comes from the Roman Catholic Church, with its denominational policy, and the more perfect the national system becomes the more vigorously is it abused by those who are devoted to a denominational method. All that we desire is to strengthen a national system which shall be in accordance with the consciences of the majority of the people, with due provision for the minority. And so we urge that this matter should be placed in the hands of the people for decision. And there can be no rest in this matter until the voice of the people is heard.

I now desire to hand in a copy of correspondence received by a Committee appointed by the Methodist Church of Australasia to inquire into the working of religious instruction in Australian State schools. [Appendix A.]

4. *Professor Hunter.*] Would you tell the Committee of your actual experience as a minister in charge of a parish in New South Wales?—I had no actual experience in charge of a parish in New South Wales—I was not in charge of a parish.

5. In regard to your criticism of Mr. Caughley's figures, are you aware that the Department in Sydney made that regulation because of the different ways in which statistics were compiled?—Yes, I am quite aware of that. The statement to me that it was a common practice did not mean that it was the universal practice, and I am simply repeating the statement as made to me by the teachers.

6. How many teachers made that statement to you?—Three different teachers made the statement to me.

7. Do you think a statement made by three teachers in regard to a matter like that ought to be taken as evidence to refute the statement of the Department that the regulation was made in order to bring the practice into agreement?—The statement is not in conflict with the statement of the Department at all, and those three teachers, coming from different parts of New South Wales, indicated that their statement could be taken seriously as indicating a common practice, and not as in any way being against the statement made by the Department.

8. You looked upon the statement of those three teachers as indicating a common practice?—Yes, I did.

9. You say in your statement that one of the advantages in the teaching coming in is the power to get discipline. Would not that apply also to the clergy under the right of entry—that their power of getting discipline is not so good as the teacher's?—It would depend upon the individual minister. This statement, for instance, made to me by a teacher, might apply to his own experience, but so far as my own experience with the lessons by ministers is concerned, they had no difficulty in getting discipline.

10. They conduct the classes themselves without the aid of teachers?—In the cases where I attended the classes this was the case. I might mention in that connection that I took classes myself when visiting New South Wales, and in those cases the teachers were present.

11. That was during the three months you were visiting there?—Yes.

12. I want to call your attention to the fact that one reason Dr. Gibb gave was that he could not get discipline in the school?—Yes

13. That is why he wanted the position to be changed. You are aware of that?—Yes, and apparently from the statement made to me by a teacher, that might easily occur.

14. Then, with regard to the question of Victoria and New South Wales, you think the difference in the rainfall and the effect of rabbit-trapping, and the convict question are reasons why crime is greater in New South Wales than Victoria?—I simply gave those as three illustrations of the differences that do actually exist, which makes it impossible to give a comparative statement, unless all the conditions of life and population are taken into consideration. There are others that could be mentioned, but I took those as three differences between the two States.

15. Could you mention some of the other differences?—For instance, there is a very great difference in the climate. If you were to refer to the graphs in the Commonwealth Year-book you would discover that the greater part of the population of Victoria is outside the range of the heat-wave area, whereas this is not so in New South Wales, which tells against morals, creating the "tired Australians" you have heard of. Another condition is this: that in New South Wales the male population is very much larger than the female population, while in Victoria it is a trifle less. An excess of male population in a country of that character, separated by pastoral industries from the brake of home influences, always tends to a higher crime-rate, as you will find in reference to the Northern Territory and Western Australia. These are just a couple of local differences that occur to me, but there are many others.

16. Your opinion is that the difference in the crime-rate between New South Wales and Victoria indicates differences in climatic and social conditions morally—no question of education comes in at all?—Yes, the question of education comes in in this way: that there has been a tremendous decrease in the crime-rate in New South Wales, and that is ascribed to education. I will give an illustration of what it means. The gaol population of New South Wales has declined steadily. Take the figures from 1885 to 1912. In 1885 the gaol population was 270 per 100,000; in 1895, 195; in 1905, 114; in 1910, 81; and in 1911, 74 per 100,000; showing a steady and abnormal decrease in the crime-rate, so far as is indicated by the gaol population. Sir John Findlay, in an interview reported in the *Times* of 28th December, 1912, said that he had spent a great deal of his time in New South Wales in study of criminology, and that the statements of the Comptroller of Prisons and the statistical evidence showed that there had been a steady decrease in crime for many years past. This was attributed to education, and the education included these Scripture lessons and the right of entry.

17. I would point out that religious education was introduced in 1866?—Yes.

18. And the method of education has not been changed as far as Scripture is concerned since 1866. Do you think, therefore, that this great change can be due to the religious education as distinct from secular education?—If we were to take notice of the New South Wales Inspectors' reports we find they lay the very greatest stress on the value of moral education in schools.

19. I want to know your opinion?—My opinion coincides with that of the Inspectors from my experience, knowledge, and testimony of the teachers.

20. How would you account for a similar decrease in the crime-rate in New Zealand and Victoria, where you have not this religious education?—I doubt, in the first instance, if the decrease in the crime-rate corresponded here with what it does there, and there would also come into consideration the difference in conditions of life and population. I think the only way in which I could make a scientific comparison in any of those countries is with its own present and past, taking into consideration the evidence given by people who know the conditions, and that is what I am going by in this case. I could not make a comparison between New South Wales and New Zealand in these matters, because I am not sufficiently acquainted with all the differences of conditions. I am only speaking of New South Wales as I know it.

21. You are basing that, as far as conditions of religious instruction are concerned, on a three-months visit to New South Wales?—No, I base it on something beyond that: I base it on the thirty-four years' experience I had personally in New South Wales, in the three great divisions of the State. I was associated constantly with Christian work and school-teachers, and came in contact with a great variety of people, and a great variety of localities. Besides that, my two brothers were schoolmasters. My eldest son was intended for the teaching profession, although he afterwards diverged into business, and my younger son has gone into the profession. I have been specially interested in New South Wales system, and for the last fourteen years in New Zealand in every district I have been in I have preached or lectured on this subject of the Bible-in-schools system, regarding the New South Wales system as being a solution. In addition I have kept in touch by spending three months in that State, and looking into the matter again in 1909.

22. My point is that your actual experience of the system is three months, and the rest is what you gathered as a citizen of New South Wales?—Yes, that is so.

23. Coming now to the actual system itself, would you consider a scheme of religious instruction to be just or unjust if the State teachers of your denomination could not carry out the Scripture teaching imposed upon them without violating the principles of their Church faith?—If I thought it was a serious violation of their faith it would certainly not be just to them, but so far as this matter is concerned I would not consider it a serious violation.

24. But if those teachers think it is a serious violation of their faith, who is to judge whether it is or not?—If those teachers are servants of the State and have to do service for the people, then the people themselves have the right of opinion as to their responsibility; but when we remember that the great bulk of the children of Australia and the bulk of the teachers of Australia corresponding in faith, and all divisions of faith as in New Zealand, are receiving and administering those lessons and raising no such difficulty, then the people have the right to judge as to whether it is imposing too big a burden upon the teachers.

25. But if those teachers have entered the service of the State without any religious test of that kind at all, is it fair at a particular point in their history to impose it upon them?—Judging by the results in Western Australia and Queensland, where the same thing has occurred, I do not think there is any unfairness.

26. I want to know whether you consider it unfair?—I certainly do not consider it unfair.

27. If the State decided to adopt the religious lessons of the Roman Catholic faith in the schools of New Zealand, would you think it would be fair to compel the Protestant teachers to give those lessons?—No, not if they were compelled to give any sectarian or dogmatic teaching, and that is what it would amount to in the case you presented.

28. That is to say, you believe there is a Protestant faith that is not dogmatic, but every Roman Catholic faith must be dogmatic?—Oh, no.

29. What did you mean by saying that from the case I presented it must be dogmatic?—Because you have plainly indicated that it is the teaching of a particular sect that is to be given, and the teaching of a particular sect could not be given without its being dogmatic.

30. Then you do not consider that if four Churches come together and agree to something that it is the opinion of some particular section?—No, I do not believe it is a particular section, when it is not the teaching of any of those particular Churches.

31. You are aware that the Anglicans and Roman Catholics are a majority of the community. Supposing they agreed to a form of religious worship or teaching in the schools, do you think it would be fair for Protestants to be compelled to accept that?—No, I do not think it would be fair for them to be compelled to accept that, but it is not on all-fours with the present thing, because we are simply asking for instruction in Scripture, and Scripture is not the property of any particular sect, and they are not asked to give the religious teaching of any particular sect.

32. It means they have to come to a common basis, and do you think it is fair that people who cannot agree on that common basis should be compelled to teach those lessons without a conscience clause?—Yes, judging by the past success of the system in other places I should say that is fair. I should like it to be understood that the system does not belong exclusively to the particular people who happen to be associated with those four denominations you have referred to.

33. And if the other people say they cannot accept that, who are to be the judges of whether it is so or not?—In this case we simply refer the matter to the people.

34. That is to say, on this religious issue you are prepared to take the vote of the majority to compel the minority?—Not on the religious issue, because we are simply asking the teachers to give the reading-lesson from the text-book, without dogmatic teaching.

35. You are aware that under the New South Wales Act that you are asking us here to adopt there is general religious teaching. Do you think it is fair that the teachers who hold that that would be a breach of the faith of their Church to give those lessons, that they should be compelled to do so without a conscience clause?—I think under all the conditions it is quite fair.

36. Do you think it is fair, then, to decide the question of Church disestablishment in Wales by a majority?—I have never studied the question, and it has no bearing on my evidence.

37. You are aware that in your programme you have two distinct issues—namely, Bible-teaching by teachers, and the right of entry of the clergy. If this matter went to a referendum, do you object to dividing those issues?—I object for a very practical reason, and that is that the system we are proposing to introduce is not an experiment, but one that has had its trial, and has proved a success everywhere it has been tried. Therefore, I should be very much afraid to give my voice for the division of the issues when the system has worked so well as a whole.

38. But you have already said you want the people to decide what particular kind of system you are to have?—Yes.

39. If some people want the Bible lessons and do not want the right of entry, and others want the right of entry and not the Bible lessons, do you think it is fair to compel the people who want one to vote for the other or go without?—Personally, as I desire an effective system to be placed before the people, I should like to get their views upon an effective system.

40. But by dividing the issue will not prevent anybody from voting for both. If you divided the issue so that any voter may vote for one or the other or both, would you think that would be fair?—In giving a vote on any system which contains more than one issue—and it is difficult to get a system which does not—the people have to judge the system as a whole, and therefore I think the vote would be quite fair because they were asked to vote on that.

41. Then am I right in thinking that what you want is a vote on your system and on no other?—For or against this system, when it has proved so successful. That is my present attitude.

42. Do you think it is fair of the Bible in Schools League, who says it wants to get the real opinion of the people, to say, "You must vote for or against our system and not any other system"?—I think so, when this is the effective system which they desire to see tested.

43. Which system desire to see tested?—The system the Bible in Schools League has introduced.

44. But if the people say they want to have the issues divided, is it not fair that the issues should be divided?—If the people express their opinion that they want the issues divided, then it would be quite fair.

45. Are you aware that at the present time before this Committee there is a petition of one thousand people of the Bible in Schools League and from some fifty thousand people who are opposed to this issue? Do you think under those circumstances this Committee would be justified in recommending that your system and yours only should be put to the people?—I should be dealing with the question as I see it not from the point of view alone of the evidence that might be placed before the Committee so far as those particular facts are concerned; but as I see it, in connection with the organization throughout the country, the evidence is in the other direction.

46. That is to say, you would accept the view that if this Committee decided to recommend that the issues should be divided in the interests of fairness, that that ought not to be done?—In

that I should be guided altogether by the opinion I entertain myself (because it is a personal opinion you are asking for) as to whether this Committee represented the people or not.

47. But how do you find out who represents the people?—Not always by a parliamentary Committee.

48. That is not my question. How have you found out that the Bible in Schools League represents the people?—Because we have taken the initiative in this particular matter, and, as far as we possibly can, have tested the people, and that is why I personally came to this conclusion.

49. Can you tell me how many public meetings the Bible in Schools League has held?—I could not tell you. I have no record of that.

50. Can you tell me if any public meeting was ever held?—I have no record of that.

51. You think that, not being able to tell this Committee of any one occasion on which you have held a public meeting, that you are justified in saying you have consulted the people?—I know that over 150,000 cards have been signed.

52. You know it personally?—I do not know it personally, but I know that is the record so far as the League is concerned.

53. What evidence have you from the people—are they electors?—I have only the evidence in my own locality.

54. Are they electors?—Yes, electors in every case with which I was acquainted.

55. Are you aware that many people have been induced to sign those cards under the belief that they were going to put the Bible into the schools?—I do not know of any case personally.

56. If I told you that the woman who asked me to sign the card told me that there was a conscience clause for teachers and insisted upon it, would you think that remarkable?—I would think it remarkable.

57. You agree, however, that if those issues were divided the people would still have the right by voting for both issues to vote for or against the New South Wales system?—If they were divided the people would not be voting for the New South Wales system.

58. But by voting for both they would?—Yes.

59. If this system or any other system were adopted which certain Churches were unable for conscience reasons to accept, would you consider it fair that those Churches should be given a corresponding grant in aid, as is done in England?—I do not think they should receive a grant in aid with this system.

60. Would you be opposed to giving the conscience clause to teachers?—I should be very much opposed, in the first instance, because the Australian experience proves it is unnecessary, and, in the second instance, I should be opposed to it for the protection of the teachers themselves, because if a conscience clause were given for teachers then the teacher would become the hinge of the whole matter. It would render it extremely difficult for teachers in localities where the teacher personally would have to settle whether the lessons should be given or not, and in single schools it would mean that he would have to take the whole responsibility of deciding, and I do not think that would be fair to the teachers.

61. You fear that there is behind a certain influence that would act detrimentally on the teachers if they have to take a stand in this matter?—Not a Church influence necessarily, but if the teacher had to take the responsibility in each locality, then it would make it difficult for the teacher; but the teacher is saved from that by not having a conscience clause, so no cases of that kind have occurred.

62. If the teachers are prepared to take the consequences and ask for a conscience clause, are you prepared to give it to them?—No, I am not prepared to give it to them, for the sake of the effectiveness of the system.

63. That is to say, you want the system, and the question of the teachers' conscience and the fairness of the system to those people who cannot go into it are matters of detail?—Yes, I consider they are matters of detail that are fairly met in the working of the system.

64. Do you think the people ought to be asked to vote for the introduction of a text-book that they have never seen?—I think so, if they have confidence in the impartiality of those framing the text-book.

65. The Education Department or a body of other people may draw it up—there is no decision in your scheme as to who shall draw it up. The people are asked to vote in the dark. Do you think it is a fair thing to ask the people to vote on an issue not clearly put before them?—As I have no doubt the text-book will be drawn up by people competent to do so, I think it is perfectly fair.

66. You do not agree then with the 1904 Conference that sat in Wellington and said, "Inasmuch, however, as there exist but one or two copies of the text-book as adopted by the Conference, it has been widely felt, not only by opponents but by friends of the movement as well, that it is necessary in some way to make the people who will have to vote on the question acquainted with its contents"?—I do not think personally it is necessary.

67. Do you think it is in the interests of the children that they should be segregated into different denominations in the schools?—I do not think it is at all against the interests of the children, judging by experience. The fact is that the children are segregated into different denominations in the community, and the effect in the school is that they get accustomed to it in child-life without creating any difficulty. I associated a great deal with Roman Catholics as a young man and went to and from the same school with them before that, and we were segregated into different classes for ministers' lessons, but I never knew of any difficulty arising from it. It is a fact that, although denominational loyalty is just as keen, sectarian feeling is not so apparent with Australians who have gone to the State schools together as it is with people coming from older countries and denominational schools.

68. You are aware there is a great deal of evidence before the Committee of sectarian feeling in New South Wales?—I question whether that evidence deals with the sectarian feeling in public schools. It may deal with it in politics.

69. Would you be opposed to the adoption of the system commonly known as the Nelson system, which would enable the clergy to visit the schools one half-hour a week for voluntary lessons, either acting jointly or severally as the clergy may determine, outside school hours?—I believe the Nelson system is good as far as it goes, and therefore I am not opposed to it, but my objection to it is that it is of least use where most needed—that is, in the large country districts where there are no Sunday schools and no Bible-teaching for the children. It is less needed in the centres than in those places. I also know that it would lead to a great deal of difficulty in connection with School Committees and to sectarian strife in many localities.

70. You have said that this system would not operate very well in sparsely populated districts because it could not be conducted by the clergy. Does not that imply that if a teacher is to teach anything it must be religious teaching, and you have admitted that he is not to be allowed to teach dogmatic or religious teaching?—The difference is an essential one from my point of view. I will take a simple definition of religion, that of Principal Caird, that "Religion is the surrender of the finite will to the Infinite will." There may be Bible knowledge and Scripture lessons without that surrender. It is not implied in the lessons given by the teacher, because the Bible-reading only is given, and the other side is not pressed home by the teacher. All that is given is a literary knowledge of the Bible which we regard as an effective basis for religious teaching. The special religious teacher does press home every side, which you may call the dogmatic or religious side of the question. The advantage gained by the lessons that are given by the teacher is that the child becomes acquainted with our finest literature, and with the fact that it is connected with our greatest moral teaching.

71. Do you think if the Nelson system were adopted it would be possible for some one to give this teaching in the back-country schools?—I have worked city charges and very wide country districts. In one country district outside my principal centre there were eight State schools in which I held services. In seven of those centres there was no Sunday school, no agent, and no church stationed there. It would have been impossible to work the Nelson system in that district. That was a district in the Waikato. In another district that I itinerated over there were thirteen State schools, and in ten of those centres there was no Sunday school, no agent, and no church, and spasmodic efforts in Sunday-school work was all that was done. It would have been impossible for the Nelson system to have been worked in either of these districts, and both of them were districts where Scripture-teaching was needed.

72. There were schools there?—Yes.

73. Are you not aware that teachers under the Nelson system very often voluntarily give the Scripture lessons?—I am not aware of any case myself where that it so.

74. Do you believe that the New South Wales text-book is a satisfactory text-book?—No, I would not go as far as to say that. I believe it can be used very effectively, but I am quite positive that the Queensland book is a very much better one, and I am also positive that if we had one in New Zealand it would be very much better. The New South Wales text-book consists of a selection of lessons arranged a very long time ago and what is required is a more up-to-date book.

75. Can you explain why in New South Wales that text-book has been in force since 1866 and has not been altered since?—I think simply for the reason that the teachers are accustomed to using it, and although many teachers do not regard it as an efficient text-book, yet those teachers do use it effectively, and therefore they have not pressed the question.

76. In connection with secular text-books the fact of the teacher getting accustomed to the text-book is not a good reason. Do you consider it is a good reason in religious instruction?—I think it is a reason so far as New South Wales is concerned, but if you ask my personal opinion of the text-book I would say it is not as good a text-book as we would have here. We are not pledged to that text-book.

77. *Canon Garland.*] In replying to Professor Hunter just now you rather gave the impression that you had only had three months' opportunity of gaining personal experience of the working of the system in New South Wales, but I understand you have had experience of it both as a pupil, as the parent of a pupil, and from other sources in New South Wales, and not merely from a three months' inquiry?—Oh, no, I was not limited to three months. I have had that experience you mention.

78. Another answer you gave was with reference to ascertaining the opinions of the public. Am I right in understanding from you, as one who has taken a prominent part in the movement in the Methodist Church, that the Methodist Church has been fully consulted through its local Church courts?—Yes, the Methodist Church has been fully consulted. The matter was brought before every Church court in the same way as every other great question that they have to settle.

79. And it is the custom in the Methodist Church that those local Church courts have something like fifteen to thirty lay persons besides the ministers?—Yes.

80. It was suggested that the figures in your statement as to the stability of the churches did not add up to 100. Is not the comparison this: that in 1891 there were, of the Presbyterians, 9·86, and in 1911 11·33, your point being that in New South Wales, so far from similar Churches having lessened in membership and strength, that they show a tendency to increase?—I had overlooked that question. I wished simply by those figures to make a comparison between the larger bodies and a section of "other Protestants," and therefore I left out some intermediate figures, such as the Congregational Church, 2·17 in 1891 and 1·40 in 1911, showing a decrease, which would be easily explainable by any one who knows the position; the Baptist Church, 1·18 in 1891, increasing to 1·28 in 1911; then the Salvation Army, 0·93 in 1891 and 0·46 in 1911; and Unitarians 0·12 and 0·05. So far as the Congregational and Baptist Churches are concerned,

they would not be largely affected so far as their membership is concerned when you take the two together. Those figures make up the total. My point was simply to make a comparison between the other bodies and the three larger Churches.

81. You heard a statement in this room this morning by a former witness to the effect that he had never heard of the text-books being used?—Yes.

82. Is that your experience as a boy in the schools?—I do not know myself of any district where such is the case. I know that in the adjoining districts to the one mentioned this morning, so far as the *Public Instruction Gazettes* are concerned, the Inspectors draw attention to the fact that the text-books are used.

83. That was in the seventies when you as a boy went to school?—We used the Scripture-lesson books then.

84. And when your own boy went to the schools in New South Wales did they have the same Scripture-lesson books?—Yes; the same books were used, and I know personally that they are used by many teachers. The use of these lessons seems to be the important question with some Inspectors. One teacher, for instance, had his school inspected by an Inspector. He had just had charge of a model country school in connection with the Sydney Training College and was therefore an up-to-date man. When the inspection was taken the master conducted the examination except in the Scripture lesson, and the Inspector took the Scripture lessons himself.

85. Mixing up so much as you did amongst the Methodist folk, have you ever heard any of them suggest that the Scripture books are not used in the schools now?—I have never heard of any case. I may mention that in February last the Rev. J. W. Collier, a prominent Methodist minister of New South Wales, was in New Zealand, and I asked him to take the platform on this question, but he said, "I am here for a rest and I never heard of these objections in New South Wales, and therefore I do not wish to undertake the work."

86. In fact, before you came into this room, did you ever hear anybody say those lesson-books were not in use in any of those schools there?—No, I have not heard the statement before.

JOHN PATERSON, M.A., examined. (No. 9.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—Presbyterian Minister of St. Paul's Church, Christchurch.

2. Do you wish to make a statement to the Committee?—Yes. I was educated in New South Wales, where the system advocated for introduction into the New Zealand State schools has been in operation for years. It includes Scripture-reading given in the ordinary course of instruction by the teachers, and also visits from the clergy of different denominations for one hour a week to give any such religious teaching as they may desire to the children belonging to their own Church. As a boy I attended State schools at Paddington, Glebe, Ashfield, Summer Hill, and Burwood. As a home-mission agent of the Presbyterian Church I have given religious instruction in Croydon Park, Boolaroo, Belmont, and Dungog Schools; and since becoming an ordained clergyman of the Presbyterian Church I have given such instruction in the four public schools at Broken Hill, and in the Broken Hill District High School, and in Sydney at Cleveland Street School; George Street School, Redfern; Alexandria School, and Waterloo School, and at the Cleveland Street District High School. I can also claim to have known during my university course many of the teachers there in training, and I have always had a good number of teachers in my congregation, and know personally the Under-Secretary for Education in New South Wales. In Broken Hill I was vice-president of the Parents' Association in connection with the schools; and in Sydney secretary of the Board for Public Examinations at the Cleveland Street centre. I can thus claim to be well in touch with the system as it works in New South Wales, having both been educated under it and taught as a clergyman under its provisions, and also from my intercourse with parents, officials, and teachers. I have never met or heard of a single teacher in New South Wales who considered that the system was an injury to his conscience, nor have I ever known of a teacher who has refused to give the Bible lessons. As a boy I was regularly taught these lessons by each teacher of the class I was in, and in two cases at least I know the teachers were Roman Catholics. I also never knew of any boy's parents refusing to allow him to attend the lessons except in the case of Jewish boys, and I never heard of any sectarian strife in the schools. At each school the various clergy came, exclusive of the Roman Catholic priests, and the boys separated to their various classes as an ordinary part of the school routine. The minister taught us Scripture lessons and gave such general religious teaching as was fitted to our years. Since becoming a clergyman and conducting classes in the schools mentioned previously I have always been most cordially welcomed by the masters and children. I have never heard of a single case where a headmaster objected to the minister holding his class. On the contrary, I have heard headmasters, children, and parents complain of any minister who was remiss in his duty. In two of the schools I visited—viz., Boolaroo and George Street, Redfern—the headmasters were Roman Catholics, and the headmistress at the Broken Hill Girls' School was also a Roman Catholic. Their attitude was just as cordial and friendly as that of others. Indeed, the headmaster at George Street was most friendly with all the ministers, and always invited two or three of us to give addresses at the Empire Day celebrations at his school. As regards the relationship with the children, they were always most enthusiastic, and I have never had any difficulty in keeping discipline. The masters as a rule welcome the ministers' visits as a help in this direction. It is a splendid means, too, of bringing clergy into touch with one another. In many schools the ministers, generally excluding the Anglicans, work together by not taking in separate classes all their own children of all varying ages, but by combining—*e.g.*, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Congregational children in one class, as grading the classes better according to ages,

and each minister taking such a combined class. Or in smaller schools in the country it is a practice to take the schools in turn, the various ministers going week about in rotation. I have worked both plans, and have always found the system conducive to comradeship among the clergy. Indeed, so smoothly and as a matter of course does the system work that it is difficult to treat seriously the imaginary troubles that theoretically may arise. The matter is quite settled in New South Wales. It is never brought up at elections. All parties are agreed that it is the best solution of the problem of religious instruction in the schools possible under existing conditions. When the high-school system was extended a couple of years ago the system was simply extended to those schools by the Minister of Public Instruction without discussion, and heartily welcomed by masters and scholars. The proof of the working value of the New South Wales system is demonstrated by its cordial acceptance by all specially interested and by the community at large. It may not be ideal, but as a working compromise capable of meeting the needs and also the objections of the vast mass of those concerned it has stood the test of time and has been adopted with similar acceptable results in several other States of the Commonwealth. I can, as one who has been trained under it and also taught under it, unhesitatingly recommend it as a sound working method of imparting that moral and religious basis essential to all real education. As regards the general attitude of the ministers of my own Church in New South Wales, I do not know any one there who has ever raised objections to the system. Most, if not all, of our ministers gladly teach in the schools, and the general opinion is that the work is a valuable adjunct to our Sunday school. The parents heartily approve of the system, and wherever I have happened to miss one of my classes I was always asked by parents and children why I was not there. The children look forward to the ministers' visits, and the parents expect it as part of their weekly duty in the parish. Our Elders' Association is so keenly alive to the value of the work that they make it their special business to pay Mr. P. D. McCormick, a retired headmaster, to take the work in certain city schools where the minister is unable to visit owing to stress of other duties or ill health. Regarding the assertion made that teachers in New South Wales cannot freely express their religious opinions, I was not aware of any such restriction. I know many teachers who are active Church workers. All they are forbidden to do is to in any way offend other people's religious convictions, which, considering their position in the community and control of the children, is an ordinary common-sense regulation to avoid possible trouble. But in any case such a regulation is not an integral part of the system of religious instruction in State schools as adopted in New South Wales.

3. *Rev. Mr. Bates.*] In the pamphlet which has been put in containing the opinions of educational experts the Cleveland State School of New South Wales is mentioned, and you said there is a considerable amount of work done there. The headmaster writes, "If clergymen could only be persuaded to take advantage of the special provision of our Public Instruction Act I believe an incalculable benefit would be conferred on the rising generation. Only one—a Congregationalist—really attends to this work regularly and punctually"?—What is the date of that?

4. It is 1908?—I am referring to the last three years, when I was a minister, and I might say in connection with the Cleveland State School that religious instruction has been regularly given by three representatives of the Anglican Church, and by the Methodist ministers, of which there were three, the Congregational minister, and myself, as the Presbyterian minister.

5. How many ministers attended altogether?—There were seven ministers, and the Anglican work was done by a lady specially employed, a Mrs. Smith, and also part of the Anglican boys' work was done by a man employed, whose name I forget.

6. You say that during the last three years there have been nine ministers in attendance, and yet two years before that this gentleman said that only one Congregationalist really attended this work regularly and punctually?—That may have been true, and no doubt it was owing to his speaking to the ministers that the work in my time was done. I am only referring to what happened at that time. I am only giving evidence of my own experience, and my word is reliable on that point.

7. We want to account for this tremendous increase in the attendances during the past three years: can you account for it?—Well, it may have been due to the fact that there was a considerable change of the ministers during that time, and it may have been due to Mr. Conway, but certainly that is what was happening all the time I was there. Mr. Conway retired some time last year.

8. Do you not think there has been pressure brought upon the ministers of the different denominations not to neglect their privileges in order to set us an example in New Zealand?—Not that I know of.

9. And to show it as desirable to us?—Not that I am aware of. As a matter of fact, I was not aware that this matter was live politics in New Zealand until a few months ago.

10. You regard this matter as politics?—I used that expression.

11. As political propaganda?—No, I do not consider it as political propaganda. My position here is to give evidence. It is political in so far as it is working for the referendum and parliamentary action.

12. Do you regard Canon Garland as a political organizer for this scheme?—I do not know I thought of it. He is the organizer.

13. For political work?—In so far as it is a political issue he is the political organizer.

14. Now, are you aware that a short time ago, in a sermon by the Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A., in the Anglican Church, quoted in the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of the 20th July, 1914, he said, "Religion is being crowded out of the school. It is altogether excluded from the high-school course, except as an act of grace"?—I am not aware of that, but I might explain, however, although I am not sure of the exact date, that three or four years ago there were comparatively few high schools in New South Wales. There were really only the Sydney

high schools and the West Maitland High School, and religious instruction was not given in those high schools; but since that time the high-school system has been altered and a number of district high schools established, and religious instruction has been given in those schools. The Minister of Instruction was simply asked about it. There were comparatively few boys in those two high schools. The boys really doing high-school work were in the ordinary State schools. A number of the State schools now have a high-school department, and they were called "district high schools," and the question came up whether the ministers were to go in. I believe it was Archdeacon Boyce who brought the matter under the notice of the Minister of Instruction, and he sent out instruction to the headmasters that religious instruction should be given. As a matter of fact, in Broken Hill High School the headmaster was not aware that any alteration had been made in the status of his school in connection with religious instruction, and I simply carried on my work in the Broken Hill High School. We commenced to do it also at the Cleveland District High School, and nothing was said, and the high school came under the same arrangement. At the present time, although religious instruction used not to be given in the Sydney high schools, it is being given now. The Congregational minister, the Rev. Mr. Cocks, visits there, or his assistant and the Superintendent of the Methodist Church, the Rev. Mr. Hewitt, was visiting there when I left Sydney. There may also have been others.

15. You are referring only to special religious instruction by ministers, and not religious instruction with regard to the Irish text-book. Are you aware of the Irish text-book?—The Irish text-book has nothing to do with ministers' instruction. The minister is not asked to use the Irish text-book—that is the text-book that can be used and is used by the teacher. When I was a boy at school I used it regularly. I cannot say from personal knowledge whether it is being used in the schools now. I read it as part of the regular work. It is still read in the schools, but when the minister comes in he can use any book he wishes.

16. Are you not aware that general religious instruction, with the use of the Irish text-book, has been excluded from the high schools?—Yes, that is perfectly true. The religious instruction by the teachers, I believe, is not included in the syllabus of the high schools, and there is a special reason. Boys and girls at that age, it was felt, would be better instructed by a man whose business it is to teach religion, so the whole matter has been left entirely to the ministers. If the matter had been desired I have no doubt it would have been kept with the same perfect ease as we keep the minister giving the regular religious instruction.

17. Have you had sufficient experience in New Zealand to say whether the Sunday-school system is more progressive and more flourishing in New Zealand than in Australia?—No, I cannot say that. I have only been three months in New Zealand, and I would not like to make any general statement about the Sunday-school system in New Zealand. I do not see that that has anything to do with it.

18. Have you never heard the parents say that the children get enough Scriptures during the week, and it is not necessary to send them to the Sunday school?—No, I have no heard anybody saying that.

19. *Professor Hunter.*] You are, of course, not authorized by the Presbyterian Church to speak here?—No, simply invited to give my personal evidence.

20. Would you tell the Committee what is the actual length of your experience as a minister in New South Wales in giving those Bible lessons?—It amounts to about eleven years.

21. Actually giving the lessons as a minister?—No, as a home-mission agent I gave religious instruction in various schools when studying. That was not so regular. I was then assisting a minister, but I have been an ordained minister for nearly eight years.

22. You are aware, of course, that very many Presbyterian ministers and Presbyterians in New Zealand oppose this scheme?—I am not aware of very many, but I am aware that the General Assembly discussed the matter, and by a vote of 131 to 13 they carried their belief in this platform.

23. Do you know any Presbyterian Church congregation in New Zealand whose members have had an opportunity of voting on this issue?—No, I do not, and I would be surprised to hear it, because it is not the custom of the Presbyterian Church to lay these matters officially before the congregation. The Presbyterian Church is governed by the session, and the decision of that session officially given is the decisive decision of the Church, just as the decision of the General Assembly is the official decision of the Church as a whole.

24. Does not the Presbyterian Church allow that the congregation must decide before the session can act for the Church?—Not at all. The presenting of any matter to the congregation is an act of courtesy on the part of the session.

25. Would you be surprised to hear that Mr. Caughley, in giving evidence, said his session had passed a resolution in favour of it, and he had had the resolution altered to the personal opinions of the members of the session because of the fact that they had no right to do it?—Yes, I would be surprised to hear that.

26. You have been recorded as having been struck by the fact when you came to New Zealand that clergymen in New Zealand all seemed political propagandists and talked nothing but politics?—I would like to explain that. When I was welcomed at Christchurch by the city at a tea-meeting the talk was mainly on the question of politics, and at the public welcome the Mayor and authorized people, in welcoming me, hoped that I would take a place in public life, and laughingly I said, "You seem to be political propagandists." I said I considered my first duty was to look after my church. However, I have always reserved to myself the right to speak on all big public questions. At the same time I always avoid taking part in party politics.

27. Do you agree that this religious question should be decided by a majority vote?—Well, it is only asking the method by which a democratic community can decide what is to be done, and as all other such questions are settled it is the only possible method, and, of course, at the

same time every effort should be made to safeguard the minority. In New South Wales the teacher is not asked to give religious instruction: he is simply asked to read the Bible to the children as a text-book. Whether he believes it or not is no business of the State. He is asked to instruct the children in the matter contained in the text-book.

28. Well, will you explain if the teacher is not giving religious instruction why you propose to give the conscience clause to the parent in regard to these religious lessons?—I do not propose anything.

29. You are here supporting the Bible-in-schools platform?—No, I am here giving evidence on the system.

30. You are not here giving evidence in support of the Bible-in-schools platform?—I am so far as its working is concerned in New South Wales.

31. Do you think it would be right in a matter where you felt compelled to give the conscience clause to parents not to give a similar conscience clause to teachers?—Of course, as far as I am personally concerned, I would try, in introducing any such matter, to give every protection to the reasonable conscience scruples of anybody. That is my personal opinion.

32. That is to say, if the teachers of New Zealand said that they conscientiously wanted the conscience clause you personally would be prepared to give it?—I would certainly give the conscience clause if they said they did not wish to teach religion, but I cannot see it is a matter of conscience hearing children read any religious book.

33. The Bible in Schools League proposes to give the conscience clause to parents. If I were a teacher in a public school I would have the right to exempt my child from attendance at those lessons that I myself was compelled to give: do you think that would be fair?—Yes, you as a parent would have the right to exempt yourself if the State said the teacher was to teach a certain subject, and if the teacher said he would not teach that subject then I do not see it is a question of his conscience.

34. He would simply have to give it?—Yes. In New South Wales this question of conscience never came up, because the teacher is not asked to teach religion; he is simply asked to hear the children read the text-book. He is not asked to express his private opinion. The teacher of New South Wales is merely asked to hear the children read the text-book and explain any difficult words—the mere English meaning of them. He is not asked to express his opinion to the children for or against the ideas in the book. He hears the children read the Bible as he hears a child read, say, the Book of Virgil, and he is not asked to say whether he believes the religious ideas in the Bible any more than the ideas in the Book of Virgil. The minister comes in after the knowledge imparted by the teacher to impart the religious teaching.

35. I am dealing with the position proposed by the Bible in Schools League. Their proposal is that the teachers shall give lessons out of the book the same as the teachers of New South Wales. The teacher shall be compelled to give lessons, but that the parents shall have the conscience clause in regard to those lessons. If the parent is to have a conscience clause for his child, should not the teacher have a conscience clause?—No, because the position is different. Nobody is compelled to be a teacher, but every parent is compelled to send his child to school.

36. They have entered the service, and they must put up with the consequences?—Yes.

37. All the teachers have entered the teaching profession without a conscience clause, and do you think it is fair now to impose this system on them without a conscience clause?—If the State is asking them to do anything which entails a real matter of conscience, but if to read a certain book is a matter of conscience——

38. I am asking you personally?—I personally think that if teachers have been admitted and they have any objections, that everything should be done to meet that objection as far as it possibly can be done.

39. If it is necessary you would personally go the length of giving the conscience clause?—I would personally, yes.

40. With regard to the issues, as some people want one issue and some want the other, do you think it would be fair to have the issues separated so that the people could vote separately, or do you hold that the issues must be put conjointly?—Of course I am not very definitely in touch with the working of the whole thing, but, if there are various questions, personally I think they should be framed in such a way that everybody could be given a perfect right to express just what their opinion is.

41. *Canon Garland.*] You were asked a question about the form of Presbyterian Church government. I presume that the procedure you understand is the practice in New Zealand of not consulting the congregations, but allowing the Church sessions to speak for them the same as elsewhere?—Yes, the Presbyterian Church government is governed by the elected office-bearers, who have authority.

42. Have you ever in coming in contact with Presbyterians or with your reading of Presbyterian history heard of the practice as a regular practice of consulting the congregations?—No.

43. So that if here in New Zealand on this question of the Bible in schools the Assembly had consulted the congregation it would have been doing something extraordinary?—Yes. Except in the call of the minister the congregations are not consulted.

44. I understand Dr. Gibb has written to you on that point?—Yes.

45. Would you read that letter to the Committee?—On the question of the New Zealand attitude to sessions, Dr. Gibb writes, "I should have liked very much to have an opportunity of appearing before the Education Committee to deal with certain statements reported to have been made by Mr. Caughley in his recent evidence. I refer especially to his disparagement of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church as not representing that communion. It is difficult to understand how an elder of that Church can be so ignorant of its essential constitution. The Assembly in the most emphatic sense *does* represent the Church. It is composed of a

membership one-half drawn from the clergy, the other half from the laity—or, since the elders are ordained men, I should say from the clergy and the ruling eldership. Each elder represents his own Kirk session, and every member of the session is elected to that office by the free vote of all the members of the congregation in full communion, both men and women. It is impossible to think of any elected body as representing its constituents more emphatically than the General Assembly represents the membership of the Presbyterian Church. The matter may be looked at from another point of view: the Assembly is by the will of the people and the constitution of the Church the body which gives law to the Church. It determines our doctrine and polity; it administers and disposes of all our funds; it is the final court of appeal (within the ecclesiastical sphere) in all cases of discipline, whether for heresy or evil character. It is impossible, I say, to overemphasize the representative character of this deliberative and judicial body. The representative character of the Assembly is further illustrated by the method it pursues to ascertain the mind of the Church in general before it comes to definite conclusions on questions of first-rate importance. All such questions are sent down to presbyteries Kirk sessions, and sometimes to committee of management, and their opinions are duly ascertained. But congregations are never appealed to. Presbyterianism is not Congregationalism. It is ruled by delegated authority. It is true that some writers hold that on a question involving possibly the integrity of the Church it would be well that congregations were consulted. I believe, for example, that the Canadian Presbyterian Church, contemplating union with the Methodist and Congregationalists of that Dominion, deemed it well to submit the issue to congregations as well as to Kirk sessions and presbyteries. I would not say it was *ultra vires* for an Assembly to take such a step, for in the exercise of what is termed its *nobile officium* a General Assembly regards itself as superior even to its own laws, except in purely judicial cases. But, as I say, our polity and practice know nothing of this. I have known Presbyterianism in New Zealand for nearly twenty-nine years, and never once in all that time has an issue been submitted to congregations. When negotiations for the union of the two Presbyterian Churches, which became *un fait accompli* in 1912, were proceeding the mind of presbyteries and sessions was on several occasions ascertained, but the congregations of the Church were never consulted. No man dreamed of consulting them. The Assembly is a representative body, and its determinations are law to the Church. May I add that nothing can possibly be clearer than that the General Assembly of our Church has committed itself in the most emphatic way to the League's platform. Both presbyteries and sessions were consulted, and the Assembly came to its finding after having ascertained the mind of the subordinate judiciaries in the only way known either to our theory or our practice.—I am, yours faithfully, JAMES GIBB."

46. *Professor Hunter.*] It would not be fair, then, to assume that because the Kirk sessions and assemblies had passed those votes that necessarily the majority of Presbyterians themselves were in favour of the proposal, would it?—It is not a question of assumption. If the Assembly passes a resolution upon the whole character and idea of our Church, that is the voice of the whole Church.

47. That is not my point. In the Assembly actually expressing the opinion they were not in any way reflecting necessarily the opinions of Presbyterians in New Zealand?—Of course, no deliberative body, not even Parliament, expresses the opinion of all they represent, and that is the only official way the opinion of the whole Church can be discovered. Every loyal Presbyterian, when the Assembly passes a resolution, as a rule submits to it unless it is a matter so serious that he claims the right of officially registering his dissent, and then he is allowed the opportunity of taking any steps he pleases. If you officially register your decision then you are free to take such a course as you like.

48. If you accept that form of delegated Church authority for deciding issues, are you prepared to accept the representative delegated form of decision in this issue by Parliament—I am asking you personally?—I think it would be better to submit it to a referendum.

49. But not in the case of the Presbyterian Church?—I would be perfectly willing to submit it to the individual members of the Presbyterian Church.

50. Do you think it ought to be?—If anybody asked me to submit it to my congregation I would be willing to do so.

51. Do you think the Church should act until it has been submitted?—Yes, it has a perfect right to.

52. *Mr. McCallum.*] Would you feel bound by what the congregation decided?—Not necessarily, for the reason that my congregation is not an official authoritative body recognized by the Presbyterian Church. I feel bound by what my session decides, and if my session was against me on a matter of importance I would resign from my position.

53. *Professor Hunter.*] You are aware that a plebiscite is not part of our Constitution?—I know practically nothing about the New Zealand Constitution.

54. *Canon Garland.*] From your contact with ministers and elders in your own Church, you are satisfied that Dr. Gibb represents the matter correctly in that letter?—Yes, there can be no question.

55. Mr. Caughley said that the congregations should have been consulted, but you say it is not customary to consult the congregations on such matters?—No, it is not.

56. Professor Hunter put to you a question about the matter going to every Presbyterian. Are you aware that if the referendum is refused then every one will be deprived of the opportunity of voting on it, but if the referendum is granted every Presbyterian and everybody else in the Dominion will have an opportunity of saying Yes or No?—That is the reason why I think a question like this should be settled by a referendum, and then if introduced it will be with the great body of the people behind it.

57. You have heard it stated here that a great many Presbyterians are opposed to the proposal. What has been your experience meeting Presbyterians here in New Zealand in regard

to this proposal?—As far as my personal experience is concerned up to the present, I have not met any one individual who is opposed to this matter. Many people have asked me for information, and in any case where the thing was in doubt and I explained the actual working of the system in New South Wales they were perfectly agreed that it was a good system. I know my own congregation is very keen on this matter, and also my Sunday-school teachers. In order to come up here I have given up a very important meeting which was to be held for me in Christchurch to-night, and the moment I spoke to those who were getting up the meeting about my coming here they were most anxious I should come and let their arrangements simply fall through.

58. And would you say that that attitude of theirs shows they are anxious to do all they can to help this movement?—Yes. Of course, it is only fair to say that my knowledge of the Presbyterian Church at present is limited, but so far as I can make out they seem to be very strongly in favour of the League's platform.

59. It was stated in evidence that one witness had never heard of the lesson-books being used in the schools: did you ever meet any minister in New South Wales who in any way indicated to you that the Scripture-lesson books were not being used in the State schools?—No, I was always under the impression they were still used as they were used when I was at school.

60. Would you tell the Committee as to the relationship set up with ministers other than yourself as a result of the working of the system in the schools?—In the two parishes I was minister of I worked, as the previous witness did, in direct conjunction with the Congregational and Methodist ministers. As a rule the Anglican ministers took their own classes separate, but not in every case. Some of my brother ministers have told me that they worked in rotation with the Anglican clergy as well. I have always found the system conducive to the greatest friendliness between the ministers. You are meeting your brother-ministers every week at the schools, and in most schools we arranged that we all came at the same time in order not to break into the school programme, and by that means you get to know your brother-ministers and work with them.

61. Talking of the grouping of classes, is it the case that under this Act working so smoothly grouping is permissible but not obligatory on the children or ministers?—It is permissible in this way: that the Act allows the minister or his substitute to give the teaching, and when I take the Methodist children I am the recognized substitute. The reason we do that is that we find we are able to grade the school and give better instruction than if we take a class with boys and girls in it of ages, say, from sixteen down to children of under ten.

62. It has been suggested before the Committee that the returns of the ministers' visits published by the Department are not quite reliable. One statement made was that it was possible for a minister to take four successive classes in one hour and get those lessons recorded as four visits. Did you ever hear anything of that?—No. As a matter of fact, I very seldom recorded my visits. I went to various schools week by week, and while, of course, technically the visitors' book should have been signed by me I very seldom signed it. I think the vast majority of the ministers do not sign the book every time they go. I will admit that they ought to.

63. You would say that the returns, so far from being overestimated, are probably underestimated?—I should say so, considerably.

64. I think you said in your statement that you knew Mr. Peter Board?—Yes.

65. I heard him described here as merely an official and not as an educationist. Would you say he was not an educationist?—He has a reputation in New South Wales as being an educationist of considerable ability, and when the new system was adopted he was considered as the best man available to put it into practice.

66. And not as an official who signs letters and administers the routine of the Department?—No.

67. You referred to high schools, and you said that the Minister of Education gave a direction that religious instruction, meaning ministers' visits, should be given in those schools?—Yes.

68. Would you say he gave that direction because he was clear in his mind that he would get into great trouble with the people for introducing into those schools a very objectionable thing?—No, I suppose he looked upon the system as so much a matter of course and as working so smoothly. The moment the matter was mentioned to him he sent round a note to the various schools to the effect that the ministers were to go there as they were in the habit of going to other schools.

69. Do you think Mr. Carmichael would go out looking for trouble?—In New South Wales I have never heard of this matter of biblical instruction and ministers being connected with polities or elections at all.

70. And therefore the fact that the Government of the day, through its Minister, who was responsible to Parliament, by a stroke of the pen extended this system to a new branch of the schools is proof that the Government of the country knew the people would approve its action?—Yes.

71. The question was asked as to Sunday schools, and that parents considered they need not send their children to Sunday school because they got sufficient Bible lessons during the week. What is your experience after your visits to the schools—that the interest in Sunday-school work is increasing or decreasing?—It has increased, because the minister is able to get into touch with all the children living in the district.

REV. WILLIAM ALFRED KEAY examined. (No. 10.)

1. *The Chairman.*] What are you?—A Congregational minister, residing in Auckland.

2. Do you represent any one?—No, I appear individually.

3. Will you make your statement to the Committee?—Yes. I have had experience of the Bible-in-State-schools system as a boy in the schools of New South Wales, and afterwards as a

minister of a Congregational Church. My experience, therefore, leads me to a whole-hearted support of the scheme that is now before the people of the Dominion. The attitude of my own denomination in New South Wales is one of unanimous approval of the Bible lessons given by the teachers and the right of entry on the part of the clergy. The last meetings of the Congregational Union held in Sydney amply demonstrate the attitude of the whole Churches. At the above-mentioned Union meetings a report was presented by a prominent lay member (an ex-teacher) suggesting certain directions in which the Bible-in-schools scheme could be worked with better results to the denomination as a whole and the Church individually. The consequence was that the report was adopted by the whole council, and steps were taken to add to the number of ministers, and sanction teachers whose duty it would be to see that this important opportunity was fully carried out as far as the children of the Congregational Church were concerned. I have had recent communications from ministers who, moving from a State where the system did not obtain to New South Wales, entered upon their new charge with very serious misgivings and prejudices, and so very naturally were looking for the alleged abuses, but felt themselves bound to admit upon practical experience that the system worked well to all denominations. I am aware how easy it is to make assertions either for or against this system of Bible lessons, &c., but it is quite another thing to produce sound, reliable evidence; and what I have said concerning the whole-hearted appreciation of the Congregational Union of New South Wales to the Bible-in-schools scheme can be borne out by appeals to the official year-book of last year. That year-book contains the names and addresses of the ministers and home-mission agents who have to do with the carrying-out of the right-of-entry clause. They can be written to if proof is required of my statement *re* the happy and useful working of the Bible-in-schools scheme. Congregationalism has always set its face against anything in the shape of State aid to religion or interference with the right of conscience. If the Bible-in-schools principle was not showing all-round fairness to all denominations the Congregational Church would be the first to oppose it, but because of its manifest fairness to every phase of belief the Congregational Churches of New South Wales heartily approve of the principles embodied in the Bible-in-State-schools scheme. A great deal has been said and written about the opportunity this Bible-in-schools scheme will give to proselytism. In all my experience in the above-mentioned State of the working of the system I have never on any occasion heard of this being attempted. Ministers of all the free Churches by common consent have arranged that all the children of the said Churches shall be instructed by a representative of the ministerial association, so that each week that class of children representative of all the free Churches would have a different minister to instruct it; but denominationalism was never taught in those schools. I never knew of a minister or teacher attempting to proselytize. Far from this arrangement being pernicious and open to abuse, it is bringing the free Churches of New South Wales together and helping to create a better understanding in a way no other plan has been able to do. As a New South Walesman I affirm there is a better understanding between the various denominations in New South Wales—Anglican included—than obtains in any of the other States, and I am firmly of opinion that the Bible-in-schools system is responsible for this breaking-down of denominational prejudice. Much has been made of the alleged injustice this scheme will put upon the Roman Catholic teacher. I have never met a teacher who refused to give the lesson or one whose conscience was hurt by the supervising of the reading-lesson. The only complaint I ever met with from a teacher was when the minister was remiss in attending to his duty in carrying out the right-of-entry clause. There may be isolated instances where the provisions of the Bible-in-schools scheme have been abused, but I have never met them. I am confident that the introduction of the scheme into this country, far from being an evil, will work unqualified good, and will prove to be the solution of the present religious difficulty.

TUESDAY, 20TH OCTOBER, 1914.

REV. WILLIAM ALFRED KEAY further examined. (No. 11.)

1. *Mr. Bates.*] Were you one of the two who recently in the Congregational Union voted against the forty majority who rejected the Bible in Schools League's proposal for a Protestant combine?—No.

2. You, however, represent a minority in your Church Union, while is it not a fact that your Bible in Schools League demands majority rule?—I am a minority in the Congregational Union in New Zealand: is that what you mean?

3. I am speaking of the New Zealand Congregational Union—you are in the minority?—Yes.

4. Do you not then feel guilty of disloyalty to your Church in exercising freedom of speech here upon this question?—Certainly not.

5. Were you a member of the Congregational Union at the time that the vote was taken?—Not of New Zealand.

6. Do you know that it is the general policy of your Church at Home to favour purely secular instruction in the public schools of England?—I do not know that that has anything to do with the question in New Zealand. I know this: that the attitude of the prominent Congregational ministers in England has materially changed, and that such men as Sir Robertson Nicoll is now a member of the committee that is in existence to bring to pass in England a condition of religious instruction similar to the one that is in existence in New South Wales, but I have no English experience—I am talking of colonial experience.

7. You think you have had sufficient experience then in New Zealand to think that it is expedient and desirable that the New South Wales system should be introduced into New Zealand?—I do.

8. For how long have you had experience in New Zealand?—Between three and four years.

9. And that experience has been where?—Wellington and Auckland.

10. Would you call the Rev. Dr. Dale a secularist because he said, "My present judgment is that we should work for the extreme position—universal School Boards, free education, and pure secularism, with whatever arrangements are necessary for making a transition to that state"?—I should conclude that Dr. Dale, if alive to-day, would have altered his opinion, as Sir Robertson Nicoll has altered his opinion.

11. The difference between the two countries, England and New South Wales, is that the Congregational Church is as much established in New South Wales as the Church of England, while in England it is not so?—Yes, precisely so.

12. You think, then, these circumstances alter cases?—The attitude of the Congregational Church at Home, as far as I can ascertain, is one of sympathy and not hostile to the Bible-in-schools question—that is, if I may take the prominent men and persons on the committee in existence to-day as a criterion; so that I think, although those wise men may at some time or other have been hostile to the education system, they have changed their minds.

13. Are you not, however, an active supporter of the political propaganda of Canon Garland to force the Bible-in-schools scheme through Parliament?—I am.

14. In your main evidence you assert that your Church has always set its face against anything in the shape of State aid to religion, or interference with the right of conscience. Now, do you think that calling upon the taxpayers to provide Scriptural books and teachers to use them, State aid, and coercing the latter against their declared conscientious objections, is violating those principles?—I do not, seeing there is a conscience clause which safeguards the objectors.

15. For the teachers?—There is no need for a conscience clause to safeguard the teachers seeing that the teacher is a servant of the State, and that the schools exist not for the teacher but for the children.

16. Then a State servant can be called upon to act in a manner without violating his conscience?—Well, unless he is constitutionally differentiated from the teachers of other States he will have no difficulty with the matter. I am judging that if the teachers of the States in the Commonwealth find no conscience difficulty, I am at a loss to see how the teachers of New Zealand are going to make one.

17. Do you think the Roman Catholic teachers would be quite open and tell you that they had conscience objections—do you not think they would rather tell their Bishop or their priest, like Dr. Gallagher and others?—I think if they had any serious difficulty they would tell me as readily as anybody else. They would refuse to carry out what they considered to be a serious religious incubus.

18. Would you be surprised to know that in New South Wales they have told me they have?—Well, of course I am not supposing for a moment that that would be impossible. It may be in isolated cases, but I affirm it is not general.

19. You think that you can speak as well for the Roman Catholic teachers in New South Wales as Dr. Gallagher?—No, not quite as well.

20. If you think you have produced sound reliable evidence for the League scheme, will you please point it out in your evidence so that I may be able to find it and examine you upon it?—Producing sound reliable evidence is, I presume, the testimony of witnesses who are competent to speak upon the question. I have in my hand some thirty-six post-cards (see Appendix) from various Congregational ministers in New South Wales and the Commonwealth who have replied to the question. These are not post-cards addressed to me, but were addressed to the Rev. Loyal L. Wirt, B.D., during the Queensland campaign. He had written to the various Congregational ministers asking for their opinion on the matter. One says, "Dear Mr. Wirt,—In reply to your query, I gave religious instruction in the Wollongong Superior Public School for about fourteen years. The New South Wales system is, I think, the best solution of the difficulty. Would heartily recommend to Queensland. It is entirely satisfactory to the Protestant denominations as far as I know. I gave religious instruction in Melbourne for about ten years. The Victorian system is not at all satisfactory. There they long for the New South Wales system, as they did when I lived in Melbourne. If I lived in Queensland I would without any hesitation vote for New South Wales system in providing religious instruction in State schools.—Your faithfully, E. T. MILES." Mr. G. Martin says, "From my experience of the working of the New South Wales Education Act I have no hesitation in saying that I have the fullest confidence in it, as it gives me all I desire in the direction of imparting religious instruction, and would vote for it if resident in Queensland." Mr. Geo. Littlemore says, "I would vote for providing religious instruction in State schools." Mr. W. A. Marsh says, "Personally I think the New South Wales system the best possible. Any minister can have all his children one hour per week during school hours for religious instruction, usually in a separate room, with blackboard if he wishes it. With our system no Church has a right to ask for Government help for denominational schools—a very important consideration. I would vote for our system every time." Mr. W. Cunliffe Jones says, "Were I a citizen of Queensland I should vote for the New South Wales system of religious instruction in State schools. It is a good working compromise: causes little friction, and is fair to all." And Mr. J. B. Cowling writes, "Yes, certainly it is the best I know in the world." I have thirty-six such post-cards, but I do not wish to take up the time of the Committee by reading any more.

21. You have given other people's evidence, and I want your own?—The sound, reliable evidence you are asking for would be found in the decision of Mr. Denham, Premier of Queensland. My evidence is the testimony of a prominent man in Queensland, and on the deck of the "Niagara" a few months ago I waited upon Mr. Denham, and in conversation with him I mentioned this matter of the Bible in schools, knowing that at the time it was introduced into Queensland he was a member of the Administration that gave the Bible-in-schools referendum and

that he was hostile to the introduction of the Bible into the schools of Queensland. He voted for the referendum, and he said to me that he had grave doubts and serious misgivings as to its workability, but he said that after two years' experience were he called upon to face the same position, instead of voting against the introduction of the Bible in schools into the country he would vote for it. That evidence I quote because it comes from a man who is quite outside the clerical combine that is spoken about, and Mr. Denham has changed his mind because he found his fears were groundless.

22. Will you point out in your statement where I can find your experience so that I may be able to examine you upon it? You have given us some opinions of others, but I want the evidence of your own experience?—If you are asking for my own experience of the working of the system——

23. I want to find what evidence you give to commend this system to the public of New Zealand and this Parliament?—Well, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was a minister of the Congregational Church in Broken Hill, and I had to do with the system there in connection with the Ministerial Association. I was one of a number of ministers who had to exercise the right of entry, and every Tuesday morning it was our duty to report ourselves to the school and the classes were arranged for us. From my experience of the working of the system there was no friction, and the thing worked satisfactorily. There was no dissension, and from that I concluded it would be quite safe to introduce the same system into New Zealand.

24. How long were you a minister in Broken Hill?—Between two and three years.

25. How often did you go to the schools personally?—Every week.

26. There was no substitution of ministers?—Yes, by a concerted arrangement with the Ministerial Association of Broken Hill.

27. Did you take the children of your own denomination.—No.

28. All the children of the different denominations were grouped, then, according to the free Churches, were they not?—Yes.

29. Did you take the Anglican?—No.

30. There was no combination between the ministers of the Anglican Church and the other Churches?—Well, for a very good reason, that the children of the Anglican Church or communion were in large numbers, and the Anglican vicar found he had all he could do to handle his own children, and all the free Churches by consent arranged the matter through the association.

31. Although you were not two distinct denominations you acted as if you were?—Between the free Church and the Anglican Church, do you mean?

32. Yes?—Yes, of course.

33. Would you call yours denominational teaching?—Certainly not.

34. You would call it what?—Religious instruction.

35. Would you call it undenominational teaching?—Yes.

36. Do you think you have shown us that the free Churches have combined to bring about what we know in New Zealand as the Nelson system of undenominational teaching?—No, I do not, because the Nelson system is something that must be worked outside the school hours. It imposes a number of injustices upon the children and upon the teacher.

37. Are you not aware that by arrangement the children come at the usual time for the morning instruction under the Nelson system?—I am aware of that, but it is a purely voluntary business.

38. Is it not voluntary that the children attend undenominational lessons on the other side?—No, it is compulsory.

39. Does not the Act say that each minister of one religious persuasion must take tho children of his own denomination?—Yes, decidedly.

40. How is it you got an undenominational combination of another religion?—Not necessarily another religion.

41. How did you get that?—I think, Mr. Chairman, that the questioner is confusing the matter somewhat, because he is talking about another religion. In Broken Hill we had Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists, and others associated with the free Churches. They, with minor differences, represented one religion. It was one religion, but the combine was to facilitate the carrying-out of this arrangement and safeguard the position. While I recognize that the Act safeguards the position so that any man desiring it shall have the right to his child being instructed in any peculiar denominational teaching, nevertheless in New South Wales that was never availed of, because the free Churches found they had a common basis to work on and there was no need to separate the children into various sections.

42. Yet while the Government recognizes those different denominations, you put them on one side as a combination of ministers. Did you approach the parents of those children on this matter?—There was no occasion to approach the parents on the matter.

43. You just took the children as they came along to you?—By a common understanding with the teachers and the parents at the back of it.

44. And without the written consent of the parents?—The written consent was not required.

45. Yesterday the Rev. Mr. Cook showed us that your denomination had declined, and you state that a report at the last Sydney Union showed certain directions in which the Bible-in-schools scheme could be worked with better results to the denomination. One of your aims, then, is denominational with regard to the New South Wales scheme?—I presume it is.

46. In your evidence you mentioned denominational prejudices. Are you not aware that denominational prejudices and rivalries are somewhat rampant, particularly in the back country towns and villages?—I am not aware it is so, and I do not believe it is rampant.

47. You agree that it exists?—It may exist, but it is not rampant.

48. In some of the back countries, I say: you believe it may be rampant in some?—No, I do not believe it is rampant in any.

49. You agree that it exists?—Doubtless it does exist.

50. Did you use the Irish text-book when giving religious instruction?—It was in the school to be used. When we went there we took the Bible and gave the lesson from it. The book was not used in the class.

51. You preferred not to use it?—There was no preference in the matter. You did not need to—you went on with your own service.

52. You preferred that to the Irish text-book?—No, not as a matter of preference.

53. Why did you not use it, then?—For convenience.

54. Are you certain that the teachers gave lessons out of the Irish text-books?—Quite.

55. Did you see them?—Yes.

56. In Broken Hill?—Yes.

57. And did you have any ministerial charge in New South Wales?—No.

58. And you never gave religious instruction in any other public school in that State?—No.

59. You mentioned your boyhood experience. Were you ever weekly instructed by a minister in those days?—My boyhood, of course, belonged to the denominational period of religious instruction in New South Wales, and my schooling was divided between the Roman Convent and the public schools, so that the religious instruction was an integral part of that.

60. Were you using the Irish text-book then?—The public-school phase of my life is somewhat hazy and uncertain. It belonged to the early period, and I am not certain of it. That was in the days of denominationalism—before the 1880 Act.

61. Do you not think that if there had been sufficient interest in the Scripture lessons that this much-abused Irish text-book would not have been superseded by the modern and superior Scripture text-books?—I do not know. That is asking me for my opinion. Doubtless the Irish text-book could be improved upon and doubtless will be; but it has satisfied the requirements of New South Wales for those years and no desire has been expressed to make a change.

62. I asked you whether you thought there was any interest in the matter?—I think there is a very decided interest in the matter.

63. But there has not been in the past fifty years to bring about a change. Do you not think that if there had been sufficient interest in the Scripture lessons that this much-abused Irish text-book would not have been superseded by the modern and superior Scripture text-books?—Are they abused by the people of New South Wales or the people of New Zealand?

64. I know they are abused in New South Wales?—Where do they get abused? I have not heard of them being abused in New South Wales.

65. Do you think there is any amount of indifference on the subject?—Yes, of course, a certain amount, but I do not think there is any great amount. I think the people of New South Wales are content with the Irish lesson-book as a whole.

66. Are you not aware that while all other school-books have been brought up to date, and your own Church has been torn with a controversy over the so-called "new theology" under its chief apostle, the Rev. R. J. Campbell, no improvement has been made or manifestly desired in these Irish text-books?—I do not know how the new theology is affecting the Commonwealth. I think that what the Rev. R. J. Campbell said some time ago he is trying to unsay to-day.

67. You are a Church follower of the new theology?—No, certainly not.

68. You believe in the Bible as the inspired Word of God?—I believe it contains the Word of God.

69. Do you believe, then, that children should be taught what is and what is not the Word of God?—Well, when I say that I mean I do not believe in the verbally inspired Bible—I mean that the best of that Book is inspired, and that it is a very easy matter to get at the inspiration.

70. Now, do you think we shall get the inspired Word in the text-book?—Yes, portions of it.

71. *Professor Hunter.*] Are you appearing here only in your personal capacity and not as representing the Congregational Church?—I am representing a Congregational Church, but not the Congregational Union.

72. You are appearing here to represent the Congregational Church of which you are pastor?—Precisely.

73. Have they voted on this matter?—Yes, without any dissent whatever.

74. Then you are aware that the Congregational Union has decided against this proposal by forty votes to two?—I am aware of that, but not against the whole proposal. They have decided against one.

75. Are you aware that the Hon. Mr. Fowlds, ex Minister of Education, said he had studied the system of New South Wales, and there was more religious intolerance and bitterness on that side than in any place he had visited?—I am not aware he said it, but his saying it does not make it true.

76. You disagree with that view?—Yes.

77. You are aware also that Inspector Hill, of Hawke's Bay, has examined the system and declared against it?—I am not aware of that.

78. You referred to Sir Robertson Nicoll: are you aware that Bishop Frodsham, of Queensland, who has gone Home, in the London *Times* has advocated the Queensland system, and that Sir Robertson Nicoll has declared against it?—I am not aware of it.

79. You are not aware it is already in evidence before this Committee?—No, but I am aware that Sir Robertson Nicoll's name has been identified with fifty-six other names in connection with the movement that is on foot in England to-day to bring about the system of New South Wales in the schools of England, or something akin to that system.

80. There is a recent cable from Home which says that he is opposed to the Queensland system?—I have his name associated with that committee in favour of religious instruction in the schools.

81. I am not saying "religious instruction in schools." The issue is the Bible in Schools League's system of religious instruction in schools?—That is the same thing.

82. No, it is not. The question I asked you is whether you are aware that Sir Robertson Nicoll quite recently declared against the Queensland system as propounded by Bishop Frodsham in England?—No, I am not.

83. You said that the State teacher, being a Civil servant, there was no necessity to give him a conscience clause?—No.

84. That is to say, no State servant, in your opinion, should have the conscience clause?—Yes.

85. Then, I take it that in your opinion no State servant has a conscience?—Not necessarily, because if you start giving Civil servants a conscience clause you will require a conscience clause for a person who sells stamps.

86. Who should decide whether a person has a conscience or not?—The individaul.

87. So that if an individual be a State servant and says he has a conscience, you would consider it fair to say he had no conscience?—I do not see what you are getting at. The point is this: if he is a public servant and he finds he cannot conscientiously carry out the duties of a public servant he must cease to be a public servant.

88. But supposing teachers entered the service of the State without any conscience clause, and you propose now to make the religious test, do you think it is fair to impose that upon the teachers already in the service?—If I introduced it, of course, it would be a wrong thing, but if the people desired the change he must bow to the will of the people.

89. Then what the people decide, in other words, is right?—Well, if the people decide he must submit.

90. It is not whether he has got to submit, but is it right?—It does not follow in all cases—he must bow to the will of the people.

91. I do not want to talk about that—I am talking about the question of right. I want to know whether you think the Congregational ministers, who Green said came back at the time of the Revolution, were right in refusing to conform to the English Church?—That has nothing to do with the introduction of the Bible in schools.

92. It is a question to do with the right of conscience which you say should not be admitted to State servants. You are prepared to say that if a man is a servant of the State his question of conscience ought not to be permitted to him?—He must obey if he is a servant of the State.

93. You would say that if the State decided to establish the Roman Catholic religion in this community everybody ought to bow to that and become Roman Catholics?—If they are public servants they should carry out the will of the majority.

94. But if the majority decided that every citizen in the State was to attend the Roman Catholic service, you say that he ought to do so?—Or put up with the consequences.

95. Now, to come to the other point: you said that you yourself were trained under the denominational system in New South Wales. Can you tell us the date the denominational system was abolished?—In 1880.

96. You are not aware it was abolished in 1866?—It might have been, but I forget for the moment.

97. Then I come to the question of the arrangement by which ministers held classes conjointly in connection with your experience in New South Wales of the Anglican Church or any other Church which taught the faith of the fathers to their children?—Not the Roman Church. I was not in a class to hear what was taught.

98. But you were in a conjoined class, and as far as your experience goes no other denomination than the Anglican or Roman Church taught the faith of their fathers to their children in the schools?—Well, if the "faith of their fathers" means Church government and denominationalism, that is so.

99. Is it not a fact that here you refuse to divide the issues on the ground that you wish to teach the faith of their fathers to the children?—I wish the issue to remain as it is, undivided, in order to safeguard the teacher, and to give each denomination a fair opportunity of giving their children the instruction they desire.

100. But if the teacher says he would prefer that it should be otherwise, do you think he should be allowed to have it otherwise: do you think the teacher ought to be considered and his views adopted?—I am not aware the teacher says that.

101. If he does say he does not want to be safeguarded in that way, would you be prepared to divide the issue then?—No, I would not. I do not want the issue divided.

102. Do you remember in a letter written to the Press in May last over your name in which you said that "a general impression prevailed throughout this country that the Congregational Church was uncompromisingly opposed to the planks of the Bible in Schools League, whereas the opposition was to but one plank of its platform—namely, the right of entry"? Did you make that statement?—I did.

103. Do you agree with that view?—I do.

104. Then, do you think it right to disfranchise all Congregationalists who wish to vote for one and not for the other?—Yes, I think it is right, because so many Congregational ministers and Churches where the system is in existence are satisfied, and it will only require the system to be introduced for the Congregational ministers in this country to alter their attitude.

105. You believe that those forty people are misguided people?—I do.

106. And that they ought to be forced to adopt this system in order to educate them?—Yes, you can have it that way.

107. You were asked by Mr. Bates whether the scholars were compelled to do denominational lessons: compelled by whom?—Because it was part of the school arrangement.

108. Compelled by the State, you mean?—Yes.

109. You are not aware, then, that no scholar under the New South Wales law is allowed to attend the class of another minister without the written consent of his parent?—Yes, that is so—that is the conscience clause.

110. You know that is a fact?—Yes.

111. Then how can you say that those children were compelled to go to your class by the State—children, for example, of Baptists or Methodists?—The parents consented, though there was no written consent. They acquiesced in the written arrangement.

112. That is to say, the children went to you and you taught them and did not think anything about the conscience objections of their parents at all?—Because they were not in existence.

113. But under the Act they had no right to come without the written consent. You were probably unwittingly breaking the Act?—If you reduce it to that it may be so, but if there had been any objection on the part of the parent that objection would have been heard and very soon manifested, but there was no objection. The parents as a whole consented to the general arrangement, because in the free Church I had to do with denominationalism never obtained—it was religious instruction and not sectarianism.

114. It was not what you are fighting for here at all?—Yes, it was. I am not fighting for sectarianism here.

115. You do not believe in sectarianism?—No.

116. Do you think it is fair to decide this religious issue by a majority?—Yes.

117. Do you think it is fair to compel the teachers to give religious lessons without a conscience clause?—I think we have had that before. I have simply said that if the teacher is a servant of the State and the schools exists for the children and not for the teacher, then the teacher must submit to the will of the State.

118. You quoted some statistics in regard to crime in New Zealand?—Yes.

119. Will you say who compiled those statistics?—The statistics I quoted appeared in the *New Zealand Herald* in June of last year, and they point in this direction: that when the population of New South Wales was less than 99,000 the convictions for the year were nearly 23,000. At the end of the year there were nearly 2,550 people in the gaols of New South Wales, but when the population of New South Wales had increased to 1,900,000 the convictions had fallen from 22,000 to 11,000 odd, and at the end of the year there were some 1,300 people in the gaols and asylums. That was the statement that appeared in the *New Zealand Herald*, and I quoted as a public document, and will continue to do so until it is recalled by the *Herald*. In connection with crime in New Zealand I made a statement that instead of juvenile crime increasing it was decreasing, and I proved it by figures from the Courts of the country. In Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin in 1910 there were 489 offences committed; in 1911, 541 offences; and in 1912, 672 offences; so that I made the statement that in New South Wales crime was decreasing, while in New Zealand, unfortunately, it was increasing.

120. Are you aware at that time you quoted those statistics that among those youthful criminals you were including some poor children who had been taken into receiving-homes because their parents had neglected them: you were including people who were found riding bicycles on the streets without lights, throwing stones, and playing football in unauthorized places?—I knew that at the back of this juvenile-crime list there was an immense strata of moral badness.

121. Were you aware that in those figures you were including those different classes of children I have mentioned as criminals?—No, I was not aware of it.

122. *Canon Garland.*] In putting in those opinions from Congregational ministers I take it your object was to show that, though you are in the minority in New Zealand among Congregationalists in this matter, yet you are with the majority of Congregationalists in Australia?—That is so.

123. In your association with Congregational ministers anywhere in Australia have you come across any who have taken an opposite view to this work?—None.

124. The attitude of Sir Robertson Nicoll was mentioned as opposed to the system which we propose here. Are you aware that what he telegraphed was not his own opinion, but that he doubted whether the Nonconformists of England would accept a very different thing?—I am not aware of that.

125. You mentioned a conversation with Mr. Denham, Premier of Queensland. He is a personal friend of yours?—Yes.

126. And he would speak to you confidentially and freely?—Yes.

127. Do you happen to know what Church he belongs to?—To the Baptist Church.

128. With regard to the idea of grouping classes, that is done in order that more children may be reached instead of more ministers going to the schools and taking little classes?—Yes.

129. And in regard to the compulsion of the State, which you referred to, did you mean that the State was compelling the children against their will or the parents?—Certainly not.

130. But that the State was working in connection with the parents' wishes?—Yes.

131. And there was no necessity of putting anything in writing?—That is so.

132. But objections would be raised quickly if children came to you whose parents did not want them to?—Yes, that is so.

133. Can you tell us anything about whether this promised better or worse relations with the other Churches—for instance, the Church of England have so many children to look after?—The vicar of Broken Hill was a personal friend of mine, and the arrangement never provoked any feeling of hostility, but just the opposite, and the vicar separated himself from the other denominations for the reason I have stated before—that his own class was a very big class and more than he himself could handle.

Rev. GEORGE SAMUEL COOK further examined. (No. 12.)

1. *Professor Hunter.*] Could you tell the Committee who collected the letters in the pamphlet of the Methodist Church of Australasia?—Those letters were collected by a committee of the conference of 1911, consisting of our leading ministers and laymen.

2. Do you know to how many people they addressed their inquiry?—I do not know how many people the inquiry was addressed to.

3. Give a rough idea?—I could not. I heard the report of the Conference and the correspondence summarized, but my memory in regard to the number is not sufficient.

4. Would the inquiries be sent to fifty people?—I should imagine so, but I do not know really.

5. All the replies received you say have been printed?—All the replies received were printed, so I am informed.

6. Including, as far as I can see, the opinion expressed by Mr. Board, which does not embody the opinion of Mr. Turner, there are only about twelve opinions?—That would be quite sufficient to satisfy the Methodist Church, because those men whose opinions are quoted are representative men, such as ex-presidents of the Conference and men who are known all over Australasia in connection with Methodism, and their opinion completely satisfied the Conference.

7. If, say, something like fifty inquiries were sent out there must have been a lot of people who did not reply?—But I did not admit there were fifty. If those answers received were sufficient to satisfy the Church it is quite possible those were the only ones to whom letters were sent, and they were sufficient to satisfy the Conference.

8. In your evidence you said the Roman Catholics of New South Wales were not hostile to the system?—No, I made no statement of that kind.

9. You are aware that in this correspondence there is ample evidence that the Roman Catholic Church is very hostile to the system?—Yes. I said in my statement that there was opposition, and serious opposition, which came from the Roman Catholic Church, but that opposition does not extend to the individual members of the Church. As I pointed out, many of them take advantage of the opportunities to send their children to the lessons, where they have confidence in the teacher.

10. You know that in the letter given by Mr. England Mr. Turner's opinions are quoted?—Yes.

11. Do you know whether Mr. Knibbs was consulted?—I do not know anything regarding the correspondence except that stated in it.

12. Do you not think it peculiar that a man of Mr. Knibbs's standing should not have had his opinion quoted?—You seem to be losing sight of the object of the correspondence. The object was to discover, not the opinion specially of educationists, although the Education Department was communicated with, but the object was to secure the opinions of Methodists, because it was intended to be a means of information for the Methodist Church. We went to our own people working under similar conditions for guidance for the Methodist Church in New Zealand, so that the opinion of educationists was not specially required. We wanted the opinions of Methodist ministers who were thoroughly acquainted with the work from their long experience, and what we asked for we received.

13. Do you know that nearly half the opinions are not the opinions of Methodists?—Yes. As I said, they approached Presbyterians, and Canon Garland was approached as organizer of the Queensland Bible in Schools League.

14. As they approached Mr. Turner and Mr. Board, why did they not approach Mr. Knibbs, who stands in the front rank, for an opinion on the New South Wales system?—If you will refer to the correspondence you will find that the approach to Mr. Turner was made on the part of Mr. England, a New South Wales solicitor, and he made that approach because Mr. Turner had been headmaster of the Fort Street School and known to him, and Mr. Turner's name and position as an educationist in touch with the system would be of very much more value probably than the opinion of Mr. Knibbs.

15. It would not be because Mr. Knibbs had expressed a very hostile opinion of the New South Wales system?—No, because it would not have the slightest effect so far as the information sought for from Methodist sources especially was concerned.

16. But Mr. Turner's opinion is here?—It is stated here incidentally.

17. You are aware that Mr. Turner says he is a member of the Education Department, and he says, "No attempt to proselytize is known." Are you aware that there was a regulation issued, known as the "Wilkins circular," incorporated in the Act, which had the intention of preventing proselytism, and which confines the minister's administrations to children of his own denomination without the written consent of the parent?—I am not personally acquainted with the Act.

18. If you look at page 9 of the pamphlet you will see that Mr. Board himself says, "It sometimes happens that, by arrangement between clergymen concerned, one of them teaches the pupils of several denominations." Then on page 10 Mr. Rutledge says that it suits the ministers, who take the senior and junior children separately, to take combined classes. Then on page 15 Mr. Prescott says, "Here I might mention that sometimes arrangements are made by the ministers themselves that, if a Presbyterian minister will take his own and the Methodist children one week, the Methodist minister will take all next week; but such instances, I think, are rare." Those are all instances of the possibilities of proselytism—you admit that?—No, I do not admit it, because if there were possibilities of proselytism those arrangements would not be made.

19. That is contrary to the Act?—Mr. Paterson has made it clear that it is not contrary to the Act, because the Act allows for providing a substitute. Take the actual example of a school seventeen miles from any minister, visited by three ministers who went out to take the Sunday

morning services in succession: none of the ministers went out except on Sunday mornings, and they had no opportunity of visiting the school and giving lessons. The Salvation Army officer visited the place during the week, and he had an opportunity of visiting the school, and so an arrangement was made by which he was made the substitute for the other three ministers. It was a perfectly satisfactory arrangement; there was no proselytism, and nobody became members of the Salvation Army as a result. The parents were satisfied, and the ministers themselves were satisfied, or else the arrangement would not have been made.

20. You are not aware that in the New South Wales Act it is provided that the religious instruction to be so given shall in every case be the religious instruction authorized by the Church to which the clergyman or other religious teacher may belong?—And in each case such teaching was authorized.

21. Does not the Act provide that the substitute shall be of the same religious persuasion as the minister?—I do not know whether it does or not.

22. In Mr. Board's letter we find these words, "The usual practice is to hold the classes for special religious instruction in a class-room, but in the case of one-roomed schools, of which there are 1,572 in this State, other arrangements, such as holding the class at one end of the schoolroom, have to be made." Do you think that is satisfactory from the point of view of keeping children separate from the possibility of proselytism?—I have never heard in all my experience of any teacher saying that it was unsatisfactory. It is a common method in one-roomed schools that different classes are held in the same schoolroom. It is quite possible for different classes to be carried on at the same time without the children being proselytized by the teaching going on in another class, which is conducted in such a quiet fashion that they are not affected by it. So far as my knowledge extends, the one-roomed schools have usually a porch similar to the New Zealand schools. Then an arrangement can be made by which, if the class is small it may be taken in the porch, and if a large one it can be taken in the schoolroom while the other children remain in the porch.

23. I am referring to Mr. Board's statement, in which he says the classes are taken at the end of the schoolroom?—I only know personally of two or three, and there was no difficulty.

24. *Canon Garland.*] Mr. Carruthers has been secretary of the General Conference, and Mr. England was solicitor to the Methodist Church?—Yes.

25. Professor Hunter seemed to question the names of those Methodist ministers as not being sufficiently representative——

Professor Hunter: No; I wished to point out that some of them were not Methodist ministers.

Witness: They are representative Australasian Methodists, the exceptions being Mr. Board; A. Harper, Principal St. Andrew's College; Canon Garland, organizing secretary for Queensland; and Mr. Turner, whose letter is incorporated with Mr. England's letter. Otherwise they are all Methodists.

26. *Canon Garland.*] Professor Hunter asked you why Mr. England did not consult Mr. Knibbs. Are you aware that at the time Mr. England consulted Mr. Turner Mr. Knibbs was a thousand miles away?—I had not thought of it at the time, but I remember now it was the case.

WEDNESDAY, 21ST OCTOBER, 1914.

(No. 13.)

Rev. Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND, Organizing Secretary of the Bible in State Schools League (No. 13), made the following statement:—

The system for which the League is asking has been at work as follows:—New South Wales: Since 1866 by Act of Parliament in New South Wales. This was while there were national schools side by side with State-aided denominational schools. In 1880 the whole educational system was recast. State aid to denominational schools was abolished; but whatever other alterations were made none was made as regards the system of religious instruction, which was again embodied in the amending and consolidating Act. In Tasmania the system has been at work since 1868, regulations embodying the system being gazetted on the 9th February, 1869. In 1885 Tasmania amended and consolidated its Education Act, and therein embodied by Act of Parliament the religious-instruction system, formerly operating only by regulation. Western Australia in 1893, by direct Act of Parliament, embodied the same system of religious instruction. Norfolk Island in 1905 ceased to be a dependency governed from England, and was transferred to the Government of New South Wales. The New South Wales Government, in August, 1906, by Ordinance of the Governor in Council, made operative in Norfolk Island the religious-instruction clauses from the New South Wales Act. This was one of the first Acts, if not the first Act, of government exercised by New South Wales over Norfolk Island, in which island there had formerly been only denominational schools. Queensland in 1910, after taking a referendum to ascertain the will of the people, passed an Act of Parliament embodying the system.

It is claimed that the fact of the system existing for nearly half a century in the States of New South Wales and Tasmania, and twenty years in Western Australia, is in itself irrefutable proof that it has given satisfaction to the vast majority of the people. It is incredible, if dissatisfaction existed seriously, except amongst a small section, that opportunity would not be made to alter or amend the system. On the contrary, New South Wales, when it cast its education system into the melting-pot in 1880 and abandoned denominational schools, throwing the whole weight of the State into natioinal schools, embodied without minimizing the original system of religious instruction. Further, when New South Wales had an opportunity of extending the system to a new dependency it did so promptly, as was the case of Norfolk Island. It is

difficult to believe that a Government would introduce to a new dependency a system unless it had learned by experience that such an action would give satisfaction.

In the year 1902 New South Wales set up a Royal Commission to inquire into existing methods of instruction and to recommend for adoption whatever improvements they might consider could with advantage be introduced into New South Wales. Following upon that Commission, the Minister of Public Instruction called a conference in 1904 of Inspectors, teachers, departmental officers, and prominent educationists, when the whole system of education was considered. Much revision of the whole education system followed thereupon, but no modification whatever was made in the system of religious instruction.

Another example of the attitude of New South Wales in increasing and not hindering the facilities for religious instruction was afforded last year, when a deputation waited upon the Minister for Public Instruction, complaining that as certain public schools had become high schools there was no provision in the present Act to give religious instruction in the high schools, and that, in consequence of certain public primary schools being made high schools, classes which had been receiving religious instruction were now quite shut out from the clergy, who were prevented from having access to these schools. The Minister pointed out in reply (see *Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th May, 1913) there had been no alteration made in the rights and privileges formerly enjoyed. They had been conserved with regard to the high schools. In all the high schools of the State the Committee might carry out religious instruction, because instructions had been given in order to allow it. It will be seen that some clergymen regarded themselves as excluded from the high schools. The Minister pointed out exactly the contrary—that instructions had been given in order to allow religious instruction in all the high schools. It would have been very easy for him to have said that, as high schools had never yet been visited on the belief that the right did not exist outside primary schools, he would not interfere.

Tasmania from 1868 had an opportunity of removing religious instruction by a mere stroke of the pen, cancelling the regulation at any time; but, on the contrary, took the opportunity, in 1885, of making the regulation an Act of Parliament.

Western Australia and Queensland: It is significant that both these States, which have introduced religious instruction into the national schools, have adopted the same system which they found in the sister States, and of which it is reasonable to suppose from their contiguity they were able to acquire more or less practical knowledge, and make confidential inquiries from the Governments of the States in which the system existed before adopting it in their own States. It therefore will be seen that the States which had opportunities of revising the system allowed it on every occasion to stand, and thus tacitly affirmed that the vast majority of the people was fully satisfied. This becomes more striking when it is borne in mind that there have been many changes in political life; yet, no matter what party came into power, this system of religious instruction remained and remains unchanged from the day of its introduction.

It easily can be understood that if there were any substantial demand for its alteration, individual politicians as well as political parties would not avoid the opportunity of pleasing their constituents by obtaining through Parliament its abolition or modification. Yet, each time it has been dealt with by the Parliaments concerned it has been reaffirmed. It is irrefutable that when once introduced the system has never in any State been interfered with, diminished, much less abolished. The solution of the religious-instruction problem afforded by this system has therefore removed the subject from the political arena.

Contrast this settlement with New Zealand, where there have been agitations, more or less continuous, since 1877, asking for religious instruction; seven Bills in Parliament attempting to deal with the problem. Not one Bill for repeal or even for modification in the Australian States after the system was established, and no agitation except from the Roman Catholic Church, which in New Zealand also has agitated, though there is no religious instruction in State schools.

It is not urged by the League that there is complete and universal satisfaction, or even that the system is absolutely perfect, for there is nothing under the sun which gives complete and universal satisfaction—objectors are to be found to anything and everything. It is admitted, and never has been claimed to the contrary, that the Roman Catholic Church opposes the system of religious instruction advocated by the League: but it is pointed out that that Church is also opposed to the secular system of education, and advocates a system of denominational schools supported by the State. On the other hand, every other Christian Church which has expressed itself in Australia stands by the national school system, provided it includes the religious-instruction system referred to.

In addition to the Christian Church, it is well known that the Jewish Church supports the system, as will be seen from the statement made by Mr. Cohen, B.A., teacher, Hebrew School, in speaking at the Educational Conference, Sydney, April, 1904. In addition to the opinion of Mr. Cohen, above referred to, the Rev. I. A. Bernstein, Jewish Rabbi, of Christchurch, as a result of a visit to Australia, published the following statement in the *Christchurch Press* on the 21st June, 1913: "Speaking on the Bible-in-schools system in operation in New South Wales, Mr. Bernstein said he was surprised to find how splendidly the system was working. Clergymen and ministers from the different denominations or their assistants visited the schools regularly to give instruction to the children in school. The effect, he was assured, was most beneficial, for a number of children who, on account of the indifference of their parents, would receive no religious instruction at all now got such instruction. The scheme worked without objection or friction, and everybody seemed to be quite satisfied." It seems quite clear from both those opinions that members of the Jewish faith in Australia do not fear from any point of view the imaginary bogeys raised by our opponents in New Zealand.

Though it is not claimed that the system is perfect, yet after making due allowances for all the circumstances the Churches constituting the League came to the conclusion that no other system seemed to offer so practical and permanent a settlement of a difficult problem.

Religious Instruction provided in English Educational Systems generally.

So far as I can learn, after inquiries, I have yet to find any, with the exception of New Zealand, English-speaking States in the British Empire which does not make some provision for religious instruction in connection with its educational system. I submit a statement of the result of inquiries on the subject so far as I have been able to ascertain, for Great Britain, Ireland, Canada, and South Africa, the statements in which are subject to comparisons with official documents. Four States of Australia have been dealt with already, and it may be pointed out that, in the cases of South Australia and Victoria, which have not adopted the Australian system of religious instruction, yet under the Acts in both those States some provision is made for the recognition of religious instruction.

In South Australia, Regulations 160 and 161, page 7, 1912, provide that the teachers may read portions of the Holy Scriptures to such scholars as may attend with the consent of their parents for not more than half an hour before 9.30 a.m. The attendance of children at such reading shall not be compulsory, and no sectarian or denominational religious teaching shall be allowed in any school—the teachers must strictly confine themselves to Bible-reading. Should the parents of not less than ten children attending any school send to the Minister a written request that the Bible may be read in the schoolroom as above provided, the Minister may require the teacher of such school to comply with the request. Small though the provision may be, and unsatisfactory to many, as shown by the existence of a Bible in State Schools League recently formed for the purpose of obtaining the Australian system, yet the regulations mean that the Bible is recognized instead of being prohibited, and that the teacher may have it in his hand and the children may read it though before ordinary school hours.

In Victoria, Regulations, 1905, page 52, Regulations 362 to 370, provide that half an hour may be set apart for the purpose of giving religious instruction in State schools by persons other than the State-school teachers: the time to be from 9.15 a.m. to 9.45 a.m., or 3.30 to 4 p.m. It therefore will be seen that Victoria provides for what is known in New Zealand as the Nelson system, with these advantages over the Nelson system as in New Zealand: that provision is made by regulation under the Act for recognition of religious instruction, and that it shall be during what on other days would be ordinary school hours. Thus Victoria provides for a right of entry in school hours, which, however, is regarded as inadequate, inasmuch as in Victoria an agitation is maintained, as in New Zealand, to obtain the Australian system.

Cape of Good Hope, South Africa: The Provisional Council of the Cape of Good Hope, which after the Union of South Africa had the education system of the Cape reserved to it, set up a parliamentary Commission which reported strongly in favour of religious instruction upon a basis not unlike the Australian system, though in its details it goes much further. The draft ordinance introduced provided—(1.) That the schools should be opened daily with the Lord's Prayer and with the reading of the Bible, a conscience clause being provided for the parents. (2.) That a dogmatic catechism should be taught by the teachers, with a conscience clause for the parents; and a conscience clause for teachers, with the proviso in the case of teachers that if there were no teacher in a school willing to teach the catechism, then the Committee would appoint some fit person to give the instruction. (3.) Further provision was made for a right of entry in the case of a majority of the parents desiring some other form of religious instruction than the dogmatic catechism. (4.) Provision was also made for a right of entry on behalf of the parents for a minority of children to receive definite religious instruction in compliance with the wishes of the parents. That draft ordinance is submitted herewith, and is dated 9th May, 1913. I have not a copy of the statute as passed, but I am informed and believe that the Act was passed substantially in accordance with the above terms, with negligible amendments.

The evidence of the Cape Select Committee contains information which is illuminative as to the attitude of the teaching profession. Page 11 of the report, questions 131, 135, shows that in 1905, before any question was raised at any ecclesiastical conference, the Teachers' Association carried by fifty-two votes to three a resolution advocating regular Bible lessons in the schools, to be given by the teachers. In 1912 the Teachers' Conference passed a resolution in favour of the compulsory placing in the curriculum of a definite amount of time for religious instruction, with a conscience clause for teachers and children. That was carried (question 132) by one hundred votes to two. Question 135 showed that the Teachers' Association at this same conference passed a resolution by forty-nine to twenty in favour of the permissive use of the dogmatic catechism, which was subsequently adopted.

There is in South Africa another teachers' organization known as the Zuid-Afrikaanse Onderwizers Unie, or the South African Teachers' Union. This union passed a resolution in 1905 deciding that Bible-teaching must definitely be one of the subjects of the curriculum. At practically every conference subsequently the principle was reaffirmed. Questions 279, 280, 293 show also that this union agreed to the adoption of the catechism.

The whole of the English-speaking parts of the Empire being accounted for, New Zealand remains the only State which is not in line with the rest of the British Empire in its English-speaking parts in making some provision for religious instruction in connection with its educational system, and almost all these places, with the exception of South Australia and Victoria, incorporate some system of religious instruction as an inherent part of the curriculum. Adopting the language of the Hon. A. L. Herdman, Attorney-General, speaking as reported in his second reading address on the Defamation Bill on the 17th July, 1914, the League is urging a system which for the most part has provisions such as exist in the law of almost every English-speaking State in the Empire. The League is endeavouring to make the education system of New Zealand harmonize with the rest of the Empire, and according to a law which has worked so admirably in Queensland and Tasmania, New South Wales and Western Australia, and in Norfolk Island.

I have pointed out already that New Zealand, as far as I can learn, stands alone in the English-speaking world for making no provision for religious instruction in connection with its

education system. It further may be pointed out that it singles out the schools in this respect. There is no other law dealing with any part of our national life in New Zealand which says that the proceedings shall be "entirely secular." The Bible has a recognized place in the hands of the Governor, in the hands of members of Parliament, in the hands of the Judges and Magistrates, and of the witnesses in law-courts. Parliament itself is daily opened with prayer, which, so far from being within the term "entirely secular," is distinctly and strongly Christian. The Bible finds its way into the cell of every prisoner in the gaols, who, moreover, is afforded facilities for religious instruction from his own minister. In the Maori day schools under the "entirely secular" Education Act the Bible is read and religious instruction given. I have made inquiries, and have not heard of one Maori school to the contrary; but within the last few months I have heard of the closing of a Maori school near Huntly, the children of which had been accustomed to their Bible-reading and religious instruction, but on crossing over to the pakeha school found they were deprived of these advantages. The "Amokura" training-ship, itself a State institution, has religious instruction. This League asks that the same recognition which is made in other departments of the national life shall be extended to the schools. The position at present is this: Though a boy who obeys the law must not have Bible lessons or religious instruction in school, if he break the law and is transferred to gaol or the reformatory he at once finds that provision made which was denied to him while he remained a respectable child.

The war in which we are engaged shows a similar recognition of religion by the State. Chaplains are provided, given an official status, and paid by the State to enable them to supply religious ministrations ("instruction"); and "orders of the day" show how amidst the exigencies of military life provision can be made in "time-tables" for the exercise of religious ministrations ("instruction"). The League is not asking for payment, but that the Churches may be allowed at their own expense to provide ministers who will give religious instruction, the State being asked to do no more on this point than make provision in the "time-table."

Evidence produced and its Value.

The League has published a pamphlet, submitted herewith, of educational experts' opinions. These opinions are those of the permanent heads of Education Departments where the system exists, of political heads (Ministers of Education), of Governors, of Inspectors, and of teachers. It will be noticed that these are of various dates, some going back as far as the year 1893; but no matter what the year is the testimony is to the same effect.

Australian Teachers express free Opinions.

It is alleged by opponents that these testimonies are of no value, inasmuch as the teachers who give them are bound to express an opinion coinciding with that of their Department, to which it is replied that these testimonies were addressed, not to the Department, but to individuals not associated with the Education Department.

As to the freedom of teachers*, they have their annual meetings and their associations in which they criticize freely whatever needs criticism. In the case of New South Wales, one section of teachers has formed a union with the object of bringing the Minister of Education before the Arbitration Court on the question of salaries. Teachers who are not afraid to take such an extreme measure as that would not be afraid to express an adverse opinion, but neither in their associations or meetings has any such adverse opinion ever been expressed. If it is said that Australian teachers are not honest in their opinions, it might with equal truth be said that New Zealand teachers are not honest in their opinions in opposition to the movement, but both propositions are equally untenable.

Mr. A. Lobban, late Senior Inspector of Schools, New South Wales, with forty-five years' experience in the Department, and an Elder of the Presbyterian Church, writes as follows under date 29th June, 1914, on this point. As Mr. Lobban has been some years severed from the Department, his opinion may be taken as perfectly "unfettered" and "unmuzzled." He has nothing to gain or lose by expressing his views:—

"I am surprised to hear that doubt has been cast by the opponents of Scripture lessons in the State schools of New Zealand on the testimony of officers, Inspectors, and teachers of the Department of Public Instruction in New South Wales as published in pamphlet form by the New Zealand Bible in State Schools League. The teachers whose opinions are given in that pamphlet were scattered all over New South Wales, and represent membership of all the leading religious denominations. From an intimate acquaintance with teachers in New South Wales for more than half a century, I can say that as a body they have and still do exercise a marked influence for good in their respective sphere of usefulness. That they have been influenced in any way by official coercion or even suggestion is an utterly unfounded assumption. The replies given by them were in no way official, having been supplied in answer to inquiries furnished by gentlemen who were personally unknown to most of them. The people of New Zealand may rest assured that the teachers of New South Wales value the Scripture lessons they give to their pupils, and cordially welcome the clergymen who attend and give special religious instruction, while the great majority of the parents regard this feature of our education system as a priceless boon.

"It may not be known in New Zealand that the New South Wales public-school teachers are in no way hampered by severe regulations as to personal or religious duties, and no objection has even been made to teachers occupying positions as teachers or superintendents of Sunday schools. There is a Teachers' Association in New South Wales which has been in existence for

* See also the testimony of the West Australian Director of Education, dated 18th July, 1914, that the teachers are perfectly free to express their opinions. This is confirmed by a West Australian teacher, Mr. James.

many years, and there is also a Teachers' Union which is of later origin. Both these bodies meet and discuss educational matters and departmental rules with unrestricted freedom, and criticize defects which they believe to exist either in the administration of the Department or its regulations; but neither association has ever hinted at any objection to the reading of Scripture lessons in the schools or the visits of clergymen to give special religious instruction. Several teachers have gone into Parliament, but not one of these has ever hinted at an alteration of the Public Schools Act in regard to religious instruction. On the other hand, many teachers who have retired from service, both male and female, devote a considerable portion of their leisure to giving special religious instruction in connection with the Churches to which they belong in the schools in their neighbourhood.

"The sectarian bogey is a myth. The Scripture lessons are read in the schools by all the children whose parents have not sent in written objections, and these are so few as to be practically unnoticeable for statistical purposes. No sectarian bitterness has arisen from the visits of clergymen. As a matter of fact, the meeting of clergymen at the schools tends to the growth of friendship between them, and they are warmly encouraged by the teachers in their unselfish work.

"I have retired from the Education Department of this State, but I can never cease to appreciate the high character of the great body of teachers and their loyal, faithful, and efficient service. "A. LOBBAN."

"Wirrimbi, Wentworth Road, Vaucluse, Sydney, N.S.W., 29th June, 1914."

Teachers' Opinions confirmed by others.

But it is not teachers only who have given these opinions. Ministers of the Crown, amongst them Mr. MacGowen, Labour Premier of New South Wales in 1911 (note that he leans towards the right of entry rather than to the teachers' lessons); Mr. Hogue, Minister of Education for New South Wales, and others have made similar statements. Then, teachers have left the Department. Mr. Lobban, Senior Inspector, after forty-five years' experience, and Mr. Richardson, Queensland, both wrote after they had left the Department.

Opinions by Visitors to New Zealand.

In addition many other testimonies have been published since the pamphlet, all of them in New Zealand papers. Visitors to New Zealand, asked not by the League but by newspaper reporters for information for the guidance of the public, expressed themselves. Amongst these have been Inspector Gripp, of Queensland, who, at a meeting of teachers in Wellington, many of whom were adverse to the League system, on being cross-examined gave similar testimony. Other visitors to New Zealand questioned by newspaper reporters were: Mr. Holman, Labour Premier of New South Wales; Mr. Denham, Premier of Queensland; Sir Newton Moore, Agent-General for Western Australia, formerly Premier, who, in reply to an inquiry by an *Auckland Herald* reporter, said, "There is no friction of any kind in Western Australia over religious instruction given in the schools. There was peace and harmony over the whole working of the Education Act" (*Herald*, 14th March, 1914); Hon. A. H. Barlow, formerly Minister of Education, Queensland, and Minister in charge of Religious Instruction Bill in Upper House; Mr. James Allan, M.P., Queensland; Mr. J. T. Peet, land agent, a member of the Congregational Church, from Western Australia; Mr. J. H. Stanley, a Queensland squatter. Another public man who published his opinion in New Zealand is His Worship Alderman Prowse, Mayor of Perth, who, under date February, 1914, wrote a letter, copy of which is attached hereto. [Appendix B.] Inspector Gripp, of Queensland, made a statement in reply to a reporter of the *Auckland Herald*, and also made a statement at a meeting of teachers in Wellington, answering questions put to him by teachers known to be hostile to the League's proposals. Mr. C. J. Garland, of Kalgoorlie, Western Australia, as recently as the month of August, 1914, made a statement to a reporter of the *Dominion*, now handed in for publication. It is to be noted that the opinions expressed by these witnesses all coincide, whether they are connected with the Education Department or not. It is a striking thing that all the opposition's efforts have failed to obtain a publication from one solitary visitor to New Zealand acquainted with the facts who has given any evidence contrary to the testimony of these gentlemen.

Inquiries of New-Zealanders in Australia.

New-Zealanders who have visited Australia in the course of the present agitation and inquired personally into the working have made similar statements, amongst whom are,—

Mr. G. C. Ellis, of Cambridge, who published a statement in the local newspaper, the *Waikato Independent*, 21st October, 1913, that during his recent stay of more than two months in Queensland he noted with pleasure the opinions expressed in the Press were almost invariably favourable to the system adopted there of Bible in State schools. He observed that no question of denominational difference from a religious standpoint had any place in the conduct of the school education. He quoted Methodist ministers as showing the unanimity of feeling and appreciation of the successful working of the movement in Queensland. From various interviews with officials and people generally he found that the system in the State is well approved, and is working with perfect satisfaction to parents and teachers and Inspectors alike, and in perfect harmony.

Miss Nancy Wilson, of Bull's, during a visit to Sydney in 1913, herself went into some of the schools, and on her return to New Zealand conveyed to the public in a letter published in the *Dominion* of the 28th August, 1913, the result of her visit. (Letter attached hereto.) [See Appendix B.]

Another visitor from New Zealand was Mrs. Nield, of Wellington, who visited Norfolk Island, copy of whose letter is attached hereto. [See Appendix B.]

While all these visitors from New Zealand to Australia are of importance, perhaps the opinion which will be of most value from a teacher's point of view is that of Mr. N. R. McKenzie, Inspector of Schools under the Auckland Education Board, who publicly stated, "I paid a long visit to Australia. I went armed with letters of introduction from our Education Board to the Ministers for Public Instruction in the different States. The result was that every institution was thrown open to me. I had very special opportunities of making inquiries with regard to the educational systems of the States I visited. Among other things, I inquired into the working of the religious instruction in the schools of New South Wales, and found the system working absolutely admirably. I have read, as you have done, some of these testimonials circulated by the Bible in Schools League. I know quite a number of the men who wrote those testimonials. I know the facts of the case, and I can add my testimony to theirs: they have not at all overstated the case." (See Inspector McKenzie's statement specially forwarded for the information of the Parliamentary Education Committee [Appendix B].)

It is a fair comment to make that visitors from New Zealand to Australia who are opponents of the proposal have not come back producing any similar evidence as a result of their inquiries.

As an instance of New Zealand inquiries and also of Australian teachers expressing independent opinions, Mrs. Dunningham, of Auckland, published in New Zealand newspapers a letter from a relative of her own, Mr. C. R. James, head teacher, Claremont, Western Australia. (See Christchurch *Press*, 4th May, 1914; copy submitted herewith [Appendix B].) His letter pointed out that Roman Catholic, Methodist, Church of England, Baptist, and Presbyterian ministers visited to give religious instruction within his own knowledge. Their coming did not disturb the work; the school was richer in many ways for the unofficial, and certainly unofficious, help which those gentlemen so cheerfully gave. On the attitude of the teachers themselves he said, "We have a strong and active union and a fearless and outspoken teachers' paper. Neither union nor paper has to my knowledge found it necessary to suggest any alteration." (N.B.—This letter was written to a relative, and not to any departmental authority.)

Mr. W. E. Cocks, of Wellington, wrote to a teacher of his acquaintance, Mr. John Dart, of Croydon, New South Wales, and obtained a reply, 6th May, 1914, copy of which is attached hereto [See Appendix B]. It says, "There is but one opinion among teachers, and that a unanimous one, as to the beneficial effects of the religious instruction given in the public schools of New South Wales."

The Rev. W. A. Keay, Congregational minister, Auckland, obtained opinions from two Queensland teachers—Mr. Yardley, of Toowoomba North, 2nd November, 1913, and Mr. Fowler, of Toowoomba East, 1st October, 1913—copies of which are attached hereto. [See Appendix B.]

Mr. J. A. Johnson, Principal of the Hobart Training College, who was well known in New Zealand as headmaster at Timaru, in reply to an inquiry addressed to him by the Rev. T. Stinson, of Timaru, wrote, "The system works splendidly. After my experience here I have no hesitation in recommending New Zealand to adopt the Tasmanian system. It works smoothly, raises no friction between the children, and brings no trouble between teachers and parents." Original letter submitted and copy attached hereto. [See Appendix B.] This is another example of a New-Zealander making inquiry, and on this occasion from a New-Zealander. It will be noticed that Mr. Johnson confirms everything that has been said of the system in Tasmania as well as elsewhere.

A further example of a New-Zealander making inquiries is afforded by Mr. J. C. Thomson, M.P., who, in speaking in 1905 on Mr. Sidey's Referendum Bill on Bible in Schools, said, "I visited the largest school in Sydney, and the head teacher told me that he had not heard of any discontent with the system, and that he himself would be very sorry to see religious reading-lessons taken out of the schools, as they were productive of very much good."—*Hansard*, 1905, page 731.

An example of a resident in New Zealand who has lived and worked in Tasmania and New South Wales is afforded by the statement of the Rev. H. Coates, Presbyterian minister in the Marlborough District. [See Appendix B.]

Retired Teachers confirm the Testimony.

With reference to the statement of opponents that teachers in Australia are biased by fear of their Department, there is the striking fact that teachers who have left the Department have given testimony in favour of the League's proposal.

Mrs. Speer, of Paparoa, Auckland Province, wrote, under date 31st October, 1913, the following letter, which was published in New Zealand newspapers: "I was teaching in various schools in New South Wales for ten years prior to coming to New Zealand towards the end of 1902. In my experience I taught with teachers of all denominations, and each of us gave the usual Scripture lessons such as were prescribed in the syllabus, and from the matter given and the method used one would not be able to distinguish Catholic from Protestant teacher, and of all the teachers I have known and worked with not one ever demurred or complained at being compelled to teach Scripture. We took it as part of the day's work. Although parents had the right to withdraw their children from the classes during the Scripture lessons, not one—and I used to have Jewish as well as Roman Catholic children in my classes—ever used the privilege. As for the teachers themselves, we never discussed religious questions during hours of duty, and no discordant note was ever struck. Clergymen and ministers or their accredited substitutes paid weekly visits, and took the children of their own denomination in a separate class-room; so you see the proselytizing which is feared by so many could not possibly take place. With all good wishes for the success of our great cause, and with kindest regards."

Mrs. Attwater, who had retired from the Department, visited New Zealand in January, 1913, and stated to a reporter of the *Dominion* that she was a teacher in New South Wales for

fifteen or sixteen years, and had been upon the staff of the Model School in Fort Street, Sydney. She testified to the smooth working of the ministers' visits and of the teachers' lessons.

Another teacher may be quoted as a retired one—Miss Halstead, from Queensland—who, though during her visit to New Zealand was actually in the Department, left it immediately after her return. She pointed out, in an interview in the *Dominion*, 17th February, 1913, that she had been for twelve years one of thirty-seven teachers in a school with an average daily attendance of a thousand children. She had not anticipated the introduction of the Bible in schools quite favourably, having some fears about it, but she found it seemed to come into the school on oiled wheels, and in a week or two she found her own fears had been perfectly groundless. The *right of entry had not emphasized sectarianism; the teachers did not know what that* meant. She stated that the visits of the ministers helped them in creating a tone in the schools and brought an enlargement of the children's minds. She had thirty fellow-teachers in the school, and there was not one of them that found the least difficulty with the lesson-books. She thought every one of them had welcomed the substitution of a Scripture reading-lesson for some of the matter which was displaced in the syllabus. The withdrawals were very few, except the Roman Catholic children, who went on with some other subject in which they might happen to be weak.

Departmental Statements.

In addition to witnesses there are further departmental statements made quite independently of the League.

Queensland.—Letter addressed by the Hon. Digby Denham, Premier of Queensland, to the Roman Catholic Archbishop, dated 3rd August, 1911. (N.B.—This letter was submitted to Parliament—see Queensland *Hansard*, 1911, page 1770—and accepted without debate, which meant that Parliament saw no reason to question it.) (Copy attached hereto.) [See Appendix B.]

The Queensland Education Department prepared, in response to the many inquiries it had, a statement for general public information. [See Appendix B.] It was issued on the authority of the Hon. James Blair, Minister of Public Instruction, whose initials appear in the margin. It will be noticed that this shows in cold, official language the departmental opinion, and that it fully bears out any statements made by the League. The figures referred to in the Minister's statement will be found on page 29 of the "Queensland Report on Public Instruction for the Year 1912." The report shows the net enrolment, omitting high and private primary schools, for Queensland was 101,939. The average number for eleven months in the year 1911 receiving religious instruction from the ministers of their own church, or by arrangement from other ministers, was 16,748, which is 16 per cent. of the net enrolment. The average number for 1912 for the corresponding eleven months was 26,720, which is 26 per cent. of the net enrolment. On the average daily attendance for 1912 the Queensland Government stated that the percentage of children visited by ministers was 39·5.

Friends of the Nelson system claim that 16,060 children are at present being reached in its work throughout the whole Dominion, which is about 9 per cent. of the total number of children on the rolls. This is after sixteen years' working and the attention lately drawn to it by strenuous efforts to get the system extended throughout the whole Dominion. Thus it will be seen that in the first year of working under the League's system a little more than as many children were reached in Queensland as in New Zealand last year after sixteen years of the Nelson system; and that in the second year of working the increase on the first year is 10,000 more children instructed, while the percentage of the second year is nearly three times that of New Zealand after sixteen years.

In Appendix B will be found an interesting statement of evidence given by Mr. R. H. Roe, Inspector-General of Schools, Queensland, being replies made by him to a Royal Commission of Education from South Australia which visited Brisbane. It will be seen how impartially Mr. Roe deals with the subject, and it is not doing him an injustice to say that he was not regarded as a supporter of the proposal before its introduction.

New South Wales School Inspectors.—Attached hereto [See Appendix B] are extracts from reports of Education Inspectors taken from the *New South Wales Public Instruction Gazette*, 30th April, 1913. (N.B.—These statements were not furnished to the League, but to the Education Department in the ordinary course. That they are sometimes critical shows that these Inspectors are impartial and makes their favourable testimony all the more judicial in weight.)

The official report of the Minister of Instruction, New South Wales, for 1913, submitted to New South Wales Parliament 6th April, 1914, is attached hereto so far as the report refers to religious instruction [See Appendix B]. It has been stated by opponents that the increase of 4,438 visits shown by the return upon the year's work is the result of manipulation because the Department is in sympathy with religious instruction. (Incidentally this is opponents' testimony that the Department approves.) But there is the emphatic statement made by the Chief Inspector that the number of visits made by the visiting religious teachers during the year shows a very considerable increase.

In the report of the Moral Education Congress, 1908, page 299, Mr. Alexander Mackie, Principal of the Training College, Sydney, New South Wales, said, "The Public elementary schools of New South Wales provide for 80 per cent. of the children of the State. The Public Instruction Act of 1880 provides that 'General non-sectarian religious teaching . . . shall form part of the secular instruction in all schools.' Periods from one and a half to two and a half hours a week are devoted to civics and morals, the lessons being based on the four (Scripture text) books issued by the Irish National Board. . . . The general result is, that pupils have a more or less satisfactory knowledge of Scripture history, and some acquaintance with the moral teachings of the Bible. . . . In many remote districts this is the only direct Scripture teaching which pupils receive, as they rarely see or hear a clergyman or missionary. The success

of this teaching is often commented on by outside clergy. The Public Instruction Act also provides for right of entry and for denominational instruction during one hour each school day. As a rule the clergy of the different denominations give instruction once a week in the large centres. In country parishes they give it, if at all, at much longer intervals."

Western Australia.—The latest available parliamentary report of the Education Department, 1912, gives in bald figures an estimate of the successful working of the system, only forty-one children being withdrawn from their ministers; and, exclusive of Roman Catholics, only 240 children in the whole State withdrawn from the teachers' Bible lessons, and which lessons are "general religious instruction," more than that for which the New Zealand League is asking.

Mr. Cyril Jackson, formerly Inspector-General of Schools Western Australia, 1896–1903, said, in the Report on the Moral Instruction Congress, 1908, page 308: "The Education Act provides that 'Secular instruction shall be held to include general religious teaching as distinguished from dogmatic or polemical theology.' This teaching is given by regular teachers of the school, and is subject to inspection. In addition, "a portion of each day not exceeding half an hour may be set apart, when the children of any one religious persuasion may be instructed by clergymen or other religious teachers of such persuasion.' The Church of England and the members of the Jewish faith avail themselves fully of their privileges; the Roman Catholics only when they have no school of their own. The free Churches have combined, and, generally speaking, authorize joint delegates, who teach together the children of their own persuasion concerned. . . . Lessons are to be given orally by the teachers. They are to impress upon the children the value of the Scriptures as a basis of moral instruction, as the oldest historical record, and also as the finest collection of literature in the language. . . . A regular syllabus of the Scripture teaching is issued: it includes the memorizing of the Lord's Prayer, of parts of the Sermon on the Mount, of the Ten Commandments, and some Psalms." (N.B.—Mr. Jackson at the time of speaking was no longer an officer of the Department.)

The following letter was received by me as late as the 1st August, 1914, from the Director of Education, Western Australia:—

"Education Department, Perth, 18th July, 1914.

"In answer to your cable on the subject of special religious instruction, I am forwarding you a quotation from an article on the curricula of our schools which has recently been drawn up for the English Board of Education:—'General religious instruction is given in all the primary schools by the school-teachers. The instruction is based on a definite prescribed syllabus, including in each class lessons from the Old and New Testaments, with passages from Scripture to be learnt by heart. Dogmatic or polemical theology is excluded. Children can be withdrawn from this teaching at the request of their parents; such withdrawals affect less than 5 per cent. of the numbers on the rolls. Of those withdrawn about 87 per cent. are Roman Catholics, and about 9 per cent. Jews. Children thus withdrawn are given other work to do during the Scripture period. Special religious instruction is given in the primary schools during school hours by the duly accredited representatives of various Churches or denominations. Under the Act half an hour each day may be set apart for such teaching; in practice half an hour a week is the amount given to each class where regular visits are paid. In most town schools weekly instruction is regularly given. In most of the country districts such regularity is impossible, but occasional visits are paid when a clergyman or minister is in the neighbourhood. Rather more than half the children on the rolls come under special religious instruction in this way. The system works smoothly and difficulties are almost unknown in connection with it. Where representatives of different denominations visit the same school, arrangements are made for their periods of instruction to coincide. The Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Congregational Churches unite for the purpose of this instruction and authorize one delegate to take the children belonging to all. About 57 per cent. of the schools received special religious instruction in 1912: 50 per cent. were visited by representatives of the Church of England, 36 per cent. by delegates of the Nonconformist bodies, and between 8 and 9 per cent. by Roman Catholics. The last named Church has schools of its own in many centres throughout the State.'

"This system of religious instruction has been in force for many years, and is generally accepted as part of the regular school-work. No objections to it have been raised during the period of my connection with the Department—namely, the last thirteen years and a half—either by teachers or parents. There is no truth in the suggestion that the absence of objections on the part of the teachers is due to the fact that they are not free agents. The teachers are perfectly ready to object at any time to anything they do not like. Their union constantly brings up objections of all kinds, and included amongst them have been many objections to portions of the curriculum. They have not, however, ever brought up an objection against the system of religious teaching. "CECIL ANDREWS, Director of Education."

Evidence stands Testing.

In the pamphlet of expert opinions published by the League, page 4, appears the following statement: "The Director of Education, Tasmania, writes under date 14th September, 1906, 'As far as I can ascertain no difficulty arose from the system adopted in 1868. The system existing in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty.'" Under date 12th November, 1912, Bishop Cleary printed and published in various newspapers the following statement: "From information received from Tasmania it appears that the Director of Education there, Mr. Neale, never made the foolish statement attributed to him. Whether the remaining three wrote as asserted I know not."

Immediately after this printed statement of Bishop Cleary's appeared I publicly repudiated the accusation, producing at the Presbyterian Assembly in Wellington the original of the Tas-

manian statement, an incident duly reported in the Press. I repeated the repudiation in the Bishop's Cathedral City of Auckland on the 9th December, 1912, in a gathering of some thousands of people in the Town Hall, again producing the original document for public examination.

On the 2nd December, 1912, a cablegram was despatched by the present Director of Education, Tasmania, to Bishop Cleary, which showed that the document dated the 14th September, 1906, from the Tasmanian Director was genuine and authentic. The following day the Tasmanian Director of Education sent Bishop Cleary a copy from the departmental records of the statement supplied 14th September, 1906, which showed that the statement published by the League was authentic and accurate, and also conveyed to the Bishop the information that a similar statement had been made by the Tasmanian Department to the Queensland Department of Education, in which latter the words had been used, "The system in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty."

Bishop Cleary withheld from public information the fact that he had received confirmation of the League's publication, and did not even admit receiving it until the League published the fact that the Bishop held in his possession substantiation of the League's evidence.

This is the only instance where there was an opportunity afforded of testing the assaults upon the evidence, and the result has been seen. It is worth noting that Bishop Cleary's charge by innuendo implied that there were other statements as well upon which similar doubt could be cast, which was as sheer imagination on his part as that about the Tasmanian testimony.

A further confirmation of the value of the League's original statement in its pamphlet is found in a letter issued by the Education Department, Tasmania, dated the 12th September, 1913, addressed to Mr. J. Hutchinson, M.L.A., Victoria, and read by him in Parliament, to be found on page 1374 of Victorian *Hansard*, 1913. (See copy attached hereto.) [Appendix B.]

It is a remarkable thing that our opponents have failed to produce evidence from the Churches in Australia, with the exception, of course, of the Roman Catholic Church; and that they have failed to produce evidence from any leaders or leading men in those Churches; and that they have failed to produce any statements (except from a very few individuals) testifying from personal experience as to the actual working of the system. Nearly half a century's working of the system and the introduction of it into successive States would afford ample opportunity for critics to be found who honestly tried to work the system and found it productive of all the evils predicted by our opponents.

Professor McKenzie stated in my hearing that he had never visited Australia. I therefore withdraw any suggestion that "It is understood that Professor McKenzie, the secretary of the opposition League, himself visited Australia since the present campaign began." It is a matter of regret that Professor McKenzie has not had the advantage of a visit to a continent where the mental horizon is as wide as its land and its prevailing educational system free from the domination of that secularism of which Mr. Joseph McCabe, ex-Roman Catholic priest, is the modern apostle.

Speaking in the Unitarian Church, Wellington, on Sunday evening, 15th September, 1912, in an address subsequently published by him on the Bible-in-schools question, Professor McKenzie said, "Have we not John the Baptist of the new moral evangel already with us in the person of Canon Garland? Has he not got, too, the moral law writ large in four precious volumes known as the Irish, and also as the New South Wales, text-book? Canon Garland and quite a large contingent of good men and true among our ecclesiastics have been testifying, liberally and generously, to the smooth working of the New South Wales system. The teachers over there—those who do not accept the Protestant, and even those who do not accept the Christian, interpretation of the Scriptures, as well as those who are perfectly sound in the faith once committed to the saints—seem to be frantically felicitating themselves on the wonderful influence and priceless value of their Bible lessons and the reign of grace already obtaining throughout their State and Australia generally. I have the very best authority for stating that in the opinion of a large number of the head teachers in New South Wales the whole thing is a gigantic farce and failure. How, indeed, could we expect anything else when teachers (whose own personal religion is a matter of absolute indifference) are required to use as a manual on morals a text-book for which many of them entertain a supreme contempt? The defenders of the existing secular national system in New Zealand are now having evidence collected in Australia, and hope very shortly to be able to furnish a considerable body of testimony as to the hollow mockery that the New South Wales system is."

Two statements of Professor McKenzie's demand attention. He said, "I have the very best authority for stating that in the opinion of a large number of the head teachers in New South Wales the whole thing is a gigantic farce and failure." This is a mere opinion of Professor McKenzie's, which he has failed to substantiate. He does not give his "very best authority," nor does he give, out of the "large number of the head teachers" whom he mentions, the name of one who describes the "whole thing" as a "gigantic farce and failure." Why is he unable to produce even a retired teacher no longer under the control of the Department, or a statement made by one of the several teachers who have found their way into Parliament, where they certainly would neither be "fettered" nor "muzzled"?

The other statement, "The defenders of the existing secular national system in New Zealand are now having evidence collected in Australia, and hope very shortly to be able to furnish a considerable body of testimony as to the hollow mockery that the New South Wales system is." This "considerable body of testimony" has not yet been produced, though, as pointed out, the visits to Australia of opponents to the proposal should have afforded ample opportunity of collecting the evidence.

It fairly may be assumed that no effort has been left undone to gather such evidence. There is an example of this in the letter of the Rev. T. A. Williams to Mr. Allan, M.L.A., Brisbane.

showing that the present national organizer of the opposition League so late as May, 1914, made an inquiry in Australia, and, as that letter was sent out in a manifold form, it is assuming too much to suppose that a manifold copy was made and sent to a solitary person and not to a number of persons. I can well understand, in view of the reply which Mr. James Allan, M.L.A., Brisbane, gave to the Rev. T. A. Williams (copy of which will be found in Appendix B), that the opposition League is not anxious to publish replies of that nature. It may be quite sufficient to ask, if Mr. Allan's opinion had been in accordance with the views of our opponents, would it have been left to me to produce?

New Zealand Teachers' Attitude.

At the annual meeting of the Teachers' Institute, held in New Plymouth, January, 1913, a resolution was carried by forty-two votes to seven condemning the League's proposals. It may be noted that the teachers, before condemning the League's proposals, did not invite any representative of the League to state the case, but took action without hearing the case from such representative, though there were teachers in the meeting who spoke on behalf of the League. On the other hand, there were circulated at the annual meeting—and, it is stated, circulated by officials of the Institute—pamphlets by Bishop Cleary and Professor McKenzie, opposing the League's proposals. It is alleged that these were placed on the desk of every delegate, and, if so, it is obvious that the League did not receive fair play.

Immediately after the Institute meeting in January, 1913, the *Journal of Education* for February, 1913, on page 2, referring to the resolution passed by the Institute, in a leading editorial said, "That the great majority of the teachers of the Dominion are opposed to the programme of the Bible in Schools League is clearly evident from the result of the vote—forty-two to seven. If the advocates of the New South Wales system wish to secure the support of the teachers of New Zealand they must first give them a Dominion scheme of appointments and promotion. The fact that teachers in the Australian States are Civil servants and beyond the reach of persecution by petty parochial bodies makes all the difference in the working of the scheme, and this difference is not, we feel sure, fully appreciated by those outside the ranks of the teaching service." It is plain, therefore, from this paragraph that there were some influences at work on the subject of centralization of appointments, the implication being that if this were attended to the opposition of the teachers would cease.

As to the constitution of the Institute, it appears that it is not elected on any principle of representation. An authoritative writer, in defending the representative character of the Institute against country teachers who complain that they are not represented, said (May, 1914, *Journal*, page 81), "At any ballot for the election of representatives not more than one-third of those qualified to vote exercise their vote, and the greatest delinquents are the country teachers, who complain that they are not represented—that the personnel of the Institute is not representative of the great body of lower-salaried teachers."

In the April, 1914, number of the *Journal of Education*, page 61, Mr. James K. Law, head teacher, Aramoho, writes, "The Institute in conference assembled is not, in my opinion, nor for many years has it been, representative of the opinion of a great majority of the profession. The average salary of its members is far above the average salary of members of the profession. It is composed largely of men already in the highest positions, or looking forward to attain to these, and in this matter it is, in my opinion, moved largely by self-interest."

Another writer, signing himself "Reform," and obviously a teacher, in the same *Journal*, page 61, complaining of "the obvious ineptitude" of the Institute, concludes, "I hope and believe that unless the Institute does something to justify its existence a teachers' union will very soon be an accomplished fact."

Mr. J. Duggan, speaking at a meeting of the Napier Branch of the Teachers' Institute, held at Waipawa, 28th February, 1914, reported on the business done at the Auckland Conference, January, 1914. He stated, "The attitude of the majority did not reflect the spirit of the teachers of the Dominion. The majority of the delegates were pleased to talk ideals, being satisfied in their enjoyment of good success and salaries. There was therefore something wrong in the matter of representation, for which a remedy would have to be found. He found fault with the executive, who went behind the decision of the Conference, who decided that the minimum salary should be £150, rising to £500; the executive reduced the minimum to £120, rising to £450 only." Mr. Duggan did not refer to Bible in schools, but it would be quite fair to say, if he charges Conference with not representing the spirit of the teachers and applies that specifically to the matter of salaries, about which the teachers have so much concerned themselves, then the same criticism as to the Institute failing to represent the teachers may be applied to a purely educational matter such as Bible in schools, on which the teachers decline to accept the offer of sending two of them at the League's expense to Australia to inquire into it.

"The latest available returns give the teachers in the primary schools at 4,105; the membership of the Institute has not yet reached 3,000" (*Journal of Education*, November, 1913, page 218). It therefore will be seen that even if the Institute is taken as representative of those teachers who belong to it—which, as above shown, is questioned by teachers themselves—yet it only is entitled to speak for three-fourths of the whole body of teachers. If the 1913 vote is truly representative of those who belong to it it is clear that one-seventh—that is to say, some four hundred and fifty of the members of the Institute alone—are in favour of the League's proposals. The League has a list of over five hundred teachers, members and non-members of the Institute, who have declared their adherence to the League's platform, but it is a significant fact that some of these desire that their names shall not be published. It has also been stated by Mr. D. M. Yeats, late headmaster of Hutt District High School (statement attached hereto), that 30 per cent. of the teachers are in sympathy with the League's proposals, so that it cannot be

said in any case that the teachers are unanimous, or approaching unanimity, in their opposition to the League's proposals. So far from the teachers being unanimous, there are amongst them such as Inspector McKenzie, of Auckland, and Inspector Inglis, of Southland, strong advocates of the League.

Extracts from Teachers' Letters.

Mr. James Boswell, Katikati, writing 23rd October, 1913, said, "Personally I am in favour of the teaching, but for obvious reasons do not think that the teachers as an organized body should be for or against the movement. I therefore do not take an active part in it."

Mr. C. J. Bottrill, B.A., head teacher, formerly of Whangaparapara, now of High School, New Plymouth, in publishing a statement in support of the League, said, writing 2nd July, 1913, that "His views were typical of the views of a good number of his acquaintances, who, being young teachers, are rather ignored in Institute meetings." And writing under date 25th August, 1913, said, "The profession as a whole has always been opposed to innovation; witness the present attitude towards medical and physical reform."

Mr. Henry Astbury, head teacher, Kimbolton, writing 25th August, 1913, says, "At a public meeting I made the statement that the Teachers' Institute met at New Plymouth, 1913, while the Australian teachers were visiting New Zealand, and ample opportunity was given of ascertaining, at all events, private expression of opinion from the individual visiting teachers. I had seen in no newspapers comments on the matter, silence which might be inferred—(1) Either that their opinion had not been asked by opposers to the Bible in schools; or (2) that their opinion had been a favourable one, and no mention had been made concerning it."

A head teacher under date 10th October, 1913, writes, "I believe a considerable number of teachers are more or less in sympathy with the Bible-in-schools movement, but as the New Zealand Educational Institute has set its face so strongly against it they are rather afraid to make themselves heard. Some teachers seem to think that the schools exist for them and not they for the schools. After all, they are the servants of the State, and will have to do what the State—*i.e.*, the majority of the people—determine. If the people wish for the Bible in schools, the teachers will be no more able to check the demand than Canute could check the incoming tide."

Writing under date 27th October, 1913, the same teacher says, "I extremely regret that the executive of the N.Z.E.I. is so strongly opposed. I am a thoroughly loyal member of the Institute, and I feel unable to take any active part in the campaign, but none the less I deplore the action of our leading teachers; the manner some of them—only a few, I trust—adopt is, to say the least, unworthy of their high profession. I really think it would be a more dignified attitude on their part if they were to remain neutral and allow the people to decide the question without interference. We teachers are the servants of the State, and it is our duty to obey and not to dictate. To hear some teachers talk one would think that the schools exist for them, and not they for the schools. Surely it is the parents who are the people to decide what should be taught and what not. If they desire the Bible to be read in the schools—and it seems to be admitted on all hands that if a referendum were taken a majority, and probably an overwhelming majority, would so desire—it is surely an unwarrantable impertinence for the teachers to endeavour to thwart them." N.B.—This teacher, who has such strong convictions, does not wish his name published, but I will give his name in confidence to the Chairman of the parliamentary Committee. This is an indication of how the teachers' opinions in favour of Bible in schools are held back.

Mr. James Dean, head teacher, Waihi, under date 26th July, 1913, says, "The attitude of the teachers is partly due to fear of adding to an already overloaded syllabus, but the pruning-knife could be freely used on the syllabus with advantage to all concerned. I regard the action of the Institute in adopting the resolution it did as a piece of impertinence. The members would have done well to remember that those who pay the piper have the right to choose the tune."

An assistant teacher in an Auckland school, writing under date 17th April, 1914, said, "I am a young teacher, and at first was strongly opposed to the proposals of the League, but am now fully convinced that the introduction of the Bible into State schools would certainly be a step in the right direction. It seems to me that the strongest opposition comes from older teachers, for many of the younger members of the profession seem to be in sympathy with the movement." N.B.—Though it is not stated in the letter, it is understood that he feared his name being described as a supporter, but I will give his name in confidence to the Chairman.

Mr. A. E. Featherston, head teacher, Kennington Public School, ex-President Teachers' Southland Institute, said at Invercargill, February, 1913, "If the bulk of our people want this system introduced on national grounds they should have their wishes acceded to—(1) Because of the beneficent influence of religion on the national character; (2) because in the absence of religious teaching, personal and public morality cannot be properly maintained; (3) because as a Christian nation we are bound to recognize in our national education the history and precepts of Christianity; (4) because the children are ours, and nothing is of greater importance to us than the moral and religious instruction of our children; (5) because the schools are ours and the money that supports them is ours. We have a right to say how it shall be expended and what system shall be in force, whatever opinions some few may hold to the contrary."

Mr. L. F. de Berry, head teacher, Hokitika Public School, in addressing a public meeting on the 4th April, 1913, expressed his longing to see the Bible introduced, as a means of uplifting the children. He questioned whether the opinion of the Teachers' Conference was representative of all the State-school teachers, as he was satisfied that the teachers supporting the League's proposal, though in a minority, were a very strong minority, which he believed would become a majority. It was strange that the teachers were prohibited from going to the highest source

for their work in character-building. They were urged by authority to go back to first principles; the syllabus provided for moral training of the children, but the Act precluded the one Book to which they might go for first principles. They were told on the one hand to build a character of moral fibre, and told specifically on the other hand they must not use the Bible. He went on to say, "I cannot see any sense in that." Personally he could not see where sectarian trouble could come in. He would heartily welcome the introduction of the League's proposal as the best solution of the problem; the public should know that teachers feel very strongly they cannot do their duty by the children if religious instruction continued to be forbidden.

Mr. James Hain, President of the Southland Educational Institute, is reported in the *Southland Times* of 28th June, 1913, as stating in an address to the Institute, "Should the Bible be called to their aid in the matter of discipline? He had for many years been opposed to it, but he was so no longer. He had come to believe that the results of their efforts would be all the better for the introduction of the Bible to the schools."

A New Zealand Teacher.

Mr. A. Inglis, M.A., M.Sc., Inspector, Southland Education District, late headmaster of the North School, Invercargill, ex-President Southland Teachers' Institute: "I must confess that the attitude of the teachers of New Zealand towards the subject of religious instruction is somewhat perplexing. So far as definite information is available, some of the district Institutes have either declared for the existing secular system or simply recorded their opposition to the introduction of the Australian system; others, again, have made no pronouncement on the subject; while the Southland District Institute has declined to give official support to either side in the present controversy. Further, the delegates to the annual meeting of the New Zealand Educational Institute held at New Plymouth last January decided by a large majority against the programme of the Bible in State Schools League. Since, for the reasons stated above, many of the delegates had no instructions from their respective district Institutes, and recorded merely their own personal opinions on the question, the voting could not be regarded as representative. Nevertheless, I am constrained to say that, if a plebiscite were taken, the teachers in favour of the Australian system would be found to be in a minority—a minority, however, which is more considerable than it is generally supposed to be. The most perplexing aspect of the matter is, however, the fact that a conference of leading teachers should restrict itself to the passing of a purely negative resolution stating that it did not favour the Australian system, while it remained silent on the extremely important question of religious instruction in general. The result is that the N.Z.E.I. has, to all intents and purposes, resolved itself into a branch of the Schools Defence League, with a consequent loss of power to mould public opinion on the subject. If it were the duty of the official organization of New Zealand teachers to define its attitude towards the Australian system, it surely was a prior and more imperative duty, not only to itself but to the public at large, to say categorically whether it supported any form of religious instruction in the schools. As matters stand, those delegates who voted with the majority, but who favour religious instruction, have been placed in an equivocal position from which it is to be hoped better counsels at the forthcoming annual meeting at Auckland will release them.

"On the general question, I am not in a position to say whether the teachers of New Zealand as a whole desire a change from the present secular system to one that includes some form of Scripture lessons. I am aware that the consensus of opinion among educational authorities all over the world is in favour of religious instruction in schools, and I should be surprised to learn that the majority of our teachers had ranged themselves on the opposite side. So far as my own observations have enabled me to form an opinion, I am disposed to say that the chief objection among teachers to the Australian system is based on fears of sectarian difficulties. Perhaps the chief reason why I do not share these fears is due to the fact that I received the greater part of my primary education under a system somewhat similar to that obtaining in Australia. During my period of contact with the system I saw or heard of nothing in the shape of sectarian trouble, and I can therefore readily accept the evidence testifying to the smooth working of the system in the Commonwealth. At the same time I must say that the numerous testimonies from Inspectors of schools and teachers of standing in Australia and Tasmania have not received at the hands of the teachers of New Zealand the consideration due to them. One of the writers is Mr. J. A. Johnson, M.A., Principal of the Teachers' Training College in Tasmania, and formerly one of the most highly respected of New Zealand teachers, and President of the New Zealand Educational Institute. I think I can venture the assertion that had Mr. Johnson made a statement unfavourable to the Australian system his opinion would have been proclaimed from the housetops all over the Dominion. I cannot refrain from quoting the striking testimony of Mr. John Tucker, headmaster of one of the city schools of Perth, and, at the time of writing, president of the State School-teachers' Union of Western Australia. Mr. Tucker says, 'From South Australia I was an opponent to the introduction of the system, as I thought it would tend to brand distinction that would not be pleasant; but so far as I can see, after seven years' experience, my fears had no foundation in fact. Your Queensland teachers have nothing to fear in the introduction of religious instruction, but will have an added lever to raise the young lives to the high ideals they so much desire.'

"Contact with teachers on both sides of the question has led me to respect the honest convictions of those whose views do not coincide with my own. I cannot close, however, without taking exception to a claim which has been put forward on behalf of teachers as an argument against the introduction of the Australian system, but which, I am glad to say, I have never heard mentioned by any member of the profession: I refer to the suggested conscience clause for teachers. As a logical argument it appears to me to lack the essential quality of common-sense;

for it would be strange indeed if it were left to the teachers of New Zealand to unearth a violated conscience which thousands of teachers in Australia failed to discover after working the system for so many years. Further, the argument savours of insincerity, inasmuch as our authorized text-books contain lessons wholly or in part of a religious character. For example, I recently picked out from a bundle of old *School Journals* twenty-six such lessons. Although the matter contained in the our text-books has never been found to conform to the requirements of a purely secular system, not a single protest on account of conscientious scruples has, so far as I am aware, ever been made. Moreover, the State, like any other employer, expects its servants to do the work it considers to be necessary. The State recognizes no conscience clause for the Customs officials who facilitate the distribution of spirituous liquors, or for postal, telegraph, and railway servants who are required to give the services on Sundays; nor is it likely that the State, should it decide to introduce Scripture lessons into the primary schools curriculum, will grant permission to teachers to defeat its will."

Mr. D. M. Yeats, late head teacher, Hutt District High School: "For a long time I had been antagonistic to the introduction of the Bible into our State schools, but after considering the proposals made by the Bible in State Schools League, and forming my own independent judgment of the overwhelming testimony to its success in those States of the Commonwealth into which it had been introduced, I more than a year ago came to the conclusion that the proposal deserved my support. I notice it has been said that the testimony from Australia is worthless, because it is given by teachers who say only that which they think will please their superiors. With this position I do not agree, and it cannot apply to testimonies given by others, such as Sir Harry Rawson, Governor of New South Wales, who said, 'The Public Education Act showed that the statesmen who framed it had considered it very carefully, fairly, and discriminately, for although they had very strongly laid down the rule that religious instruction in State schools was to be non-sectarian, they had at the same time opened the way for clergymen of every denomination to teach the children of their own Church.' There are many other testimonies from people quite independent of the Education Departments in Australia, such as the Hon. J. T. McGowen, when Premier of New South Wales, and these opinions cannot be thrust on one side.

"The objection to our syllabus as overcrowded does not seem to me a valid one. There was a time when our syllabus was rigid and teachers had no choice of their own, but had to follow a fixed routine. Now, as pointed out by Mr. Hogben at the meeting of the N.Z.E.I. in Auckland last January, the syllabus is merely a suggestion of what work should be done, not a hard-and-fast set of regulations in each subject. Mr. Hogben's view is borne out by the action of our Inspectors for the last few years, who have been in the habit of saying, 'It is the quality of the work we are going to look at, not the quantity done.' Every headmaster makes out his own general scheme of work, and if Inspectors are satisfied with it they examine within its limits. I have no hesitation, from an experience of thirty-five years as a headmaster in our schools, in saying that the introduction of Bible-reading as part of the literary training of our children, and the visits of accredited teachers, will not interfere injuriously with the school syllabus of work.

"Something has also been said about the conscience clause for teachers; but as they are not being asked to teach religion, why ask for such a clause at all? They are only asked to have the Bible lessons in the same way that they have any other reading-lessons, and deduce from them the moral and literary beauties therein to be found. The religious teaching will be given, under the League's proposal, not by State-school teachers, but by the accredited teachers from the Churches, so that a teacher will be able to say, 'I have no responsibility; that lies with the Churches.' My own opinion is that if a Scripture reading-lesson had to be taken, it would be taken with all due reverence and respect by almost all those engaged in the educational service. The fact is surely convincing to us that in the States in which the system has been carried on in the Commonwealth of Australia not one teacher has been heard of who refused, for conscience' sake, to take the required share in the work, nor has any demand for such a clause ever been made by the teachers, and this notwithstanding that the teachers have their unions which put their grievances before the public and Parliament. What stronger refutation of the need of such a clause can be brought forward than this?

"The fact that appointments by Committees would be affected by a teacher's religion seems to me very far fetched. My own opinion is that exactly the opposite effect will be produced, because, as every Church will have the right to take its own share in religious teaching, there will not be the same necessity (as some allege has existed in the past) for appointing teachers belonging to any particular Church. I do not for a moment think that a teacher's religion would come into consideration with a School Committee any more than it does now. As a result of my thirty-five years' experience, I deliberately express the opinion that if there had been some such system such as the League proposes included in our educational system, the benefits thereunder would have been much greater and the rising generation more moral under a non-secular system.

"The suggestion that a referendum is not suitable to a religious question because the religious aspect is regarded as being held by the majority is first of all a plain admission that the present educational system is not approved by the majority of the people: but, secondly, the argument has no force because there is no attempt under the proposal to force the minority to do anything to which they object. The parents of those children who do not want them to read Bible lessons or to be visited by ministers will not be interfered with in the least. The minority will have its rights respected, just as at the present time, but with the difference that the majority will have just the same rights. There is no compulsion in the matter at all. The suggestion that the teachers are to be compelled to give religious lessons is met with by the fact that they are not asked to do anything of the sort. They are asked to give reading-lessons taken from the best

literature in the English language. I have gone carefully over these reading-lessons in the Queensland books, studying them with a view to seeing how I would take them with a class. I find no difficulty in treating them as ordinary reading-lessons, giving any necessary explanations as to meanings, without any religious comment at all; and I believe there are very few teachers in the whole of New Zealand who would find any more difficulty than I myself. Even for its literary value alone teachers should welcome the introduction of the Bible into our national schools. I believe that 30 per cent. of our teachers are heartily in accord with the proposals of the Bible in State Schools League" (*Dominion*, 27th June, 1914). NOTE.—These are but samples of a large mass of communications from teachers in sympathy with the League's proposal. It may be taken for granted that there is a strong undercurrent amongst the teachers in favour of the League, and if those teachers are only in the minority, yet it is a minority which includes so many as to make it impossible to say that the teachers of New Zealand are opposed to the League's proposals.

The League's Offer to New Zealand Teachers.

Dean Fitchett, speaking in Dunedin, 13th June, 1913, said, "I offer the teachers a challenge. They distrust the Australian evidence, then let them select two of their most trusted teachers as a commission of inquiry to proceed to Australia and investigate the facts on the spot. If they will abide by the result the League will pay the expenses. That is fair, I think. Let them accept this challenge or let them hold their peace."

Speaking in Auckland, 26th July, 1913, I renewed this challenge, making it even more definite, offering to pay the expenses of the then president of the Teachers' Institute, Mr. Wells, and any teacher selected by Mr. Wells, to go to Australia, provided the teachers would abide by the result of the inquiry. The challenge was not accepted, though it is true Mr. Caughley offered to produce evidence which he had obtained: but this was a very different proposition from agreeing that teachers should accept—at the League's expense—the opportunity of going round Australia and investigating the thing personally themselves. The League could make no fairer or more generous proposition than this. There was no limit mentioned as to the expenses. It was a *bona fide* offer, and, not being accepted, the teachers can no longer question the evidence submitted.

Alleged Disabilities of Teachers.

Our opponents rely upon certain regulations in Australia which it is claimed impose civil and religious disabilities upon teachers unfairly, and which it is further claimed are the consequence of religious instruction. To this it is replied—

(*a.*) That the position of teachers as public servants is different in the Australian States from that in New Zealand.

(*b.*) That the regulations are never interpreted in the drastic manner alleged by our opponents. Ample testimony to this effect has been afforded by Mr. Lobban and Miss Halstead. The Director of Education, West Australia, under date 18th July, 1914, writes, "There is no truth in the suggestion that the absence of objections on the part of the teachers is due to the fact that they are not free agents. The teachers are perfectly ready to object at any time to anything they do not like. Their union constantly brings up objections of all kinds, and included amongst them have been many objections to portions of the curriculum. They have not, however, ever brought up an objection against the systems of religious teaching." Inquiry would show that teachers in Australia have freedom and act in many capacities in Church-work, such as Sunday-school superintendents, Sunday-school teachers, choir members, altar servers, and members of Church courts and synods.

(*c.*) I have been present and heard teachers in public gatherings express their individual opinions on the subject of religious instruction in schools. I never heard of any teachers being rebuked by the Department for this as transgressing the regulations. I think the regulations would be enforced if any teacher were found attending a gathering of a sectarian nature intended to attack some other Church, or taking a prominent part on a political party platform.

(*d.*) That the regulations themselves have nothing to do with the religious-instruction system is shown by the fact that they were in Queensland for over thirty years before religious instruction was introduced there, and consequently could have nothing whatever to do with that subject. It does not seem to me to be fair controversy to suppress such a well-known fact.

(*e.*) That the teachers themselves do not regard these restrictions as burdensome or as depriving them of freedom may be concluded from the absence of any request on their part to have these restrictions removed. They have their annual conferences, at which they discuss matters affecting themselves. They lay the result of the conference before the Minister of Education, asking him for such things as they think desirable, and for such alterations as they wish. I never remember hearing of any occasion on which a teachers' conference or their deputations to the Minister protested against these regulations, or made requests to have these regulations abrogated or modified. However, so far as the New Zealand League is concerned, it is not asking for these regulations; nor does it follow that the religious-instruction system, if adopted in New Zealand, need entail the adoption of the regulations referred to.

Parliament troubled Seven Times.

The present campaign of the League is but the culmination of many protests made against the absence of religious instruction from the New Zealand schools. The Churches have made various attempts to have the "entirely secular" clause modified. As evidence of this, there were the following Bills introduced into Parliament to deal with this question: 1885—Mr. Downie Stewart: 1892—Mr. Downie Stewart (lost by one vote only); 1901—Mr. Seddon's General

Referendum; 1903—Mr. Arnold's Special Referendum; 1903—Mr. Seddon's General Referendum; 1904—Mr. Seddon's General Referendum; 1905—Mr. Sidey's Special Referendum. (N.B.—It will be seen later that Mr. Seddon's General Referendum Bills were intended to cover the question of Bible in schools.)

Contrast these seven efforts made in the New Zealand Parliament with the condition of affairs in the four States of Australia, where, since the religious-instruction system was introduced, there has never been any Bill even introduced to modify it, much less to repeal it. In those States there has been political peace in Parliament on the subject. The settlement of the problem has remained politically permanent no matter what political party came into power.

I take it for granted that our opponents, who have shown themselves industrious students of *Hansard*, would have unearthed any efforts, or, indeed, any serious protests in Parliament, against the religious-instruction system. I do not believe that any such exists, and will wait for our opponents to produce evidence to that effect. There have been lengthy debates in Parliaments at the introduction or reaffirmation of such religious instruction, but the subject disappears as a disturbing factor in parliamentary life once the system has been adopted.

The Precedents for the Referendum.

The home of the referendum is in Switzerland, where the Constitution of 1874, Article 89, provides for what is known as the "initiative": see "the Referendum in Switzerland," by Deploige, 1898, page 116, to be found in Parliamentary Library—"Federal laws shall be submitted for the acceptance or rejection of the people if the demand is made by 30,000 active citizens or by eight cantons. The same principle applies to Federal decrees which have a general application, and which are not of an urgent nature." In other words, a request from a section of the population to call into operation the will of the people as a supreme legislative power requires only 30,000 active citizens to make the demand.

The population in Switzerland in 1910 was 3,738,600; the proportion of the population required for the demand or initiative is 0·8 per cent.—that is, less than 1 per cent. Taking our request at 153,000, out of a population of 1,008,468, our request is supported by 15 per cent., or in actual figures by over five times the number required in Switzerland, the population of which is over three times as many as that of New Zealand. While in New Zealand there is no law providing for an initiative, the League has justified the demand on the ground of numbers of individual electors in accordance with the precedent of Switzerland. The League's request is signed by 153,000, which, taking the electors at 590,042 in 1911, is over 25 per cent. of the electors—well over one-third of the 486,100 electors who voted in 1911.

It is not alleged by the League that the conditions are on all-fours with Switzerland, but if less than 1 per cent. in Switzerland can compel a law to be submitted for acceptance or rejection by the people, the League claims that its request, supported by the signatures of 15 per cent. of the population of New Zealand, is worthy of being granted by Parliament, especially as that request if granted will have no legislative effect (unlike Switzerland), but merely will ascertain the will of the people for or against the League's proposal, and will be subject nevertheless to future legislative action by Parliament.

Suitability of Referendum for settling Religious Instruction recognized in the following Cases.

Switzerland in 1882 took a referendum upon a proposal to remove religious instruction from the schools: see Deploige (page 222 *et seq.*), who writes, "Of all the popular votes which have taken place since the introduction of the federal referendum, that of the 26th November, 1882, is unquestionably the most notable, both from the importance of the question voted on and from the large number of electors who went to the polls. The people were called upon to approve a federal decree passed by the Chambers in pursuance of the terms of Article 27 of the Constitution. By that article, 'the cantons shall make provision for elementary education, which must be adequate, and placed exclusively under the direction of the civil authority. Such instruction shall be obligatory, and in the public schools free of charge. The public schools must be so organized that they may be frequented by those belonging to all denominations without prejudice to their freedom of belief or of conscience. The Confederation shall take such measures as may seem necessary against cantons who do not fulfil their obligations in this matter.'

"Since 1874 no steps have been taken to enable the Confederation to exercise its right of control over elementary education. The entire organization, administration, and supervision of the public schools were left to the cantonal councils, and the provisions of Article 27 as to non-sectarian teaching were nowhere observed. In deference to the wishes of their citizens, the State had continued religious teaching within the schools, and in a great many of the communes of the Catholic cantons the teachers were members of recognized religious associations.

"Such a state of things seemed intolerable to the Radical majority in the Federal Assembly. They envied the laurels gained by Liberalism in other countries, and, doubtless in obedience to cosmopolitan freemasonry, they resolved to make education the field for religious warfare. To start the campaign, they voted an inquiry into the methods of teaching in the Swiss cantons by a resolution framed as follows:—

"Art. 1. The Federal Council are asked to make immediate inquiry, through the Department of the Interior, into the condition of the schools in the cantons, and to make the necessary investigations in order to ensure that Article 27 be fully carried out, and to collect evidence which may form the basis of future legislation on the subject.

"Art. 2. To enable the State Department to perform its task, a special secretary is to be appointed (Secretary of Public Instruction), whose annual salary shall be 6,000 francs (£240). His powers shall be determined by a special order of the Federal Council.

"The proposed inquiry was bound to reveal that Article 27 had been disregarded in many places, and the immediate result was bound to be a new law on elementary education. The lines upon which this law would be framed were clearly indicated by a Federal Councillor when called upon for an explanation from the platform. Elementary education would be made either non-sectarian or secular. The staff would be laymen, the subjects secular, the methods secular, the school-houses secular. Education would be secular down to the most minute details, even in the purely Catholic communes.

"The publication of the federal resolution was the signal for a general outcry in protest. 'God in the schools' was the motto adopted by Catholics and orthodox Protestants throughout the whole of Switzerland. A vast petition was organized within a short time, to which 180,995 signatures were appended. No demand for a referendum had ever been so strongly supported before. It is easy to imagine the energy with which the campaign was conducted up to the day of voting. The authors and partisans of the resolution used every means in their power to ensure success. They raised a bogus cry against Catholicism, denounced the danger of clericalism, and, as a supreme argument, represented the Jesuits as waiting to enter the country. It was all in vain. The common-sense of the country asserted itself, and could not be exploited as in 1874. All these intrigues were estimated at their real worth, and on the 26th November the federal resolution was rejected by 318,139 votes to 172,010.

"Catholics, federalists, orthodox Protestants, and religious people generally united to vote 'No.' The minority was composed of German Radicals, freethinkers, and socialists. The referendum on this occasion did good service for Switzerland. It checked the advance of anti-religious Radicalism at the very first step, and saved the country from the educational struggle and its deplorable consequences."

(N.B.—The Roman Catholics there saw no objection to the referendum dealing with a matter of conscience.)

Further recognition of the suitability of the referendum for religious instruction is afforded by *South Australia*, which in 1896 submitted the question by referendum to the people. The answer of the people was in the negative. Taking the referendum there had the effect of settling the question and removing it from the political arena certainly until last year—1913—and a demand is coming forward again for the referendum. The South Australian question was split.

Victoria first recommended and resolved upon the referendum method of settlement in June, 1899, and repeated that decision by its Act of 1901. The referendum was taken in 1904 on a split question, which secured favourable majorities for each question. This gave a confused result, each side claiming victory, but the agitation never ceased. To-day both sides are supporting candidates for Parliament, independently of political parties. A request for the referendum was rejected by the Victorian Parliament in 1913, but the principle of it as a method of settling the question still stands as the unrepealed voice of Parliament, and the agitation for referendum continues as strenuously as ever. (For fuller information about the Victorian referendum see Appendix B.)

Queensland (1910).—A referendum was taken on one question embodying the principles of the Bill before the New Zealand Parliament. It was carried, and since then there has been an end of agitation. It is significant that no other method than that of referendum has been followed in the Australian States in recent years. It has been asserted that the Queensland referendum was not a representative vote of the people. But the facts show that it was regarded as so fully representative as to justify Parliament in passing the enacting Bill giving effect to the referendum by thirty-six votes to twenty-two in the Lower House and by seventeen votes to nine in the Upper House. Subsequent to that there was a general election which gave the people an opportunity of reversing the action of Parliament, but what was the result of the election? The Government which had put through the final Religious Instruction Act went to the country with a majority of only eight, and was returned with a majority increased to nineteen. That was the endorsement by the people of the Government which recognized the referendum as fully expressive of the will of the people. Moreover, there has been no attempt in Parliament to repeal the Act—an indication that the majority of the people are satisfied that the referendum was adequately representative. Queensland was satisfied that the will of the people had been ascertained.

As the Hon. F. Brentnall pointed out in the Upper House (see Queensland *Hansard*, 1910, page 1610), "138,560 electors went to the polls and voted on this subject. A majority of 17,547 is not a small majority. With the whole strength at their backs of the State Labour party of Queensland and of their socialistic allies exerted to the very utmost of their voting-power, the three Labour candidates for the Senate only polled 13,327 more votes than their opponents. The Hon. Andrew Fisher, the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth, got in by a majority of 1,851. The Hon. Henry Turley, the President of the Senate, got in by a majority of 3,824 over Mr. Thomas Glassey. The Hon. Charles McDonald, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, got in by a majority of 3,987. The whole of these high officials, the three most important in the Commonwealth Parliament at the present time, sitting in their supreme dignity, with all the honours and glories and vast emoluments of their respective positions, only polled 9,662 over their opponents. Yet this Bible League carried their vote by a majority of 17,547—almost double the majority of these three successful candidates for the Commonwealth Parliament. . . . Switzerland, I think, is the home of the referendum. During twelve years, from 1897 to 1908, there were twelve references to the people. They varied in results from 34 per cent. to 77 per cent., and the average was 55 per cent. of the votes on the roll. . . . The votes given in this State" [on the same day the religious-instruction referendum was taken] "on the financial agreement averaged 50·63 per cent. of the total number of electors. The vote on the State-debts agreement represented 50·8 per cent. of the electors. In 1901 the majority in Queensland for federation was 7,492. In 1906, over the amendment of the Constitution, only 45 per cent. of the

electors voted. But for this religious teaching in State schools 53·44 per cent. of the electors voted."

It is worth noting that federation was carried by a majority of only 7,492, and was practically irrevocable, and that the religious-instruction referendum was carried by 17,547—two and a half times the majority which carried an irrevocable federation, compulsory on those who voted against it. The religious-instruction referendum was merely declaratory—was not compulsory on Parliament or on a single individual; yet Parliament considered it so truly representative of the whole people that it gave legislative effect to the referendum without delay. It may be added that not only a majority of electors but a vast majority of electorates declared in favour of religious instruction. Out of sixty-one electorates forty-four declared by majorities in favour and only seventeen against. Out of seventy-two members of Parliament fifty-four sat for constituencies which by majorities declared in favour, and only eighteen for constituencies which declared against.

In Queensland at the Federal elections, 1910, referendum returns were received from sixty-one State electorates, comprising 260,021 electors on the State roll. Of these, 138,560 went to the poll and voted on the referendum, being 53·54 per cent. of the electors on the State roll. For the Federal elections there were 279,000 on the Federal roll, of which only 170,164 voted, being 61 per cent. of those enrolled. The difference, then, between the vote on the Federal and referendum vote is less than 8 per cent. The difference is somewhat accounted for by the absence of the postal vote for the State, postal votes being accepted on the Federal election and questions, but not on the State referendum. Had facilities been given for absent voters in the State referendum as in the Federal matters, the numbers would have been nearer to each other. It also was recognized that there were not sufficient supplies of ballot-papers on the referendum. Had these factors not been present there is every reason to believe the State and Federal votes would have approximated.

It is not true to say that the people of Queensland were not aroused. Both sides of the case were well represented, Press, pulpit, and platform being fully availed of. The opponents of the proposal were not silent. One metropolitan paper had more articles and statements against the proposal than the whole of the remainder of the metropolitan papers had in its favour. The Socialist organ, *The Worker*, devoted page after page and cartoons to the same purpose. Twenty-six country newspapers alone had a simultaneous article of three columns against the proposal. In *Hansard*, out of 248 columns in three years occupied in discussing the question, 201 columns were occupied by opponents, leaving only forty-seven columns in *Hansard* in support of the proposal. State Labour members of Parliament opposed to the proposal stated in Parliament that they had spoken on the platform on the subject. Federal members and organizers on that side gave numerous speeches throughout the State against the proposal. The Roman Catholic denominational papers circulating in the State were loud in opposition both to the referendum and also to the religious instruction proposed, and that Church displayed great activity in opposition. I never remember any question so fully or widely debated on both sides in Queensland as was this.

New Zealand.—In 1901 Mr. Seddon introduced a General Referendum Bill, which he expressly stated was to include the Bible-in-schools question (see *Hansard*, 1901, page 267): "I say that the matters I referred to in introducing the Bill—I do not want to recite them again—are matters upon which the public mind is fully made up. There is the question of the elective Executive, Bible-reading in schools, any interference with the Education Act, the question of federation, and the disabilities of women—all these are questions which the public mind is prepared for if you remit them to the country to-morrow. That is my contention. If there are other questions that could be referred to the people, and if there was a danger of the people being caught, that would be a very good argument against the proposal. The passing of this Bill would not affect it. It would enable this House and the Parliament to know whether the matter should be referred to the people." This Bill passed its third reading, but was lost in the Council. The principle of the referendum as applicable to the Bible-in-schools question was therefore accepted by the House.

In 1903 Mr. Seddon again introduced a General Referendum Bill, which was expressly stated by him to include the Bible-in-schools question (*Hansard*, Volume 127, page 259). Mr. Seddon said, "Bible-reading in schools, therefore, is one of the purposes for which a referendum is required—for the purpose of taking the voice of the people." An hon. member: "How do you get it under this Bill?" Mr. Seddon: "Quite simply—by resolution of both Houses, or by a Bill being introduced by the House and rejected; but the simplest way would be by having a resolution passed by both Houses. I am quite prepared, if the Bill passes, to give members the opportunity of expressing an opinion on this matter, by moving a resolution, so that I am not bringing down this Bill merely for the sake of having it on the statute-book when it is being availed of for the specific purposes intended."

In 1904 Mr. Seddon again introduced the General Referendum Bill, and that it was intended to be applicable to the question of Bible in schools is shown by the following extract from *Hansard*:—

Referendum Bill.

(*Hansard*, Vol. 128, p. 106, July 1, 1904.)

"The Right Hon. Mr. SEDDON (Premier): Sir, in moving the second reading of the Bill I desire to place before the House the views of the Government upon the measure. I feel sure that the Bill will be passed. It is practically the Bill of last year. It is a measure that has been asked for by the country. It has been passed by the representatives of the people, and, with slight modifications, has been twice rejected by another place. As to its being sound in principle regarding given questions going direct to the people, there is no member of the House

who will deny that. Members must admit that to submit questions direct to the people is proper in a self-governing country like New Zealand. The statement that there is anything to fear from the electors in respect to this, or giving them the power to decide questions, is, to my mind, chimerical. We have had the opinion of the people direct on given subjects, and have it at every general election; and I myself fail to see grounds for the fears that are expressed by many in reference to submitting direct to the people what is provided for under this Bill. . . . Before I come to what I think has led to the introduction of the Referendum Bill in the past, I would like to say that there are one or two questions which I think should be referred to the people. One question above all others is as to whether there should be Bible-reading in our public schools. I myself have ever been, and remain, a steadfast believer in our national system, and I would be the last to do anything, or be a party to doing anything, that would jeopardize that great boon which has been conferred upon the masses of the colony. I am only the servant of the people, and for me to say that I would refuse, or had the power of refusing, to the people the right to have this matter referred direct to them—if I were to take up that attitude—I certainly would be placing myself in an invidious position. I should not be doing my duty, either to the country or to the high position which I occupy. There is no necessity for me to go into the question for or against the principle that has been asked should be referred to the people. All that this Bill would do, if either the Bill is passed or if resolutions were passed—the machinery provided in this Bill would allow such matters to go to the people."

In 1905 Mr. T. K. Sidey, M.P., introduced a Bible Lessons in State Schools Plebiscite Bill, and carried it past its second reading. This was a remarkable feat for a private member to accomplish with so highly contentious a matter, and showed that the opinion of the House was distinctly in favour of settling the Bible-in-schools problem by means of a plebiscite or referendum. The debate will be found in *Hansard*, 1905, pages 701–736. The division-list in favour of Mr. Sidey's Bill showed, of the then members still remaining in the House, the following who voted "Aye": Messrs. Buddo, Davey, Ell, Fraser (W.), Hanan, Herdman, Herries, Lang, Mander, Massey, Rhodes (R. H.), Thomson (J. C.), Sir Joseph Ward, and Mr. T. K. Sidey; and in the pairs for the Bill, Sir Walter Buchanan.

Thus it will be seen that in 1901, 1903, and 1904, on Mr. Seddon's General Referendum Bills, the principle was admitted as applicable to Bible in schools; and that again in 1905, on Mr. Sidey's Bill, it was specifically agreed upon by the House as applicable.

The referendum principle is already accepted in New Zealand on certain matters, such as prohibition, weekly holidays, and certain municipal affairs. It is pointed out that, in the opinion of many people, some of these referenda touch questions of conscience. The question of prohibition, both for and against it, is to many people a matter of conscience and of religious opinion.

Votes on municipal loans may also determine matters of conscience, which also may compel, through the payment of rates, a voter to contribute to that of which he conscientiously disapproves: for example, where a tramway system has to be provided out of a municipal loan, the question of its Sunday running is very seriously felt by not a small number of earnest Christians who object to all Sunday working, and especially to increasing Sunday labour. Yet though such persons may vote against the loan and be influenced from that point of view, nevertheless if it is carried by the poll of ratepayers, which is after all only a referendum, then they have to share the liability as taxpayers for the loan raised for the purpose.

The argument also applies to the question of municipal theatres. Two instances are furnished, those of Palmerston North and Napier, where, if I am correctly informed, the question of these theatres was submitted to the people by a municipal inquiry or referendum. Here again the question of conscience comes in. Many people regard the theatre as harmful; others again object to their being used on Sunday for any purpose; yet in these matters of conscience, once the referendum is carried, the objecting taxpayer has to bear his share of that to which he strongly objects on conscientious and possibly on declared religious principles.

The Dominion Parliament is being asked merely to give effect to a principle recognized already as applicable to various matters of conscience, and particularly so admitted by former votes of the House in regard to religious instruction in schools.

THURSDAY, 22ND OCTOBER, 1914.

Rev. Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND examined. (No. 14.)

1. *Professor Hunter.*] Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to cross-examine Canon Garland I should like to have my protest recorded against the unfair method adopted by Canon Garland in his statement as regards myself. It is not in regard to traversing any of my evidence, but as regards his interpretation of my cross-examination. My cross-examination will appear in the printed evidence, and the public without doubt will draw their own inferences from it. Personally I do not think it is fair that in the evidence itself a witness should give his interpretation of my cross-examination. I shall refer to some of the points when I come to deal with his statement. Now, Canon Garland, you are the representative of the Bible in State Schools League?—Yes.

2. What is your official position?—Organizing secretary.

3. Is it a paid or an honorary post?—That is a question I do not quite like answering.

4. You refuse to answer?—No, I do not like the question.

5. *The Chairman.*] I must ask you to answer the question?—Very well, sir, I will answer it with pleasure.

6. *Professor Hunter.*] I ask you whether it is a paid or an honorary post?—I wish first to say that I do not see what that question has to do with the petitions that are before the Committee, but as the Committee wishes an answer I shall give it. I am paid to such an extent that if I were in a position to write a cheque for £1,700, that would represent the loss to me of occupying that post. That was the reason, gentlemen, I was reluctant to answer the question. I did not want that fact to come out.

7. What is the salary of the post?—That I shall decline to answer.

8. *The Chairman.*] I think you should answer the question?—The salary is £500. Again I protest against a question which does not refer to anything in the petitions before the Committee.

9. I have given an immense amount of latitude in both the examination and cross-examination, and I hope you will recognize that in answering?—Yes. It is only this personal aspect that I take exception to. Anything else I shall be glad to answer as fully as I can.

10. *Professor Hunter.*] Are there any other paid organizers of the League?—Not at this particular moment here. I do not know what you mean by "organizers."

11. Organizers of the League?—Oh, yes, there are.

12. Paid organizers?—We do not call them "organizers."

13. Well, any other paid officials of the League?—Yes, there are.

14. How many?—I would have to think for a moment. We have three paid secretaries.

15. Those are the other paid officials?—Yes.

16. How long have you been organizer of the Bible in State School League?—Two years and three months.

17. Can you give the Committee some idea of the cost of the movement up to the present time?—I could not, because I do not keep the accounts.

18. The League expresses itself as representing 74 per cent. of the population?—Speaking on behalf of Churches representing 74 per cent. of the population.

19. Does your estimate of 74 per cent. come from the census returns?—Yes.

20. Before the Bill in Queensland, what percentage did the organization there say that it represented?—I will have to think about that and answer it only roughly.

21. Only very roughly will do?—I should say, something between 65 and 70 per cent. of the population.

22. That estimate is obtained by taking the religion set down opposite the name of the person in the census list?—Yes.

23. Is it not a fact that in the census return, Appendix, 1911, the Church attendance of Anglicans is 13 per cent. of the number of people so recorded as Anglicans in the census?—I do not know; I have not looked it up.

24. You do not know that for the Presbyterians the figure is 24 per cent.?—I believe that is correct.

25. And for the Methodists 41 per cent.?—I do not remember. I have not got the Year-book.

26. So that if all those attenders at church were members of your League it would represent, roughly speaking, 20 per cent. of the people who are on the electoral rolls of the country: are you aware of that fact?—No, I do not accept the situation at all. I do not claim that in any sense of the word. The census return of attendances of public worship is not a representative fact, because I am informed by a great many clergymen of different denominations that they object very much to the census return and object to filling in the figures, and consequently do not send them in. Besides, you cannot take that as a test of the attendances unless you know that a similar plan of checking the attendance is applied to make things equal between the different Churches, and that, I venture to express the opinion, is practically impossible.

27. Your League aims at getting the opinion of the public on this question?—Yes.

28. How many meetings have you personally conducted since the campaign started in Wellington?—I have never kept a record.

29. Probably hundreds?—I would not say that, or thousands, or scores.

30. Over a hundred?—I really could not say. I have not kept a record of such things.

31. I only ask you to give me an expression of your opinion?—I would not express an opinion, because I have not kept a record.

32. You cannot tell the Committee whether it is five or five thousand?—I know it is not five or five thousand.

33. Is it fifty or more?—I should say it is more than fifty.

34. More than a hundred?—I should not say it is or is not.

35. How many of those have been public meetings?—If you define what meetings you are referring to—by holding private meetings of members or public meetings——

36. I want to know how many public meetings you have held?—I could not give you an idea of the number, but I know I have held a great many.

37. Will you tell me where you have held a public meeting?—There was one in Wellington attended by some thousands of people, and one in Auckland which I addressed, and there was one in Auckland of thousands of people which I did not address.

38. Can you give us some other instance?—I would have to think. I remember a public meeting at Wanganui addressed by Dr. Gibb, and another there addressed by myself, and another at Aramoho addressed by myself. I have addressed public meetings at Christchurch, Dunedin, Invercargill, and Bluff, and generally as I went round.

39. Is it not a fact that those meetings are advertised for supporters only?—I do not remember any such advertisement.

40. You have never seen such an advertisement in the papers?—No, I have not seen such an advertisement unless on a special occasion.

41. Are you aware that at the meeting at Wellington the chairman announced that it was for supporters only?—I do not remember it.

42. Are you aware that in the Dunedin Presbytery the Rev. Mr. Chisholm moved the following motion: "Whereas, according to the Divine order and the experience of the Church in every age, the home and the family circle furnish the first and by far the best opportunity for bringing the children to the feet of Christ that they may learn of Him, and whereas the introduction into the State schools of selections from the Bible to be taught not as the Word of God, not as Holy Scripture, able to make the children wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus, but as a manual of history, literature, and morals is, from a Christian point of view, a political device of very doubtful utility, this presbytery regret that the attention and energies of the Church should be largely diverted from what is primary and essential in the Divine order and directed to a movement piously designed to make up from outside help for what she has failed to accomplish by her own inherent power." Do you know of that resolution?—I do not remember that, but I have a hazy idea that it was rejected. I have a hazy idea he moved some resolution like that on more than one occasion, and that it was rejected by an immense number.

43. Are you aware that an attempt was made to get the amendment ruled out, on the ground that it was merely an expression of regret?—No, I do not remember that.

44. You are not aware the moderator would not take that course?—No, I do not remember all the facts. I remember the general thing.

45. And then Mr. Scorgie moved that the presbytery proceed to the next business?—I do not remember that.

46. And that the presbytery proceeded to the next business and did not take a test vote?—No. I remember this: that the matter came up at a subsequent presbytery meeting and was dealt with in a highly satisfactory manner from the League's point of view.

47. Will you produce the letter to which Mr. Board's letter, quoted in the League's publication of the opinions of educational experts, is a reply?—I will send for it.

48. Was that letter addressed to you?—Not that one: that was addressed to Bishop Pain, of Gippsland.

49. Mr. Caughley made the statement that some words were left out: have you found out whether those words were omitted?—Yes, those two words "general" and "special" were left out.

50. They were underlined in the original?—Yes.

51. And were they the underlined words that were omitted?—Yes, as far as I can find out.

52. Why were they omitted?—I will show you when I get the papers I have sent for. It was a pure accident.

53. Do you think any other words more favourable to your case could have been omitted from that document?—No, I would not say they were favourable or unfavourable. There was certainly no intention of drawing a deduction one way or the other. The omission was made in Victoria and not here, so it could not have been made by us.

54. Do you know what is the probability that those two words, and those two words only, could be omitted from that document as a printer's error?—I could not tell, because the actual printer's error occurred in Melbourne, and not under my control at all. I did not know about it.

55. Do you know what the probability is in a letter containing nine hundred words that those two words, and those two words only, could be omitted from that document?—I should say it is similar to that which happened in the *Post* the other night. Mr. Cook had said he did not know of any district in New South Wales where the Scripture books were not in use, and the *Post* left out the word "not." I am sure the *Post* did not do it purposely, but it has gone out to the world that he knew of many districts where the books were not in use.

56. Would you be surprised to know that mathematically it is millions to one on those two words being left out?—I do not know anything about mathematics. The printed document reads, "Outside this religious instruction, section 17 of the Act provides for what is called religious instruction." It is quite clear that there is something wrong there, and no one but a fool would intentionally publish it so. How it should have read is, "Outside this general religious instruction, section 17 of the Act provides for what is called special religious instruction." I knew nothing about it until I saw it here in this room, but I can imagine that either the typist or the printer, seeing the word "special" or "general" underlined, thought they should be struck out. Any member of the Committee will see that no one would leave out those words deliberately, because it is so obvious.

57. You remember that Mr. Caughley said that Mr. Board himself had taken the major part of this from Mr. Knibbs's report, leaving out what did not favour the Bible in Schools League's view?—He said that was his opinion.

58. He said it was taken from the Knibbs report?—I do not admit that. I say that Mr. Board in writing an opinion like that embodied what he thought represented the true and accurate state of the case, and I claim there is no higher authority in expressing an official opinion than the official head of the Department, who is responsible for everything he does, through his Minister.

59. Do you think Mr. Board is not biased in regard to the scheme in New South Wales?—No one who knows Mr. Board, as I have known him for many years, could regard him as biased in our favour. He is an absolutely cold-blooded, impartial man. Personally I do not happen to know what his views or predilections are on this point, and I do not think any one else would.

60. Would you be surprised to find out that we have applied to Mr. Board in regard to statements made in Bishop Cleary's evidence as to whether they are true and we have not got a

reply?—I would not be surprised, because I have also applied to him for information and have had no reply, and my explanation is that he is being pestered so much by the whole lot of us, including Victoria and Australia, that he is calling a halt.

61. In regard to the rest of the statements in the pamphlet, will you produce to the Committee the letters to which those are replies?—It would be absolutely impossible. I think I have a copy of one letter written, because some replied on the back of the letter that was forwarded. I will produce that.

62. Who collected the letters?—Quite a number of people. I collected some of them myself, and others collected them and sent them in to me.

63. Do you know if all the replies that came in response to the circular or letters that were issued are printed in this pamphlet?—As far as I am aware they all are.

64. You cannot be sure, because so many people received them?—That is so.

65. Is the whole of each letter published here?—No, and I want that to be clearly understood. We do not purport to publish the whole of any letter. We purported to give, as far as possible in the words of the writer—not exclusively so—a *résumé* of his opinion, leaving out the trimmings and repetitions that had been published in other parts so as to get something readable for the public.

66. Did every man who replied answer all the questions?—I am not sure about that. No, I do not think so. The pamphlet contains what we published for the public.

67. Is that indicated anywhere in the pamphlet?—No, it is not.

68. Are there any parts of those letters that are not favourable to your scheme omitted?—Not to my knowledge and not with my consent—certainly no letter that came to me.

69. You have not seen all the originals?—I should say not.

70. Did the teachers who have replied know the opinion of the Secretary of Education on this point before they replied?—Oh, yes, because it is public property. Everybody knows it: it is in the newspapers and all over the world, and it is known to your organization. It is well known all over New Zealand.

71. This was long before our organization?—Then it is to you. It was well known in all parts of Australia.

72. I want to know if the teachers were aware of the information contained in Mr. Board's letter when they replied to this circular?—As Mr. Board's published letter was written in 1906, men who wrote in 1903 could not have been in possession of it.

73. Are you aware that Mr. Banks starts his letter with "I quite endorse the answers given by the Under-Secretary"?—He is obviously referring not to the letter but to something else the Under-Secretary has said.

74. And the same with Mr. Thornton, who said, "I beg to state that my experience in this matter warrants me in fully endorsing the Under-Secretary's replies to Mr. Garland's questions"?—Yes, that is in 1893. I can recall those two—that was in the West Australian movement, and it was not Mr. Board. It does not matter who the Under-Secretary is, they all express the same opinions. I think it was Mr. Johnston. I am not sure who it was, but whoever the Under-Secretary was he made a brief statement at the request of the Minister. That was published in West Australia; and the Sydney papers, I suppose, knew of it, and it would be handed to the daily Press for publication.

75. Do you think that teachers knowing the Under-Secretary's views on the question were likely to be eager to express a view contrary to his?—I think teachers who are not afraid to form a trades-union and to bring their Minister before the Arbitration Court should not be afraid of any Under-Secretary.

76. Do you think any individual teacher, in view of the expressed statement of the Under-Secretary, would be perfectly free in giving those opinions?—I am absolutely of the opinion, after my acquaintance of the teachers of New South Wales, that they would not be afraid to give their opinion contrary to the opinion of the Under-Secretary.

77. Would you be surprised that many teachers over here expressed a view against the system but did not want their names disclosed?—I would be so much surprised to hear it that I would not credit it unless I had the statement made to me by an individual teacher. I do not say you could not find in all these four States a teacher who is not as much in love with this system as I am, but I say it would be an extraordinary thing to come across a teacher who in his heart would believe one word against it such as we have heard here.

78. We have one case in which one teacher has put his view before the teachers of New Zealand. In your statement it reads, "Mr. Grundy remarked that it would be difficult to treat the text-book as the other subjects of the curriculum would be treated by an intelligent teacher with modern ideas. The present idea was to encourage the child to ask questions. If a child asked questions, how was a teacher to get over it? 'I do not know how he would get over it,' said Mr. Gripp. 'Refer the child to the minister.' Mr. Gripp agreed that that would relieve the teacher of the responsibility." Do you think that would be a satisfactory solution of the difficulty in a Scripture lesson?—I think that was the proper way of dealing with the question. That was wholly absurd and fallacious, because while in theory it may be that a child will ask an awkward question, the fact is that in practice that is not the case. A teacher is a teacher of intelligence, in my experience.

79. Do you know that Mr. Grundy is one of the oldest and most respected teachers in Wellington?—I have no doubt; but I am not reflecting on Mr. Grundy, but on the fallacy of a grown-up and experienced teacher not being able to deal with a little child's difficulty.

80. You realize if it is a fallacy it is Mr. Grundy's fallacy?—No, it is the fallacy of those who should have practical experience enough to find out.

81. Do you know anything about Mr. Grundy's experience?—No; but he had had no experience of Scripture-lesson books in schools.

82. In your statement Mr. Johnson is quoted as saying, "You ask if there are any practical difficulties. Yes, I have heard of one case. A young Methodist minister was particularly good with children, a most interesting teacher, and the little Anglicans from the adjoining classroom used to sneak in to the 'popular' man without the teacher's knowledge! As this is the only difficulty I have to relate after six years' experience you can understand how smoothly everything works." It is possible, therefore, for a popular teacher to attract children from other denominations?—I say it is possible, but I say it is so improbable that Mr. Johnson, who began his investigations into this system as a confirmed opponent, has to admit that all he can hear after six years' experience is that a young Methodist minister used to take poor unfortunate little Anglicans away from their own class because he himself was so popular. I want to point out that there have been suggestions of proselytism and small Churches suffering in consequence of the dominations of some larger Church. The only case which can be brought up where something occurred is not where a large Church swallowed up a small Church, but of the minnow swallowing the whale.

83. It is the only case that I can find in your evidence, but not the only case that can be brought up?—Well, wait till we hear of others.

84. You have no knowledge of the number of requests that were sent out for these letters?—No. I got a parliamentary return of the names of the teachers at the time we were working in Queensland, and I looked down the list and took what I thought were typical districts and typical schools, regardless of the man and not knowing who the man was. There is hardly a name there of any personal friend.

85. Were they sent out through the Department?—No, sent out by me direct or by other people, and some by ministers of religion who were not opponents and not supporters, like the Rev. Loyal Wirt, of Brisbane. His personal feelings were against any such thing, but he said he could not condemn it for that—he must inquire into it.

86. You are aware, of course, that the regulation in New South Wales forbids the teacher to supply such information?—No, I am not, as shown by the fact that the information is public property.

87. How many teachers are there in New South Wales?—I could not answer that question.

88. About five thousand?—I should say something like that.

89. How many replies have you got?—I never counted them. I am told there are ninety-eight.

90. In treating my evidence you rather laughed to scorn the idea that we have eleven ministers out of 322. You say in your statement, "Professor Hunter can only mention two Anglican clergymen, one of whom it is well known is engaged in secular work, and has been so for many years, and therefore is hardly to be taken as representative. Professor Hunter emphatically states *many* Presbyterian ministers are strongly opposed to the proposed scheme. He gives eleven names out of a possible of 322." You will realize that in my evidence they were given as examples?—No, I do not. I realize they were given as all you could get. Do you mean to say you could get more than eleven Presbyterian ministers who signed that petition?

91. In my statement I said, "Many Presbyterian ministers are strongly opposed to the proposed scheme. These include such representative men as Rev. Dr. Erwin, Rev. Messrs. W. Hewitson, J. Chisholm, A. Cameron, J. H. Mackenzie (Nelson), J. M. Saunders, A. A. Murray, Walter McLean, F. W. Robertson, J. Miller, Dodds, and others"?—Yes.

92. You realize that what you said in your evidence was not a perfectly accurate statement?—I say in my statement, "I deny that amongst Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministers many can be found dissenting from the decision of their own Church courts and in sympathy on this matter with the National Schools Defence League and the Roman Catholic Federation. Professor Hunter can only mention two Anglican clergymen, one of whom it is well known is engaged in secular work and has been so for many years, and therefore is hardly to be taken as representative. Professor Hunter emphatically states many Presbyterian ministers are strongly opposed to the proposed scheme. He gives eleven names out of a possible 322 names, the number of Presbyterian ministers recorded in the Year-book, page 159. A vote of the last Presbyterian Assembly showed eleven ministers in opposition."

93. So that there were only ninety-eight teachers who replied out of five thousand in New South Wales: do you think it is wise to throw stones like the one you threw on page 182?—You understand that in throwing the stone there was nothing offensive. You do not mean that.

94. What I mean is that a person who throws a stone in a printed book should realize how far it is going?—It does not go any distance.

95. It goes as far as the number of copies printed?—That is not what I mean. What I mean is that there is no comparison whatever between the action we took in ascertaining the opinion in Australia on this subject and the action taken by the Defence League in sending an urgent circular to every minister whom they regarded as in sympathy with them, and getting only eleven supporters out of the number. We did not pretend to send to anything like every teacher in Australia—that would have meant something like ten thousand; we simply sent to typical cases. If there is any doubt as to their being representative I would suggest that the Chairman of this Committee send out a circular addressed to every teacher in Australia, and we will abide by the result.

96. You said we had sent out a circular and got eleven replies: what justification have you got for that?—Well, you gave eleven names. How many did you get, then?

97. We did not send out a circular. How many petitions have been presented to the House?—I do not know.

98. Would you be surprised to know there are nearly a hundred?—I do not know. I heard you say the other day that the number was eighty-six, and I took it at that, and you said you

thought there were some others coming in. I also noticed in the *Dominion* this morning a repudiation by one gentleman whose name was attached—Mr. Thomas, Congregational minister—and I have been informed since the publication of those names that several of those published are the names of men who have left the Dominion, and others the names of those who are not clergymen, in the sense that they are carrying on some other vocation.

99. There are more than eleven?—There may be.

100. Dealing with the Wilkins circular referred to in the inset to your statement, you are aware that the leaflet you there refer to was not in my evidence?—I am aware that your League circular No. 7 was not in your evidence. I do not remember it being there.

101. Was the heading "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing" in my evidence?—No, I do not remember it there, but I remember it in this leaflet.

102. In the leaflet No. 7 does it pretend to make proselytism or sheep-stealing part of the Wilkins circular?—It puts it as a heading to the page on which the Wilkins circular appears.

103. Have you looked through the leaflet?—Yes.

104. It is clear that proselytism or sheep-stealing does not pretend in this leaflet to be in the Wilkins circular?—No, I do not admit that.

105. Look at the type on the second page. The first heading is "Positive Australian Evidence," the next "The Sectarian Virus in Politics," and the next "Proselytism or 'Sheep-stealing'"?—Yes.

106. Are you not prepared to say that it so happens that proselytism or sheep-stealing comes at the head of that page?—Yes.

107. But it does not pretend to be part of the Wilkins circular?—I took it as part of the Wilkins circular. It is at the head of the Wilkins circular.

108. It is a heading to our leaflet?—Then it should have been headed "Alleged Proselytism and Sheep-stealing." To me it is absolutely clear that the intention was to convey the idea that this circular dealt with proselytism and sheep-stealing, when as a matter of fact it said nothing whatever on the subject.

109. This document that appeared in the Queensland *Hansard* and the copy from the Queensland *Hansard* starts at a point "Religious Instruction in Public Schools": is that right?—No, that is absolutely wrong. The document does not appear in the Queensland *Hansard* as reproduced. The Queensland *Hansdrd*, which I have here and which members of Parliament will understand, shows clearly that what is spoken of as part of the Wilkins circular is part of some other document which was never in the original circular.

110. My point is this: you are accusing the National Schools Defence League of incorporating as part of the circular proselytism or sheep-stealing in your evidence?—Where do I say I accuse them?

111. You say in your inset, "It will be noted first that the heading 'Proselytism or Sheep-stealing,' put into capitals in opposition League's leaflet No. 7, does not exist, nor is the word 'proselytism' once even used, in the alleged circular itself"?—Yes, and I emphasize that. I ask the members of the Committee to look at the *Hansard* themselves, and they will see that the words "Proselytism or sheep-stealing" are not there as the heading.

112. But do you mean to say that you think the National Schools Defence League, in bringing forward that document, attempted to make it appear that proselytism or sheep-stealing was actually in the document?—I am afraid I got that impression, but I would be very glad to have it corrected.

113. You got a second cable from Mr. Board that you have printed?—Yes.

114. Was that cable in answer to another cable of yours?—Yes.

115. Will you read the other cable?—Yes; here is my cable in full—"13/7/14.—Director Education, Sydney.—Please cable urgently whether Wilkins or any other official ever issued official document containing following paragraph, which opponents allege is part of Wilkins circular: 'The following is a copy of the circular of instructions issued to all State schools in New South Wales for guidance in the matter of giving religious instruction in such schools. The italics in the second clause are inserted to add emphasis to the direction given because some clergymen 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 to their classes.'—GARLAND." That is the full cable I sent.

116. And a few days after you made your statement in the synod you were aware the circular letter had been issued?—No, not a few days after—a week after.

117. Now, the letter you quote from Mr. Board of the 26th November, 1906, shows of course that you had knowledge of it before?—It shows I had a knowledge of it in the year 1906, but that it had absolutely escaped my memory.

118. Had the Queensland *Hansard* escaped your memory too?—No.

119. Did you report the fact to the synod that you had got this second cable?—The synod was not sitting.

120. Did you report it to Bishop Sprott?—I think I mentioned it to him and one or two others I met.

121. Is it not a fact that when Mr. Wilkins was secretary a circular was issued, part or whole of which appears in *Hansard*, to the effect "The Council of Education requests your careful attention," &c.?—I shall not admit that as a fact until some official statement is produced from the Department showing that it was issued, because I believe there has been a mistake over it.

122. You admit that Mr. Board says it was doubtless issued?—Doubtless something of the sort was issued.

123. Do you know that the document that appears in the Queensland *Hansard* was a reissue of the whole or part of the original circular, with this preamble by the Education Department drawing attention to it?—No, I do not; and unless I have some official information I would not accept it. You may have official information and you may have been keeping it back, but I would be very much surprised to see it, because my belief is that that first paragraph was an invention of an opponent who wanted to give that twist to a circular which was undoubtedly issued and which would not have borne that construction without it. I ask you to produce the document which you and Mr. Caughley stated to the Press emphatically was in your possession. The leaflet No. 7 says explicitly, "The following is a copy of the circular issued." You could not say that is a copy unless you had the original. In my inset it is stated, "Yet the opposition League, in leaflet No. 7, says, 'Mr. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on 15th July, 1900, issued the following circular to the teachers in the State schools. It speaks for itself'; and there quotes as Mr. Wilkins's circular a paragraph taken from some other and unknown source (probably the opinion of an opponent in a letter to a newspaper) as if this opinion were part of the text of the Wilkins 'circular.' Why did not the opposition League print the 'circular' from the original of one of those circulars of which they say (*Dominion*, 11th July, 1914) 'opponents in New Zealand received copies from the Education Department, New South Wales, under date 15th July, 1900, when (the Committee are informed) the Wilkins circular was reissued'? Why did not the opposition League give the name and address of the authority who forwarded the 'copies' of the circular? Why did not the opposition League give the name and address of the authority who informed them it was 'reissued' 15th July, 1900?"

124. I am asking you the question as to whether you know that this preamble was issued at some subsequent time to the Wilkins circular along with this part of the Wilkins circular?—No, I am not aware of that, and I would be glad to believe it, because I only want to get at the facts.

125. Do you know that the substance of the Wilkins circular appears in the Public Instruction Act of 1880?—No, I would like to see it.

126. Clause 17 reads, "And a portion of each day—not more than one hour—shall be set apart when the children of any one religious persuasion may be instructed by the clergyman or other religious teacher of such persuasion, but in all cases the pupils receiving such religious instruction shall be separated from the other pupils of the school." You are aware that is in the Act?—I believe so—I will accept your reading of it, but by no means do I admit it has anything whatever to do, even that resemblance, with the Wilkins circular. I want to point out that the Wilkins circular, so far from being issued because of the danger of proselytism, was issued in order to explain to teachers. The system was coming into more extensive use with the abolition of the State aid to the denominational schools, and teachers who had not had to do with the matter so much, now taking to it, it was simply an instruction issued to them to explain how they were to work—that they were to let the children in provided the parents consented. "The whole tenor of the 'circular' itself, as printed in Queensland *Hansard*, was intended to deal not with 'proselytism or sheep-stealing,' but to facilitate the smooth working of the ministers' visits. Upon this and other matters of detail the Council desires that you will co-operate with any clergyman who may attend at the school under your charge for the purpose of giving special religious instruction, and that you will afford him all the assistance in your power in making satisfactory arrangements." A very different thing from that contained in leaflet No. 7.

127. You understand that I am not dealing with leaflet No. 7—I am dealing with the statement in my evidence which you are traversing. There is no necessity to confuse leaflet No. 7 with my evidence?—I am not confusing it.

128. If it were put in this way you would not agree that Wilkins issued his circular, that later the Council of Education reissued part or the whole of that circular with the preamble given in *Hansard*, and that when the Act came into force, so necessary had it been found that all the provisions of the Wilkins circular were put into the 1880 Act?—I do not admit for a moment that they embodied anything resembling this circular in the Act of 1880. As a matter of fact, the Act of 1866, speaking from memory, had almost similar regulations. There were only verbal changes between the Act of 1866 and the Act of 1880 in relation to religious instruction.

129. Are you aware that Regulation 128 of the West Australian regulations reads, "The teacher must ascertain from the parents or guardians of the pupils attending his school the religious denomination to which they belong (see Regulation 85). If a parent notifies in writing that he wishes his child to attend the instruction given by the delegate of a denomination other than that which appears in the register, the teacher must retain the parent's letter as his authority for permitting such an attendance"?—Yes, I am aware of that, and think it a splendid regulation.

130. I come now to the Presbyterian Assembly of Queensland: You criticized my statement that the Presbyterian Church of Queensland was against the proposal of the Bible in Schools League there?—Yes.

131. You handed me a document in proof that my statement was false?—I do not like that expression.

132. That I was in error in making the statement?—Yes.

133. You were aware when you handed me that statement that it did not refer to the Queensland Assembly but to the Australian Assembly?—I am not aware of that, because the General Assembly of Australia is the main body to whom the courts are responsible.

134. Are you not aware that that document you handed to me referred not to the Queensland Assembly, but to the Australian Assembly?—I have two such documents, and I do not remember which of them I showed you. One reads, "Presbyterian Church of Australia, St. Stephen's Manse, Ipswich, 18th September, 1908.—Dear Sir, You are doubtless aware that the General Assembly of Australia, which met at Adelaide in September of last year, unanimously

resolved 'That the Assembly approve of the use of the Scriptures in public schools, and of the access of ministers to these schools for the purpose of giving denominational teaching to the children of their own congregations, and hope that members of the Church in Victoria and Queensland may use their influence to promote legislation in this direction.' Recognizing the importance of this matter, and the fact that by the passing of the Referendum Bill during the last session of the Queensland Parliament the people will be called upon to decide whether Bible lessons shall form part of the regular work of the school curriculum, and accredited teachers be permitted to give instruction to children of their own denomination, as moderator of the General Assembly I desire to place before you the necessity of exercising your influence on behalf of this movement for giving to the children of our State the knowledge of that Word which is the foundation of our Protestant faith and practice, and without which knowledge the work of the Church is made increasingly difficult every year. I shall be glad to learn from you what you can do in your district to further this great cause, whether by the formation of a branch of the Bible in State Schools League, by the support of the same if already formed, or by other means which you may deem effective in your particular circumstances.—I am, yours in the common service, PETER ROBERTSON, Moderator." It was the General Assembly of Australia. The second pastoral letter contained the resolution of the Assembly, as follows: "'Approve of the action of the ex-moderator in issuing a circular to the Church in Queensland on the Bible-in-State-schools question; commend the Churches in the States in which the law permits to make full use of their opportunities for giving Bible instruction to our children in the State schools; and urge the ministers and people in Victoria and Queensland to aid to the full measure of their influence the securing of a like boon in their States.' Having regard to the great importance of this matter as relating specially to the State of Queensland, I have been instructed by the Public Questions Committee to issue a circular containing the foregoing finding of Assembly, and to urge upon the ministers and people in Queensland to act together in this matter, and to advance the efforts of all *re* endeavouring to secure Bible instruction for children in the State schools, so that the object aimed at may be speedily attained." That is the decision of the Presbyterian Church of Australia, and therefore the decision of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland.

135. You knew it was the Assembly of Australia?—Yes.

136. Were you not aware at the time that the Queensland Assembly had twice had a proposal to approve the Bible in Schools League proposal before it, and did not approve of it?—I am aware that the State Assembly did not pass a resolution either for or against it, so that it would not be right for me to say that the Queensland Assembly approved, and it would not be right for you to say that the Queensland Assembly disapproved. No matter what resolution they passed or did not pass, they were entirely bound by the decision of the General Assembly.

137. You knew that a motion in favour of the Bible in schools had been twice before the Queensland Assembly, and that they had passed a motion on two previous occasions to go on to the next business?—I am aware they did so, and I am equally aware that that is no proof they were opposed to it. As a matter of fact, I know a majority were in favour of it.

138. You remember that that is exactly what happened to Mr. Chisholm in Dunedin with his motion—it was defeated by taking the next business?—On that occasion; but there was something done later that I do not now remember which left it quite clear as to the opinion of the presbytery.

139. In your League is there not a "League of Earnestness"?—Yes.

140. Will you tell me what the pledge is?—I have not a card with me.

141. Will you put one before the Committee?—With pleasure.

142. Is it not a fact that the idea of that pledge is to put this Bible-in-schools issue at the next election before any and all other issues?—No.

143. I come now to the Conference of educationists and others held in Sydney in 1904. You referred to that?—Yes.

144. By whom was the Conference called?—By the Minister of Education.

145. He would act, I suppose, under the advice of the Under-Secretary for Education?—He would act in a matter like that under Cabinet, I presume, but I am not in the State secrets.

146. Why was it called?—Because they were recasting the whole educational system.

147. They had just received the expert opinion of two Commissioners, Mr. Knibbs and Mr. Turner?—No. They had the expert opinions of two individual Commissioners—a very different thing.

148. What has been known as the Knibbs report?—No, what your people have called the Knibbs report.

149. It is commonly called the Knibbs report?—No, it is not. I never heard it called the Knibbs report till I heard it called so by your friends.

150. Well, the report of the Commissioners?—Yes, the report of the Commissioners—a very different thing.

151. I should have thought it would have been "reports"?—No, it is "report."

152. When was that published?—In 1903.

153. And when authorized by Parliament to be printed?—I do not know.

154. My copy says, "Ordered by the Legislative Assembly to be printed on 21st January, 1904"?—You probably have the document that was printed by Parliament, and I have the document that was printed by the Commissioners themselves.

155. We have the official edition which was printed by Parliament?—And I have the official edition issued by the Department.

156. Now, the Conference was held two or three months later?—No, the Conference was held in April, 1904, and this was issued in 1903.

157. The document became public?—It was public as soon as this was printed by Parliament.

158. You do not think that this Conference, at which certain educationists attended and at which certain ministers offered to attend, was an attempt to meet the severe criticism given the New South Wales system by the report of Mr. Knibbs in the Commission's report?—No, not for a moment. There was no such suggestion in the whole Conference report.

159. I come now to the Palmerston petition in favour of the Bible in Schools League. You officially know nothing of that petition?—Oh, yes, I do know about it.

160. Have you scrutinized it?—No. I may have seen some of the signatures.

161. Would you be surprised to find in that petition that 117 names are apparently written in the handwriting of 55 persons?—I would be surprised.

162. And that one name is marked with a cross and not witnessed?—I do not know—I have never seen it.

163. With six names attached to a separate sheet with no petition heading?—No.

164. And with about fifteen names on the back with no heading?—I have not seen it.

165. And the petition says it is the humble petition of the undersigned electors and persons qualified to be electors at Palmerston North?—Yes, I believe that is correct.

166. Now we come to the League's cards. Are the signatures on those cards restricted to people on the electoral rolls?—No, those signatures are invited from people who are either on the rolls or qualified to be on the rolls, and where any signature is found of any person who is not on the roll and not qualified to be on the roll we do not include it.

167. How do you find out?—By checking the rolls.

168. But if some are only qualified to be on the rolls how do you find out?—The canvassers take pains to find out.

169. How do they find out?—By going and asking the person.

170. Do they always go and ask the person?—I would not say "always"—that would be absurd; but that is the general practice.

171. Have you ever had the fact brought under the notice of you and others that a great deal of misrepresentation was going on in the getting of signatures?—No, I never had the fact brought under my notice, but I have heard the statement made by you and your friends.

172. Would you be surprised to know that the canvasser who asked me to sign told me there was a conscience clause for teachers?—After noticing, Professor, your extreme cleverness here—and I congratulate you on it—I would not be surprised that any poor old lady who went to you, that you got her tangled up.

173. It was not an old lady?—If you give me the name I would be delighted to bring the person here and find out what happened.

174. When you paid your official visit to Dunedin you did not see in the paper a letter calling your attention to the fact and asking you to deal with the fact at your meeting?—I did not see the letter.

175. Those signatures have never been subject to scrutiny?—By whom?

176. By some outside authority?—I do not see why the membership of our organization should be subject to scrutiny by some outside authority. Do you consider that the signatures of the members of the Defence League or the Roman Catholic Federation should be subject to scrutiny by some outside authority? For a moment that does not mean that we object to our membership being investigated, and we showed that long before any question of this sort arose, because on the 1st September, 1913, in a public deputation to the Prime Minister, I said in the name of the League that we were willing to submit our cards of membership to any inspection the Government desired, and also to allow any individual member of Parliament to inspect our membership cards in his own electorate. In addition to that I have written to quite a number of members of Parliament personally making the proposal to them. When an organization does such an exceptional thing as that in regard to its own membership, I think we have shown extraordinary openness in the matter; but as to allowing our opponents to examine our cards, do you think I am going to allow the members of the League to be annoyed and harassed by the clever questions that Professor Hunter puts to me?

177. Are you aware that the National Schools Defence League's petition has been presented to Parliament and is open to scrutiny?—I have not bothered my head about it.

178. If the Prime Minister, accepting your offer, had suggested that the National Schools Defence League should scrutinize your petitions, would you agree?—No, I would not. It is no use putting that question. I cannot imagine a man in the position of the Prime Minister of this Dominion or any other Minister of the Crown taking such an extraordinary course as that. It is what I can imagine the National Schools Defence League would suggest, but I cannot understand a man with a sense of responsibility agreeing to it.

179. Coming to the Referendum Bill, it has been described by your supporters as your Bill?—What do you mean by "your" Bill?

180. That is what I am wanting to find out?—Read the description.

181. Bishop Sprott has referred to it as "our" Bill?—That is not referring to it as "my" Bill.

182. I am referring to you as the representative of the League. You do refer to that as the League's Bill?—No, I would not.

183. Then Bishop Sprott would be wrong?—No, he was not wrong. I think where a man is speaking of a document he is speaking in a colloquial fashion, and does not every moment he speaks want to describe the full title of the Bill. I was very much surprised at our opponents seizing on an expression like that, and thought they were very hard up.

184. Did you take any part in framing that Bill?—Mr. Chairman, is that a fair question?

The Chairman: I think so.

Witness: Then I want to know what you mean by taking a part in framing that Bill?

185. *Professor Hunter* (to witness).] Well, any part?—What do you mean by any part? I did not take a pen and write it.

186. Did you suggest the nature of the Bill?—To whom, and how?

187. To the maker of the Bill?—I do not know who was the maker of the Bill.

188. Did you make any suggestions to the Minister of Education?—I made absolutely no suggestions to him.

189. Did you make any suggestions to Mr. Allen as to the nature of the Bill?—Absolutely none.

190. Did you send this letter to the Hon. J. Allen: "Sir, In view of the present crisis by which the existence of the Empire is challenged, and by which our political and national life are being dislocated, and considering the serious developments which may occur at any moment, the executive of the League is of opinion that nothing should hinder the closest union of every section of the community, and also that no matter which would distract the attention of the Government from the vital affairs concerning the future of the Empire should be allowed to hamper the mind of the Government. I have therefore the honour to request, under the above circumstances, that for the present the Bible in State Schools Referendum Bill be withdrawn from Parliament.—DAVID J. GARLAND"?—Yes, I wrote that letter.

191. Now I want to ask you about this letter: "Bible in State Schools League.—(For the cause of the children).—Devonport, 20th July, 1914.—Private and confidential, and very urgent.—Dear sir or madam, This week is the most critical in the history of our campaign. Our Bill, introduced by the Hon. James Allen, will come up for the second reading, and should it be thrown out, or altered so as no longer to represent our wishes, it will be quite three years before we can again come back to this point; and then the referendum could not be taken before 1917. Our energies must now be concentrated in urging our member (and any other members we can influence) to vote for the second and third readings of the Bill as introduced. Should our Bill fail to pass this session, the coming election will resolve itself into a battle for or against Bible in State schools, other political questions of perhaps equal importance being completely overshadowed. In the interests of good government this is not to be desired, and we would regret it as much as any one else, but it may be forced on us. By acting at once and telegraphing our member you may help in saving the country from this. Our opponents are leaving no stone unturned, and it behoves all Protestants to be up and doing, demanding that they shall have the right to decide whether their children shall have the Bible taught to them during school hours. The conscience clause provided in the Bill gives ample protection for any who do not desire their children taught the Scriptures, and the fact of the Hon. James Allen, Minister of Education, introducing the Bill is sufficient guarantee of its fairness and *bona fides*. Remember, do it now.—Yours faithfully, CHAS. N. BAGNALL, Local Secretary.—P.S. If you cannot telegraph, then write; a telegram might have more effect"?—What are you reading from?

192. From a newspaper report?—Have you vouched for the accuracy of that?

193. Do you know anything of that letter?—I knew nothing of that letter till I saw a purported copy in the *Post*.

194. Did you send out the following letter addressed to a branch of the W.C.T.U.: "Your branch of the W.C.T.U. probably will be better satisfied now that the Convention is more in accord with the wishes of the great majority of members. This is a victory for us as far as it goes, and I personally would have been satisfied to let the matter rest at that but for the emphatic way in which it is now being attempted to represent the Union as not supporting us. Professor Mackenzie, for example, is reported as saying in Wellington on the 22nd instant 'Another highly gratifying fact was that the W.C.T.U. declined by an overwhelming majority to commit itself to the Garland system of Bible in schools.' This is such a complete misrepresentation of the position that it becomes important in our interests, and, I think, in the interests of the Union also, that the facts be placed beyond dispute that the Union by an overwhelming majority of branches is supporting us. Will you be good enough to submit the enclosed resolution at your next meeting, and, if passed, have it sent to each of the nine Cabinet Ministers, whose names and addresses I enclose. This will have the effect of showing where the Union really is, and that the women who do such great work for God, home, and humanity under the inspiration of Frances Willard are true to her original principles for religious instruction in State schools. I shall be grateful if you will let me know if the resolution is passed.—Yours sincerely, D. J. GARLAND"?—Yes, I sent that letter, and was very proud of the results.

195. You are aware that at the meeting before last the W.C.T.U. passed a resolution in favour of the Nelson system and against the Bible in Schools League proposal?—I am aware that in 1913 the Nelson convention passed such a resolution, and I am aware that at the next Convention in 1914 it passed a resolution commending religious instruction, and leaving it to the branches and individual members which method they advocated; and our position is, we are proud to say, that the great majority of the branches declared in favour of this League's platform and in the Nelson system.

196. Is it not a fact that at the last meeting to which you refer a motion was brought forward by Mrs. Harrison Lee Cowie in favour of your system?—Yes.

197. And that an amendment was proposed endorsing the general conception of religious instruction in schools, but leaving members free to adopt any plan they liked, and that the amendment was carried by fifty-two votes to seven?—Yes, I am quite aware of that. It exactly bears out the statement I made; and I am also aware that Mrs. Harrison Lee Cowie accepted that amendment and asked our friends to vote for it. It was the vote of our friends and not of our opponents, in order to prevent a division in the Union.

198. Do you think that a statement like this of Bishop Sadlier's to prominent representatives in Nelson might have had something to do with influencing the women of Nelson—"While I leave it to your common-sense and to the common-sense of your people to make any further comments you may think desirable, I feel the responsibility of asking you to see to it that our Christian women who are members of the W.C.T.U. are not cajoled into selling the principles of God, home, and humanity at the dictation of misleading leadership. I venture to suggest that it may even be the duty of our Christian women to withdraw from the Union unless the branches to which they belong immediately repudiate the resolution carried at the convention, and to express their regret that the convention was so misled as to pass a resolution which brings the Union into conflict with the principles of religious education adopted by the majority of the Christian electors in the Dominion, and which is calculated to be the destruction of the principles which all temperance reformers are endeavouring to place before the public." Do you think that would influence a number of votes?—That statement was made exactly after the Nelson convention had passed the resolution against us, so that it would not have influenced them.

199. But at the next convention?—I would not venture to say. It would be forgotten by 1914. I hope it did influence them.

200. Will you point out in my evidence any regulation there that is not embodied in the regulations of any of the States mentioned?—I have not examined them, so I cannot answer the question.

201. In a document issued by the League you say, "The League regrets that statements are being made to the effect that the teachers of New Zealand cannot be trusted to give these lessons, it being said that the teachers will impart their particular 'isms,' and that so many of them are unbelievers that the children reading lessons under their supervision will become atheists, and also that there are so many teachers of 'uncertain' character that the whole profession is not worthy of being trusted with the Scripture lessons. The League officially and without a shadow of reservation or hesitation repudiates this charge made by its opponents." Can you give any evidence of that statement?—Yes; not by members of the League: opponents of the League had said that one of their objections to our proposal is that the teachers are not fit to give the lessons.

202. Will you mention one member of our League?—Did I say by members of your League?

203. Opponents of the League?—Opponents of our League, I said.

204. Will you name one opponent of your League who has made those charges?—I cannot at this moment, but I am aware of the fact.

205. Will you lay the information before the Committee later?—I will endeavour to do so. Miss Halstead herself stated that she had been spoken to here. I was surprised that a Queensland teacher visiting New Zealand should have been spoken to. She gives a detailed instance of being spoken to by some one who objected to our system on behalf of the teachers.

206. I want to know from you definitely the name of any one opponent of your League who has actually made the statement?—Well, in this case the name is not given; but here is a reliable and reputable person who has nothing whatever to gain. Miss Halstead, a Queensland teacher, was asked, "And what about the teachers"? She said, "I would prefer to say nothing about their attitude, because I cannot think they would oppose it if they had my practical experience of it; but what does surprise me about the teachers is the number of people who have mentioned to me their objections to the teachers having anything to do with the lessons. This week at a public gathering a lady, whom I do not know, got into conversation with me, and told me there were too many of the teachers whom she did not trust."

207. I want you to give the name of a person who actually made the charge?—I am not going to give the name of the person who has actually made the charge, because I cannot; but here is a person who has publicly stated that the statement has been made to her.

208. Would you be prepared to give the Committee the name of the person?—I will find out the name and give it to the Chairman.

209. I am sure if it is a member of the National Schools Defence League he will be delighted?—I will give the name and evidence of it to the Chairman in confidence. I do not think we should publish a name like that.

210. You will recall the pulpit attacks made on Mr. A. R. Atkinson by yourself, Dr. Gibb, and Archdeacon Harper and Mr. Cook?—I have not the papers here.

211. Did you agree to preach that sermon on that Sunday—was there any agreement about preaching it, or did it happen accidentally?—I do not think it happened accidentally. Speaking from memory, there was a great deal of indignation amongst our people about two things we were charged with, which, if I remember rightly, were to the effect that we were inspired by religious bigotry and dogmatic something else.

212. I do not want to go into that?—I do when it is brought up. We are not afraid of everything being brought up. It was said we were guilty of political cant and religious bigotry. That was telegraphed all over the Dominion, and I got a sheaf of telegrams drawing attention to it. The result was that I had to call the advisory committee together and see what action was to be taken, and we decided to take a certain course. We believed that we were doing good to the country, and we claimed that it was most offensive and an improper thing to describe us as bigots and canters.

213. You are aware that Mr. Atkinson pointed out that it was not a fair copy of his statement?—I am aware, and again speaking from memory, that Mr. Atkinson revised the report as it appeared in the *Dominion*—that he publicly wrote and published the statement that he had revised it, complimented the *Dominion* on publishing a good report, and asked them to correct errors which he pointed out. Having thus revised it, studied it and revised it and corrected it, he left those most objectionable words standing unqualified.

214. Did those words appear in the report of the *Post* and *Times*?—I could not say.

215. Did Mr. Atkinson say in his letter that they did not appear in the *Post* and *Times*?—I do not remember.

216. You would have seen them if they had appeared?—Yes. If you say they did not I will accept it.

217. Do you say Mr. Atkinson revised the report?—Yes.

218. Did he not say he had read the *Dominion* report hurriedly after having read the other two?—He did not say that until after we had drawn attention to the use of the words. In the first letter he did not then say he read it hurriedly; it was when he found himself in a difficulty he tried to get out of a small hole. That was after having spontaneously stated that he had read it, that it was a good report, and that he wanted them to make certain corrections. It was such a small hole he tried to get through that I do not believe he is out of it by saying that he did not read it carefully but read it hurriedly.

219. You believed Mr. Atkinson was not speaking the truth subsequently?—I do not say that for a moment.

220. In your answer you have in effect said so?—No, I am not accustomed to bring that kind of accusation against persons. What I would say is that the fact that on the second occasion he said he read the letter hurriedly shows that he does a great many things hurriedly and repents afterwards.

221. Did Bishop Sprott accept Mr. Atkinson's denial that he used the words?—I think my memory is clear, but, subject to correction, on reading the report at the time Bishop Sprott did not say he accepted Mr. Atkinson's correction. Bishop Sprott said, as all of us said in the matter, he was prepared to accept Mr. Atkinson's withdrawal whatever it was—a different thing to accepting it. We were prepared to accept it.

222. You quoted Professor Findlay. When he was here did the Bible in Schools League publish in the *Dominion* various extracts from his book "The School"?—Yes.

223. Did Professor Findlay subsequently write to the *Post* on that matter?—I know something appeared in the *Post*, but what I have got shows that he did not write to the *Post* but that the write to the *Post?* If I had not my reference when dealing with Professor Findlay I would write to the *Post?*" If I had not my reference when dealing with Professor Findlay I would at once have said Yes; but I find by my records that Professor Findlay was interviewed and did not write, which is a very different thing to writing to a newspaper.

224. Did the *Post* report Professor Findlay as saying, "'Without entrenching on the position of affairs in New Zealand,' Professor Findlay went on, 'it might be interesting to point out that in England, during the last few years, both political parties had yielded to some extent to a more tolerant public sentiment. While it was recognized that differences of religious beliefs and practice necessarily affected the organization of the schools, it was hoped that Governments would be able to develop education, both public and private, so as to satisfy the public demands without increasing sectarian bitterness.' 'The quotations which had been published,' said Professor Findlay, 'were quite accurate; but if any one chose to read the chapter from which they were taken, he would get a more impartial view of the relation of the State to the public school and the teaching of the Bible than was given in those extracts. The book was cheap and easily accessible'"?—Evidently it did, and gave him a very good advertisement for an admirable book which agreed that there should be religious instruction in schools.

225. You quoted the Rev. Dr. Rashdall, who has said, "So far from ethics being based upon or deduced from theology, a rational theology is largely based upon ethics"?—I did not know of this small book you hand me, and I would not accept this quotation taken from Dr. Rashdall as representing his view at all on the subject in view of what I know of his voluminous writings on the same subject.

226. You admit that the statement you took out of Dr. Rashdall's great book "The Theory of Good and Evil" was also taken out of its context?—No, I do not. Let me read it—"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." That will be found in his "Doctrine and Development," page 257, and so far from being torn from its context, it represents Dr. Rashdall's views generally.

227. You said Dr. Robertson Nicoll was a member of a committee that put forward a resolution?—"Towards Educational Peace" is the name of a pamphlet in 1910 which described "A Plan of Resettlement in English Elementary Education, issued by the Executive Committee of the Educational Settlement Committee: Longmans, 1910: Object, to promote and maintain religious teaching as an integral part of the system of education, and to work on non-party lines for educational settlement which will respect all forms of conscientious belief." Sir Robertson Nicoll was a member of the committee, and a great many men like him, besides members of Churches. I do not know whether there is a Roman Catholic on the committee, but I do not think there is.

228. The *Daily Mail* Year-book for 1911 says, "An Educational Settlement Committee, representing all opinions, has been debating a plan for the settlement of the education controversy. Sir C. T. Dyke Acland is chairman, and Professor W. E. Sadler and Mr. T. E. Harvet are the hon. secretaries. The proposals of this committee are thus summarized: (1) A national system of educational organization under public control; (2) religious teaching as an integral part of school life (subject always to the right of withdrawal under the conscience clause), and adequate opportunities for such teaching in all schools and colleges under public control; (3) administrative arrangements favourable to sincerity and reality in such religious teaching, with full respect for various forms of conscientious belief among parents and teachers; (4) the

removal of the grievances which exist in areas in which there can be no effective choice of schools; (5) the recognition (where the parents so desire) of denominational schools or other alternative schools in districts where an effective choice can be given; (6) avoidance, compatible with the above objects, of religious division within the school." Are you aware those were the provisions of that settlement?—I am not, and I cannot agree that that is so. That is a summary drawn up by some one else. I have the report here.

229. Can you say it is a correct summary?—I cannot say, as I have not compared it.

230. Do you say that the Rev. Dean Inge is a representative Anglican?—It depends.

231. Writing in the *Hibbert Journal* of July, 1914, he says, "In education especially the influence of ecclesiasticism has been almost uniformly pernicious, so that it seems impossible for any country where the children are left under priestly influence to rise above a certain rather low level of civilization." Do you agree with that view?—That would depend on what he said preceding it. If he means the children educated under the exclusive control of ecclesiasticism or of the Church, then he is opposing that for which your friends of the Roman Catholic Federation are asking.

232. You were asked not to use that word yesterday?—I did not say "colleague." I will not say that again. They are your friends in the sense that you are both our enemies, and it is very good company. The Dean is of a mystical turn of mind.

233. Do you realize that you have asked no laymen to appear before this Committee?—I cabled over to Australia to each of the departments, and asked them would they send an official of the department or an Inspector or teacher at our expense here to give evidence before this Committee. We also intended to call Mrs. Harrison Lee Cowie, who was most anxious to come before the Committee, but owing to the sittings being put off she had to go on with other engagements. It is not our fault we have not got lay people here. I would have been most delighted if not one of us had spoken, but that four people chosen by their departments had come before the Committee.

234. But there are many lay people in the movement in New Zealand, are there not?—I am glad to get that admission, because we were told it was only composed of parsons. There are 153,000 members of the League, and as there are only 1,000 ministers of religion you will see how many lay people we have supporting us.

235. Are they all busy like Mrs. Cowie that they could not come here?—No, they would not have the same experience that she has. She was warned on going into Victorian schools not to talk about God, but in the case of the other schools she goes in with the ministers.

236. There are many people who have been teachers and others who have had experience of the New South Wales system now living in New Zealand: are you aware of that?—You wanted to know when you asked the question before how we had not approached them.

237. I want to know whether there are those teachers in New Zealand?—Yes, I am aware there are some, and I am also aware that we have endeavoured to put evidence before this Committee through my statement from such people of whom we knew; and I am aware that yesterday Professor Hunter, representing the Defence League, took exception to our putting in that evidence.

238. You have heard of Mr. Robert Lee, for many years Inspector in the Wellington District?—I think I have heard of him.

239. You know he has declared very strongly against the platform of your League?—Yes, like Mr. Caughley, Mr. Grundy, and others.

240. In your notes of my evidence you say it is defective from its omissions, but you did not, as far as I can see, quote the opinion of any outstanding representative since 1883. I am quite prepared to quote them, but I remember that yesterday you thought I had already got in too much. If you ask me to I am quite prepared to bring in any amount. I have a list of nearly five hundred teachers of this Dominion protesting against the action of the Teachers' Institute, and I would be very glad to get them in.

241. You have quoted in your statement the opinion of Inspector Hill, of Hawke's Bay, in 1879?—Yes.

242. Do you know that Mr. Hill visited New South Wales recently and is vice-president of the National Schools Defence League?—I did not know that he had visited New South Wales recently. I did know that he was an opponent of ours. I do not know the exact position, but I know that in 1879 he said, "I sincerely hope that the present educational machinery, good as it is in many points, may be perfected by permitting the introduction of the Bible as a reading-book into the public schools."

243. Did you know that in the *Post* of the 20th December, 1912, Mr. Hill had stated his view with regard to the suggestion that he was still of the opinion at the present time that he was in 1879?—I remember he said something, and I would like to hear what it was.

244. Will you read it?—Yes, with pleasure. He says, "A friend in Wellington has sent me a copy of your last Saturday's issue, containing a letter signed 'David J. Garland,' in which he uses my name ostensibly as a supporter of his scheme of religious instruction in public schools. What I am quoted as having said was written in the year 1878, before the present system was organized or before facilities were offered to those interested to give Bible-reading lessons in the public schools outside the ordinary school hours. Unfortunately, I was away from Napier when Canon Garland addressed a public meeting on the Bible in—it ought to have been 'out of'—the public schools, otherwise we might have met to discuss the subject as presented by him and by the Bishop of Waiapu. But let me say here, so that Canon Garland may quote it as my latest statement on the scheme of religious instruction he and certain parties would have introduced into the schools, that I am utterly opposed to the entry of any minister, of whatever order, type, or class, into a public school for religious purposes during the four hours set aside for secular instruction. There is no need to say more. My old friend Mr. Cook is sufficiently capable of

vindicating the present system, but I would just say here that I am due, by invitation, to give a lecture in Hastings next Friday evening in opposition to Canon Garland's claims and mission, and if he cares to be present I undertake he shall have toleration and fair play from the workingmen of the district whom I am invited to address. As one who has passed through the religious (?) school system of England, and has visited the Australian schools, and knows something of the tone and character of our own schools, I am prepared to stand shoulder to shoulder with every person wishing to keep our public schools free and independent of religious discords. If the schools are to be worth the having they must reach a higher social—aye, and a higher religious—plane than can possibly come through Canon Garland's proposals." I am aware of that, but where is my reply to that? Would you mind reading it?

245. I am not aware of any reply?—I replied to Mr. Hill.

246. When you quoted Inspector Hill's opinion in your statement, did you know that his most recent opinion was that which you have just read?—I was aware of it, but I was quoting Inspector Hill as evidence not of his opinion to-day but as evidence of something else—as evidence of the protest against the exclusion which began in 1877, and I wanted to show, as I have shown here, that the dissatisfaction was from the very earliest days entirely a secular act. I am not at all suggesting that Inspector Hill has changed his view.

247. But it would go out to the world if printed like that?—No, it would go out to the world that in 1879 he was brought forward as a witness who protested against what was done in 1877.

FRIDAY, 23RD OCTOBER, 1914.

Rev. Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND further examined. (No. 15.)

1. *Professor Hunter.*] From the criminal statistics of New South Wales and Victoria given in my evidence, do you think any inference can be drawn as to the comparative morality of Victoria and New South Wales?—That is a difficult question to answer. In fact, I think it is almost impossible to answer it without a long dissertation. It would be impossible to answer that question without spending hours on the subject.

2. Do you not think that if this religious instruction in schools were so necessary for morality the New South Wales criminal statistics would be lower than those of Victoria?—That question is a question which I consider impossible to answer. It is not because I want to avoid it. If I am pressed on this point I am quite prepared to go into it, but I must be allowed to go into it thoroughly, which I think would take a couple of hours at least. I will just add one remark in answer to it, that I think, as I said in my statement, as follows: "On the contrary, it will be for all time a marvel requiring explanation how out of such unpromising material New South Wales could to-day rise to the high position which she occupies in the Empire. Intelligent people will draw their own conclusions as to whether it may or may not have been a contributing factor that from her beginning until this day her school system has never denied a place to the teaching of that righteousness which alone exalteth a nation. I know of no similar instance in the history of nations, and for my part I am proud to express my strong conviction, after a long and careful study of the subject, that such a happy result would have been impossible had it not been for the splendid educational system, in which has been included always a definite recognition of God and the teaching of His laws. I am not suggesting the absence of other factors, but all else would have been minimized, in my opinion, if the State had by a process of negation taught its children that God is of less account than arithmetic."

3. Do you think that the influence of the convict settlements in Australia has any material effect on the morality of Australia to-day?—I certainly think that the original trouble caused by the convict settlement in Botany Bay has left such a state of things that to-day they suffer from it in consequence.

4. The State of Victoria was separated from New South Wales in 1851, was it not?—Yes, I think that is right.

5. Are you aware that in the article "Victoria" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica" (Vol. 28, p. 43) it says, "Gold was discovered a few weeks after the colony (Victoria) had entered upon its separate existence, and a large number of persons were attracted to the mines, first from the neighbouring colonies—some of which, such as South Australia, Van Diemen's Land, and West Australia, were almost denuded of able-bodied men and women—and subsequently from Europe and America"?—Who is the author of that?

6. I do not know who the author is—it is from the "Encyclopædia Britannica," last edition?—I should like to know who the author is.

7. All I ask is if you are aware of that statement in the Encyclopædia?—I am not aware of that statement in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." I have never seen it before. I do not know what else is in the article, and I have what I consider an absolute refutation of that extract, a summary of which will be found in the statement already submitted.

8. Do you agree with some of your witnesses and correspondents in saying that in New South Wales many of the Non-conformist Churches often act together in giving the special religious teaching in the schools?—As a fact?

9. Yes, as a fact?—Oh, yes.

10. Does not the Nelson system in New Zealand permit these Churches to give similar teaching within the usual, though not the official, hours of the school day?—Well, that is a point I will not admit, because I am not quite clear about it. I think it is open to argument whether it is the usual hours or not—whether it is technically so. I do not admit what is implied in your question, that it is similar teaching, for this reason: that under the Nelson system undenomi-

national lessons are compulsory, whereas under our system undenominational lessons can be given by the minister. They are grouped together, but it is not compulsory. That is the advantage.

11. *Mr. McCallum.*] It is not compulsory under the Nelson system?—The advocates of the Nelson system put it forward—and I am not talking of what happened in the House the other day—but they put it forward that one of its advantages is that there is no denominationalism or no sectarianism in it, because all the ministers take the children interchangeably.

12. *Professor Hunter.*] Would you mind telling the Committee who made it compulsory?—I want to know who made the Nelson system law. It is not to be found in any Act of Parliament. Whoever made the Nelson system law made that method of teaching compulsory. In other words, your question now brings out the point that the Nelson system is not recognized by law. Our contention is that there should be a formal and definite recognition of religion as an inherent part of education without compulsion on the children.

13. If the lessons under the Nelson system were conducted jointly or severally as the ministers might decide, would not the Churches have the opportunity of giving to the children religious instruction similar to that now given in the special religious instruction of New South Wales?—The answer I give to that question is that the Churches have, by their decision to form the League and make this request for a referendum, shown that they do not regard the Nelson system as giving to the children religious instruction similar to that given to the children in connection with the religious-instruction system in New South Wales. They have applied to the Boards and Committees, and they have been turned down on so many occasions that I understand the Churches collectively, where they are associated with us, say it is no use trying for it again, but will try for something that will not be subject to the whim of the Committees.

14. Do you think that the Nelson system goes three-fourths of the way towards the scheme of the Bible in Schools League?—No, I do not think it goes any part of the way towards the proposal of the League, for this reason: that it is not recognized by law. Under our system the law expressly and explicitly provides for religious instruction. Under our system the teacher gives the lessons from the Scriptures, which are within the reach of every child without any child being compelled to receive them. Ministers, of course, have the right to go in—not the right to go and knock at the door and say to the teacher, "I have come and you have to get away," but they have a recognized legal right which only needs the least little consideration between the teacher and the minister to bring about what is desired without any friction whatever. Then, moreover, under our system religious instruction finds its place on the time-table. It is there for the children to see as part of their work. Under the Nelson system it finds no such place. It is, as my friend the Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland—with whom I thoroughly agree on this point—says, "Under the Nelson system it is as contraband as opium."

15. Is it not a fact that in the Queensland Parliament, after 26 per cent. of the electors on the roll had carried the proposals, it was urged by those introducing the Bill that no member of Parliament had a right to vote against it after the people had decided the question at the polls?—I do not remember that. I would like to see the quotation. Who said it?

16. By the people introducing the Bill, the question says?—I do not remember that. I think it is quite probable. I do not want to fence the question, but I think it is quite probable. I can imagine Mr. Kidston, a very democratic Premier, who was no friend of the movement itself, saying to the House the position is this: that the people have expressed their will, and it is our duty to carry out their will. I am absolutely certain he said something to that effect, but I do not remember the exact words.

Professor Hunter: I would like to put in the authority for that statement in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," as follows: "George Collins Levey, C.M.G.; member of the Board of Advice to the Agent-General for Victoria; formerly editor and proprietor of the Melbourne *Herald;* secretary, Colonial Committee of Royal Commission to Paris Exhibition, 1900; secretary, Adelaide Exhibition, 1887; secretary, Royal Commission, Hobart Exhibition, 1894–95; secretary to Commissioner for Victoria at the Exhibitions in London, Paris, Vienna, Philadelphia, and Melbourne."

17. *Mr. Caughley.*] Are you familiar, Canon Garland, with the Public Instruction Act of 1880, particularly with regard to those sections and regulations dealing with religious instruction in schools?—Of what country?

18. Of New South Wales?—Yes.

19. In section 17 of that Act we have these words: "In every public school four hours during each day shall be devoted to secular instruction exclusively, and a portion of each day, not more than one hour, shall be set apart when the children of any one religious persuasion may be instructed by the clergyman or other religious teacher of such persuasion, but in all cases the pupils receiving such religious instruction shall be separated from the other pupils of the school." You are aware of that?—Yes, I think you have read it correctly.

20. Are you aware of Regulation 203?—What is the date of that regulation?

21. I am quoting from the Act published in 1912: "Special religious instruction: Where the time specified for religious instruction is inconvenient, some other hour may be fixed by mutual agreement between the Public School Board, the teacher, and the person giving such instruction." You are familiar with that regulation?—Yes.

22. And then Regulation 215: "Denominational books: The teacher in all schools under the superintendence of the Minister shall see that the religious books employed in the classes for special religious instruction are confined to the time and place of such instruction, and not left in the way of children whose parents may object to them." Are you aware of that regulation?—Yes.

23. Do you know how long those regulations have been in force?—I do not. I think you will have to apply to the Department, because that is a consolidated set of regulations published in 1912, coming into operation on the 1st January.

24. You admit they are in force now?—To the best of my knowledge. I have not heard of them being changed.

25. Are you aware that the second part I particularly called your attention to and those two regulations are the instructions which are contained in the Queensland *Hansard* version of the Wilkins circular whose authenticity you disputed?—I am not aware of that, and I am not going to admit it till it is proved.

26. I will read it from the Queensland *Hansard*, 1910, Vol. cvi, page 1985: "By the terms of the Act such instructions may be given to the children of any one religious persuasion by the clergyman or other religious teacher of such persuasion"?—Yes?

27. Does not that instruction to the teachers there correspond with the part I drew your attention to in section 17 of the Act?—It is exactly because it does correspond and has been a regulation from the very beginning and has never been changed that I say it was a most unwarrantable thing to issue a leaflet headed "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing" as a result of that. The very fact that the regulation is there and has not been amended shows they were not afraid of proselytism.

28. I am quite satisfied with your admission that you knew there was a provision of that kind in the Act, and yet you challenge the authenticity of our leaflet which contained this instruction given to teachers in the Queensland *Hansard*?—I do not challenge the fact that regulations exist to that effect, and I protest against Mr. Caughley inferring anything of the sort. I challenge the opposition League with using a statement as if it were an official document and giving it to the world to the detriment of our movement, and attempting to substantiate it by Mr. Caughley's own published statements that they had received it from the Education Department under date 15th July, 1900, when the fact is that the Department said specifically that the Wilkins circular was obsolete, and when the opposition League was challenged to produce the document that they got from the Education Department they failed to produce it. I am not for a moment suggesting anything improper there; it is only their misfortune that they could not produce the one copy that they got from the Department, and have not been able to get a duplicate of it since. My challenge is that they have taken something which was certainly issued about the year 1866 or 1870. They have taken that and have put a wholly false construction on it, and represented that as if it was something which it is not.

29. I am not talking at all about the construction. I asked you a simple question which should have been given a very simple answer. We did not quote the whole of the Wilkins circular—we quoted this regulation; and that regulation, you now admit, is embodied in the present Act and still in force, and your challenging of our circular and telegraphing throughout New Zealand the alleged exposure of this circular made it appear that such a circular did not exist?—My challenge, I repeat, is against them using this leaflet of theirs which I hold in my hand. On page 6 the heading is "Proselytism and Sheep-stealing." I wish to put this in to show that I am not guilty of the wrongdoing that Mr. Caughley is implying. There is not one word there about regulations.

30. I am quite satisfied in spite of all you have said. Do you admit that the regulations or parts of the Wilkins circular that were quoted are contained in the Wilkins circular, and that their parallel to them is still in force in the New South Wales regulations?—I do not admit that.

31. You knew, did you not, that that instruction that we quoted about the children of one religious persuasion receiving it under their own clergyman and also that about protection?—Where?

32. In the Queensland *Hansard* version?—Is it in the leaflet?

33. Yes; you know those two parts we quoted are still in force in the New South Wales regulations?—I do not know that what is quoted in your leaflet is correct, because when I find an attempt made to show the public that a document was issued on the 15th July, 1900, which was not issued then, and which had been obsolete for many years, I cannot take as correct the other statements.

34. Is it your argument that because you find a flaw, if you say it is a flaw, that everything else is a flaw?—No, that is not my object.

35. Leaving out anything else you may question, we quoted from the Queensland *Hansard* version the Wilkins circular, which is the regulation about the segregation of children?—I do not see the word "segregation."

36. Well, separation. Our point is this: that as you knew, as you have admitted, from your knowledge of the Act, that the instruction we quoted from the *Hansard* version of the Wilkins circular—that that regulation is contained in that circular—as you knew that, why did you not admit that much when you were challenging the authenticity of this circular?—I was not challenging the existence of the regulation. You might as well ask me why did I not challenge the existence of the King. It had nothing to do with it. I was challenging the action of the Defence League in publishing to the world a document with "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing" at the head of it, which they said emphatically was issued on the 15th July, 1900, when as a matter of fact it was obsolete, and that after the statement was published by me Mr. Caughley himself reiterated in various newspapers this original statement.

37. Did you or did you not know of the existence of those regulations?—Of course I know of the existence of the regulations, but my point is that it has nothing to do with this.

38. Then the challenge which you made against this leaflet, or what is contained in it under the heading—having made the challenge with regard to the *bona fides* of the leaflet which we issued, would it not appear to the public that the National Schools Defence League had been guilty of fabricating a document?—I leave the public to draw their own conclusions. I do not draw any.

39. Did you not receive from Mr. Board a second cablegram other than the one you read at the synod which would, to some extent at any rate, have exonerated us if you had published

it?—I do not claim that it would have exonerated you, because that cablegram distinctly said the Wilkins circular was obsolete.

40. You have just admitted that the instructions in it are contained in the existing Act which is in force?—No; I said I do not admit that.

41. Will you produce the second cablegram which you received from Mr. Board on the 14th July?—Yes, I have it printed here. I remember I produced the original cablegram here twice, but I cannot put my hand on it for the moment.

42. In your statement is a copy of that cablegram which you received on the 14th July?—Yes.

43. Is the copy that is in the statement an exact copy of the cable that you received?—As far as I can remember.

44. Have you not checked it?—I do not check things like that.

45. Do you not think it is rather important before you put in a document such as that which seems to support a charge against the National Schools Defence League that you ought to be careful that the document is an exact copy of the cable you received?—I think every reasonable care is taken, but I do not think you could expect any one to check every word and letter in a thing like that. I have not the least moral doubt that it is correct, if that is what you want.

46. Are you aware that a cablegram was received by another person in New Zealand also from Mr. Board on the same subject on the same day?—No, I am not

47. I will read it, and I wish the Chairman to follow while I am reading and compare it with the cable in your statement. The first sentence in the cable of which Canon Garland gives a copy is as follows: "Could not identify circular from information given in your cable last week, as Wilkins died in ninety-two." That is not contained in the other cable which came from Mr. Board to another person, but that is immaterial?—I would like to know to whom it was addressed.

48. It was addressed to Bishop Cleary; and as my honour had been impugned in the matter I wrote to Bishop Cleary and asked him if he had any information on the subject, and as soon as he received this cable he sent it to me. Canon Garland's cable reads as follows: "Circular printed in Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued, but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong." In my cable it says, "Education circular quoted Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued, but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong." Then Canon Garland's cable reads, "Original not traceable now," and my cable also says, "Original not traceable now." Then Canon Garland's cable says, "but evidently issued by Council of Education," and my cable says, "but preamble evidently issued by Council Education." Have you any knowledge why the word "preamble" does not appear in the cable of which you have given a copy?—Because it was not in the original cable received by me.

49. Can you suggest any reason why Mr. Board left out in your cable the word "preamble" and put it in another cable which he sent on the same day on the same topic?—Mr. Chairman, is it possible for me to answer such a question as that? Mr. Caughley asks me to say what was in the mind of a man three thousand miles away when he sent out two cables. I do object to that class of question.

50. I should like to see the original of your cablegram?—May I say at once without having these innuendoes that I undertake willingly to produce it again. I have already produced it twice. I regret that I cannot put my hand on it, but through the confusion it has been mislaid. I believe it is on the table here somewhere.

51. I would like to believe, and hope it is so, that what Canon Garland says is correct—that his cable is exactly the same?—I object. You say you would like to believe, and you say you hope I am speaking the truth. I am giving my word, and ask for my word to be taken till I have failed.

52. If that word had been inserted in your cable, "but preamble evidently issued by Council of Education," would not that have removed a stigma from the National Schools Defence League?—That would be a matter for the person reading it to judge.

53. Did you not say over and over again yesterday when insisting on the point about this preamble that we had no right to talk about this preamble?—I do not remember.

54. You made that the crux of your charge against us?—I would like to have my words read.

55. If the cable you received had contained the word "preamble," as the other cable did, with the admission by Mr. Board "but preamble evidently issued by Council Education as well as original circular," would not that have exonerated the League?—Are the words "as well as the original circular" in your cable?

56. Yes. Would not that have exonerated the National Schools Defence League from the charges you levelled against it?—Not, in my judgment, because nothing whatever would exonerate them from publishing a document headed "Proselytism and Sheep-stealing," and then stating, "The following is a copy of a circular issued," and not giving a copy of the alleged document but putting in words from somewhere else.

57. Your cable goes on to read, after the word "preamble" is left out, "but evidently issued by Council of Education between sixty and seventy-nine, before existing Act passed." Bishop Cleary's cable reads, "but preamble evidently issued by Council Education as well as original circular before existing Act passed in eighty." If Mr. Board had given the information to you that he gave to Bishop Cleary, would not that also have helped to have cleared up to some extent the charge made against the Defence League?—That would have been for the public to judge; but I cannot understand why, if Bishop Cleary had that cable at that time, he did not give it to you then instead of now in order to make it public. I have been trying to get further information. As a matter of fact, when I received this cable I applied to Mr. Board for further information, which I have not from that day to this received.

58. You said just now it would have been for the public to judge. Did you publish it to give the public a chance to judge—the second cable?—No, I did not, because I had cabled for further information, and that I had not received.

59. How then could the public judge about the cable if you did not publish it? Was it not your duty to publish it?—I did not consider it my duty to publish it. I found that your League was dropping the matter, and I was content with that.

60. You were content to let the charge stand against us with that cable in your possession?—No, I was not content to allow any charge to stand against you which should not stand, but though you let the matter drop you never withdrew the statement in your leaflet "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing." You still let it go out to the world, and repeated it.

61. You have set up a standard of ethics yourself in these proceedings which I will read from a pamphlet of yours headed "Methods of Opposition to Liberty of Conscience and an Open Bible." In that pamphlet you say, "It would have been thought that Bishop Cleary, having made such a serious accusation against his brother Bishops of another communion, the Moderator of the Presbyterian Church, the President of the Methodist Church, the Commissioner of the Salvation Army, and the leading ministers and laymen of these Churches in New Zealand, combined in the League, would have hastened after the above conclusive proofs to let the truth be known." Then further down you say, "It saddens me to think that one whom I recognize as a Christian Bishop, whom I looked upon at least as able and clever, should not only make this accusation, but also should for one single minute wittingly withhold the refutation of it which he had received from the official source of the original statement." Why did you not act up to that standard of ethics and publish that cable?—The two cases are different.

62. Having said that a person makes a charge and then refuses information that refutes the charge, do you not see that you should not have hesitated for a single moment to make that known?—I was endeavouring to answer the question when you interrupted me, and I object to being interrupted unless by the Chairman of the Committee, because these interruptions embarrass a witness.

63. Having set up a standard of ethics for a minister that if a person makes a charge against reputable people and then receives information which would exonerate them, it was their duty not to wait a minute but to publish the information they had in order to clear them of the charge made?—My answer is that we had made no charge. We were repudiating a very serious charge made against us—that we were seeking to do something which would bring about proselytism and sheep-stealing—and we wanted to show there was absolutely no foundation for it. We were in the position of defendants, not in the position of attackers.

64. Does that alter the ethics of the case?—We were defending ourselves.

65. When I asked you what the charge was you said the charge we made was so-and-so, and now you say you made no charge?—We made a charge in self-defence.

66. Having made the charge and having received the second cable, why did you not do as you said Bishop Cleary ought to have done—why did you hesitate for a single moment to make that public?—Because we were seeking for further information, which never came, and because we found you were dropping the point of the Wilkins circular.

67. And because you had received some information and had not received more you thought it your duty not to publish what you had received?—There was no obligation on us to publish that.

68. Did you not say the obligation rested on Bishop Cleary when he received the information?—Bishop Cleary originated the attack which we had to defend, and the same in this case. We were repudiating it.

69. In the inset to your evidence you give two parallel statements, one which you say came from our leaflet No. 7 and the other from the Queensland *Hansard*: is that not so?—Yes.

70. How is it that in the version which you attribute to us you put inverted commas in front of "Proselytism" and after "Sheep-stealing"?—In order to show it is a quotation from your own leaflet—that it is not our words.

71. Does not this extract from leaflet No. 7 make that sufficiently clear?—I thought it necessary to put it there to show we were quoting your words and not attributing to you words you had never used.

72. Then, having put those inverted commas there, the next sentence you have also put in inverted commas. Are they in our circular?—No, it is intended to show that they are taken from other matter, and are not our words.

73. Would not leaflet No. 7 make that sufficiently clear?—I have already answered that question.

74. Did you not make a strong point yesterday of the fact that the public would gather that we were trying to make out that proselytism or sheep-stealing was part of what we were quoting from the Wilkins circular? You maintained that position?—Yes.

75. And now you put inverted commas in front of that, which would seem to clinch that argument?—I put those inverted commas there in order to show we were quoting you and not attributing to you anything you did not say.

76. Then we did say in our circular there was proselytism and sheep-stealing?—You did.

77. Now you are trying to make out we did not say it?—I cannot follow you at all. I repeat my answer.

78. Did you not maintain strongly yesterday that the fact that proselytism or sheep-stealing appeared at the head of our leaflet No. 7 would make it appear that that heading was part of the Wilkins circular?—Yes, I contended that.

79. And now you publish it in inverted commas, which are not in our leaflet?—I repeat that those inverted commas are there to show that we quoted words actually used by you in your

leaflet, and not to give the impression that we had attributed them to you. I think it is ridiculous.

Mr. Caughley: May I ask the Chairman if he will instruct the clerk to the Committee to take out all the inverted commas which are not in our leaflet No. 7?

The Chairman: I am afraid that cannot be done.

Mr. Caughley: May I ask the Committee to have taken out the portion of the copy from our leaflet which contains the inverted commas which our circular does not possess, and which Canon Garland was contending strongly for yesterday?

Witness: I want to make it perfectly clear that we would have published bad English to the world if we had not put those inverted commas in.

80. *Mr. Caughley* (to witness).] You rely largely on Australian evidence in support of the scheme you are proposing under the Bill?—Yes.

81. Did not your League circulate this statement from the Director of Education, Tasmania, contained in one of your leaflets: "The system existing in Tasmania is regarded by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty"? Is that statement true?—The Director of Education in Tasmania says so.

82. I am not asking what he says—I am asking you is that statement true?—I answer that the Director of Education says so, and if he does not know how can I know?

83. *The Chairman.*] Is it true in your opinion?—I will express no opinion. How could I express an opinion? I do not know whether it is true. I have no opinion.

84. You do not know whether it is true or not?—I accept that as true from the Director's point of view.

85. The question is whether in your opinion that statement is true?—I answer it by saying that the Director says so, and I accept his word as a man likely to know.

86. And your opinion is that it is true?—Yes, from him, based on what he says. The Director of Education is speaking of that which he knows and with which he is officially concerned. He is dealing with the departmental point of view.

87. *Mr. Caughley.*] Do you know whether that statement is true or not?—I do not understand that question. Do you mean is it correct?

88. Do you know on the merits of the statement as it stands, apart altogether from the Director of Education, whether the statement is true or not true?—I am not in a position to controvert the statement made by such a man as the Director of Education.

89. You refuse to state that you do not know that it is true or not?—I repeat that I am not prepared to question a statement made by the Director of Education, who knows more than I do.

90. *The Chairman.*] But do you or do you not know whether the statement is true?—I have not been enough in Tasmania to know or not to know. I really object to that class of question.

91. Do you know whether it is true or not?—I do not think that is a fair question. How could I know?

92. *Mr. Caughley.*] Then if you do not know, why not say so?—Because I am not going to say. I know what you are leading up to.

93. Do you know that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Tasmania published on the 8th May, 1914, an emphatic statement to the effect that his denomination does not by any means accept this system in Tasmania as a happy solution of the religious difficulty?—I do not remember if this is the first time I have heard of it. I have no knowledge that he published what you state. I have heard you state he did so.

94. Would you be prepared to say that the Roman Catholics of Tasmania do accept this system as a happy solution of the religious difficulty?—I not only would not be prepared to say it, but I have never suggested it.

95. You circulated a statement in which it is said that all denominations accept it as a happy solution to the religious difficulty?—I circulated the statement for what it was worth from the Director of Education, and I had no right to suppress it or alter it.

96. Regarding the statement which came from Tasmania, you issued a leaflet, "Methods of Opposition to Liberty of Conscience and an Open Bible," dealing first of all with Bishop Cleary's method of meeting this statement?—Yes.

97. And then following that it deals with the idea of this being a happy solution to the religious difficulty, and then reads "Bishop Cleary accuses," &c. It also deals with visits of the Roman Catholic clergy to give Roman Catholic instruction to children under the right of entry?—Yes.

98. One heading in the leaflet reads, "The Bible in State Schools League's objective includes: Obtaining for the Roman Catholic Church—in common with every other Church—the right for its priests or accredited teachers to instruct the children of that Church during school-hours and in the State schools in the faith of their fathers." You remember that statement?—Yes, that is right.

99. I want to draw your attention particularly to the words, "The right for its priests or accredited teachers to instruct the children of that Church." You notice those words?—Yes.

100. Then following that it says, "The following official statistics of New South Wales show that visits were paid to State schools by Roman Catholic priests to instruct the Roman Catholic children." You notice those words?—Yes.

101. And then it goes on and gives the record of visits from 1905 to 1911 and the number of children opposite, which you explained was an accident, as you put down children instructed instead of children enrolled?—It is perfectly true that in the first edition of this leaflet, which was a small edition, the words "children instructed" appeared instead of "children enrolled." As soon as attention was drawn to that error it was corrected, and corrected in as public and ample a manner as the original statement had been made. Everything possible was done.

102. You notice that that accident, which caused "children instructed" to be published instead of "children enrolled," fits in with the words in the two previous clauses, "Priests or accredited teachers to instruct the children," and "Visits were paid to State schools by Roman Catholic priests to instruct the Roman Catholic children." Then we get the column headed "Children instructed"—they all follow on harmoniously?—I should say that was the very reason why the mistake was made. It was the easiest thing in the world for a person to do either in typing or printing it, but I have never discovered which. There was the word running, teachers to "instruct" children, priests to "instruct" children. It is quite obvious how that sort of thing would honestly happen wherever it did happen.

103. You compiled the statement, did you not?—Yes.

104. You have published a return for 1905 giving the number of visits and the number of children enrolled?—Yes.

105. And from the 1905 report you misrepresent "children enrolled" for "children instructed"?—I do not know where the misrepresentation occurred. It is quite clear that the word "instructed" found its way in when the word should have been "enrolled."

106. Then you take the 1906 return, and in the other column again there are the words "children instructed," which should have been "children enrolled"?—I would say that what happened was very clear. The heading was made, and then the books were turned up to get the figures, and you do not look at the heading every time. I cannot for the life of me find out whether the word "enrolled" was put in or whether it slipped out. You can see it was a perfectly easy mistake to make.

107. When you took the 1907 return would you not have a look at the heading of that column again to find out the figures, and again you represent it as "children instructed"?—I deny it. You are inferring that I saw the words "children enrolled" and represented it as "children instructed." It is too absurd to ask this Committee to think that I would do such a thing as that.

108. Would you not have a look at the heading of the column in order to know what the figures were?—I repeat that you would have to look at the head of the column, but I also repeat that wherever the accident happened it was an accident; that is obvious to any one who does not want to try and twist the thing into some enormous offence.

109. Then for the 1908 return the heading would have to be found, and "Children enrolled" would be seen at the head of the column, and you did not notice it was "Children instructed"?—Mr. Chairman, this is going on interminably, and I repeat that this word "instructed" was not put in by us intentionally. Mr. Caughley is suggesting as a matter of certainty that the word "enrolled" was under our eyes.

110. Coming to the paragraph which follows those figures we have these words: "Thus it will be seen from the above figures that the system which the League is advocating, so far from prohibiting the Roman Catholic religion, obtained for the Roman Catholic Church the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing in seven years an annual average of 31,423 Roman Catholic children, and yet Bishop Cleary treats this as a revival of the Penal Code"; and again we have the words "visiting" and "instructing" and corresponding to the children instructed?—The words "children instructed" would be there, and justly there, no matter what words were used, because those words are not to be taken by themselves, but to be taken with the preceding words, "obtained for the Roman Catholic Church the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing." It did not say they did visit and instruct.

111. Did you not write in a letter to the *Lyttelton Times* of the 7th May, 1913, as follows: "In regard to the accidental error which was committed by us in the use of the word 'instructed' instead of the word 'enrolled,' surely Mr. Caughley can see that the accident which put the words 'children instructed' instead of the words 'children enrolled' at the head of a column of figures was the cause of the paragraph being written as if there were 31,423 children instructed"?—Yes, I believe I wrote that.

112. Is not that an admission that this paragraph was written as if there were 31,423 children instructed?—No, it does not admit anything of the sort.

113. It reads, "was the cause of the paragraph being written as if there were 31,423 children instructed." Does not that mean that that paragraph declares that that number of children were instructed?—No; you are putting into my mouth an application of my words which I did not convey, and which will only be found by your own desire to find them. When I wrote that I was referring to the paragraph and columns in it headed "Children instructed."

114. You say that the accident was the cause of the paragraph being written as if there were 31,423 children instructed. You admit that that means the paragraph was written as if that number of children were instructed?—No, I was referring to the fact that we had through an accident allowed it to go out that an average of 31,423 children were instructed. In writing a letter to the Press I did not do as Mr. Caughley has done with me—take each word and repeat each figure. I have taken the average. I might have expressed myself more clearly, but that is my misfortune when I am dealing with Mr. Caughley, as I am never able to make myself understood.

115. You admit in that answer that you allowed it to go out to the world that an average of 31,423 children were instructed by the Roman Catholic priests?—I admit that through an accident we allowed it to go out, but we corrected it as soon as ever we were made aware of it.

116. And you admit it is not correct that that number of children were actually instructed by the Roman Catholic priests?—We never stated so. An accident happened which allowed it to be stated, but we never intentionally said so.

117. You admit the statement in the paragraph is incorrect?—I admit that statement is incorrect that 31,423 Roman Catholic children were instructed during the seven years, but I do not admit that number of children had not the value of being visited and instructed.

118. The last paragraph says, "But it is incredible from the above large figures that such a mass of Roman Catholic parents are guilty of violation of conscience"?—Yes.

119. That would again refer to the accidental statement that 31,423 children were visited and instructed by their priests?—No, you have left out words. As you were so particular about punctuation you will see there is a full stop, and then we go on, "Bishop Cleary also suggests," and then there is a colon; and then it reads, "that the introduction of the system will violate the consciences of Roman Catholic parents whose children attend the State schools. But it is incredible from the above large figures that such a mass of Roman Catholic parents are guilty of violation of conscience."

120. Those large figures are the 31,423 which you say you put out to the world by accident as having been instructed by their priests?—Those large figures are the children attending the State schools of New South Wales—the Roman Catholic children.

121. But the above large figures are only contained in this paragraph which relates to the number of children which, by accident, you stated were instructed by their priests. It refers to those figures in that paragraph, does it not?—No, no; it refers to all the figures—not exclusively to that one paragraph. It does not say it is incredible from the figures in the last paragraph but one. It says, "above large figures," used in a sense that a writer always uses. He uses the word "above" not necessarily meaning the same page.

122. The fact that the 31,423 in the paragraph is the average in the seven tables, does not that sum up all the figures you have quoted?—Yes, I should say it does sum up.

123. Then it refers to all the figures in that section?—It refers to all the figures printed on the matter.

124. In the first paragraph we get, "Visits to instruct children in the Roman Catholic Church." In the next paragraph we have the number of visits, and then "Children instructed," and then "The valued opportunity of visiting and instructing children," and then we have a reference to the large figures as evidence that the Roman Catholic people do not regard this system as a violation of their consciences. All those fit in with one argument, do they not?—There are two arguments used here. We are repeating the charge made against us by Bishop Cleary of seeking to revive the Penal Code, and we rebut that by saying that so far from prohibiting the Roman Catholic religion, it gives the Roman Catholic Church the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing in seven years an annual average of 31,423 Roman Catholic children. Therefore, that is not a revival of the Penal Code which gave such an opportunity. We proved also that the number of visits ran from 797 to 1,127 in each of seven years, and that they are not prohibited. Then there is a second argument: we are rebutting Bishop Cleary's statement, "that the introduction of the system will violate the consciences of Roman Catholic parents whose children attend the State schools." We show from the preceding figures that if children numbering over thirty thousand attend the State schools, it is an incredible thing to imagine that their parents are guilty of violating their consciences. That is our argument.

125. When you referred to those "above large figures" it was the number of children who had been visited and instructed by priests?—The "above large figures" refers to all Roman Catholic children mentioned. The word "above" covers not the preceding paragraph only, but the whole thing.

126. Does not the trend of the argument right through this part relating to the children instructed go to support this statement from Tasmania that the system existing in Tasmania is regarded as a happy solution to the whole religious difficulty?—I did not connect Tasmania and New South Wales.

127. And is not that sentence also followed by an attempt to show that Cardinal Moran recognized the principle that Scripture lessons could be read in the schools by Roman Catholic children under the supervision of the State-school teachers?—Yes.

128. Would not that tend to support the statement that the system existing in Tasmania is regarded by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty?—That would depend on who was reading it. There is no connection suggested here.

129. That is the only topic dealt with in this pamphlet?—Yes, I think so.

130. The leaflet was published on the 14th January, 1913?—I do not remember.

131. The date of your letter is at the bottom?—Oh, no, it was published some time considerably after that. That letter was dated the 14th January, but the leaflet was not issued for some time afterwards.

132. And it was freely circulated in Auckland?—Not that I am aware of.

133. Are you aware that it was distributed freely and pushed under people's doors?—No, I am not.

134. Are you aware that it was distributed in Christchurch?—I believe a small number were distributed in Christchurch.

135. Distributed at a meeting at which you spoke in the King's Theatre?—I am not aware whether they were given away there.

136. You are not aware that I received one at that meeting?—I would not be surprised. I will accept your word.

137. In a letter to the *Lyttelton Times* on the 7th May, 1913, you admitted in your answer that you gave out to the world a statement that 31,423 Roman Catholic children were visited and instructed by their priests?—I would like to see the letter which I published.

138. You stated just now in answer to a question that by means of a paragraph in a leaflet you gave out to the world a statement accidentally?—I want to hear what I stated.

139. That 31,423 Roman Catholic children have been instructed by their priests?—I want to hear what I did say.

140. The reporter had read out your answer that that paragraph had gone out to the world that that number of children had been instructed?—I beg your pardon, I do not admit it; and

those are not the words the reporter took down or which he read out just now. What I want to point out is that every time you have put that question you have omitted the words "through an accident." I would not draw attention to it but for the fact that you have cross-questioned me about what was an honest and honourable mistake, and directed only to one object—that is, to discredit us as honourable people. Each time you put the question you leave out the vital words and then put to me the question "You admit you issued it," and I admit it was omitted by accident.

141. The notes of the reporter will show that I used the word "accident" at least six or seven times. Your answer admits that you allowed it to go out to the world by accident that 31,423 children were instructed by their priests?—Yes.

142. Then you issued a new leaflet and we find this identical paragraph without any single comma or alteration, and it reads, "Thus it will be seen from the above figures that the system which the League is advocating, so far from prohibiting the Roman Catholic religion, obtained for the Roman Catholic Church the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing in seven years an annual average of 31,423 Roman Catholic children; and yet Bishop Cleary treats this as a revival of the Penal Code." Is not that absolutely identical with the paragraph which appeared in the first edition?—That is absolutely identical, and it is absolutely accurate. This system obtained for the Roman Catholic Church the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing in seven years an annual average of 31,423 Roman Catholic children.

143. That is not what I was asking you. You have just stated that you allowed it to go out to the world by accident?—Allowed what?

144. That 31,423 children were instructed?—No, I have not admitted it; but as regards this paragraph, I admit that, through an accident, the word "instructed" being substituted for the word "enrolled," that impression was given. We never stated that they did visit 31,423 children.

145. Are you not aware that you specifically mentioned in the letter of the 7th May, when you stated, "Surely Mr. Caughley can see that the accident which put the words 'children instructed' "——?—Yes; and I think I have pointed out that I was speaking in a general way there, making it quite clear that we had made a mistake in substituting through an accident the word "instructed" for "enrolled." I was not referring to this paragraph you are quoting there.

146. Is not that the only paragraph in which the figures 31,423 appear?—Yes, that is true, but it does not appear in that paragraph that the children were instructed. That is what I want to emphasize. It says, "There was the valued opportunity of visiting and instructing"—a very different thing.

147. But when you admitted you allowed it to go out to the world in that way you admitted it was incorrect?—I used that word not as referring to what you wish to confine it to exclusively for your own purposes. I used the word "paragraph" as referring to the whole thing here.

148. Now, with regard to the other matter of correction, you will believe me, I suppose, if I state that the leaflet was circulated in Auckland and Christchurch?—I believe it was circulated in Christchurch, but I was not aware it was circulated in Auckland.

149. Do you know whether it was circulated in Wellington?—Yes, it was to a limited extent.

150. And in Wanganui?—That I do not know.

151. This is the official correction which you made with regard to this statement, which appeared in the *Dominion* of the 27th March, 1913: "Canon Garland asks us to state that his attention has been drawn to an error in a set of figures published by the Bible in Schools League, in which a column of children attending the State schools of New South Wales is described as 'children instructed,' which should read 'children enrolled' "?—Yes, I think that would cover everything and anything.

152. Would any one in Wellington gather from that that you were referring to the leaflet?—Yes, if they came across this statement anywhere they would gather that it was now corrected.

153. Did you publish that statement in Auckland, where the leaflet was circulated?—I told you I was not aware it was circulated in Auckland till you told me, or in Wellington; but as soon as we found there was this error, of which Mr. Caughley is making so much, we issued telegraphic orders that the leaflet was not to be distributed, and we reprinted a new edition and circulated it.

154. And in the new edition the paragraph containing the figures 31,423 was identically the same as in the first edition?—Yes.

155. Now, with regard to this complaint about the leaflet, you are aware that the attention of the executive of the Bible in Schools League was officially drawn to what was considered an inadequate acknowledgment of the mistake by the League and the inadequate means of correcting this statement, which you say you have sent forth to the world?—I am aware that attention was drawn by Bishop Cleary to the matter, and I am also aware that we have considered that very ample correction had been made. I am also aware that we did not offer to satisfy Bishop Cleary or you, and in my opinion nothing on earth would satisfy either of you.

156. And shortly afterwards, in the *Lyttelton Times* of the 4th June, 1913, you sent a short letter to the editor giving as an enclosure a report of the deliberations of your executive on this matter, did you not?—I do not remember.

157. And the concluding part of that pronouncement reads, "The members of the executive take this opportunity of expressing their entire confidence in Canon Garland as the leader of the movement to secure the objects of the Bible in Schools League. They are well assured that he is absolutely incapable of wilfully seeking to mislead any one. They hereby express their invincible conviction of his straightforward veracity and his fairness to opponents as displayed not only in the matter of the complaint of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Auckland, but also in all the methods he employs in conducting his campaign"?—Yes, that is correctly read.

158. Then, in a circular which was issued by the Bible in Schools League headed "Teachers' Alleged Disabilities" we have this statement: "Opponents of the League have circulated industriously copies of regulations under the New South Wales Act which they (1) interpret in a drastic fashion; (2) allege prevent teachers taking part in Church-work; (3) assert are the consequence of religious instruction. To this the League replies—(1.) The quoted regulations never have been administered or interpreted by the Department in the sense applied to them by those New Zealand opponents, who, moreover, have had no personal experience of their working. (2.) There has never been any hindrance placed on teachers taking part in Church-work (see Mr. Lobban's statement on this page). (3.) The regulations quoted are not the consequence of religious instruction in State schools, because the same regulations existed in Queensland during the thirty years in which there was no religious instruction in State schools (see Miss Halstead's statement on page 2). Opponents failed to quote from Queensland, because that would have proved such regulations having nothing to do with religious instruction. (4.) The regulations quoted from New South Wales by opponents actually do not exist in that State. The latest official copy of the Education Act and its regulations issued by the Government Printer of New South Wales, 1912, contains no such regulations quoted by the League's opponents; the only regulation in regard to teachers' action is No. 30." You published that statement?—Yes.

159. Are you aware that it was I who quoted those regulations regarding teachers' disabilities at a meeting of the Baptist Conference in Christchurch at which both you and I spoke?—And at which I was not present when you were speaking. You wished to convey an inference, that I was present and personally heard what you said.

160. No, not at all; the fact that you say they have been quoted shows that you know they were quoted?—Yes.

161. The circular states, "The latest official copy of the Education Act and its regulations issued by the Government Printer of New South Wales, 1912, contains no such regulations quoted by the League's opponents." And above that it says, "The regulations quoted from New South Wales by opponents actually do not exist"?—Yes.

162. Did I not point out to you in correspondence on the 7th May in the *Lyttelton Times* that I was quoting at that Baptist Conference regulations which were then in force in New South Wales, and that you quote some months later from a new edition regulations refuting my statement on the ground that the regulations which I quoted were in force at the time?—What was the date of that Baptist Conference?

163. October, 1912?—Yes.

164. Are you not aware that the regulations which you quote here were gazetted on the 11th November, nearly a month after I had quoted the then existing regulations?—I do not understand your question.

165. Were you aware when you quoted the latest official copy of the Education Act that that was issued on the 11th November, 1914, nearly a month after the date I quoted the regulations which were then existing?—Yes, I was aware of that. You quoted them at the Baptist Conference just a month before they were gazetted.

166. I quoted the old regulations and you quoted the new ones, which were not issued at the time I quoted them?—I quoted against you the regulations in force at the time that you misquoted them.

167. Do you not know that that is the only occasion on which I quoted them?—No, I do not.

168. Will you accept my statement that it is?—I will if you give it to me.

169. If I telegraphed to Christchurch and have sent up a copy of the regulations bearing date the 11th November, would you not admit it was unfair to quote regulations which did not exist when I was quoting regulations that did exist?—I was charging you with not merely quoting regulations which I understood you had quoted after they ceased to exist, but I was charging you with something more—with putting a drastic interpretation on them which had never been applied to them by those who administered them.

170. This is put in special black type: "The regulations quoted from New South Wales by opponents actually do not exist in that State"?—Does that connect it with you? Is your name mentioned? I have the leaflet in my hand.

171. Every one in Christchurch knew I had made that statement at that conference?—Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Caughley has been putting words into my mouth which I have not uttered. I imagined from the way he read that his name was there, and I accepted it as an honest man. Is your name in that leaflet, Mr. Caughley?

172. I did not in the slightest degree suggest——?—I got that suggestion from you. I could not make out what you imply I had done—that I had charged you personally with saying something which you had never said. I could not imagine myself guilty of such a thing as that. Now it seems perfectly clear that I did not accuse Mr. Caughley of quoting those regulations. I have spoken generally on our openness, and that I stand by.

173. If you look at that newspaper you will see where the connection comes in. In the last paragraph of the letter of the 7th May you find these words: "A brief word on his quotation on regulations." Who is the "he" there?—I am referring to Mr. Caughley. I am dealing with your own letter, which is not before me. You complained at my having written to certain newspapers, and I say, "He states he 'quoted the latest regulations to hand on a matter concerning which even Canon Garland at the time had no more recent information.' In stating what he knows of the contents of my mind he is drawing upon his imagination as truly as he drew upon it in interpreting the regulations in an unknown and drastic fashion, and in omitting the fact that it existed where there was no religious instruction—facts which, of course, are well known to me. He wants to know why I did not reply to him on this point. I do not mind telling him that his statement seemed to me so ludicrous that I could not believe any intelligent

person would accept it. Will he forgive me for this mistake also, without 'calling names,' as I forgive him for his mistake, which I have always regarded as unintentional on his part? When, however, I found that the Women's Christian Temperance Union largely based a resolution adverse to our League upon Mr. Caughley's interpretation of the regulations, I thought it was time to let the facts be known." My memory is much clearer now that I have read that.

174. Coming back to the beginning paragraph you say "He states he 'quoted the latest regulations to hand on a matter concerning which even Canon Garland at the time had no more recent information.'" Was I not correct in making that statement that at the time in October when I quoted those regulations you had no later regulations, which you subsequently quoted?—I could not say what I had then.

175. Could you have had the regulations issued on the 11th November in your possession in October?—No, I could not.

176. I gave you there an opportunity to exonerate me about quoting regulations which did not actually exist in that state in New South Wales, but instead of accepting the opportunity and exonerating me, did you not say, "In stating what he knows of the contents of my mind he is drawing upon his imagination as truly as he drew upon it in interpreting the regulations in an unknown and drastic fashion"?—I would like to see your letter and my reply. Probably it was in the usual strain in which you write.

177. In the letter of the 7th May you quote my words where I did say that?—Well, I would like to see your letter.

178. Did you not in the letter of the 7th May quote sufficient to show that I was drawing on my imagination?—I had your letter before me when I said you were drawing on your imagination.

179. Was I drawing on my imagination when I said you had not in October the regulations that were gazetted in November?—I do not know what knowledge I had in October.

180. Would you not admit that I had a claim on you in terms of the standard of ethics you put to Bishop Cleary—that having made a charge that I was drawing on my imagination, that those regulations did not exist at the time I quoted them, you should have hastened to let the fact be known?—I thought after you made that statement this statement was still being circulated on your authority.

181. Do you not think you should have applied your own standard of ethics, and that you should not for a single minute wittingly have withheld the refutation when you made that statement?—Which statement?

182. The statement that I was drawing on my imagination?—I say you are drawing on your imagination. Could you say what I did or what I did not know? It is not an important fact.

183. Does it require any imagination for a man to state that a person did not have in October regulations which were not issued until November?—That is not what you stated.

184. Then, with reference to the words which you and I have had at various times with regard to the accuracy, for instance, of that leaflet with regard to the Roman Catholic children, and with regard to the accuracy of your statements in respect to alleged disabilities of teachers and others, are you aware that I published in the *New Zealand Times* in the first week in September, 1913, a tabulated list of eight or nine statements, where I asked you to state to the public whether certain statements you made publicly were true or not?—What were they?

185. Are you aware that I published a list of such statements?—I believe you published something, but you published so much that I do not pretend to remember everything, and I would like to know what it is.

186. Are you aware that the Rev. James Gibb, in a letter dated the 5th September, 1913, wrote, "Is it too much to ask Mr. Caughley to reflect on the proverb 'It is an ill bird that fouls its own nest'? If he did succeed in proving Canon Garland to be what he charges him with being the discredit of it would attach to our Church, not only here but likewise in Australia, where the Federal General Assembly—the Assembly of the six States—on two occasions passed resolutions commending the movement of which Canon Garland was then leader"?—Yes, that is so.

187. Do you consider that when I published the statement of Canon Garland that I believed that it was not true, that it was good advice to give him, "if he did succeed in proving Canon Garland to be what he charges him with being the discredit of it would attach to our Church"?—That is a matter of opinion.

188. Would it not be of more credit to the Church that if such charges were true I should clear our Church from any such statements if they were not true?—That is also a matter of opinion, and depends on the procedure.

189. Then, on the 6th July, 1914, do you remember this construction of yours: "When St. Peter wrote this epistle the Christians were treated by the pagans, prohibited by legal enactments from the exercise of Christian liberty, and misrepresented even by the philosophers of those days. Their desire to do good was wilfully misrepresented—'They speak against you as evil-doers,' writes St. Peter; they were misrepresented as untrue to religion, as having no religion: they were accused of injuring and destroying child-life. But to accomplish this they suffered for righteousness' sake, and counted themselves happy, being not afraid of the terror of the present or troubled by the misrepresentations of the pagans, who boasted they would crush Christianity. Those who suffered for righteousness have gone their way and entered into the joy of their Lord, and we of to-day, from their example and the lesson of their triumph, for which we thank God, can take heart to 'be not afraid' when we too have to suffer for righteousness' sake at the hands of those who in this twentieth century would deny liberty to Christian parents to have their children in their day schools, paid for by those parents

as part of the whole people, taught those truths about God and that knowledge of Jesus Christ which are part of the common law of the British Empire. From the example of the long roll of white-robed army of martyrs and their victory, often by death, we can learn to 'be not afraid, neither be troubled' when we are misrepresented in our efforts and our desires for the moral and spiritual benefit and welfare of the children of this country." Do you remember preaching that construction?—Yes.

190. In view of the fact that your action with regard to the leaflet containing the visits to Roman Catholic children, your neglect to exonerate us by the publication of the second cable with regard to the Wilkins circular, and your neglect to acknowledge the fact that I quoted regulations which were then existing, and that you were quoting a copy subsequently issued, when we complained about you, do you think you are suffering for righteousness' sake?—That is a question I do not think any one would answer, and I do not think the question is a fair and proper one.

191. Are not those who make any attempt to combat methods which we object to parallel with those in this passage, which you described as the pagans who persecuted the Christians?—I was proceeding to answer. The question assumes a number of premises which it might be impossible to answer. Having done that you now put another question, and I made no connection between Mr. Caughley and the pagans there.

192. When we make a complaint about the methods which have been used by the officials of the Bible in Schools League do you consider that the public criticism of such action qualifies a minister to rank himself amongst the white-robed army of martyrs who suffered for righteousness' sake?—That depends upon what the methods are. Mr. Caughley may say he complains of those methods, but it has to be proved there is just cause of complaint.

193. You would say that even in view of the fact that the minister of my own Church says that, and even if I knew the charges to be true, I should not make them?—I did not know any one to say that.

194. Dr. Gibb said even if I knew them to be true the discredit would attach to our Church?—That is different from what you said before. You said you should not say them if they are true; but now you are substituting words, and that is where the attempt is made to tangle me up.

195. Dr. Gibb says, "Is it too much to ask Mr. Caughley to reflect on the proverb, 'It is an ill bird that fouls its own nest'"?—I would not imagine that Dr. Gibb was referring to the fact that you were acting out of accord with your whole Church in the matter in any question of what was true and what was not true. It is quite different from the way in which you put the question to me three or four minutes ago. He never said you were to withhold the truth.

196. Are you not aware that he used the following words: "If he did succeed in proving Canon Garland to be what he charges him with being, the discredit of it would attach to our Church"?—Yes, he used those words.

197. I wish to ask you now some questions with regard to the scheme you are submitting to the people of New Zealand?—When you use the pronoun there, do you refer to me personally?

198. No, the Bible in Schools League?—I am glad to know it.

199. Is it not correct that the system of religious instruction offered to New Zealand only divides itself into the right of entry of the clergy or religious teachers, and, on the other hand, Scripture lessons by State teachers?—No, I do not admit that at all. It is not a system of two parts; it is a system of a complement, and each part is an essential complement of the other.

200. Are there not two kinds of teachings provided for under this system?—Yes, that is so.

201. One, the right of entry and religious instruction by the clergy, and, on the other hand, Scripture lessons by the State teachers?—Yes.

202. Under the right of entry, would all denominations have the same right?—Yes.

203. Catechisms, creeds, and dogmas may be taught if the religious instructors choose?—Yes.

204. Does the State prescribe what may or may not be taught under the right-of-entry instructions?—No.

205. Does the State prepare or provide the books which will be used for that right-of-entry instruction?—No.

206. Do the State teachers take part in this right-of-entry instruction?—Not that I know of.

207. Would they under this system you propose?—No.

208. Would the State pay the visiting instructors under the right-of-entry instruction?—No.

209. Would the State see that this right-of-entry instruction is regularly given?—No.

210. You mean that the State would merely permit it?—No, I would not say the State permits it. I think there is something more than that. The State gives it as a right. It is not a permission; it is a right bestowed by Parliament.

211. Is the State in any way responsible for the giving of religious instruction under the right of entry, or the nature of it, or the cost of it?—No.

212. Is all the cost and labour provided by these denominations concerned?—Yes.

213. Would you consider that any claim with regard to the injustice or conscience could be made against the State concerning the right-of-entry instruction?—No, because it is allowed to all equally. There are special privileges for none.

214. Could the State free itself of any such claim because it does not give, prescribe, control, or pay for the right-of-entry instruction?—I must look at a question like that; it is very long and involved. What does such a claim refer to?

215. With regard to injustice or conscience?—I really do not understand your question. What claim could arise? I cannot get on with your question. There is an assumption of a claim. Who has made the claim?

216. I never said any one had made the claim?—Then how can you speak of such a claim?

217. If a claim regarding injustice or rights of conscience were made, could the State free itself on the ground that it does not prescribe, control, or pay for the right-of-entry instruction?—The State could absolutely free itself from such a claim as you mention, and on the only occasion on which I heard of any claim being raised the State did free itself at once. If I may be allowed a moment I will prove that.

218. I will accept that—you refer to Queensland?—Here is a letter written by the Premier of Queensland to the Roman Catholic Archbishop, read in the Queensland Parliament on the 25th October, 1911 (*Hansard*, 1911, page 1770).

219. Is not that in your evidence?—Yes, but I want to read it to show what the opinion was. It states, "I contend that there is no just ground for complaint against the decision of the people being given effect to, nor do I see any special connection between this subject and the subject of endowment."

220. Are you not also aware that the Hon. Mr. Barlow, who put the Bible in Schools Bill through the Upper House, said, "When the State interferes with conscience the only remedy is to suffer"?—I do not remember an occasion on which Mr. Barlow said such a thing. I have heard you say it.

221. Are you not aware that that is in the Queensland *Hansard?*—I have heard you say so.

222. You will accept my statement that he said it?—I would like to know how he said it.

223. It is in my evidence?—Then I accept it.

224. Do you consider it is a remedy for the violation of conscience to suffer?—I do not know.

225. Turning to the other kind of instruction which is given—that is, Scripture lessons by the State teachers—are those lessons given by the State through the State teachers?—These lessons are given by the State-school teachers.

226. And therefore given by the State?—No, I do not say that follows. That is my opinion.

227. Do you not hold that a State which orders any of its servants to give a certain type of instruction is thereby giving that instruction?—That is a matter of opinion, and a matter that is open to argument.

228. Do you think any sensible person would say that the Government was not giving that instruction?—I say your question is exactly like this: when you rely upon the State to do so-and-so it is the State that is doing it for you. It seems to me to be as absurd as to say when a railway porter opens a door for you the State is opening that door.

229. If the State gave instruction to a Government official to carry out any act, would my claim of action if I had a grievance be against the servant or the State?—That depends on the servant who carried out the instructions.

230. But if he carries them out as the Government gave them?—That would depend upon the instructions.

231. Does the State provide the books to be used for the Scripture lessons?—Yes, the State would.

232. Would the State prescribe what those Scripture-lesson books would contain or leave out?—Yes, the State would.

233. Would the State paraphrase, re-edit, or condense passages of Scripture contained in these books?—Yes.

234. Would the State pay for those books under that system?—Yes, certainly.

235. Would the State prescribe how the Scripture lessons were to be given by the teacher?—Yes.

236. Would the State compel the State teacher to give the Scripture lessons?—That would depend on the way the regulations were drawn up.

237. Under the scheme as you have it in this Referendum Bill, would the State compel the teacher to give those Scripture lessons?—That depends on what Parliament does when it arranges the matter. I cannot forecast the future, and it is only you who would expect me to.

238. If this Referendum Bill were passed as it now stands, would the State have to compel the teacher to give this religious instruction?—The answer is emphatically No.

239. Would you explain?—There is no explanation. I have given you the answer to your question, but not the answer you were looking for.

240. If this Referendum Bill as it is now before Parliament were carried into effect, and any teacher refused to give that right-of-entry instruction, would the State not compel that teacher to do it?—Absolutely No. It shows you do not understand the matter. If the Referendum Bill were carried to-morrow and the Governor signed it to-morrow, there is not one teacher who would be compelled. You are putting a question on one thing and trying to get an answer in regard to something else all the time.

241. If the Referendum Bill were passed as it now stands, and this issue were submitted to the electors and they determined in favour of the proposal, and Parliament by enactment incorporated the system as it now stands in the Referendum Bill, and those requirements became part of the Acts and regulations of New Zealand?—Which requirements?

242. The requirements of the teachers in regard to the Scripture lessons. If the referendum were carried and Parliament carried an amending Act to the Education Act, would the State then not compel the teacher to give the Scripture lessons?—I cannot tell what the State would do. How could I? It depends on what Parliament does. If the referendum is carried there is nothing obligatory on Parliament.

243. Do you mean that if Parliament passes an amending Act to the Education Act requiring that teachers, irrespective of denominations, shall give those Scripture lessons, that Parliament will not see that the provisions of the amending Act are carried out?—I cannot tell. That depends on the Minister of Education, the administration of the Department, and on a hundred-and-one other things.

244. The Scripture lessons to be given by the teachers are already an enactment in the Queensland State, and does the Government there require every teacher to give those Scripture lessons?—I have never heard that the Government requires every teacher to do so or does not.

245. Does the Government of the State of New South Wales require every teacher, irrespective of denomination, to give those Scripture lessons?—I would say that the regulations would say that they required it to be done, but I would not say it therefore follows that the Act of Parliament to be passed here when the referendum is granted would require the same thing.

246. Reading from your own leaflet, we have this sentence by your authority, Mr. Board, "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach these Scripture lessons"?—Yes, that is there.

247. Therefore all teachers, irrespective of creed, in New South Wales are required to teach Scripture lessons?—If you are quoting his words, then I would accept what he says.

248. Therefore the State does require it?—No, Mr. Board does not say the State requires it.

249. He says, "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach these Scripture lessons." If the State does not require them to do it will you say who does?—Mr. Board will tell you. You are asking me something which I cannot answer.

SATURDAY, 24TH OCTOBER, 1914.

Rev. Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND further examined. (No. 16.)

1. *The Chairman.*] I understand you wish to make an explanation?—Yes. May I now deal with the missing cablegram? I will ask you, Mr. Chairman, to hold this telegram, if you please. It is to be found in the inset to my statement, and I will ask you to be kind enough to check me as I read: "Could not identify circular from information given in your cable last week, as Wilkins died in ninety-two; circular printed in Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued, but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong; original not traceable now, but evidently issued by Council of Education between sixty-six and seventy-nine, before existing Act passed; no record of any such circular since eighty. Table thirty-six has no connection with Wilkins circular.—P. BOARD, Director of Education." The "six" should be added into the print, and I ask that that correction be made. Have I read correctly?

2. Yes?—Now I wish to be allowed to make a statement. In handing in now a copy, certified by the Post Office, of the original cablegram received by me 14th July, 1914, from Mr. Board, Director of Education, Sydney, I wish to say how keenly I felt the position in which I was placed yesterday when on being asked to produce the original I failed to lay my hands upon it. Still more keenly did I feel the attempt, as it seemed to me, to imply that I had not acted in a straightforward manner, but had on page 3 of the inset suppressed vital words which Mr. Caughley stated were in a cablegram of the same tenor and date received by Bishop Cleary from Mr. Board, which suppression would imply that in order to deceive this Committee I had first falsified the cablegram, and then suppressed the original which I had received, an imputation repeatedly implied by word, innuendo, and inference subsequently. The effect upon me of this conduct was to embarrass me seriously for the rest of the morning, causing my mind constantly to wander after the whereabouts of the missing cablegram. That there was no honourable justification for so treating me as guilty before I could defend myself is proved by the facts.

Mr. Malcolm: I would ask your ruling, Mr. Chairman, on a point as to whether the witness, being under cross-examination, is at liberty to address the Committee at length as to what his feelings are. What his feelings are is of absolutely no moment to the Committee.

The Chairman: It is rather long-winded; could you not make a brief statement?

Witness: I will not go on reading unless I am permitted. I was placed in this position: that in effect I was accused of falsifying an original document, and then, when challenged to produce it, of suppressing it.

Mr. Caughley: I object to that statement—I never said so.

The Chairman: You have already stated, Canon Garland, that you have been misrepresented in the matter, and that will be put on record, but I do not think I can accept this long statement.

Witness: May I say now that I hope the members of the Committee will examine this cablegram and see that it is a genuine document issued by the Post Office.

Mr. McCallum: It should have the impress of the office upon it. It is not a certified document and would not be accepted in a Court of law. It is just a copy.

Witness: It is supplied from the Post Office.

Mr. McCallum: It does not say so.

The Chairman: I think we should accept it.

Witness: Is it to be beyond all dispute now that I have produced from the Post Office a certified copy of a cablegram which, with the exception of one word, reads exactly the same as the cablegram I published?

The Chairman: Yes, that is so. The other matter does not come before us. We accept that as a copy you received from the Post Office.

Witness: And that ends all dispute.

The Chairman: The question is not raised.

Witness: But it is obvious it is going to be raised. To place me in such a position that, after accusing me of falsifying a document, then suppressing it, and then to suggest by implication that I am not producing the original document, is extraordinary.

The Chairman: It is not suggested.

Mr. Caughley: May I now state that Canon Garland will not find anywhere in the evidence a statement that he falsified the document or that he suppressed it. He has made that charge against me, and it is not justified. The reason that I wanted the original of that document was that in two other documents we have found that the Bible in Schools League has serious printers' errors, and Canon Garland admits that even in this document he has produced there is one word wrong, and we wanted to be certain that there were no printers' errors of the kind which occurred before. We wanted to know if it was an accurate copy. I made no charge against Canon Garland of falsifying the document, nor a charge of suppressing it, and I think he ought to withdraw that statement.

Canon Garland: What I said was "which suppression would imply that in order to deceive this Committee I had first falsified the cablegram and then suppressed the original, which I had received, an implication repeatedly implied by word, innuendo, and inference." And I remember that at the moment I actually protested against it. With reference to one or two questions I was asked about yesterday, I would like to hear what they were and what it was I said, in order that I may have an opportunity in open Committee of making any correction that might be necessary. I was asked a question as to whether I knew that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Tasmania had made a certain statement, and I want to hear how that question was phrased, and exactly how I replied.

The Chairman: You were asked the question and you answered it.

Witness: Yes; I do not know whether I want to make a correction, but the trouble I am in is this: that I find a word used, say, an hour or two ago is taken as something else to convey another inference.

The Chairman: You will get a copy of your evidence.

Mr. McCallum: You can apply to the reporter when the Committee has finished and make any necessary correction.

Witness: Thank you, that will do.

3. *Mr. Caughley* (to witness).] Are you aware of the series of events which led up to my receiving this copy of the cablegram from Mr. Board regarding the Wilkins circular?—No, I knew nothing about your receiving that cable until you said so yesterday. I was surprised to find there was such a cable in existence.

4. Are you aware this was the course of procedure: "Mr. Caughley, M.A., Christchurch.—Dear sir, In reply to your inquiry concerning the Wilkins circular which appears in the Queensland *Hansard*, I may say that, seeing Canon Garland's alleged 'exposure,' I sent an inquiry to Sydney, and have pleasure in acceding to your request for information, as you have indicated that the matter is of great importance to teachers, and likely to be required at the next meeting of the Teachers' Institute.—I remain, faithfully yours, HENRY W. CLEARY, Bishop of Auckland." "Mr. John Caughley, M.A., Christchurch.—Dear sir, In accordance with the spirit of your previous request, I enclose herewith some further documents in connection with the Wilkins circular, which you are free to use at the meeting of the Teachers' Institute. Kindly keep these documents safely until such time as I may have occasion to ask for their return.—Faithfully yours, HENRY W. CLEARY, Bishop of Auckland." These are the documents which were forwarded to me: "Hon. Frank McDonnell, Brisbane.—Kindly ask Hon. Davey send if possible or indicate official source of Education circular quoted by him in House November ninth nineteen ten page nineteen hundred eighty-five. Director Education Sydney says cannot be identified. Auckland." The reply was as follows: Davey quoted official document. Suggest communicate Trefle Sydney. Must recorded document.—MCDONNELL, Brisbane." "Minister of Education, Sydney.—Kindly see Education circular quoted in Queensland debates Vol. one hundred and six page nineteen hundred eighty-five. It quotes previous but undated circular issued by Wilkins. Kindly say is it genuine or surely fraud. Auckland." The reply to that by Mr. Board was "Education circular quoted Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong. Original not traceable now but preamble evidently issued by Council Education as well as original circular before existing Act passed in eighty.—P. BOARD, Director Education, Sydney." Are you aware that was the procedure I followed in connection with this information?—How on earth could I be aware of it, as I did not hear one word of it until just now?

5. You stated yesterday in your reply that you challenged the opposition League with using an anonymous statement as if it were an official document, and giving to the world a purely anonymous statement?—Yes. What was that referring to?

6. When you were defining the nature of your challenge with regard to leaflet No. 7?—Yes.

7. And this circular from Mr. Board says that the Education circular quoted in the Queensland *Hansard* was doubtless issued. Are you then justified in saying that we used an anonymous statement as if it were an official document, when Mr. Board says that the Education circular quoted in Queensland *Hansard* was doubtless issued, and when he also says that the preamble was evidently issued by the Council of Education, as well as the original circular, before the existing Act was passed?—When I said that I was absolutely justified in saying it, because I was unaware of the document which Mr. Caughley has produced and which he and Bishop Cleary were aware of from the 14th or 15th July last. If that had been produced then, instead of being held as it has been until it was convenient to produce it and embarrass me by producing it, I would at once have accepted it.

8. Then you now withdraw the statement that the opposition League used an anonymous statement as if it were an official document, and giving to the world a purely anonymous statement?—I accept Mr. Board's statement absolutely and unreservedly until I have reason to believe to the contrary.

9. You will be speaking about innuendos presently?—There is no innuendo there.

10. Now that you have this information, and remembering that you had a cable from Mr. Board on the same day containing not the whole of it but a good deal of it, will you make as publicly as you made the original charge an exoneration of the National Schools Defence League with regard to leaflet No. 7?—I did not make the original charge; the National Schools Defence League made the original charge against us, by using a leaflet headed "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing," which they said showed that there is ample opportunity for proselytism. I rebutted that by producing the exact cable that Mr. Board sent to me at that time, which read as follows: "Mr. Wilkins retired eighteen eighty-four, died eighteen ninety-two. Could not therefore have issued circular referred to by you, which cannot be identified." I find in regard to any published statement I made I did not come prepared with the matter until Professor Hunter brought it up here at this Committee as a proof that proselytism did exist under this system. Then, in order to rebut it, I prepared this statement, and not until then did I make any further statement about the matter.

11. Now you have admitted that your statement is not correct?—I have not admitted the statement is not correct.

12. Referring to the question I asked you yesterday with regard to the Scripture lessons given in State schools, if as a result of the referendum the system of religious instruction you advocate is made legal in New Zealand, would not the State compel the State teachers to give the Scripture lessons?—You put exactly the same question yesterday. Would you say exactly what the question is? I would be most anxious to give you the fullest answer I can, but I really cannot follow so involved a question. Mr. Caughley read yesterday from Mr. Board's letter of the 11th October, 1906, the words "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach the Scripture lessons," and then he put the question to me as if he had read a complete sentence. I regret that when he did so I did not ask to see the document from which he read, for then at once it would have been apparent to me and to this Committee that the words he pretended to quote as a complete sentence were much less than half, being only seventeen words out of forty-three. I found cause to complain yesterday of similar wresting of a context on Mr. Caughley's part, and also of putting words into my mouth implying to me things which I had not said, and all this on the part of the one who claimed of me an accuracy so meticulous that even the doctrine of infallibility does not cover it. In consequence of his conduct, and also because of the highly involved nature of his questions, I found it impossible to give so full an answer as I wished to give, and which now I give in reply to this question, "Are all teachers, irrespective of creed required to teach these Scripture lessons?" By adopting as my own opinion the whole forty-seven words of Mr. Board, "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach these Scripture lessons, and in no case has any refusal to do so taken place, nor has any complaint been made to the Department that the lessons have been ridiculed or made light of." I also add as an integral part of my answer, the former part of which is not to be torn therefrom, the fact, which is beyond dispute, that neither in Western Australia nor in Queensland is any case to be found on record of any teacher refusing to have the Scripture lessons on their introduction into the previously existing system of education. In regard to the question as to whether the State would compel them, I have to give this answer: that I am not in a position to say what the State will do. Our request is that Parliament shall ascertain the will of the people as to whether they desire the particular system or not, but I am unable to say what the State will do.

13. You have included in your answer that I pretended to read a whole sentence but only read part. I read, "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach these Scripture lessons"?—Here is what was actually said. You are putting a word into my mouth which I never used, as you did over and over again yesterday. Mr. Caughley read yesterday from Mr. Board's letter the words "All teachers, irrespective of creed, are required to teach these Scripture lessons," and then put a question to me as if he had put a complete sentence. "I regret that when he did so I did not ask to see the document from which he read, for then at once it would have been plain to me and to this Committee that the words he pretended to quote as a complete sentence were much less than half."

14. I told you it was there, and that you did use those words?—I express my regret entirely, and if you like I will quite withdraw my statement that I did not use the word "pretended."

15. Do you not think it must be a fair system of religious instruction advocated by the League when its chief official advocate says that the State would have to compel the teachers to give the lessons, and you will not admit it?—I do not say that I will not admit anything. I simply say it is an absolute impossibility, psychologically or mentally, to tell what the State will do. We are asking for a referendum to be taken on certain principles, and it will then be for Parliament to decide how those principles are to be carried out. It is not for us to decide.

16. Is it impossible to indicate that a State which passes an Act of Parliament will see that that Act is carried out?—There is no guarantee when the referendum is taken that a subsequent Act of Parliament will follow.

17. My question intended that if an Act did follow, and it became an Act of New Zealand, this kind of religious instruction would be given in the schools. Does it require any great imagination or otherwise to know that when the State passes an Act the State will see that the Act is carried out?—I have heard of a great many complaints about Acts of Parliament not being carried out. I do not know of any Act of Parliament that is fully carried out.

18. Would the State, if an Act were carried into effect, see that the lessons are read in New Zealand?—That would depend upon the administration by the Department.

19. If a teacher refused on the grounds of conscience to give the State-prescribed Scripture lessons in a State-prescribed way, would not that teacher be subject to dismissal?—That would be entirely a matter for the Department to say; but I have never heard of a teacher who refused being dismissed in consequence of such refusal.

20. Do you think that if a teacher in New Zealand, if this Act were passed, did refuse that the State would allow the teacher to defy the law?—I have no opinion on the subject. That will depend on the next Government returned and the kind of Minister at the head of the Department.

21. Would not the Scripture lessons have to be given, prescribed, controlled, enforced, and paid for by the State?—Yes.

22. Would not the State be solely responsible for those Scripture lessons?—I do not like that word "State," because there is an imputation in it. If you will substitute for that the word "Department" I will be able to answer you a great deal more fully.

23. I will say "Government"?—No, "Education Department."

24. Would not the Government be solely responsible for the Scripture lessons?—The Government would be responsible for the Scripture lessons in the same way that Parliament would be responsible to the people for them. The actual responsibility lies, as everybody knows, with the Education Department.

25. And the Education Department is responsible to the Government, is it not?—The Education Department is responsible to the Government, as the Government is to Parliament, and Parliament to the sovereign tribunal, the people.

26. Therefore, if there was any claim with regard to injustice or conscience, would it not be only with regard to the State-given Scripture lessons?—I could not say that I think a man who would raise a claim for reading as ordinary literature the sublimest passages in English literature—a man who would raise a claim for compensation on that would raise a claim for compensation on a hundred-and-one other things.

27. Seeing that under the right-of-entry instruction the Churches are responsible for the religious instruction and not the State, could any claim with regard to injustice or conscience be made against the State with regard to right-of-entry lessons?—A claim by whom?

28. By anybody?—You never can prevent foolish people making claims on any subject. If you will tell me by whom I will try and answer the question.

29. Is it not true that these Scripture lessons will be provided by the State in only one form and given under only one method?—That, again, is an involved question that it is impossible for me to answer. Your question is equivalent to—Is it not true that the State will do something of a problematical nature on a problematical date? How can I say? We are asking for a referendum, a proposal which includes, *inter alia*, this principle: lessons to be read in school-hours by the children themselves from Scripture-books provided by the Education Department, the State-school teachers supervising the reading, but not giving sectarian or dogmatic teaching.

30. Would not the State under this system provide only one form of Scripture lesson to be given in the State schools by the teachers, and only one method by which those lessons will be given?—There, again, that is an involved question to me. If you allow me to answer the question in this way: where the system is at work the State provides in some cases the reading-books; in other cases the State does not provide the reading-books; and the State does not prescribe a uniform method of Scripture lessons any more than it prescribes a uniform method for other subjects. The different details depend on the different States, and within each State there is a latitude that educationists recognize must be allowed in all subjects.

31. The card that you just looked at states that the lesson is read by the children themselves from Scripture-books provided by the Education Department: that refers to New Zealand?—No, it does not.

32. Is not that the system you want established in New Zealand?—Here is Mr. Caughley doing what he did with me yesterday. This card shows that for which we are asking, and it is expressly headed, "System of religious instruction in the State schools prevailing in Australia."

33. And on the other side it says, "I am in favour of the system of religious instruction in State schools described on the other side"?—Yes.

34. Then that is what you are asking for?—I have said that is what we are asking for.

35. Then what are you quibbling for?—I am not quibbling.

36. You say on the card, "I am in favour of the system of religious instruction in State schools described on the other side," and then there is the system on the other side—"That lessons are to be read in school-hours"?—Would you mind reading the line in heavy print?

37. Yes. "System of religious instructions in State schools prevailing in Australia: Lessons read in school-hours by the children themselves from Scripture-books provided by the Education Department." If your request is acceded to, I ask you would the State provide only one form of Scripture lesson-books?—I say it is absolutely impossible for me to say what the State will do. How on earth could I? It depends on what the Department says and the advice it receives from its own experts.

38. You mean, then, that you do not know what the system would be if it were introduced into New Zealand?—I know what the system would be if introduced—it would be on the lines of that which exists in Australia.

39. Then the card reads, "State-school teachers supervising the reading, but not giving sectarian or dogmatic instruction"?—The wording on my card is "teaching," not "instruction."

40. Would not the State there be prescribing the method under which the teachers were to give the lessons?—I can say of my own knowledge, as far as it extends, that I have never been aware of any special method of giving Scripture lessons being obligatory or even directed.

41. Does it not say in the New South Wales Act that the teachers are to give general religious instruction as distinguished from dogmatic or polemical theology?—That is correct.

42. Is not that a direction as to how the lessons are to be given?—That is a prescription as to what is not to be done: they are not to give dogmatic or polemical teaching.

43. Does not that mean that the teachers' work is to be everything else but that?—I would leave any one to draw their own conclusions. I say it means that they are not to give dogmatic or polemical instruction: they are to give that which is there described as general religious instruction.

44. Would there be, if this system is adopted in New Zealand, any alternative form of State-given religious instruction for any denomination whose religious principles are opposed to the State method?—That question again—"whose religious principles are opposed to the State method"—I do not know of any State method.

45. Do you not see that the man who should be most able to explain the system is unable to give a straight answer to that question?—I see nothing of the sort, and I say those questions are so involved that the idea they give me is that they are meant to trap me and trick me.

46. Is this a trap question: would the State under this system provide Scripture lessons of alternative types acceptable to various denominations?—Yes, it is a trap question. I think there are two questions there. You are asking me is it a trap question, which I say it is; and you also ask me if the State would provide alternative Scripture lessons acceptable to all denominations. I cannot tell whether the State would or not. What I do know is that there has never been any demand for alternative lessons from the various denominations. With the exception of the criticism by Cardinal Moran of the New South Wales text-book, I have never heard of any demand being made for alternative Scripture text-books. I have heard a complaint made about other lesson-books and demands made for an alteration of other lesson-books, but I have never heard of any demand for an alteration of the Scripture lesson-book except the one I mentioned.

47. Under this system, if adopted in New Zealand, would not the State be providing Scripture lessons in a form acceptable to the Protestant denominations only?—Well, there I find great difficulty in answering, because I want to know what you mean by "Protestant denominations." If the people decided in the affirmative, then Parliament would have the full option of rejecting or carrying out the will of the people, and deciding that there was to be the system for which we are asking, and the experience elsewhere would show that all the denominations except one—the Roman Catholic Church—would be satisfied with the arrangement.

48. You have just said that all denominations except one would be satisfied?—Well, the Seventh Day Adventists do not like it.

49. Would not the State then be taking a side with certain denominations, and this one would not be provided for?—No, because that one is provided for. The Scripture lessons are available to them, and the Scripture lessons are read by the Roman Catholic children notwithstanding what the Church may say. I do not wish to imply that their Church wishes them to read them, but that the Scripture lessons are read by the Roman Catholic children is beyond question. The Roman Catholic Church equally with all other Churches has the same privileges, and can go into the schools as often as it likes and teach its own children.

50. Do you not maintain most strenuously that the official utterance of the official court of the Church is the representation of the people of that Church?—Yes.

51. And now you say that the official utterance of the Roman Catholic Church cannot be taken as the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to this question?—Once again, Mr. Chairman, I object. I did not say anything like what Mr. Caughley is seeking to put into my mouth.

52. It is as near as I can interpret it?—It is either your fault or mine, but it is not near anything like what I said. It is perfectly true, as I said in my answer—and we have never said anything to the contrary—that we have always pointed out that the Roman Catholic Church—and I believe conscientiously so—is heartily opposed to our proposal here, and to the system wherever it is at work. We have never implied anything to the contrary. But notwithstanding that opposition of the hierarchy, there is the fact the Roman Catholic children to the number of thousands and tens of thousands do read these particular lessons, and there is the fact that though it is not proportionately as large in numbers as the other Churches, yet it is a fact, as the official records show, that both in Western Australia and New South Wales the Roman Catholic clergy do go into the schools; but let me repeat, in nothing like the same proportion as with the other Churches, and not, as far as I know, in the cities—not in the places where they have their own schools, but out in the bush where there is no convent school, and none of the good sisters to look after the children. There, when the Roman Catholic priest comes round, he gets hold of the children from the school. I believe in many cases he does not give the lesson in the school, but takes the children out. But we can be doing no injustice to the Roman Catholic Church when we are asking for a privilege which they could fully avail themselves of, and which would give them a chance of looking after the children that otherwise they do not reach.

53. In the long answer that you have given you used these words: "The Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the system wherever it is at work"?—Yes, but I very expressly added qualifying words. There again you are doing a thing that I complained so much about yesterday.

54. Did you expect me to repeat the whole of that long answer you gave?—I expected you, as an honourable man, which I believe you to be, not to take some of my words and misapply their context.

55. Did you not say in your answer that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the system wherever it is at work?—I did say that, and I added that, notwithstanding that opposition of the hierarchy, the fact remained that tens of thousands of children read the Scripture lesson-book, and that hundreds of visits are paid by the Roman Catholic clergy to the schools, although the Roman Catholic Church does not like the system.

56. Is not Tasmania one of the States in which this system is at work?—Yes.

57. Therefore, according to your statement, would it not be true that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the system in Tasmania even if the children do attend the lessons and they

do not like the system?—It would be absolutely true that the Roman Catholic Church in Tasmania is, there as elsewhere, opposed to the system; but it would be true I believe that, notwithstanding that opposition, the Roman Catholic clergy do visit the schools, and it would be true I believe that the children there do read the Scripture lessons. I am not positive of that latter fact, but I believe it is the case; and I further believe that when the Director of Education said that the system was extended to all denominations he was not dealing with the outside opposition of the Roman Catholic Church but was looking at it purely from the departmental point of view, and that it was acceptable to the Roman Catholic children who were in there.

58. *Mr. McCallum.*] Do you desire the Committee to believe that Bible lessons are given by Protestant teachers to Catholic children?—Yes; I mean the lessons are given indiscriminately by the State-school teachers to both Roman Catholics and Methodists, and so on. Anybody knows what they are, and those are accepted by the children unless their parents withdraw them.

59. Would not that give rise to a charge of proselytism or "sheep-stealing"?—The charge of proselytism is generally laid against the right of entry—not against the State-school teachers. May I add that I have never heard of a charge of proselytism laid against the State-school teachers, and I have never heard of our opponents producing an instance of proselytism by State-school teachers.

60. *Mr. Caughley.*] Seeing you have stated that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the system wherever at work, with the qualifications you have given, and that that system is in existence in Tasmania, is it then probable that the system existing in Tasmania is regarded by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty?—The Director of Education said so, and he stood by it. He not only said so to us in the document we published—and we neither endorse what he said nor pass any opinion on it—but he also said so in the report on the working of the system which he furnished to the Queensland Government when that Government was making its own confidential inquiries. I am aware if he was looking outside the walls of his Department he could not say such a thing, because I know—and I want this to be made clear—I have read the statement by Bishop Cleary, and I accept his word that the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Tasmania states that the Roman Catholic Church does not approve of it, but nobody ever said they did.

61. Does not this statement from the Director of Education, Tasmania, say it is regarded by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty?—What are you reading from?

62. I have asked you about fifteen times the same question?—I have answered that, and I am ready to answer it the fifteenth time.

63. Seeing that you have admitted that the Roman Catholic Church—we will say officially—in Tasmania is opposed to this system, can it be true that the system is regarded by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty?—I do not know what you are reading, but I am reading from the published statement which was made, and it does not coincide with what you have read.

64. I am reading from your leaflet. Will you read what you have?—"The system existing in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty."

65. That means that you have not a correct report of what the Director of Education of Tasmania said?—Here it is, dated the 14th September, 1906: "The system existing in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution to the religious difficulty."

66. And the other version gives the word "regarded." That is a printer's error?—It may be.

67. Would not the State under this system with regard to religious lessons be taking a side with certain denominations?—No, because those lessons would be offered equally to all.

68. But would it not be taking a side if they are offered in a form acceptable to some denominations but repugnant to others?—You could never find anything under the sun that would be acceptable to every member of the community, and there is this to be considered: that we are asking for those lessons, so far as the State-school teachers are concerned, from the point of view of high English literature only. We are not asking for them from the point of view of religious teaching. We are perfectly content. We admit that it is not the highest ideal, but in order to try and meet in every reasonable way any reasonable objections, we say we shall be content with less advantages than they have in some of the States of Australia, taking lessons merely as literature; and surely every denomination can read the sublime passages from the English Bible as literature.

69. You realize it is sufficient for our case that you admit that the State could not give those Scripture lessons that would suit all denominations?—I did not ever realize or admit it is sufficient for your case, but I admit that for all reasonable and intelligent people to approach this subject in an intelligent way, the fact that these Scripture lessons have been used for nearly fifty years in two States, for twenty years in another State, and three or four years in a fourth State, and that is successfully, is plain proof that the great majority of the people are more than satisfied with it.

70. I am speaking of denominations. Are you aware that Cardinal Moran sent a telegram to one of the members of the Queensland Legislature to the effect that "the Scripture lessons are avowedly Protestant, and are opposed by me and all good Roman Catholics." Are you aware he made that statement?—I believe he did say something to that effect, but this is what he placed on record himself in a speech made by him at a conference of Inspectors, teachers, departmental officers, and prominent educationists held on the 5th July, 1904, under the chairmanship of the Minister of Education in New South Wales.

71. I have read that?—But I want to read it. He said, "For my part, I would be most willing to supply all our Catholic children with the four Gospels according to the corrected Douai

version, the same as will be read in our religious schools." And members of the Committee will notice that in my statement I have made a proposal to meet the Roman Catholic difficulties in the matter on the lines of Cardinal Moran's own idea.

72. Are you not aware that it was in refutation of that statement that Cardinal Moran uttered the one I mentioned—namely, that the Scripture lessons are avowedly Protestant, and are opposed by me and all good Roman Catholics?—I am aware that after use was made of a statement similar to that I have made the Cardinal did send that telegram, but he never withdrew one word of what he said—that he was ready to put the four Gospels into the hands of the children of the State schools, and at his own expense.

73. Are you aware that with regard to the Nelson system which Dean Fitchett said would be objectionable to Roman Catholics he said, "The State would have taken a side that Roman Catholics could not be refused their grants"?—I think Dean Fitchett said something like that.

74. It is on record?—Where?

75. In the Dunedin papers, and also in the leaflet of the lecture he gave?—That is all right. He said something like that.

76. If Dean Fitchett, an official of the League, makes a statement that the State would have taken a side that Roman Catholics could not be refused their grants, would not the same argument hold if the State introduced a system of Scripture lessons which would be opposed to Roman Catholics?—The question of whether the same argument is to hold is a matter for Judges to decide, not for me to commit myself to. If you mean that the Nelson system and ours are on the same footing——

77. I do not mean that?—I want to point that out. You used the word "similar." I want to point this out: that as a rule under the Nelson system, which is not provided for by law, it is only undenominational classes that are held or grouped classes by the ministers, and that unless a man was willing to take his turn with the other ministers he could not take advantage of the system. That, therefore, excludes the Roman Catholic Church, and I actually have great respect for them on that point—not for making difficulties for the working of the Nelson system, but for their principle there. But under our proposal the ministers can group themselves, and the ministers even do group themselves, as we heard here in the evidence. It has been brought up against us as an opening for proselytism, but there is this difference, that they did not do so by compulsion—they are not compelled to. Under our system where the ministers prefer to work denominationally they can do so. Where they prefer to work undenominationally they can do so, but it is not compulsory. I am of the same opinion as Dean Fitchett is—that the Nelson system, if made legal by Act of Parliament, would give the Roman Catholic Church a greater claim for State aid than our system, because our system allows them the opportunity of going into the schools equally with anybody else to teach their children whatever they think is right, but the Nelson system gives no such separate opportunity to Roman Catholics.

78. Do you not notice that the only comparison I draw between the Nelson system and your system is that each of them is objectionable to Roman Catholic principles?—I did not notice that.

79. And did you not notice that Dean Fitchett argued that because the Nelson system would be repugnant to Roman Catholic principles they could not refuse the grants, and therefore if this system was repugnant to Roman Catholics they could not refuse the grants?—We know absolutely well, and personally I can respect their position in the matter, that they cannot share the religious instruction in common with other Churches. Therefore the Nelson system is unjust to them; but we know equally well that under our system they are not asked to share it with other people, and that they can come in independently. Every school is at their service. If they do not take advantage of the value of it it is there, but they do take advantage of it to such an extent that it has proved they can do so if they wish without any injustice to themselves.

80. Do you not notice that you are mixing up the right-of-entry instruction with the teachers' lessons, which is the point I am dealing with at present?—I understood you were dealing with the right of entry. You were taking the Nelson system, which is only the right of entry, and nothing to do with the teachers.

81. You have just been arguing that under your system the Roman Catholics would not be required to receive religious instruction in common with other children?—Again you are attributing to me things I did not say. I was saying that the Roman Catholic clergy would not be required to take common classes with others. I was not referring to children at all.

82. Under this system would the Roman Catholic children be required to receive religious instruction?—By whom?

83. By the State teacher?—Absolutely No. The State-school teacher has no control whatever over the child in regard to even the simple Bible lessons. I know it has been put forward over and over again, but it is absolutely untrue to say that under our system the State-school teacher has any control over the child in regard to the Bible lessons or the ministers' visits. The control lies entirely in the hands of the parent, and not the State-school teacher or the Church. A minister cannot go and say to the child that "you must come into my class."

84. I was not referring to the point of control. Under this system of Scripture lessons by the State teacher, would not the Roman Catholic child, if he availed himself of it, receive that religious instruction in common with the children of other denominations?—The Roman Catholic child would have the reading-lessons in common with other children if his parent decided he was to go in.

85. By offering the conscience clause to parents, has your League conceded that the State Scripture lessons are of a religious character?—No, it concedes nothing of the sort. It maintains over and over again that the Scripture lessons are being asked for as literature of the highest known to us in an English-speaking country.

86. Did you ever hear of any one requiring a conscience clause for pure literature?—I know it is required here in New Zealand, and has been so for many years. History requires a conscience clause, and that conscience clause is operative for children but not operative for teachers, and history is only literature.

87. Are you aware that in your League's publications and the speeches of your leading exponents that the teacher's work under these Scripture lessons is described in no fewer than fifty-eight places as the religious instruction?—I am not aware of it. I would like to hear the context of it after my experience of you.

88. Will you accept that statement if I agree to place it on record here that there are fifty-eight statements from your publications or from utterances of your leading exponents that the teaching-work in Bible-reading would be religious instruction?—I would not accept it unless I saw it in order to understand what you have been driving at.

89. If you could do that you would accept it?—I am not going to be driven into a corner like that.

90. If the conscience clause is required for parents with regard to Scripture lessons, would it be less of a strain on the teacher's conscience to give the Scripture lesson of a kind to which he is opposed, or merely to permit his child to attend such lesson?—I cannot tell; that would depend on the teacher. I could imagine what it would be for you yourself.

91. By what right does your League claim to present to electors a scheme in which the League grants to parents a conscience clause and denies it to a teacher?—I do not know what you mean by "what right." What we are doing is, we are trying to be allowed to ask the people of this Dominion whether they want their children, as part of a system of religious instruction, to read lessons from the English Scriptures. We are only asking for them to be read as literature, not as religious lessons. We know that there are some, and I believe most, Roman Catholic parents will object to their children reading them, and in order that they may be provided for we ask for the conscience clause. The conscience clause is for the protection of the child. It is the child we are thinking of, and it operates on him, but for natural causes it is called into operation by the parent. The statement is a mere fallacy that the parent can take advantage of the conscience clause while as a teacher he would not. The object of the conscience clause would be attained by the parent then if he happened to be a teacher. His child would remain exempt if the teacher-parent so wished.

92. I asked you by what right does your League claim to present to the electors a scheme in which your League grants to parents the conscience clause and denies it to a teacher?—What do you mean by "right"? By the right of living in a free English-speaking country. We have a right to put forward any reform that we think is a good one. It is the privilege of English-speaking people to have the right to put before their fellows without molestation a proposal for reform which they think would be for the good of the country. That is our right.

93. I wish you to define that right a little further. By what right do the people who make these proposals claim that they may give the conscience clause to parents and also in a free country deny the conscience clause to teachers?—They are not claiming that they may give the conscience clause to children and not to teachers. They are asking what the people say shall be done.

94. Does your League oppose the granting of the conscience clause to teachers?—Our League is advocating a system which is not asking the teachers to give religious instruction, but only reading from the highest literature, and there is no necessity for a conscience clause any more than for history.

95. Does your League oppose the granting of a conscience clause to teachers—they either do or do not?—They neither do nor do not, because the proposition does not include a conscience clause for teachers. Let some other League come forward with a system of religious instruction for the children which includes a conscience clause for teachers, and then we would be in a position to say whether we opposed it or not.

96. Do I understand you to say that your proposal does not include a conscience clause for teachers?—Yes, that is so.

97. And would your League resist an attempt by Parliament to provide a conscience clause for teachers?—That is a problematical matter I cannot answer.

98. You remember a quotation I gave in my evidence from the *Church News*, the official organ of the Anglican Church Diocese of Christchurch, to the effect that they wanted the proposal as it was before the House passed unaltered, and that the *Outlook* says that all suggestions of alterations, from whatever source they emanate, must be sternly resisted from the outset?—I believe the *Outlook* made some such remark. I should say that is the opinion of the *Outlook* and its editor, and that "The chief danger besetting the Referendum Bill is not that it may be thrown out, but that the issue may be divided or another one added. We ask for a definite question on a complete scheme—the use of Bible-reading in schools and the right of entry. There may be an attempt to put these two issues separately as alternatives. If so there will be a sufficient majority for neither. Or again the Nelson system may be added as an alternative issue and lead to no result. These or some such alterations will be suggested, and we need to make it clear, wherever influence can be brought to bear, that our claim is for a referendum on the issue as defined in the Bill and no other."

99. I think it says they want to stand by the issue defined in the Bill and no other?—That is the opinion of the writer of that paragraph.

100. As that is in the official organ of the Anglican Church, if they do not understand the Bible-in-schools system probably very few people would?—I do not know.

101. You think they would have a fairly competent knowledge of the system?—That is a matter of opinion.

102. When this statement says that and no other, would not that mean that they would oppose the conscience clause?—Whom do you mean by "they"?

103. Those who are responsible for the issue of this Anglican paper?—I have no idea who is responsible for that paragraph. It is what it is worth on its face as the opinion of some writer. It is not by any means the opinion of the English Church.

104. But this is the leading article?—But the Church of England does not write the leading article.

105. Is their opinion wrong?—I am not going to say it is or is not.

106. Is it right?—I will not say.

107. Do you know whether it is right or wrong?—I am not going to say. What does it matter—those little extracts picked out in a magnificently mosaic manner from all over New Zealand?

108. Is it not sufficiently clear that the writer of this article, whose claims for the referendum are similar to those in the Bill and no other, would not accept the conscience clause?—A conscience clause for teachers; and that evidently is not desired for the same reason that the League is not asking for it—namely, that the teachers are not to be asked to teach religion but only to be asked to teach the highest English literature.

109. It is not reasons, it is facts I want?—It is the reason I want brought out to prevent the facts being misrepresented. There has been so much talk about a teachers' conscience clause, as though we were asking them to hold services or go into the class for spiritual intercourse with the children. We are only asking the teachers to handle the lessons in the same way as they handle other lessons. Already the teachers are under an obligation to give Christian teaching, and they have never demanded the conscience clause. They are under that obligation notwithstanding the fact that the Act says the teaching shall be entirely secular. No teacher can teach a child to write a letter without giving the child Christian teaching. The first thing a child has to be taught is the day and the year of our Lord. Who is our Lord? Is he God, or only a mere man? There is a conscience difficulty, and it crops up day after day, in almost every piece of literature in the schools, and yet we hear nothing about conscience. We are not asking the teachers to do more with these Scripture lessons than they are already doing and that which is obligatory upon them if they are to give the child an English education.

110. Would you consider a scheme of religious instruction to be just if an Anglican teacher could only carry out his official duties by violating the fundamental teachings of his Church? There is again in that question the suggestion of something for which we are not asking. We are not asking for anything to be carried out which will violate the fundamental teachings of any teacher's Church, as shown by the fact that no teacher from religious or conscientious or any other motive has ever refused to give these lessons. As an example, here is what Archbishop Duhig says: "Catholic teachers in public schools are free to give the Scripture lesson provided for in the curriculum."

111. Free to give them is not the point?—Oh, yes, it is.

112. Would you consider a scheme of religious instruction to be just if a Roman Catholic teacher could only carry out his official duties by violating the fundamental teachings of his Church?—I reply that there is an assumption in that question which is not met by the facts, that the Roman Catholic teachers everywhere have given those lessons without in one instance ever coming forward with any objection on their part, and Archbishop Duhig, on the introduction of the system, said, "As servants of the State Catholic teachers in public schools are free to give the Scripture lessons provided for in the curriculum; and we feel it is not necessary to impress on them that in doing so they should be most careful to abstain from any sign or word that would cast the least reflection on the religion of any of their pupils." And from my own experience there is no teacher in the whole of the service who gives these lessons with more acceptance to the rest of the community than the Roman Catholic teacher. They are a perfect model to all the others.

113. In spite of what you have said, are you not aware that the Roman Catholic teacher could only give those Scripture lessons by violating the fundamental teachings of his Church?—I am not aware of that fact, notwithstanding what any prelate may say, because the fact remains that thousands of those teachers have been giving the lessons, and there have never been any commands given to them so far as I am aware by the authorities of their Church to abstain from giving them, and year after year Roman Catholic teachers go into the service knowing beforehand that they have those lessons to give. Therefore I say any suggestion that it is a violation of their conscience is not borne out by the facts and experience of over half a century.

114. Referring to the 153,000 membership cards which your League has, would you mind giving us the correct number: is 153,000 the approximate number?—Yes, that is the latest information I have.

115. Would you place before the Committee the number of membership cards you have for each electorate in New Zealand?—If the Committee wishes it I will be very glad to do so. I have supplied that information in the past to the Government: why should I be asked? If the Committee wishes it I shall bring the information with the greatest of pleasure.

116. I would like to have a record of it?—I will bring it with pleasure if the Committee tells me to.

117. Is that offer of yours still open that any member of Parliament may examine the cards from his own electorate?—Yes, certainly.

118. Those cards are merely membership cards, are they not?—Yes.

119. Is there anything on the card that requires the signer to be an elector of twenty-one years of age?—No.

120. Therefore a person of seventeen years of age could sign that card with perfect honesty?—What do you mean by asking that question? What are you driving at?

121. They would not be making any false declaration?—Who is suggesting they would make a false declaration?

122. They would be perfectly justified, I mean?—What are you driving at? I will answer the question at once: anybody could sign that card, but we do not accept the card unless it is the card of a person who is over twenty-one years of age, or whom we have reason to think is over that age.

123. Have you given instructions to all canvassers to ascertain that each signer is twenty-one years of age?—General printed instructions have been given.

124. As those are the membership cards, is there any rule in your League that a member must be twenty-one years of age?—We have not got rules like that. We prefer to conduct our own business in our own fashion.

125. Has the League, or yourself as acting for the League, in any way at any time indicated that those who sign those cards need not necessarily be twenty-one years of age?—Yes, there are certain cases in which we have said that if the cards are signed by those who are approaching twenty-one years of age they are not to be counted as members but to be put on one side until their birthday comes.

126. Is there any guarantee that the 153,000 persons who signed those cards are really people of twenty-one years of age?—Well, I do not know what you mean by "guarantee." If you mean, has reasonable care been taken and that we have only counted those who appeared to be over twenty-one years of age, then I say Yes.

127. You remember you referred to the question of the resolution of the St. Andrew's Session, Christchurch, and you put in a letter. Are you aware that this is a copy of a resolution passed by the St. Andrew's session on the 14th July, 1913: "It was agreed that the session records its approval of the proposals of the Bible in State Schools League, and agrees to use its influence in furthering the movement." Are you aware that is the minute to which Mr. McKenzie referred?—I am not aware of that, and was not until I heard it, but Mr. McKenzie, Dr. Gibb, and Mr. Aitken informed me that that resolution speaks for the congregation of which Mr. Caughley is a member.

128. Are you not aware that my statement was that the members of the St. Andrew's Church as a congregation had not been consulted on this matter?—And as I have already pointed out, it is needless repetition. Mr. Paterson pointed out that it is not customary to consult the congregations in the Presbyterian Church, but that the proper court was consulted which is consulted on all similar subjects.

129. You remember, when referring to extracts from two newspapers regarding the numbers of children who receive religious instruction, that you made this statement: "Did you know that I have taught tens of thousands of children religious instruction in my career, which has reached its silver jubilee only this month"?—Yes, I did say that.

130. And would not tens of thousands of children be at the most twenty thousand?—Now, what is this driving at? The real point I wanted to bring out was that Mr. Caughley, in speaking publicly of me, had said he knew something of me, and that I had done so-much but had not done as much as he had. I do hope that he has done more than I have, but that is not my point. What I took exception to was that Mr. Caughley was in the habit of attributing to me things he could not possibly know about me. That is the point. It is not the point of numbers. I have taught tens of thousands of children.

131. How many have you taught this year?—I dare say I have given religious instruction to four hundred or five hundred children already in New Zealand this year.

132. With regard to the number of right-of-entry visits in Australia, in large schools, say, of three hundred or five hundred children, would the religious instruction on a given day in connection with the Anglican Church be given by one instructor, or by two or more, generally?—It depends on the circumstances—sometimes by one and sometimes by more.

133. In a school of five hundred children there would probably be about two hundred Anglican children, would there not?—I would say that would be a fair estimate.

134. So that one teacher would not be able to instruct the two hundred?—I have done so myself in State schools.

Reverend GEORGE SAMUEL COOK further examined. (No. 17.)

1. *Mr. Caughley.*] In the statement of your evidence you say, "The number of visits for 1912 totalled 52,883, and for 1913 57,321. Mr. Caughley has attempted to show that this increase is only apparent, and that it is due to a direction from the Department that if a minister takes two classes in a school in one day that these shall be counted as two visits. But Mr. Caughley does not know that this is simply making a definite regulation of what was previously a common practice. The view has been taken by teachers that if a minister takes one class in a school, and another on the following day, and two visits are counted to him, then he should also be credited with two visits if he does the double duty on the one day." Do you mean there that under the regulations a teacher of a particular denomination, say an Anglican, could give a lesson on Tuesday, and then if he liked could go and give a lesson to some children on Wednesday and Thursday, and that is allowed under the regulations?—Yes.

2. Section 17 of the Act limits him to one hour's instruction on each particular day, does it not?—No. You will find by reference to the testimony of a minister given in the Methodist correspondence which I brought forward that ministers do visit a school for one hour and three-quarters. That would mean that they would not be an hour and three-quarters in one department, but that they would put the time in in different departments.

3. Does not the Act state that any minister visiting a school shall only give one hour's instruction in a day in a school?—That might be used with very liberal interpretation, so that

one hour's instruction would be confined to one department of the school, or an infant school, the fact being, as shown by the evidence of Methodist ministers who carry out instruction, that it is the common custom in large schools to divide the one hour and three-quarters; but that time would not be taken in an infant school.

4. In that case he would count it as two visits if he taught in two departments?—Yes.

5. And if in the same way he taught those two lessons in the one hour it would still be counted as two visits under the new regulations?—I could not say.

6. It would have to be divided into two lessons in two different departments?—Yes, if he gave two lessons in the one hour and three-quarters.

7. Or two lessons in an hour?—I could not say that.

8. The regulation says that each lesson must be counted: that would be two lessons if he gave them in two rooms?—Yes.

9. If he gave two lessons in an hour he would be doubling the number of visits?—It would be in that case, but I do not know of any case of that kind.

10. Therefore do you think you are justified in saying that the regulation does permit that? You stated that the picture of a minister giving four lessons in an hour is a characteristic stroke of genius. Is it not an actual possibility?—I should say not. I should like to see the minister produced who gave four lessons in an hour.

11. What about two?—I have known a single visit on the part of a minister in which he only occupied half an hour in the lesson, and considered that sufficient. He was not compelled to give an hour, and that counted as a visit. He is not really compelled to give an hour's lesson, even if it be counted as a visit, and I think it is a reasonable thing for the children's sake, sometimes.

12. You say a minister does sometimes give half-hour lessons?—Certainly, a minister is not compelled to take up the whole hour.

13. But they do give half-hour lessons?—I have known cases where probably the lesson would very little exceed half an hour.

14. And therefore in one hour to give two half-hour lessons in different departments?—It would be possible under those conditions, and the lessons may possibly be satisfactory lessons.

15. And I think it would be better than hour lessons?—I agree with you, from my own experience.

16. At the same time, would not the minister be recording twice as many visits in that way?—Yes, and if he did double duty he has paid two distinct visits in that school, and given two distinct lessons, and satisfactory lessons probably. I do not think four would be satisfactory in an hour, but I think those two lessons should be counted, as they have been in New South Wales.

MONDAY, 26TH OCTOBER, 1914.

Canon Garland: Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Bates puts any questions to me I desire to know for what party he is appearing. I understood, unless my memory fails me, that I was overruled when I stated there were only two parties to this inquiry, those for the referendum and those against it. I bowed to the ruling of the Chairman, and accepted the decision that there were four parties—the League, which I represent; the Roman Catholic Federation, represented by His Lordship Bishop Cleary; the opposition, represented by Professor Hunter; and the Teachers' Institute, represented by Mr. Caughley. I understood clearly that each of the parties was to have the right to cross-examine the other side; but I did not understand that witnesses brought forward, such as Mr. Bates is, on behalf of the National Schools Defence League, were also to have that right, while I, on behalf of my witnesses, did not seek for permission for them to cross-examine the other witnesses. I ask your ruling, sir, on this point.

The Chairman: The position is this: that we have already allowed Mr. Bates to cross-examine, and I do not know that it would be quite right to intervene now and go back on what we have already permitted.

Canon Garland: Am I to take that as a final ruling?

The Chairman: Yes, we have discussed the matter.

Canon Garland: Then may I ask that His Lordship the Bishop be allowed to cross-examine me now in order that I may have time to consult my executive and legal advisers as to the course I should take in regard to Mr. Bates being allowed to cross-examine me?

The Chairman: I think that is quite a legitimate request.

Mr. Hanan: What does Canon Garland mean by that?

Canon Garland: So that I can have time to consider the situation.

Mr. Hanan: I do not want to cross-examine you, but what does that mean?

Canon Garland: It means that we have not had the right to cross-examine by more than one voice. We were told that there were four parties, and that each party would have the right, but not each of the witnesses, and I certainly acted on that assumption.

Mr. Bates: Might I state that I do not belong to the National Schools Defence League.

The Chairman: You represent yourself. I think Canon Garland is in order in asking that His Lordship might cross-examine first.

Mr. Statham: I think we ought to hear if Mr. Bates has any objection to that course.

Mr. Bates: I have an objection to that course because it was agreed that the Bishop would come last. I have been attacked by Canon Garland, especially in his statement. He has devoted several pages to me, and I have not had an opportunity of cross-examining him on that. I do not appear for the National Schools Defence League, and I have done this at my own expense,

and considerable trouble, to represent those in the Church of England—and there are thousands of them—who have not bowed the knee over this action.

Mr. Hanan: If Canon Garland can show us good reason why Mr. Bates's cross-examination should be held over, then the Committee ought to accede to his request; but we ought to hear from the Canon what are the reasons on which he bases his request that the cross-examination by Mr. Bates should be held over. He may have good grounds.

Canon Garland: My ground is that I consider the position is so serious in allowing an ordinary witness, who does not represent anybody except those whom he says he represents, to be allowed the right of cross-examination when our other three witnesses were not allowed it.

Mr. McCallum: I object to the use of the words "not allowed"; they did not ask it.

Canon Garland: I did not ask for it because I understood the ruling was so very clear.

Mr. McCallum: Then you should not say they were not allowed.

Canon Garland: Then what word would you suggest to me?

Mr. McCallum: That you did not ask for it.

Canon Garland: We did not ask for it because we understood the ruling was that the parties were to cross-examine and not the witnesses.

Mr. Hanan: May I point out in the interests of the Canon himself that supposing he does not allow this cross-examination, does he not prejudice his own case by refusing to answer certain questions put forward by Mr. Bates? In his own interest I think he ought to.

The Chairman: I do not think he is refusing; he is only asking that the cross-examination by Mr. Bates should be postponed for the present.

Mr. Hanan: It is for you to say, Mr. Chairman, whether the Canon has given sufficient reasons for that course to be adopted.

The Chairman: On the 18th July I wrote to Canon Garland that four witnesses would probably be heard in connection with the petitions against the Bill.

Mr. Guthrie: Who are the four witnesses?

The Chairman: Canon Garland had three witnesses, and on the other side we had Bishop Cleary, Professor Hunter, Mr. Bates, and Mr. Caughley.

Mr. Guthrie: Then Mr. Bates was one of the parties.

The Chairman: But he was not representing any body. The whole question before us just now is as to whether Mr. Bates should be allowed now to cross-examine or whether Bishop Cleary should be allowed to cross-examine. If the Bishop is ready I will ask him to go on now, and we can postpone the cross-examination by Mr. Bates.

Reverend Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND further examined. (No. 18.)

1. *Bishop Cleary.*] Will Canon Garland accept my assurance on the following points: (1) That in referring to him I invariably refer to him in his official capacity as organizing secretary of the League; (2) that there will be no innuendo or insinuation of motives of deliberate error in any of my questions, and nothing but what appears plainly on the surface of my questions; (3) that my object is to get at facts in the most correct way for the information of the Committee; and (4) that wherever error shall be discovered it shall be presumed to be inadvertent, be frankly acknowledged, and duly corrected? Does the Canon accept these assurances of my method and aim in questioning him?—I have the greatest pleasure in accepting the Bishop's assurance. It is quite a pleasure.

2. To save time, will the reverend organizer accept the following as the publicly declared position of New Zealand Catholics in regard to the League: (1) That Catholics believe in the essential union of religion and education; (2) that they are irreconcilably opposed to the purely secular system for their own children; (3) that they are warm supporters of biblical and religious instruction in the public schools; (4) that they differ with the League not on the principle of religion in the schools, but only in the *methods* of introducing religious instruction into the public schools; and (5) that they are prepared to confer with the League and other interested parties with a view to a fair all-round method of introducing biblical and religious instruction into the public schools? I am now merely asking if, as a matter of fact, this is the declared attitude of the Catholic body in New Zealand on this matter?—I accept that.

3. The reverend organizer no doubt recalls having heard my evidence to this effect before this Committee on the 24th July, and under cross-examination by him on the 4th August. Do you recall that, in point of fact, that is our publicly declared position?—Yes, I do.

4. Will Canon Garland now turn to this declaration by him in the *New Zealand Herald*, Auckland, of the 1st October, 1912: "He absolutely agreed with the Bishop in his ideals: he absolutely agreed with the Bishop's contention that the religious and moral instruction of children was of paramount importance, and must become part of any national system of education; but he entirely disagreed with Bishop Cleary as to the method to be pursued"?—I accept that. I take it your Lordship has accurately copied it.

5. Is it accepted as correct?—Yes.

6. Can the reverend organizer quote one instance since November, 1912, in which he or the League stated the Catholic declaration of the Catholic attitude when criticizing the Catholic attitude?—I do not remember. I think we might have referred to it, but we would not set it out in detail. My general attitude and that of my League has been that which you have just read. Whenever I have referred to it—I do not say absolutely, but as a rule whenever I have referred to the Roman Catholic position—I have spoken of it in this fashion: that their ideals are good.

7. But apart from that one quotation, could you point to any other since the 1st October, 1912?—I cannot now, but I know I am in the habit of speaking like that.

8. May I now direct Canon Garland's attention to just a few sample statements on this subject? And, first, the reverend organizer no doubt recalls words of his address at the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1912 to the following effect: that "Roman Catholicism" seeks to "keep the Bible prohibited in our schools," and other statements to a like effect? Will Canon Garland quote any pronouncement of any New Zealand Catholic Bishop on his movement which can be fairly interpreted in such a sense?—I have got an authorized copy of that address, and I would like you to look through it and see if you can find it. I do not say it is not in the *Outlook*.

9. Will the Canon be good enough to look at the following from the Bible-in-schools column in the *Outlook* of the 21st January, 1913, where it speaks of Dr. Cleary's "ardour, at any cost, to keep the Bible out of the State schools"?—Yes; you direct my attention to it. I do not think it is mine.

10. In view of my clear declarations to the contrary is it fair to write of me thus?—I think you had better write to the editor.

11. Then the Canon does not wish to express any opinion on the matter?—No.

12. Has this pamphlet [produced] by a League vice-president, Rev. Dr. Gibb, been issued with the authority of the League?—Yes.

13. Will Canon Garland peruse this sentence in that pamphlet: it describes Dr. Cleary as "the self-appointed leader of a sorry host that is out against the cause of Bible in schools"?—Yes.

14. Will Canon Garland tell the Committee when, where, and in what detailed form I appointed myself a "leader" against the cause of Bible in schools?—I am afraid I must refer you to Dr. Gibb. We published the speech made, but we are not responsible for every word of the speech.

15. Are you not prepared to endorse that statement?—That is a very difficult question. I would not say you are yourself a self-appointed leader. I do not think I ever have.

16. Would it not be fair to describe me as one leader of those who favour the cause of the Bible in schools, but not some of the League's methods of introducing it into the schools?—I think when the words "Bible in schools" were used they were used in a colloquial fashion to refer to the movement. Here I am quite sure when Dr. Gibb refers to you as out against the cause of Bible in schools he did not mean you were against any Bible-in-schools system, and if he did I would repudiate it.

17. His words stand, and in their absolute meaning you would not endorse them, I presume, without explanation?—I would not endorse them if they meant you were against religious instruction in schools, but I do not understand them to mean that. I understand them to mean that you were against our proposal known as the Bible-in-schools movement.

18. In the same publication by the Rev. Dr. Gibb it says, "Though we utterly object to and protest against the secularism of the schools, they (Roman Catholics) say the schools shall continue secular." Taking this statement as it stands, is it a correct statement of the Catholic declared attitude towards the secular system?—If I am to understand what Dr. Gibb meant there, I take it that he was using an argument like this: that if the Roman Catholic Church is successful in opposing our movement the schools will remain secular.

19. But taking the words as they stand: of course, you are not able to say for certain that that was the meaning in Dr. Gibb's mind?—I would not attempt to say what was in his mind, and you would not ask me.

20. But, taking the statement as it stands independent of who spoke it, is it a correct statement of the Catholic declared attitude towards the secular system?—No, if you have not got our movement in mind: but having our movement in mind, then I would say that those words would convey the idea that if you were successful the schools would remain secular. I mean, if you were successful against us and not successful in carrying out your policy.

21. Then I take it the statement as it stands is not quite correct?—I would not say that. It is a statement that requires an explanation. I think you should take the whole speech.

22. Would it not be correct to put it in this way: that Catholics, so far from saying "the schools shall continue secular," have publicly offered to co-operate with other parties to make them religious, on fair conditions all round, for those desiring them religious?—No, I do not think we could accept that, because we have to define what is meant as "fair conditions," and it is understood that one of the conditions which the Roman Catholics would regard as fair and as imperative is State aid to denominational schools.

23. That brings me back to a previous question, which probably the Canon remembers, where I said that Catholics would be satisfied with even a partial settlement irrespective altogether of this question of grants. Was not that statement made in my evidence?—I accept it if you say it is there.

24. Has Canon Garland tested the accuracy of the League quotation given in my evidence-in-chief—that is, where opponents of the League are collectively described as "hostile to the Bible and religion"; "Romanists, atheists, and Unitarians"; "secularists, atheists, and Roman Catholics"; "the anti-Bible party"; "a tatterdemalion crew, with whom Falstaff would not have marched through Coventry, but all very dear to Dr. Cleary"; and Canon Garland's words, "The principalities and powers of darkness" (*i.e.*, demons) "are fighting against the League"? Can the Canon say if these are correctly quoted?—I cannot say anything about other people's statements, but I do know that the application here to my words "principalities and powers of darkness" as if they referred to Bishop Cleary is wholly imaginary. I never used them in that sense.

25. In my evidence is the quotation regarding principalities and powers of darkness referred to in that way?—Your statement says, "He ranks the opponents of the League with the demons of the nethermost abyss. 'The principalities and powers of darkness,' said he at Mosgiel, 'are fighting against the League.'" I never said anything of the sort I used the context, but did not apply it to our opponents.

26. May I direct the attention of the reverend organizer to the few following samples of invective: (1) Canon Garland: "The principal opposition to the League comes from the Roman Catholics and the atheists"; (2) that opposition is from "the secularist, the agnostic, and the infidel" (*Waipu Church Gazette*, June, 1913); (3) Presbyterian opponents are "traitors" to their religion (*Outlook*, 3rd June, 1913); (4) "Mr. Caughley prefers to place himself in the camp of the Romanists, atheists, and Unitarians" (*Outlook*, 27th May, 1913); opponents are "an improper, antiquated, and indecent survival" (Dean Fitchett in *Otago Daily Times*, 17th April, 1914). May I presume that the reverend organizer has no real sympathy with such invective against Christian men?—I would not call it invective. When I said "The principal opposition to the League comes from the Roman Catholics and the atheists," I think that is not an unfair way of stating it. That is not reflecting on you in the least.

27. Canon Garland, presumably, remembers my statement made in his presence before this Committee on the 4th August to this effect: "that an alliance or combination of Catholics with the League is conditionally easy, but that that upholds the secular system is, on principle, impossible." May I presume that you take my statement to be sincere?—Certainly.

28. Do you believe that Bishop Cleary or the "Romanists" really entered into an "unholy alliance" or "combination" with secularists, atheists, or infidels to keep the Bible out of the public schools, or is it one of the loose and incorrect expressions that are sometimes used in the heat of controversy?—I quite accepted the Bishop's assurance which he gave here in this Committee-room. That was the first time I had any opportunity of accepting it; but while I accept his assurance that there is no collusion, I could not help thinking there was some "colloguing" between the Bishop and the other side when I found they were in possession of correspondence with the Bishop, and they were working side by side in regard to that Wilkins circular. I still accept your assurance, but you can see we had good ground for the belief that though there may not have been any formal alliance, there was a very good understanding.

29. I was not here when the Wilkins circular was put in, but am I right in saying that it was handed to Mr. Caughley at his request on behalf of the Teachers' Institute?—He read correspondence between himself and you.

30. As an official of the Teachers' Institute?—Yes.

31. Will the reverend organizer name any body of atheists who are taking an active part in this campaign, and specify the part they are taking?—I say that the National Schools Defence League represents the atheist position, notwithstanding the fact that there are some Christian ministers associated with them. In the *New Zealand Times* of the 4th July, 1910, we find the reason why we say they take up the atheist position. The word I really prefer is "secularist" position. There was a meeting held in the Town Hall, presided over by Sir Robert Stout, when Mr. Joseph McCabe gave a lecture on secularism, and Sir Robert Stout said, "Wellington has the honour of passing the first Secular Education Bill in the British Empire." Then John Gammell moved, "That this meeting affirms the desirability of forming a National League for the defence of our secular system of education, and that before this meeting closes steps be taken to form such a League." Then Mr. Gammell went on to say that the Nelson system, if introduced, would destroy the spirit of the Act. The Nelson system was getting introduced into our schools as one Education Board after another was giving way, and unless they all woke up and formed a great League to oppose this movement they would lose their glorious institution altogether. The motion was carried unanimously, and a great many remained behind to take part in the formation of the proposed League. Professor McKenzie was, I believe, elected treasurer, and Mr. Bates was present and took part in the proceedings. Well, our position is that a movement which originates under such a person as Joseph McCabe, who is a recognized apostle of secularism, that movement is secular, and in that sense is atheistic, no matter who joins it.

32. *Mr. Bates.*] I was not present at that meeting, and I had nothing to do with it?—Then my informant was wrong.

33. *Bishop Cleary.*] Will the reverend Canon turn to this statement in a pamphlet written by Dr. Sprott (a member of the League executive): "I cannot help thinking that those who call upon Parliament not to permit the community to do this or that do so with their tongue in their cheek." This was perhaps an unconsidered or unintended expression, but was it fair thus to suggest, in an official League publication, that the opponents of a plebiscite on this question of religion are acting a part and deliberately hoodwinking the public?—That is not an official publication. As far as I know, it is a reprint of a speech made on the matter just as if we had reprinted one of your speeches—which we are not likely to do.

34. May I ask if this particular pamphlet has been distributed from your office?—Yes.

35. Has this imputation about "their tongue in their cheek" been corrected? If not, may I take it that the reverend organizer will see that it is speedily rectified, and that each correction receives as much publicity as the original statement?—I think that is a matter for Bishop Sprott.

36. Will the Canon see that the circulation of this particular pamphlet is discontinued as far as that particular statement is concerned?—As a matter of fact, I should say it is not being distributed now.

37. That particular pamphlet was obtained last week?—I was not aware of that. Is it his last synod address?

38. Yes?—I thought it had been finished up. Somebody must have asked for it specially, because I am quite sure that it has not been in general circulation.

39. Will the Canon accept my explanation that this particular pamphlet was distributed among a number of other pamphlets issued by the League on a request for a full series of the publications of the League?—Specimens were obtained.

40. Exactly?—How were they obtained—from my office?

41. Yes?—It does not imply they are being circulated. What happened was this: that after the Bishop made his address in the synod, that part of it which referred to the Bible in Schools League was reprinted by us and distributed. If some respectable-looking person came and asked for a particular copy he would get it.

42. Will the Canon see that this matter is corrected, if the pamphlet is distributed further?—I should have to ask Bishop Sprott to correct his own statement. He simply says, "I cannot help thinking that those who call upon Parliament not to permit the community to do this or that do so with their tongue in their cheek." I do not think there is anything very improper in that. It is a very ready way of saying that they know perfectly well that the people must be allowed to settle it. I would not take any other meaning out of that.

43. That is a distinct suggestion, as I understand, and, as I have said in my previous question, that the persons making those statements are acting a part?—No, I would not accept that. They know this thing must be settled sooner or later, and settled by the people. In whatever way the people settle it, by Parliament or by means of a referendum, it must be settled by the people, and when it was said we cannot appeal to the people I think the Bishop took it in a semi-jocular way when he said they do so with their tongue in their cheek.

44. A statement of that sort necessarily, and on the face of it, implies that they are acting a part?—No, I do not think it meant they are acting a part.

45. You have, of course, read the document published in the *Dominion* of the 13th July, 1914?—Yes.

46. May I direct your attention to the following extract: "This championship of secularism on the part of the Roman prelates ought to be very carefully considered by the parliamentary Committee at present sitting to hear evidence for and against the referendum on the Bible in schools. It is the duty of the Committee and the duty of every member of Parliament to have an intelligent knowledge of what the Roman prelates have said in the past about our secular system of education, and if they do so they will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that there is a lack of straightforwardness in the propaganda of the Roman Bishop." Is that correctly quoted?—Yes.

47. Does not that, on the face of it, seem to be a plain direction from the League to this parliamentary Committee as to the duty which it ought to carry out?—No, I do not think so.

48. Is it not in effect a direction by the League to this Committee that if it does its duty it will adjudge the Roman Bishop of lacking in straightforwardness?—I do not think so. I would not take that meaning out of it.

49. Does Canon Garland recollect the day (was it not the 24th July) on which, as the declared representative of the Catholic heirarchy, clergy, and laity, I gave evidence before this Committee touching in part on the secular system?—Yes; but I remember this statement also was in the hands of the *Dominion* a considerable time before the 24th July.

50. And six days later—the 30th July—did not the League publish its intimation or suggestion to this Committee that in their attitude on the secular system the Roman bishops were lacking in straightforwardness: I am only dealing with the bare question of facts now?—I take this to read that the statement was that there is a lack of straightforwardness in the Roman bishops at the present time.

51. Motives and intentions apart, and taking the League's words as they stand, were they not an imputation or suggestion to this Committee to distrust or disbelieve the evidence given by me six days previously as to the Catholic attitude on the secular system?—No, they could not have been that, because these words were actually written long before the Committee sat, and they were in the hands of the printer before you gave your evidence. It is true they were published after you gave your evidence.

52. Canon Garland has, no doubt, seen these passages in the Bishop's manifesto in which (1) they declare the strength of the Catholic objection to "the divorce of religion from education," and (2) the willingness of Catholics to "unite with people of other faiths" in an effort "to make our education system religious" on fair conditions for those desiring it to be religious?—Yes, I have no doubt that is quoted correctly.

53. Probably the Canon remembers receiving a registered letter containing the manifesto?—I do not remember.

54. Canon Garland also, I presume, both heard and read my evidence on the 24th July before this Committee, expressing the willingness of the Catholics to join in a conference to introduce biblical lessons into the public schools, and thus do away with the present purely secular system?—Yes.

55. On the 24th October did Canon Garland express his conviction that the Catholic bishops conscientiously held the opinion which they expressed on this question?—I suppose I did. You have taken my words down.

56. Yes?—I will accept what you say.

57. May I then take it that it was an error to publish this statement on the 30th July: "The Roman prelates are fighting to preserve the secularism of our school system, which they have condemned for thirty-six years"?—No, it was not. I should say it was a dialectical way of stating it, because if the Roman Catholic bishops are successful in opposition to our movement, one of the possibilities is that the secular system will be maintained in the sense that there will be no religious instruction, and that is what I think the writer meant if the whole of the article is considered. He does not mean that the Roman Catholic bishops are fighting for secular educa-

tion, but he is endeavouring to prove that their opposition to our movement, if successful, would perpetuate the present secular system.

58. Will you quote any expression in any published document which really bears that interpretation?—If you take the whole article I think you will find that the writer sets out his thesis. I do not think in this article it suggests that it is the desire of the Roman Catholic prelates to preserve secularism. It says they are fighting to preserve it though they have condemned it for thirty-six years. The idea of the writer was to show that as the result of the fight they were putting up it might end in secularism.

59. Does he mention the word "result"? Does he not say they are fighting for this thing?—I think if you take the whole article it will bear the construction I have given to it, and that is shown I think by the fact that there are ample quotations, chiefly all from Bishop Cleary, with the exception of one, condemning the secular system. I think there the writer did the perfectly fair thing. He took the words of the bishops to show how they condemned the thing in the past, and in order to justify his argument that their action to-day would perpetuate a thing which they condemned in the past, but not because they wished to perpetuate it.

60. Will you quote the exact terms in which he says or suggests that the effect of the Bishop's words would be that—will you produce the word "effect" or anything like it?—No, it is not in the article.

61. Well, as it stands, it means that the Roman prelates are fighting to preserve the secularism of our school system. Will you quote one solitary hint in the Bishop's manifesto that they are fighting to preserve the secularism of our school system?—We never said it was in the manifesto.

62. This is the reply to the Bishop's manifesto, is it not?—Yes. Here is a summary which I had not seen a few minutes ago, from the point of view of our writer: "The foregoing record of inconsistency on the part of the Roman Catholic authorities should convince every member of Parliament and every citizen of the utter unfairness of the Roman Catholic attack on the proposals that the people should have an opportunity of saying 'Religion' or 'No religion' in our schools at the ballot-box. Those who wish the Bible and religious teaching in the national schools are friends of the national system: the Roman authorities are its traducers and its foes." And he continues on in the same strain.

63. Is it not a matter of common knowledge that for nearly forty years Catholics have been fighting against, not for, the purely secular system?—Yes, and it is shown in that article.

64. And will the Canon accept my assurance that the Catholic bishops never fought for such a system, and that each and all of them would go freely to death rather than do so?—I believe that.

65. Can Canon Garland quote any statement or declaration of the bishops showing that their attitude on the secular system at the present time is different from what it has been for the past thirty-six years?—I do not know of any.

66. Does the writer of that League publication of the 30th July allege any declaration of the Catholic bishops which would show they adopt a different attitude towards the secular system now to what they have adopted during the past thirty-six years?—No, I do not think the writer tried to do that. What the writer tried to do was to show that the result of the Roman Catholic bishops opposing our proposal would be, if they were successful, to perpetuate the secular system, and that in a sense they were fighting for the secular system. He has never suggested that they believe in it or like it, nor has any one of us suggested such a thing.

67. Has the Canon been able to find in that League document of the 30th July the word "result" or its equivalent in that connection?—I do not think he uses the word "result" or its equivalent, but he sets himself out to prove "that the Roman Catholic Church in New Zealand is organizing itself through the 'Catholic Federation' to preserve and perpetuate our secular system," and then he goes on to show from his point of view as an argument that their action will have that result, and points out that it is inconsistent with their past denunciation of the secular system.

68. Has he shown where the inconsistency comes in and given details of it?—I should say he had.

69. Has he quoted any recent declaration of the Catholic bishops on the secular system which differs from the position taken up by them on the secular system during the past thirty-six years?—No; what he does is, he tries to show that the action which they are taking now towards our League would, if it is successful, result in perpetuating secularism in the schools.

70. Then I again, for the third time, have to ask where the word "result," or its equivalent, appears in the document?—I do not say the word "result" or its equivalent does appear, but I say that is the conclusion one would draw from reading the article.

71. But the word does not occur?—No.

72. Will Canon Garland now turn to the League leaflet, "Methods of Opposition." On page 2 it says, "Bishop Cleary also accuses the Bible in State Schools League of seeking to revive the Penal Code of Ireland, which prohibited the Roman Catholic religion." Will Canon Garland take me as not suggesting any conscious error on the part of the League or its organizer in connection with this League statement just quoted?—Yes, I am quite glad to get an assurance like that—it is quite refreshing.

73. The Canon will perhaps recall that I strongly denied the accuracy of the League's quoted statement in the secular dailies, in the *Outlook* of the 29th April, 1913, and in the communication addressed to the League. I am merely dealing with the question of fact now, not with the accuracy of the League's statement?—Yes.

74. Can the Canon quote the exact words which I used referring to the Penal Code?—Here is one attributed to your Lordship. I am quoting from the Auckland *Herald* of the 18th October, 1912: "At St. Patrick's Cathedral yesterday evening Bishop Cleary spoke to a large congre-

gation. He summarized his objections to the scheme. The League would revive some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code in order to force the Government to make good, at the cost of the general taxpayer, the failure of some of the denominations to provide for the religious instruction of their children." Then there was a letter from your Lordship, portion of which read, "By what right would the League place conscientiously objecting Catholic, Jewish, Unitarian, Congregationalist, and secularist teachers, and many Baptist and other Protestant teachers, between these two alternatives: 'Act a part, defy your Church, be false to your conscience, or we will drive you out of the Public Service as surely as if you were convicted felons'?" Those words are put into the mouth of the League by the Bishop. Then he further says, "The penal laws forced conscientious objectors into Church services in which they did not believe; but, bad as they were, they at least spared their victims the ignominy of compelling them to conduct, publicly, biblical instruction and 'general religious teaching' on principles and methods from which their consciences recoiled." Then later on in the letter the Bishop says, "This is a modernized revival of an old penal enactment." Are you satisfied with that and do you accept it?

75. I believe it is substantially correct. Will the reverend organizer quote any pronouncement of mine referring to the Penal Code which did not specify the particular educational disabilities which I believed to be involved in the League's scheme?—Yes. The portion I have quoted is a general application.

76. It is educational disabilities?—Yes, and I would point out to your Lordship those words I have just quoted—"The League would revive some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code."

77. Would the Canon be good enough to look back over that deliverance of mine and see if there are detailed references to any of those disabilities—I think you will find four?—"The right to formulate and impose upon the public schools a particular kind of religion"—is that one?

78. That is No. 1?—Yes.

79. The second is, "This Grahamized Bible is to be interpreted by children and teacher on the sectarian principle known as 'the right of private judgment'"?—Yes.

80. Then the third, that "this is contrary to Catholic principles and discipline." Then fourth, "by referendum, to submit a disputed question on religion and conscience to a count of voters' heads." And fifth, "a conscience clause which would, by Act of Parliament, compel all children, no matter of what faith, to receive instruction in the established State-school religion, unless such children were furnished by their parents with written certificates of exemption." Are not those the disabilities referred to in that utterance?—No, my Lord; what I would say is you do include those, but you take the Penal Code itself and refer to it.

81. In its educational connection, is it not?—No, you nowhere limit it.

82. The League would revive some of the principles?—Yes, you said that.

83. The conclusion limits the application of the Penal Code, does it not?—No, I do not think so. The Penal Code itself is such an objectionable and odious thing that any one using it for the purposes of controversy, I think, should be very careful to see that they are limiting it; and the Bishop, instead of limiting it, speaks of some of its most dangerous principles. I think the Bishop knows, and will accept our assurance, that the Penal Code is a matter of abhorrence to us.

84. But it is certainly limited by your word "some," and it is certain it is also limited in the matter regarding "to provide for religious instruction of their children"?—I certainly do say that the Bishop did not say we were trying to get the pitch cap restored, but as he spoke of us as desiring to get applied some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code, there was no necessity to talk about details.

85. Are not some of those principles already specified?—Yes, and you specified "some."

86. Perhaps the Canon recalls this: that in one of my letters to the daily papers and to the League executive I said, "(1) The Penal Code of Ireland was not mentioned by me; (2) I neither said nor suggested that the League is intent on 'prohibiting the Roman Catholic religion.'" Is the Canon prepared to accept my oft-reiterated statement on these subjects?—I remember the first, but I do not happen to remember the second.

87. I will show it to you?—I will accept it, that you did say so, without looking at it.

88. Will the reverend organizer turn to a statement to the following effect in the same League leaflet: "that I treat the right of entry of the Catholic clergy into the New South Wales State schools as a revival of the Penal Code." Is this the purport of the paragraph?—Yes, that is a fair argument.

89. Will the Canon quote the exact words in which I made that statement?—It would be impossible to quote the words, because it is drawn from your argument. You accused us of seeking to introduce the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code, and we pointed out that so far from doing that we were seeking to get the right of entry for you in common with everybody else, and yet it is that which you treat as a revival of the Penal Code—seeking to obtain a privilege for you.

90. Do I understand from the reverend Canon that those words were not actually used by me?—Oh, yes.

91. Well, will the Canon please note that in the statement which I made regarding the Penal Code I used the word "some," which is indefinite, and that the Canon has made the thing definite by specifying things which I did not specify?—Well, I have heard you say it now.

92. In my remarks on the Penal Code I declared that the League meant to revive some of its features?—"Some of its most dangerous."

93. Quite correct. The word "some," I understand, is indefinite, is it not?—Yes, and I accept that. I have already in a previous answer said that you do not imply that we wanted to

restore every aspect of the Penal Code, because you never implied that we want to hang a man because he taught his child to talk in Irish.

94. May I understand from you that I did not use the words to this effect—that I did not treat the right of entry of the Roman Catholic clergy into the State schools as a revival of the Penal Code?—I cannot agree with you there. You were condemning us for proposals we were bringing forward. You said some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code were in our proposals. In order to show we were not bringing in some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code, we pointed out we were trying to gain a benefit and privilege which the Roman Catholic Church could share, and yet Bishop Cleary talks of it as a revival of the Penal Code.

95. I am sure I have not made my question clear. I mentioned "some" of the most dangerous principles: that is indefinite, is it not?—Yes, we agree on that.

96. The only way in which I could have mentioned this is by defining it in some way. Did I define it?—You did not define it to include the right of entry, but you charged us with reviving some of the most dangerous principles of the Penal Code, and we showed that so far from doing that we were doing things which the Penal Code would have prevented.

97. Then I did not say that the right of entry of the clergy was a revival of the principles of the Penal Code?—We did not say that you did.

98. Will the Canon accept my statement that I really never made such a statement?—Certainly.

99. May I direct the reverend Canon's attention to statements to the following effect from the Bible-in-schools column in the *Outlook* of the 21st January, 1913: "He" (meaning Bishop Cleary) "accused the League of seeking to revive the Penal Code of Ireland with all its horrors. This was but a neat way of saying that they (the League denominations) were seeking for legislation prohibiting the Roman Catholic Church from existing in New Zealand. Reviving that Penal Code would necessarily include some of the horrible methods used under it in Ireland, such as preventing a child learning the only language its father could understand, or making it a punishment by death or imprisonment for taking part in the holy service of the Roman Catholic Church. Such an accusation against the League could only be brought up by one who was in desperation. It is impossible to imagine that the Churches concerned could have such an intention, and no one knows it better than Bishop Cleary himself": the words in quotation-marks as given?—That is sufficient—you have read correctly.

100. Will the witness take this matter as it stands? Does it not, in effect, state "No one knows it better than Bishop Cleary" that his alleged words are untrue?—I would not take that meaning out of it.

101. If, in point of fact, Bishop Cleary had really launched these lurid accusations, and if he were guilty of wilful prevarication, would he not deserve the scorn and indignation of decent people?—There is no such suggestion. It is impossible that the Bishop could be guilty of prevarication.

102. Is the Rev. Isaac Jolly a member of the League executive?—Yes.

103. Has the reverend organizer seen correspondence between the Rev. Isaac Jolly in the *Ohinemuri Gazette* of September, 1913, in which I denied ever having made such accusations against the League, and even went so far as to describe them as inventions?—I believe I have seen it, but I do not remember it now.

104. Does Canon Garland hold me guilty of these specific quoted accusations against the League? I am speaking of specific accusations—that I hold the League wants to prevent a child learning the only language its father could understand, or making it a punishment by death or imprisonment for taking part in the holy service of the Roman Catholic Church. May I take it that I would not be guilty of using such words?—That you did not accuse us of using them too.

105. Is Bishop Julius a vice-president of the League?—Yes.

106. The reverend organizer has presumably seen this declaration of Bishop Julius in the *Lyttelton Times* of the 26th February, 1913, that "The League had many opponents, but, boiled down, they were all Roman Catholics"?—I will accept your quotation. I have seen it, but I would not take it as correct unless I heard what the Bishop said about us. It is very unlikely he did say it.

107. Subject to this reservation, coming from so high a League official, would not this be calculated to create the impression that Catholics are in some sense the only opponents of the League?—I have already said I do not think the Bishop would be likely to state it in that bald way. There is probably some little word left out which would make the difference.

108. Now, if Professor McKenzie were boiled down, and Professor Hunter, and Mr. Caughley, would they be all Roman Catholics?—I would never be surprised to hear it. I would wish them to be that rather than what they are to-day.

109. If boiled down, would the Nelson Presbytery and the large body of reverend petitioners against the League be all Roman Catholics?—Well, that is the first time I have come to differ with your Lordship about your form of question. I do not admit that it is a large number. I say it is some number.

110. I will strike out the word "large"?—Very well.

111. If boiled down, would the Nelson Presbytery and the body of reverend petitioners against the League be all Roman Catholics?—There are only four in the Nelson Presbytery.

112. Would they all be Roman Catholics if boiled down?—I am sure I do not know what would happen to the Rev. Mr. McKenzie, of Nelson. You understand that the Nelson Presbytery withdrew its resolution of opposition. I had forgotten that till my friend Mr. Elliot reminded me.

113. Has it accepted the whole platform of the League?—I could not say. I would have to look it up

114. May I suggest to the reverend Canon that the Nelson Presbytery approved of the introduction of the Bible into the schools, but not of the complete platform of the League?—Yes, but I will have to look it up.

115. Is this a correct report of Canon Garland's words at the Presbyterian General Assembly of 1912: "Our answer is that we are satisfied with the system, and that we will stand by and support the national system. We are prepared to stand by it. We do not condemn it and seek to shatter it; we are only asking that one thing—the keystone—should be added that it may stand firm for ever." Is that quotation correct?—Yes, I am correctly reported there, and that is the general tenor of my remarks on that point.

116. The "keystone" referred to by Canon Garland is presumably biblical and religious teaching?—The system for which we are asking.

117. And the reverend organizer is no doubt aware that Catholics are willing to co-operate in having that keystone added?—No, my intention of a keystone is the system for which we are asking.

118. Does not that mean religion?—No, the particular system of simple Bible lessons and right of entry and the conscience clause for parents. That is what we say is the keystone to the national system.

119. The Canon would not consider religion a keystone to a national system if it was introduced in any other form?—I would consider that any system of religious teaching which would be thoroughly acceptable to the great majority of the people would prove a keystone to the national system of education, and I add that experience has shown us that the system we advocate for New Zealand has proved itself to be the keystone, giving stability to the national system of education wherever that keystone has been introduced.

120. Canon Garland presumably recalls this: On the 24th July he was present when I repeated before this Committee the following declaration in substance of the Catholic bishops: "That we aim at making the education system truly national, truly suited to the conscientious as well as the intellectual requirements of all the people of the nation, secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious"?—Yes.

121. Does the Canon believe that we honestly and sincerely hold the view stated in the last question?—Of anything the Bishop has said I do not question his sincerity.

122. Would it not then seem that both Catholics and the League have expressed a desire for a national system, but that they differ on some points as to what constitutes a national system?—I accept what the Bishop says—that Roman Catholics and the Churches in the League both desire a national system of education with religious instruction, but that they are diametrically opposed as to the method of including that religious instruction.

123. Canon Garland describes the Catholic ideal as "anti-national"?—I would like to see my quotation. My argument is that the denominational system would prove to be anti-national because it would break up the present system, and would never be applicable to a country like New Zealand. That is the sense in which I spoke of it.

124. And have not Catholics retorted by describing the League's system as anti-national?—Yes, the kettle calling the pot black.

125. In the circumstances we might agree to cry quits in this matter?—Just as we have agreed up to a certain step we are national, and up to a certain step we have called each other anti-national.

126. According to the evidence laid before this Committee, Catholics and Leaguers have both used pretty lively language in stating their objections to the secular system?—Yes.

127. As far as verbal attacks on that system are concerned, may we not also cry quits?—I do not know what you mean by crying quits, but if you say we are not to call each other names I shall be delighted, because I do not want to start a discussion on the point; but I am not conscious of starting to call names or using strong language first, and if any of our people have done so first I would repudiate their action. We have always thought we had strong reason for strong words. It was always our intention not to use strong words except under provocation.

128. The question I ask refers to a statement made in this League publication of the 30th July, 1914, where it says that the authorities are traducers of this national system?—Meaning the present national secular system.

129. So far as verbal attacks upon that system are concerned, may we not cry quits?—What do you mean by crying quits? Do you mean you are not going to call us names in future, and say we are introducing some of the principles of the Penal Code?

130. May I suggest that my meaning is this: that seeing the very strong language used by the League and by ourselves against the secular system, it is rather out of place to describe us in this League pamphlet of the 30th July as traducers of that system?—Well, I do not know. That depends on how the person reading it regards that statement as substantiated by the statements from your Lordship's own books, and I have adopted your own words. You spoke of God as being as contraband as opium and being treated as a leprous thing. The argument of the writer there was not quarrelling with what you said, but rather agreeing with what you said, and saying that if you were successful now in your opposition to us you would be establishing permanently the very thing you had condemned before, and which we agree with you in condemning.

131. We are conjointly agreed in condemning the secular system?—Quite so.

132. And we did not spare language in condemning it?—When I have wanted strong language about it I have always looked up your Lordship's statements.

133. May I judge from the Canon's words just stated at the Presbyterian General Assembly he regards the present purely secular system as a national system?—Yes, as the national system of New Zealand. Sir Robert Stout said it at McCabe's meeting.

134. I understand that on this particular point the Canon and Sir Robert Stout are in cordial agreement?—I would not like to be in agreement with him on anything.

135. Will you now turn to the League advertisement of the 30th July, 1914, where it says of the State schools, "Without the recognition of God and His Word our secularism makes them anti-British and anti-national"?—Now, I am afraid you rather confuse me there, because when I was speaking of the national system I meant that it is *de facto* the national system. I do not mean it represents the national spirit of New Zealand. On the contrary, I say that, through circumstances which we need not argue now, the system has been made *de jure* the national system which is absolutely unrepresentative of the national character and spirit of this Dominion. I understand you have not laid a trap for me, that it is national by law and anti-national in being contrary to the Christian spirit of the nation.

136. We are agreed upon that point?—Yes.

137. May I direct the reverend organizer's attention to this letter of the Rev. Gray Dixon's in the *Otago Daily Times* of the 20th May, 1913. I refer to the passage where he describes Bishop Cleary as standing for "clericalism in the most dangerous form," and so on, in education, and saying that were Bishop Cleary's "own principles on the matter of education rightly understood they would not be tolerated for a moment in our free, Christian, and anti-Romish State"?—I have your quotation.

138. May I take it that Canon Garland and the League executive have no sympathy with such a declaration as this from a prominent League controversialist?—I would say that Mr. Gray Dixon was expressing his own personal views there: he was not speaking on behalf of the League.

139. And may I take it that those are not the Canon's ideas on the matter?—I do not think you need ask me the question.

140. The reverend organizer is no doubt aware that there are in New Zealand a number of Anglican and Presbyterian denominational high schools, or select schools, for the children of those who can pay?—Yes, I am aware, and I am also aware that it is the policy of the Church of England and the Presbyterian Church not to seek State aid for those schools, though I do not say what would happen if the people were refused the opportunity of speaking on the question. I am very much afraid of what would happen.

141. Supposing that thing did happen, would that make the schools anti-national?—No, they are not supplied in order to be in opposition to the national system of education. They seek no payment for what is done. It is quite different from the position of the Roman Catholic Church, which is to seek payment for its work in connection with education.

142. Then do I understand that seeking for such payment constitutes our schools anti-national?—Yes, in this sense it would, if the request were granted; it would make it an anti-national system of education, in my judgment.

143. If it is not anti-national for Protestants to give such education for the rich, how can it be anti-national for Catholics to give it to the poor?—Well, there, of course, I know the Church of England does not build schools only for the rich in New Zealand: she builds schools for the poor also, and does not seek State aid for it. I know one Church of England school here and a large one in Christchurch, and when the latter was opened in Christchurch a year or two ago a declaration was made that there was no intention to seek State aid.

144. Is it the policy of the Church of England in the British Isles to take State aid for schools?—In the British Isles it is the policy to seek State aid for school-work. In Australasia it is exactly the reverse; she upholds the national system, provided there is that religious instruction for which we are asking here. The Church of England builds schools only where she thinks it is desirable, or where she thinks it would be helpful to do so, but not in competition with the State and not to seek State aid.

145. But, as a matter of fact, does not the Church of England accept State aid in England for her schools?—Oh, yes.

146. Is it not a fact that the Church of England has university colleges receiving £500 a year as State aid?—I would not be surprised.

147. Does that constitute the Church of England or that particular school or university college an anti-national institution?—No, I should not say it would; but the circumstances are not the same, because giving a grant to a special case like university-work—and mind, of course, not as has been suggested here in the evidence that only the Church of England gets these things in Australia—but giving it in common with other Churches for special purposes, and nothing to do with primary schools at all, does not make it anti-national.

148. I understand from the reverend Canon that if grants are received by denominational schools for secondary or superior education his schools are not anti-national?—I would not say Yes or No. I would say not exactly so. It would depend on circumstances.

149. But in the case of primary schools they would necessarily be anti-national?—Under the circumstances existing in New Zealand they would necessarily be anti-national, because what I want to point out is this—again I am not speaking dogmatically, but expressing my own opinion: the denominational system aided by the State will not reach the needs of the case, and the only thing which will meet the needs of the case under our conditions in New Zealand is a national system under the control of the State, and reaching every part of the Dominion.

150. In Belgium and Germany, for instance, the various religious denominations receive State grants for primary schools: does that constitute them anti-national schools?—No; I would say the conditions of the Belgian and German people are totally different from ours here. The plain English is that even if money is given to all the Churches to build schools the schools would not reach all the children. I want to see a system which will reach every child in the State.

Bishop Cleary: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that I have already explained to Canon Garland, and he has been good enough to accept my explanation, that the documents in regard to the

Wilkins circular which I had in my possession got into the hands of Mr. Caughley in this way: in July he wrote to me asking if I had any information on this matter, and stating that he might find it desirable to place it before the next meeting of the Teachers' Education Institute, and requesting me, if I had the information, to supply it for the purposes of the Institute. I did supply it, and the information has been in the hands of Mr. Caughley since then. I had no intercourse for any information of any sort in connection with this matter with the National Schools Defence League, and had no part in any act in connection with the use made of those documents by or for the National Schools Defence League.

Witness: Before we go into this question may I correct a matter in regard to the Nelson Presbytery. The first resolution the Nelson Presbytery passed in May, 1913, was against the Bible in State Schools League. The second resolution, which I could not give the Committee this morning, was this, and I read from the *Outlook* of the 7th October, 1913: "Resolved, That it" (the former resolution) "be rescinded, and the following put in its place: 'The Presbytery, having considered the remit of Assembly *re* Bible in schools, resolved that the Presbytery is in fullest sympathy with the Bible-in-schools movement, but is afraid that the proposed right of entry will not help the object in view, and would rather see a referendum of the people taken on Bible in schools unhampered by the right of entry.'"

Bishop Cleary: According to that resolution the Presbytery of Nelson is in sympathy with the League movement practically except one—that is, it is not sure of the right of entry.

Witness: It says it is in fullest sympathy with the Bible-in-schools movement, but is afraid that the proposed right of entry will not help the object in view—that is, in gaining our end.

151. *Bishop Cleary.*] Reverting to the question of the national or the anti-national character of the Catholic schools, am I right in gathering from the Canon's answers to my previous questions on this point that the nationalism or anti-nationalism of a school system is a relative matter—a denominational system if national in one country may not be in another country?—That is so—that is how I understand it.

152. Does the Government proclaim the Catholic schools as anti-national when it takes the children free to them on the national railway, and accepts the Catholic schools' certificates on a par with those of the State schools for national employment?—I should say that it does not come into the question of national or anti-national when it makes those concessions. It leaves the question still open.

153. Is not this a practical recognition by the Government that the Catholic schools are doing national work?—No, I would not say that; they give this concession without entering into the logic of the position.

154. They leave the question undecided?—Yes.

155. Will not Canon Garland agree with me that those schools are doing a service to the nation which teach children to know and love God, to be moral, and to respect the Civil authorities as being ordained by God?—Yes, certainly.

156. Would the Canon kindly read these two quotations from pamphlets issued by the League: (1) "We have talked long enough about admiring the Roman Catholic devotion in supporting their own schools"; (2) "So strongly does one great Church feel on this question that with an earnestness, a sincerity, and a courage which must excite the admiration and the respect of every right-thinking individual, it has provided at no small cost and sacrifice to it and its adherents"?—They are correct quotations.

157. May I refer Canon Garland to his own evidence, where, speaking of his personal willingness to meet me, he said, "I would urge our followers to accept the whole Bible, the Roman Catholic children to read the Douai version, provided this would remove the Bishop's objection to the Roman Catholic children reading the Scriptures in the State schools." Are the words as read correct?—Yes, my Lord. Please never ask me that question. I will take your reading.

158. Will the reverend organizer accept my assurance that I welcome this offer as a first approach towards (I hope) an understanding?—I am glad to hear it.

159. May I ask if the League executive is associated with Canon Garland in this offer, or if it is purely his personal offer?—It is purely my personal offer as implied in the words. To show how willing I should personally be to meet the wishes of the Bishop I should now say I would urge our followers to accept the whole Bible.

160. Does the Canon propose that the Catholic version as well as the Protestant version be brought out at State cost, or is it his desire to follow Cardinal Moran's plan and let each party supply its own Bibles at its own sole charge?—That I have not considered. I look on that as quite a detail.

161. May I take it that Canon Garland would have no objection to the Catholic version of the Scriptures, with notes from the Holy Fathers of the Church and from learned Catholic writers, as laid down in Section 1, Chapter III, No. 7, of the Constitution dealing with these matters?—No objection to the Roman Catholic children. You see, my Lord, I do not want to start an argument, but where you have to define terms I claim that the version commonly spoken of, and inaccurately spoken of, as the "Authorized Version" is a Catholic version. If you mean by this, would I have no objection to the Douai version, as regards being with notes from the early Fathers and Catholic writers, being placed in the hands of Roman Catholic children in the school, I would say it would be a very good thing to do. May I have the word "Catholic" altered? I am not asking you to give away any theological position.

162. Would it not be better if we understood that when I use the word "Catholic" I mean Roman Catholic?—No, I would not like to start an argument.

163. We do not officially admit the designation of "Roman Catholic," although we use it when we must, as in legal documents. I will ask you to accept me as meaning by "Catholic" what you mean by "Roman Catholic"?—Yes.

164. Would the Catholic version of the Scriptures be treated with religious veneration as God's revelation to man, or would it be used merely as literature?—That is a question it would be impossible to answer at this stage. Our proposal is that the Bible lessons shall be read only as literature. This question implies quite another proposition which we have not put before the country.

165. Is the position the Canon takes up in this matter that he is giving a decision that the Bibles supplied to Catholic children shall be used merely as literature or not?—We have not come to any decision one way or the other. I say that we were prepared to consider whatever we thought were reasonable difficulties on the part of the Roman Catholic Church.

166. Would the Catholic version be used as a vehicle for so-called unsectarian, or undogmatic, or undenominational teaching?—That is a question that could not be answered now.

167. Would the Catholic children receive instruction in their Bible from teachers of other faiths, or of no faith?—I would presume—supposing this were the ultimate solution—that the children would be taught the various versions according to the various denominations—the Roman Catholic children would hold the Douai version, and other children the so-called "Authorized Version."

168. Am I to understand that this reading-lesson would be conducted by teachers of the various faiths?—Yes, by the State-school teachers. I put it on the lines of Cardinal Moran's suggestion.

169. Did he suggest that?—He did not say anything against the State-school teachers handling these lessons with the children. He took exception to the particular lessons that were in use, and there was his opportunity when he was talking about the lessons in use to enter his protest against the teachers giving them; but so far from doing that he said, "I want the teachers to do something better than we are doing," and was ready to supply the four Gospels in the Douai version to each child, and the teachers would have acted in common.

170. Do I understand that Cardinal Moran made any suggestion that this version should be taught to children of his faith by teachers of other faiths?—I will read what he said—"It is the desire of all, as far as I can see, that our system of education should, in its various details, and in all its departments, be worthy of our State and worthy of our Commonwealth. Now, it appears to me that the Scripture lessons read in the schools are not worthy of Australia nor worthy of this State, for this reason: they are but garbled extracts from, we will say, the Old and New Testaments, and I would venture to suggest, as a vast improvement (both for the teachers and for the senior pupils), that the four Gospels are substituted in their stead. If any difficulties were presented in the matter of expense I think that they could easily be got over; indeed, it does not appear to be a matter in which the State should be called upon to bear any expense at all. Each denomination would be able to present its own children with the necessary books. For my part, I would be most willing to supply all our Catholic children with the four Gospels, according to the corrected Douai version, the same as would be read in our religious schools." Let me add to that, so far as I am personally concerned, if the Roman Catholic Federation would say that the difficulties disappear by this proposal, I will pledge myself to do everything possible with our League to accept it on the lines laid down here—that is, that the Roman Catholic children would read the four Gospels or whatever shall be agreed upon by their authorities, similar passages being placed in the hands of other children from the ordinary English version.

171. Does it appear from the quotation given by the reverend Canon that Cardinal Moran specifically states or implies that the children of his faith should receive the lessons in their Bible from the teachers of other faiths?—I would say that the word "teachers" means "teachers in the schools," and he did not raise the question of the faith or denomination of the particular teachers.

172. Will the Canon accept my statement if I say what follows?—I will desire to accept it.

173. (1) That we would cordially approve the teaching of the Catholic version of the Bible in the Catholic way to Catholic children in the public schools; (2) that we could never in conscience agree to teaching the Bible as mere literature, or making it the vehicle of the kind of instruction called unsectarian, &c., nor to its being taught to Catholic children by other than Catholics?—I accept your Lordship's statement.

174. Would the League executive be prepared to hold a conference with us to discuss this subject with a view to a satisfactory arrangement if possible?—I cannot answer that question. I have all along taken up the position that those who desire a conference on a particular subject are the people who should invite the conference and lay down its terms.

175. The reverend organizer presumably recalls his letter to the Hon. Mr. Allen, stating that on account of the war the League executive is of opinion that nothing should hinder the closest union between every section of the community. Is that a correct quotation?—Yes.

176. Did Canon Garland receive from the Catholic Federation a registered letter dated the 1st October, requesting some clear and definite understanding between the League and the Federation on the following points: (1) as to whether in the present crisis any pressure should be exercised on members of Parliament or candidates on the Bible-in-schools question, either for or against; (2) as to the propaganda-work by means of the pulpit, the platform, the newspaper Press, and the pamphlet or leaflet; (3) as to a conference either to deal with this question of an understanding as above, during the crisis, or to deal with the Bible-in-schools question as a whole, or some part of it. May I presume that this letter was received?—You have evidence that it was received. There is no necessity to ask the question.

177. Does the League desire a truce with a view to the better avoiding of anything that should hinder the closest union between every section of the community?—The League did desire a truce when there was that Imperial crisis, but when it was found that the Parliament of this country resumed its ordinary procedure, and when it was found that we were to be brought

before this Committee again, we came to the conclusion that our desire for a truce had not been accepted.

Mr. McCallum: I think that that should be put right from this Committee's point of view. You refused to answer this Committee in regard to a truce, and it was only then that the Committee decided to go on.

Witness: I did not refuse to answer the Committee.

Mr. McCallum: The question was asked Canon Garland when it was announced in the House that the Bill was to be dropped and the agitation was to drop. The clerk was specifically instructed to ask Canon Garland whether by that we were to understand that the agitation was to be dropped in the country, and we were advised that Canon Garland did not see his way to answer the question.

Witness: I now recall the telephone conversation, but I certainly did not take it that the clerk was putting any proposition to me.

The Chairman: At all events, a telephone communication is not evidence.

Mr. Malcolm: I distinctly desire it to be known that the Committee desired to go on only after Canon Garland refused to answer the question.

Witness: I had nothing to do with it except the telephone message.

Mr. Hanan: I was in the chair at the time. The position is that the clerk went downstairs to get some information, and what I was informed was that Canon Garland was communicated with by telephone, so my informant told me, and the information that came to us was that Canon Garland had stated he could not give any assurance or answer the question without consulting his executive.

Mr. Guthrie: It is not an important point, because if a truce had been declared on one point we went on and proceeded to take evidence.

Mr. Malcolm: But we decided to go on after Canon Garland refused to call a truce. The clerk was instructed to ask Canon Garland whether, in the event of the Committee ceasing to prosecute the inquiry, the agitation would be dropped by the League he represents, and the information we got was that Canon Garland could give no assurance on that matter.

Witness: That is correct—not that I could give no assurance, but that I could not answer the question. I can remember now I said I would have to consult my executive. As a matter of fact, I did not like being communicated with in an offhand way like that on an important thing—to decide at a moment's notice on the telephone that we were to abandon this thing indefinitely.

178. *Mr. Malcolm.*] Did you consult your executive since?—I informed them of it.

179. And did you advise us of what your executive's opinion was?—No, there was no necessity, because I received notice to come to this Committee again.

180. How long afterwards?—I do not remember.

181. A very long time afterwards?—I do not remember.

Mr. Malcolm: I decidedly object to Canon Garland's answer going in as it is, because it misrepresents the position as concerns this Committee.

Witness: I have not thrown the onus on the Committee. The fact is that we were called out again to give evidence; we did not ask to be called out, but we were called out to give evidence without any action on our part.

182. *Mr. Malcolm.*] You were given an opportunity of saying whether the agitation in the country would drop, and that opportunity you did not accept?—We were given an opportunity of answering what appeared to me a mere casual question on the telephone, and I say that is no way of asking us to decide such a grave issue as that.

Mr. Guthrie: I remember perfectly well that the question came up as to whether this matter was going to drop because the Bill was dropped, and it was dropped for a short time. Then I was absent for a time, and the next time I came back to the Committee you were going on with the inquiry.

The Chairman: It was dropped to enable us to go on with the Education Bill.

Mr. Guthrie: Another thing came up; it was not a matter for the Committee—it was a matter of the petitions that we were to consider that came from the House, and we had to make some report to the House upon those petitions that were before us

183. *Mr. Statham.*] Canon Garland says that after he got word from the clerk through the telephone he did mention the matter to his executive. Now, did the executive come to a decision as to whether they would go on with the campaign or not?—Yes, certainly, because we found the ordinary business of the country resumed, and we also found that the work was going on in this Committee again.

184. You say the executive did come to a decision to go on with their campaign?—Yes.

185. Was that decision come to before you got notice to attend this Committee?—I should say it was come to before we got notice, but only in a tentative way. Soon after the telephone message came I consulted those of my executive whom I could reach, and we discussed the matter in a tentative sort of way without coming to a final and definite decision; but the moment we knew the Committee was going to resume we did come to a definite determination. As a matter of fact, our active work was entirely suspended through the whole of August and September. There might have been a little work resumed towards the end of September, but our active work has only been resumed this month.

186. Then it was not quite correct for you to say that the executive came to no decision until you got word to come before this Committee again?—No, we were discussing it and wondering what we should do. We do not decide our business by passing formal resolutions and minutes; we sit more as Cabinet does. We discussed the matter from time to time, but we did

not come to a definite conclusion until after we were informed that the Committee would begin the inquiry again.

187. Did you in the meantime take any active steps at all?—I should say No, speaking from memory. Our idea was to remain quiescent for the whole of August and September.

188. You certainly did not go on with your organization?—There may have been some things done, but we were not actively at work; we were looking after the possibilities of the election, but not at work in the pulpit, or on the platform, or in the Press.

189. *Mr. Malcolm.*] And you had no intention, I understand, of dropping the agitation during the election?—We had a distinct intention of abandoning the whole movement at the time that we certainly believed there was a terrible crisis on in the country. Our feeling was this: that the Ministers of the Crown were suddenly faced with a terrible responsibility—men inexperienced in office—and that it was the right thing for us to relieve the Ministers of any worry so far as we were concerned. We took up the same attitude towards members of Parliament, but in a lesser degree—that the members should not be embarrassed at a time when nobody knew what was going to happen. That was the motive from which we worked, and while we were of that opinion we did not move a little finger in our own cause.

190. And yet you advised us that your executive, though not formally, came to a decision not to drop the agitation in response to the message from this Committee?—I say we did not get a proper message from this Committee.

191. I say "the message"—you need not quibble about that?—I am not quibbling.

192. I say that your executive, after receiving the message from this Committee, decided not to drop the agitation in the country?—No, that is not right. We decided that as the inquiry was being resumed we would resume.

193. At that time it was not being resumed?—At that time our decision was that we would wait to see how things were going. We did not come to a final conclusion.

194. That is not what you told us a few minutes ago?—Well, I should like to have it read.

195. I know the meaning of the English language, and I am not going to be humbugged in regard to the matter?—I did not say it was the Committee which rejected our truce. I am speaking of what I mean, and surely I am entitled to explain the meaning of my own words without a member of this Committee telling me I am trying to humbug him. What we did after receiving a message from the Committee was to tentatively decide that we were ready to go on, but that we would wait events. As a matter of fact we did not go on.

Mr. Malcolm: Canon Garland said that when the question of the truce was mentioned the truce was not accepted.

Witness: We came to a tentative decision to be guided by coming events.

196. *Bishop Cleary.*] Reverting to the letter of the Catholic Federation to Canon Garland regarding the truce, and regarding a conference to deal with the Bible-in-schools question as a whole or some phase of it, has the reverend organizer yet acknowledged receipt of that letter?—I did not acknowledge receipt of those letters, because I saw no necessity. The first of those letters was brought to my office by some person who demanded a receipt before he would leave it. Then the letters arrived by registered post, and as they came by registered post no acknowledgment was necessary. If those letters had come to me in the ordinary way, without a preliminary visit to say that they were not to be left without a receipt being signed, a courteous acknowledgment would have been sent.

197. Has the League taken any steps in regard to a conference between the parties interested?—We always took up the position that those who desired a conference are the persons who should call it.

198. Has not the Catholic Federation at least suggested a conference?—I would say its feelings were towards a conference.

199. If an invitation for a conference is sent to Canon Garland would he accept it?—That would depend upon the terms of the invitation.

200. For an open conference without restriction?—I will consider it when it comes. I remember that there have been such conferences in other places without result.

201. Would Canon Garland favour me with a newspaper report of Archbishop Duhig's statement?—Yes, it is from the *Age*. [Report handed to Bishop Cleary.]

202. Did I understand the Canon rightly yesterday when he said he was prepared to submit the cards of membership of the League to this Committee with a view to their inspection?—No, I did not say that. I said on the 1st September, 1913, that we stated at a public deputation to the Prime Minister that we were prepared to submit our cards of membership to the Government or any person they may appoint; that in addition we were prepared to submit them to any member of Parliament in his own electorate; and that statement has been published over and over again since. As a matter of fact, I believe the majority of the members of Parliament have personally had that offer from me in writing.

203. Would the Canon be prepared to place those documents in the possession of this Committee with a view to their inspection, say, by the Catholic Federation?—That would depend on what the Committee orders. I am quite prepared, as I have been all along, even when I first protested against it, to bow to the decision of the Committee, but I would protest very strongly against the roll of membership of an organization being submitted through a Committee like this to their opponents. We have never asked you who your members are, or to submit your cards. We claim that there is absolutely no necessity for such a thing, and that the suggestion is not being made to help the thing.

204. Would the Canon like to consult the roll of those Catholics who petitioned against the proposed referendum?—No, I would not bother about it—I take their word.

205. On behalf of the Catholic Federation may I ask the Canon to submit one of the cards of the League of Earnestness?—[Card handed in to Bishop Cleary.]

206. I have no other questions to ask the Canon, and have to thank the Canon very much for his courtesy in answering most of my questions in a courteous way?—And I have to thank the Bishop for the courteous way in which he has treated me; it has indeed been a pleasure.

Professor THOMAS ALEXANDER HUNTER further examined. (No. 19.)

1. *Bishop Cleary.*] What is your position, Professor, in the organization known as the National Schools Defence League?—My present position is vice-president, but when this inquiry began I was acting-president in the absence of Mr. A. R. Atkinson.

2. Was your League founded by the Rev. Mr. McCabe?—No.

3. Is it a separate organization to that founded by the Rev. Mr. McCabe?—Yes.

4. Can it be fairly described as an organization of atheists?—No.

5. I understand there are a number of clergymen of various faiths who are members of your organization?—Yes, and their names appear in the official list of the executive, which is already in my evidence.

6. Does the Professor know of any atheists or any body of atheists who are taking an active part in the work of the Defence League?—No.

7. Has there been at any time any league, alliance, combination, or understanding between the Catholic body or their chiefs and the National Schools Defence League?—None that I know of.

8. Does the Professor remember a circular invitation sent to me inviting me to a deputation of his League?—I have no recollection of it, but I might not know of it even if it were sent.

9. Does the Professor recall that I replied immediately refusing to have anything to do with the deputation?—The secretary tells me that that is correct.

Rev. Canon DAVID JOHN GARLAND further examined. (No. 20.)

1. *Mr. Bates.*] Canon Garland, are you an organizer?—Mr. Chairman, I raised the point this morning that the original arrangement arrived at by this Committee as I understood it—and I am reading from the official report—was—"Professor Hunter: I wish to ask one or two questions. Canon Garland: I understand from your official communication to me, Mr. Chairman, that there was only to be cross-examination by one representative from each side, and I take it there are only two sides in this matter—those for and against the Bill. I understood there was to be only one from each side, and I have not arranged for other people to come and ask questions." Then Mr. Hanan says, "I would call attention to the minutes. On the motion of Mr. Malcolm it was decided that interested parties be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses through the Chairman. At the same meeting Professor Hunter attended and expressed a similar desire. Then we resolved that interested bodies be allowed to cross-examine the other side through the Chairman." Then Bishop Cleary says, "May I be permitted to point out that there are four parties to this dispute. There is, first, the Bible in Schools League; second, the Catholic Federation, which represents the Catholic bodies; third, the National Schools Defence League; and, fourth, the body of teachers." "Canon Garland: All I want to bring up is that I was not made acquainted with the decision of the Committee. I understood from the letter I received that there would only be one person cross-examining on each side, and in one of my letters I pointed out that there were two parties—those for and those against the Bill." The matter ended there and cross-examination by Professor Hunter was allowed, and I bowed to that ruling. Now the position is that after I accepted the ruling that there were to be four parties, we have a fifth party, who is not one of those persons.

2. *The Chairman:*] Who are the four parties?—The Bishop, Professor Hunter, Mr. Caughley, and myself. The words are clear—"Interested parties and interested bodies." I accepted the ruling and bowed to it willingly; and now the position is that an individual who is not one of the four parties to the matter before the Committee is to be allowed the right to cross-examine, and my witnesses who are in exactly the same position, if not a better position, have had no opportunity to cross-examine.

3. Do I understand you object to be cross-examined by Mr. Bates?—No, I am not putting it that way. I wish to know if this Committee rules that he represents a fifth party, because the ruling up to the present is that four parties were to be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses.

4. I thought this morning that your position was that you were not prepared to answer the Rev. Mr. Bates until you had consulted your executive?—No; I wanted the ruling of the Committee, and if the ruling of the Committee was adverse to me I then wanted to consult my executive.

Rev. Mr. Bates: Canon Garland did not object to my cross-examining his witnesses, and in his statement he has devoted Part VI to refuting my evidence. I have not been able to make a statement contrary to that, and now he tries to debar me from cross-examining him, although he has admitted my right to cross-examine his other witnesses. I told the Committee this morning that I had no connection with the National Schools Defence League, and declined to have, although they would have liked to summon me, and then the Committee summoned me on their own account as an independent witness.

Witness: That is news to me. I never knew that the Committee was summoning witnesses, or we should have had more. Well, how does he get here if he is not one of the four parties?

5. *The Chairman.*] He was allowed to be one of the four who came. I understood you stood out on the ground that you wanted to consult your executive?—I asked if the Committee were averse to me that I might be allowed time to consider my position, but I want to say this: I do object to Mr. Bates's appearance before this Committee, considering the way in which we have all come here as parties; but to show I have no desire to shirk the cross-examination I am prepared to say this: that if close attention is paid to it, and he is confined to examining me on what I have said upon his statement, I will raise no further objection, so long as I look upon Mr. Bates's position as entirely separate here and distinct from the four parties.

The Chairman: You can do that if you like.

6. *Mr. Bates* (to witness).] Have you not organized a political league called the League of Earnestness?—I have not organized a political league called the League of Earnestness.

7. Did you not state in Wellington that part of your organization was a league within the League?—I should like to see the quotation.

8. Do you deny stating that this was a league within the League?—I do not deny it and I do not admit it, but I do not remember the circumstances under which I stated that it was a league within the League.

9. Have you, as promised, given to this Committee a pledge-card of that League?—I handed one in. This is the kind of thing I will take exception to: "Have you, as promised?" There was no definite promise to hand it in at a particular time. I ought to be asked to fulfil my promise. I object to questions with implications.

10. Did Canon Garland write this letter, which is quoted in my evidence: "My dear fellow-worker, Mr. —— informs me that owing to the pressure of business he cannot stand for ——. He desires me to express his thanks for the honour which we did him, and wishes us every success. We are looking for another candidate, and I shall be glad to have any suggestions from you on this point. Meanwhile we are continuing to educate our followers not to vote for any candidate who will not allow the people the right of voting on our matter." Do you acknowledge this as a letter written by you?—Yes.

11. You were curate at Grafton School in 1889?—Yes.

12. How often did your minister send you to give religious instruction in State schools?—What do you mean by "my minister"?

13. That is the correct term in the Anglican Church for the incumbent of a parish—sometimes called the "rector" and sometimes the "minister"?—He never sent me.

14. You went to the main Grafton School once a month, did you not?—I do not know what the main school is. I went to the superior public school in Grafton every day in the week.

15. Did Archdeacon Greenaway give the lessons?—No, he did not.

16. Did any Anglican attend to give religious instruction?—I do not remember.

17. Next year you went to Quiringi, and did your minister send you or did you go of your own accord?—I went of my own accord.

18. Did any other minister go?—I cannot remember.

19. Afterwards you left the diocese of Grafton and Armidale, and went to St. Thomas's Church, Narandera, as a curate?—Yes.

20. Did your minister there send you to give religious instruction?—Yes.

21. How often did you go?—I do not remember.

22. Did any other ministers go?—I think so.

23. I understand that after living a short time at Narandera you went to Western Australia?—No, I was in other places, first, in New South Wales.

24. According to the official records your next curacy was at Narandera?—No, I was travelling a good deal at those times.

25. After that you went to Western Australia?—No, I was at Broken Hill for some time, and I also went into the schools with many other ministers.

26. In 1892 you were ordained priest in Perth, Western Australia?—Yes.

27. And since 1892—over twenty-two years ago—you have not been a member of any diocese in New South Wales, is that not so?—No, that is not so.

28. Where and how long were you a member of a diocese in New South Wales?—I was about twelve months in the diocese of Sydney.

29. What parish?—As a matter of fact I was in charge of St. James's, Sydney, for twelve months.

30. You attended a public school, then, while you were in charge of St. James's, Sydney?—Yes.

31. How often?—I went at least weekly.

32. For a whole year to a public school and there gave Scripture lessons?—Yes.

33. So that you have had between four and five years' experience in the schools of New South Wales?—Yes; and, in addition, experience in the schools of Western Australia, where the same system is at work; and, in addition, experience in Queensland since the same system has been at work.

34. What year were you in St. James's?—I think, 1902.

35. In your evidence you state, "I solemnly testify I never heard of a school in which the Scripture lessons were not given by the teacher"; and again, "I never heard of an instance in which the Scripture lessons were not in use." This strikes me as a purely negative statement, and no evidence at all of their use. Will you say that you have personal knowledge that the Irish Scripture text-book was used in all the schools in New South Wales which you visited?—

I would say, speaking from memory, I do remember those books being used in every school I went into, and I went into more schools than I have mentioned in my evidence.

36. To your personal knowledge you say those books have been regularly used?—No; you might ask me a question it is possible to answer. How can I say I personally saw those books regularly used?

37. My first question was, Will you say you have a personal knowledge that the Irish Scripture text-book was used in all the schools which you visited?—I repeat what I said in my evidence, that I never heard of a school in which the Scripture lessons were not given by the teachers.

38. Did you see the report of the discussion on religion in schools at the last Congregational Union in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 23rd April, 1914, where Mr. Frank Wheaton, a retired school-teacher, visiting thirteen schools in the metropolitan area, gave his experience?—I do not remember that.

39. Does not this which he is reported to have said on that occasion, so far as it goes, tend to confirm the testimony I gave to this Committee on the subject?—I do not know what he said.

40. Please let me read it: "He (Mr. Wheaton) found difficulty in estimating the value of this general religious instruction. He had seen some excellent lessons given, and others without which, he had no hesitation in saying, the child would have been better. The passages selected were often quite unsuited to the child's mind, and contained many portions not fit for reading by children. Many teachers rebelled against the form of teaching laid down at present, and either ignored their instructions and vitalized the lesson into something of real interest, or else, as was more often the case, relegated the subject into any by-way of the curriculum. When such methods were adopted in the teaching of the Scripture in the year 1914, one did not wonder that the teaching of Scripture was looked upon by the pupils as a grim joke, which need hardly be taken seriously. The only children whose age would fit them to understand present Scriptural books—boys and girls of the high schools—were not allowed the opportunity of studying them. Many teachers were active in their efforts to dissuade boys from attending Scripture. The staffs of the high schools would not be sorry to see the right withdrawn, and they did all they could to make the work unsatisfactory. If every denomination claimed the right of entry, practically every boy would be at Scripture, and no school-work would be carried on in its absence. Much of our failure" [added the speaker] "in this work arises from the fact that our teaching is rarely in line with up-to-date educational methods." Does not that which is reported to have been said on that occasion, so far as it goes, tend to confirm the testimony I gave to this Committee on the subject?—I would say No, because that same individual spoke of yesterday, and you spoke of experience sixteen years ago. I would also say that, whoever he is, he is not speaking for the body of Congregationalists in Australia. I have a statement here of the 15th October, 1913, showing how Dr. Roseberry spoke with approval of the whole thing.

41. This is a printed statement in the Press?—That throws a different light on it altogether. Mr. Wheaton is a teacher attending thirteen schools; he is a man paid by the Congregational Union to go round and teach the children, and which shows how that Church approves the system.

42. Speaking to the Salvation Army in Wellington on the 9th September, 1912, about the system in Australia, you are reported to have said, "Often, by arrangement, a Salvation Army officer, or a minister of another denomination, would go out to a school and take a class of all religions." Does not this amount to an advocacy of undenominationalism?—No, it does not, but it does amount to this: it shows the flexibility of the system—that without it being compulsory to group classes, ministers who are willing to do so can group their classes, subject always to the consent of the parents. The parent has the last word every time.

43. You do not advocate, then, undenominationalism, but surely you cannot agree with Bishop Julius when he says, "Undenominational teaching is not Christian teaching, nor anything like it. For practical purposes it is about as effective as the teaching of mechanical engineering by rule of thumb"?—When did Bishop Julius say that?

44. He said it at the synod, and it is quoted in the *Evening Post* of the 7th October, 1913?—May I give the actual opinion of the Bishop of Christchurch on the point, when his quotation was used against him, torn away from its context and all surrounding matter. He published this statement in the *Timaru Herald* of June, 1914: "It is precisely because I hold these opinions that I am prepared to further the object of the League to the best of my power, for I know of no better means by which the religious instruction of our children can be secured. . . . The Australian system promoted by the League meets the case so far as, under present conditions, it can be met. It does not ask the State-school teachers to give dogmatic instruction; but it puts into their hands a text-book of 'selected' passages of Holy Scripture, and requires that they shall teach the same as they would any other history or literature, only with that becoming reverence in which our teachers are not likely to fail. . . . The statement made by me, so far from being hostile to the aims of the Bible in Schools League, affords to it a very substantial basis of support." I have also further letters from him on the matter.

45. Does your League make any attempt to give religious instruction to the children now in our schools?—Our League is not formed for the purpose of making any attempt to give religious instruction. Our League is formed in order that the people of New Zealand may be given an opportunity of expressing their will. That is the real point.

46. Does it not rather oppose any attempt to instruct them by voluntary methods?—Certainly not, and never has.

47. Did your League promote the amendment of the Education Act this session that increased the facilities for voluntary instruction in State schools?—No.

48. Are you aware that one minister is stated by Mr. Parkinson, headmaster of Wellington South School, to have held classes which were last year weekly attended by six hundred children?

—I believe that that statement was made, but it would require a little explanation. I question the correctness of the statement. There is no connection between our proposal and visits of that casual nature by a minister who is a free lance and not attached to any Church. Under our proposal no such minister would find a place in the schools.

49. When and where did you teach four or five hundred children this year as stated in your evidence yesterday?—Do you doubt that I did? I stated that I have taught four or five hundred children this year, and do you doubt it?

50. Is it your practice to visit Sunday schools?—Will you accept my answer or not?

51. Yes?—Then I do not mind telling you. I have visited Sunday schools, and I will give the information with pleasure. I have got the impression that every statement of mine in public or private so far as the other parties are concerned—I exclude Bishop Cleary after his conduct to-day—are not to be accepted unless proved. There has been too much cross-examination of that nature.

52. Do you address Sunday-school children on the Bible in Schools League and call that Scripture-teaching?—No, I do not.

53. To save the time of this Committee, will you give me your opinion as to the correctness of my stating that when you made an address before the synod it was a private meeting?—There was not a private meeting of the clergy, and therefore I did not address a private meeting.

54. Was it a meeting of the members of the synod?—I do not know whether all the members of the synod were invited to be there.

55. I will ask your opinion as to the correctness of this statement: "On the morning when the motion on the League scheme came up, Canon Garland addressed a private meeting of members, and there endeavoured to impose silence upon any who might be disposed to oppose the scheme in order that the resolution might seem to have the unanimous approval of synod, and also, further, to limit the speaking to laymen in order that it might appear that it was solely a lay and not a clerical movement that was being promoted. To these pretensions as well as to the attempt upon the freedom and privileges of members of synod I and others were utterly opposed. Regarding this agitation for a questionable advantage to the Church, and for an inquisition upon the State's system of free, compulsory, and secular education, I felt it my duty to show that the agitation was, moreover, doing much harm to religion. In synod the mover of the resolution, Mr. Hadfield, stated that all the reports he had heard of the New South Wales system were favourable, and if any other view than he expressed was possibly held by any one, he and the synod would be glad to hear of it. Speaking within my rights, and with this invitation in view, I gave the synod the benefit of my long personal knowledge and experience in Australia and New Zealand. I pointed out that the remedy for the decline in Church attendance and indifference to religion was not to be found in the State, but in the Church itself, and Sunday schools especially. I cast no reflections whatever upon the clergy, whom I only sought to persuade in order to save the Church from being placed in a doubtful position, and this country from bitter religious and political strife. Canon Garland freely traversed my speech, calling my experience into question, contradicting my statements, and making not the slightest admission of any truth I had brought forward. After this I rose to make a brief personal explanation, but was promptly ruled out of order. The view, however, that the League's opinions were the only ones to be tolerated is not borne out by the address by Dr. Sprott at the synod of 1913, published as a League pamphlet, and concluding thus: 'as you know, the scheme has been accepted by our general synod. That in itself constitutes a strong claim, if not upon the acceptance, certainly upon the most careful consideration, of members of the Church. A loyal churchman may indeed feel compelled to dissent from the decision of the supreme synod of the Church, but he will not, I think, dissent lightly or without claim.' Silencing the clergy in the manner attempted in caucus is more tyrannical than appears on the surface, for it is a fact that only six or seven out of all the clergy of the diocese hold licenses which are not revokable at the sole will and pleasure of the Bishop. Only a very courageous or an independent man could afford to risk his living and the favour of his diocesan by opposing that to which he had given countenance and support. In a former synod (1905), when the old League for the introduction of Bible-reading without the right of entry had not the tactics of the present organizer at command, and intellectual liberty and freedom of speech were exercised, the venerable Archdeacon of Wellington, Thomas Fancourt, said he 'objected to the referendum as introducing a new principle—an appeal to mob rule.' The Rev. S. J. Handover characterized the Bible in State Schools League as 'an unholy alliance'; and the Rev. C. W. J. MacLaverty, now vicar of Island Bay, described the League scheme as 'a wrong measure in every way.' Even in the last Wellington synod (1914), Dr. Fyffe, though he had refrained from speaking and voting on the resolution of the Bible in State schools, declared he 'was entirely against the referendum on any question whatever.' Five days afterwards, in the same synod in which I had spoken on the Bible-in-State-schools scheme, a motion was brought forward to ask the Government to give higher rank in the Territorial Forces to the Bishop than that to which it was shown I had attained through long and active service. This afforded one who had seconded a Bible-in-State-schools motion in the general synod of New Zealand the opportunity to comment thus upon me in open synod before strangers and in my absence: 'He (Mr. Wilberfoss) had heard what that man had said on the Bible-in-schools issue, and he had had the impudence to dare to come and stand in this synod and express an opinion on the clergy of this diocese. He felt (continued the speaker) that he had dared to cast reflections upon those whose boots he was not fit to blacken.' As I had passed no reflections upon my brother clergy, whose good fellowship I prized, and for whose earnestness and devotion I had a profound esteem, and as I had confined myself to the inexpediency of the Bible and clergy in State schools scheme, his remarks could only refer to my attitude on that question. In a subsequent correspondence with the Bishop on the 20th July I

wrote, 'If after the solemn prayers of synod under your immediate leadership, and as it now appears with your tacit consent, such an exhibition of rancour be possible, one may cease to wonder at the spread of virulence and strife throughout the land—hundreds are, I believe, being driven out of the Churches and thousands aroused into determined opposition to religion itself' "? —I say I do not ever remember meeting in three pages of foolscap closely written so many absolute misrepresentations—I will not say falsification of fact. There was not a private meeting. The meeting was the ordinary meeting of clergy which is held at synod time, open to all clergy, including Mr. Bates himself; and it was not a meeting to discuss the Bible in schools—it was a meeting in order to discuss those things which generally concern the clergy. At the end of the meeting I, who was present, as Mr. Bates could have been, was asked to state how the Bible-in-schools movement was getting on. I do not think it took ten minutes altogether, and I pointed out that in view of that fact it was not desired to spend any time over the Bible-in-schools motion in synod, because of the amount of business to be done, and that it would be well if we allowed the laity to speak instead of the clergy. That is all that occurred, and I gave the reason, as it was alleged that it was a lot of parsons who were running the movement. Then when we got into synod the laymen spoke first, and no layman went into the objective—he only dealt with the question, should we get the referendum or not—for this reason: that synod had previously year after year openly debated the proposition, and that is shown by what Mr. Bates has said when he mentioned how the clergy spoke against it in times past. In regard to their not being willing to listen to Mr. Bates, I know that there was a little not what you call disturbance, but a little undercurrent going on within my hearing from the laity. They felt Mr. Bates had altogether exceeded not merely the point of traversing the Bible in schools, but exceeded what was due from a clergyman in his position to his brother clergy. He distinctly lectured them. Even the *Dominion* report and the *Post* report shows that. These were the remarks: he was telling the clergy to preach better sermons, and a layman chipped in, "He cannot preach himself for sour apples."

56. *The Chairman.*] You disagree with that statement?—Yes. I wish to say that in regard to that incident mentioned about Mr. Wilberfoss, he had nothing whatever to do with the Bible-in-schools motion.

57. *Mr. Bates.*] Was that meeting you addressed public or private—were any other persons from outside the members of the synod present?—Not that I know of.

58. It could not then be described as a public meeting?—It was not public in the sense that anybody could walk into it, and not a private meeting that you and other clergy could not attend.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

Submitted by Rev. C. S. Cook, Methodist Minister, representing Bible in Schools League.

METHODIST CHURCH OF AUSTRALASIA AND BIBLE IN STATE SCHOOLS: CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED BY THE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY CONFERENCE TO INQUIRE INTO THE WORKING OF RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN AUSTRALIAN STATE SCHOOLS; TO WHICH IS ANNEXED OFFICIAL DECISIONS OF AUSTRALIAN CONFERENCES ON THE SUBJECT.

LETTER OF INQUIRY SENT OUT.

DEAR SIR,— Lyttelton, N.Z., 9th May, 1911.

As the New South Wales system of religious instruction in State schools is under discussion in this Dominion, the last Methodist Conference appointed a committee to collect evidence and report to the next Conference as to its working. On behalf of the committee I am instructed to ask if you will be good enough to help us by answering the following questions:—

(1.) Have any difficulties been experienced through teachers who are personally out of sympathy with religious instruction?

(2.) (*a.*) Have any difficulties arisen with regard to ministers' right of entry? (*b.*) The Act provides that none but children of a given religious body shall attend the religious instruction given by the minister of that body: is this rigidly carried out? And (*c*), so far as you know, have any difficulties arisen through attempts to proselytize?

(3.) (*a.*) What has been the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church to the system? (*b.*) Have the Roman Catholic clergy availed themselves of the right of entry? (*c.*) Is there any disposition on the part of the Roman authorities to take up a more antagonistic attitude at the present time?

(4.) What is the practical working of the system, (*a*) in the country places, (*b*) in the city?

(5.) What is the nature of the lessons given by the school-teacher?

(6.) What percentage of children are withdrawn from the general religious teaching under the conscience clause?

(7.) Is there anything in the nature of a conscience clause for the teacher?

(8.) Is there any agitation, however slight, to abolish the system or to change it in any vital aspect? If so, what is the nature of the agitation?

Thanking you in anticipation,

I am, &c.,

B. F. ROTHWELL.

Methodist Church of Australasia General Conference, 23rd May, 1911.

MY DEAR BROTHER,—

In reply to yours of 9th instant, inquiring as to the operation of the New South Wales system of religious instruction in State schools, I have pleasure in replying as under. I may also say that yesterday I had a conversation with the Chief Inspector, who is at present Acting Under-Secretary and Director of Public Instruction, and the answers I append are confirmed by the information he gave me and the views he expressed. He also kindly furnished me with copies of the Scripture-lesson books used by the Department, and which the teachers are required to use, also with a copy of the last report of the Department. You will see on pages 15, 38, and 50 of the report references to and reports concerning some of the matters on which you make inquiries. These will be of value to you. I forward the report and Scripture-lesson books for the information of your committee.

My replies to your specific questions are as follows:—

(1.) I have not heard of any difficulties being experienced through teachers who are personally out of sympathy with religious instruction. No doubt there are some malcontents; but the Chief Inspector says the difficulties are inconsiderable, and exist mainly in imagination. Teachers know that lessons are part of the curriculum when they enter the service, and adjust themselves accordingly.

(2.) No difficulties have arisen with regard to ministers' right of entry. Except by permission of parents, children do not attend classes conducted by other than their own minister; but frequently this permission is given where no instruction is given by or on behalf of the Church to which the children belong. There is, generally speaking, a good understanding between the ministers of the various Churches on the matter, and there are no complaints of any moment as to attempts to proselytize.

(3.) The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is one of antagonism to the whole system of State education. It claims to have State recognition and support of its denominational schools. There is no disposition to take up a more antagonistic attitude at the present time, for the simple reason that its attitude has been as antagonistic as possible from the beginning. The Roman Catholic clergy have availed themselves of the right of entry to a small extent, as you will see on page 15 of the report.

(4.) The practical working of the system is that most of the Churches avail themselves to some extent of the opportunities afforded for imparting instruction, and their efforts are appreciated by the vast majority of parents. The city schools are nearly all provided for by a combination among the ministers, who take classes in rotation where they are unable to fully meet the needs of their own scholars. The Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational ministers especially act in concert in this way. In the country places the provision is not always so good, owing to the number of small schools and the difficulty of visiting them regularly. Much also depends, as always, upon the individual energy and sense of responsibility of the minister in charge of the circuit or parish.

(5.) Nature of the lessons given by the school-teacher: See lesson-books forwarded herewith.

(6.) What percentage of children withdrawn under the general conscience clause: Cannot say, but believe principally the Roman Catholic children.

(7.) There is nothing in the nature of a conscience clause for the teacher. In the Act the term "secular" is interpreted to include "general religious instruction," and teachers are expected to understand that and act accordingly. They might as well ask for a conscience clause as to the teaching of history.

(8.) There is not the slightest agitation to abolish the system or to alter it. The Roman Catholic hierarchy are always asking for recognition of their schools in some form, either in payment by results, grants-in-aid, or State scholarships tenable at their schools. But they have never asked for the abolition of the Scripture lessons or of the right of entry of special religious instructors. All political parties are at one in their avowed determination to maintain the Public Instruction Act intact. This includes the religious instruction clauses.

With fraternal regards,

I am, &c.,

J. E. Carruthers,

Rev. B. F. Rothwell, Lyttelton. Secretary, General Conference.

Dear Mr. Rothwell,— 28th May, 1911.

Since writing to you last week the Under-Secretary for Education has courteously forwarded to me some valuable official information in reference to the matter of religious instruction in our State schools. The information is so complete and important that I am writing to specially thank him for it. I enclose it for the use of your committee. When you have done with it I shall be glad if you will return it to me, as the matter will be handy for reference if I should be asked for information in any other quarter.

I shall be glad to be informed if you have received the lesson-books and departmental report sent to you last week. With fraternal regards,

I am, &c.,

Rev. B. F. Rothwell, New Zealand. J. E. Carruthers.

Dear Sir,— Australasia Chambers, Martin Place, Sydney, 19th May, 1911.

I duly received yours of the 9th instant, and very gladly respond to your committee's request to furnish them with the answers to your questions. I may say that, realizing the importance of your committee getting information first-hand, I considered that although I personally knew something, in general terms, of the working of our Act, it would be better to obtain the answers from some one having a far more extensive and practical knowledge of such working than I possess. I happen to enjoy the friendship of perhaps the highest authority in this matter in the State, Mr. J. W. Turner, and to him I am indebted for the information supplied in answer to your questions. I may state that Mr. Turner has had forty-seven years' experience in the public schools of this State, twenty-nine of which he spent as head teacher in the Sydney schools, and the other portion of his earlier years in the country schools, and the balance as Assistant Under-Secretary of the Education Department, and in the position of head of the Technical Education Branch, which is the position now occupied by him. The twenty-nine years spent in the city were—for nine years as headmaster of the Blackfriars School (in the slum area), and for the latter twenty years as headmaster of the well-known Fort Street School, Sydney, acknowledged on all hands to be far and away the premier school of this State, and which has combined with it a training school for teachers. Some few years ago, at the end of his term in Fort Street, Mr. Turner was sent with Mr. G. H. Knibbs (the present Federal Statistician) by the New South Wales Government on a commission to England and the Continent to inquire into the working of the various education systems of those countries. I have thus given you Mr. Turner's educational experience at some length so that you may attach all the more value to the information he afforded me in answer to your queries. I may add that Mr. Turner (although he may not be a Methodist now) is the son of Wesleyan parents, who were of strong religious convictions, and therefore his information will probably be all the more valuable to your committee.

The replies I give to your queries under these circumstances are as follows:—

(1.) The percentage of professed agnostics and deists in the service is small. The teacher has to give religious instruction from approved text-books, one being on the Old Testament and the other on the New. (Copies of these will be forwarded.) The teacher's work in this direction is examined every year by the School Inspectors just the same as his work in any other subject in the curriculum. A specific value is given by the Inspector to the success of the school in this subject just as in an ordinary subject of the curriculum.

(2.) None whatever. A teacher has no right to raise difficulties. He has to carry out the Act. No attempt to proselytize is known. When a child enters a school and is enrolled he is asked his religion, and it is inserted in the roll. When the minister of his denomination calls at

the school, he with his co-religionists is called and filed out to the instruction class. No children known to be of one denomination are drafted to the teaching class of an agent of another denomination without consulting their parents.

(3.) Distinctly hostile. Roman Catholic clergy have very rarely availed themselves of this right. They may have in some odd cases, but they are very much of an exception. In an experience of twenty-nine years in Sydney it has never been known by Mr. Turner. There is a disposition on the part of the Roman Catholic authorities to take up a more antagonistic attitude at the present time. (In political circles at the present time the question is whether pressure would be brought on the Labour Government by the Roman Catholics to interfere with the Act; but it has too strong a hold in the ideas of the public to allow of any probable chance of it being interfered with. This is my note, and not Mr. Turner's statement.)

(4.) (*a*) and (*b*). The experience is that some Churches in the State are better organized to do this work than others. In the country places the visits of clergy are less frequent by reason of the distance of the schools. The visits in the country are paid by the clergy. In the city and suburban area the visits are more regular. The Church of England is particularly well organized in this direction, employing agents (sometimes women) other than ministers to do this work. For the maintenance of this agency they have a special fund. Our Church does not deal with this as systematically as it might. We have a question in our quarterly-meeting business as to what public schools there are in the circuit and whether they are regularly visited by the ministers. A good many of our men find the work exacting, and I know from information received from the Church of England clergy that they find the work at times hard owing to the difficulty in restraining the boys. I do not think a teacher enters the room to keep order.

(5.) See the text-books. The school-teacher is kept strictly away from dogma, and is confined to the narrative, which he teaches in the same way as, say, a history lesson. A teacher may say, "Take the Sermon on the Mount and show, for instance, the difference between Christ's moral teaching and that of the Talmud."

(6.) It is very very rare for any child to withdraw from the Scripture class under the conscience clause. The experience of the Department is that there is very little interference by the parent with his child or children in the religious-instruction class.

(7.) No such thing is known. A teacher must teach this just as any other subject.

(8.) Not the slightest.

I am pleased to be of any service to your committee. If I can help you with any further information which I can obtain from headquarters I shall be happy to do so.

With kind regards to all my brethren,

Yours sincerely,

Rev. B. F. Rothwell, The Parsonage, Lyttelton, N.Z. T. H. ENGLAND.

P.S.—Perhaps one of your well-known ministers could give you the information from their point of view.

DEAR SIR,— Sydney, 29th May, 1911.

Re Education Act, N.S.W.: Referring to my letter to you of the 19th instant, I have now received and send herewith the following literature in this matter:—

(1.) Scripture text-book in use in New South Wales public schools (by separate parcel).

(2.) Copy of the Public Instruction Act and regulations thereunder (see clauses 7 and 17 of the Act). (Separate post.)

(3.) Copy of a letter from the Under-Secretary here to the Under-Secretary, Department of Public Instruction, Brisbane, giving information regarding religious instruction in schools under the Department of Public Instruction, New South Wales.

Please acknowledge receipt.

Yours faithfully,

Rev. B. F. Rothwell, The Parsonage, Lyttelton, N.Z. T. H. ENGLAND.

Department of Public Instruction, Sydney, New South Wales.

SIR,— 22nd August, 1910.

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th instant, asking to be supplied with information regarding religious instruction in schools under this Department.

In reply, I have to state that all instructions issued to teachers in connection with this matter are embodied in the printed Act and regulations, two copies of which are appended for your information. The passages to which your attention is invited are marked with blue pencil. A complete set of Scripture reading-books used by this Department is also forwarded.

Under the Act any clergyman or other recognized teacher has the right to give children of his own denomination one hour's religious teaching daily during the ordinary school hours, but in actual practice this provision is not usually availed of to a greater extent than one hour weekly in each department. Occasionally in large schools there may be two religious teachers occupied in different rooms at the same time, but in most cases the teacher arranges so that visiting clergymen do not attend simultaneously. In a case such as that mentioned by you, where representatives of five denominations desire to give religious instruction in the same school, use would be made of the available class-rooms, and if the number of these were insufficient, arrangements would be made for one or more of the clergymen to visit at another time. It sometimes happens that, by arrangement between clergymen concerned, one of them teaches the pupils of several denominations. The usual practice is to hold the classes for special religious

instruction in a class-room, but in the case of one-roomed schools, of which there are 1,572 in this State, other arrangements, such as holding the class at one end of the schoolroom, have to be made.

The Scripture lessons as contained in the Irish National Board's books do not form part of the ordinary reading-lessons, but are given as a distinct subject of instruction by the teaching staff.

I have, &c.,
PETER BOARD, Under-Secretary.

Central Methodist Mission Headquarters, 139 Castlereagh Street, Sydney, May, 1911.

DEAR SIR,—

In answer to your questions, let me say,—

(1.) In my experience of twenty-seven years there has been scarcely any trouble with unsympathetic teachers.

(2.) No difficulty has arisen on this point; the right of a minister to enter the school is never questioned, and masters are exceedingly careful that only the children who have a right to go into the classes go.

(3.) The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church has been hostile. Its clergy seldom take advantage of the provisions of the Act. The Roman authorities see that it is useless to antagonize the system. Its roots are too deep. They are pressing, however, for Government aid for their own schools. I do not believe they are ever likely to get it.

(4.) I am only acquainted with the city and suburbs, and here the system works well. The Churches are more and more taking advantage of the opportunity.

(5.) The lessons are undogmatic. The Irish lesson-book is used, and the character of the teaching depends largely upon the teacher.

(6.) I cannot give the exact percentage, but I know it is exceedingly small.

(7.) I am not aware that there is.

(8.) The only agitation is by Roman ecclesiastics. The great mass of the people are satisfied with the system as a happy solution of a difficult question.

With kind regards, yours very truly,
P. J. STEPHEN.

DEAR SIR,— A.M.C. Fund Office, 165 Pitt Street, Sydney, 14th June, 1911.

I have to apologize for delay in replying to your letter of inquiry *re* New South Wales system of religious instruction in State schools. Absence in the country for three months is the reason of my silence.

I enclose categorical answers to your questions, but I may add, generally, that the people of this State are so well satisfied with our system of public instruction that any attempt to alter it would be met with an overwhelming opposition, and no such attempt is likely to be made or even hinted at. Of course, the Roman Catholic hierarchy (not its people) are still agitating for a subsidy from the public funds for their schools, but they ask in vain, and even the present Labour Government, which was assisted to power by the Roman Catholic vote, has, in its exposition of its education policy, entirely ignored the Roman Catholic demand.

Referring to question 2, the law is as stated by you, but in practice it has been found more convenient to allow united classes to be taken in turn according to a monthly or quarterly "in turn" by the ministers of the Churches I have named. This practice is more general, perhaps, in centres where the population is comparatively small; yet in my last two circuits—viz., North Sydney and Newtown—where there are very large schools, this practice obtained. It suits the ministers, who take the senior and junior children separately, and is more convenient for the school authorities who have to find the accommodation.

A minister of each Church is entitled by the Act to demand accommodation for his class for one hour each day if he choose during school hours—*i.e.*, after 9.30 a.m. He goes, however, only once or twice a week.

The headmaster of a large school informs me that "Scripture lessons" appear on the school time-table the same as any other subject, and the Inspector examines the children as in other subjects.

I am sending you copies of the lesson-books now being used in the schools by the teachers, and in which the children are examined in the ordinary way by the Inspectors.

Any further information required I shall be glad to supply if possible.

Yours faithfully,
W. WOOLLS RUTLEDGE.

(1.) No.

(2.) (*a.*) No. (*b.*) No. In many places the ministers of, say, Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches take it in turns to give religious instruction to the united classes each week. (*c.*) I have not heard of any attempts to proselytize.

(3.) (*a.*) Hostile. (*b.*) No. (*c.*) Yes.

(4.) (*a.*) Very satisfactory. (*b.*) Very satisfactory. This is the unanimous verdict of all the Churches excepting, of course, the Roman Catholic Church.

(5.) I am sending you copies of lesson-books.

(6.) The headmaster of a large public school says the percentage is "almost nil."

(7.) No. The teacher has to give the lesson as contained in the books in the same way as any other subject.

(8.) Absolutely none.

W. WOOLLS RUTLEDGE.

DEAR SIR,— St. Andrew's College Lodge, Camperdown, Sydney, 25th June, 1911.

I have been so busy that I have not had time to look up the matters you ask me about until now, and now that I have looked for the report of the last Education Commission I find I have lent it to some one whom I cannot reach. But I can answer most of your questions on my own authority, as I have gone over the whole matter more than once. My answers are:—

(1.) I have not heard of any in New South Wales. In other States where Scripture-reading was not allowed, in Victoria and Queensland, I have known of very acute difficulties with teachers out of sympathy with Christianity. But in New South Wales the Irish Scripture-lesson books are used, and if teachers wish they may keep entirely to the text given them and the questions at the end of the lessons, and I have in ten years heard of no difficulty.

(2.) No difficulties have arisen with regard to ministers' right of entry, except that there are not enough of them to go round. I have heard of no difficulty as to children going to religious instruction other than their own. In fact, it is not allowed, except where the ministers in a town or district agree to combine their classes. Then, of course, all the children from the Churches of these ministers go to the classes of all the ministers.

(3.) The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is always hostile; but the hostility is less here than where no Scripture reading-lessons are given. Cardinal Moran announced a year or two ago that if the Irish lesson-books were removed and the Gospels substituted, he would himself present the Roman Catholic children in the schools with the Gospels. Later he explained that he meant the Douai version; but I do not think the difference of version would have hindered harmony. Some of the priests use the right of entry, but most do not. I do not think there is any special antagonism in the minds of the Roman Catholics just now.

(4.) Both in country and in city it works admirably. I myself value the Scripture lessons given by the teachers and reported on by the Inspectors, and the access to Christian sanctions for their moral discipline which that necessarily involves, a good deal more than the professedly religious instruction of the clergy, for, after all, that is amateur work, and, worse still, is outside the school. The reports of the Inspectors are in general in favour of the school Scripture lessons. They say they have great effect on the morale of the schools and improve the discipline.

(5.) The lessons given by the school-teachers are narratives and passages from the Scripture, to which a few notes are appended. The teacher gives this like any other reading-lesson, and asks the questions set for him, and judges the value of the children's answers. But if a teacher chooses to deal with the subject without the book and no parent objects, he is permitted to teach in that way.

(6.) I have no statistics as to the number of children withdrawn under the conscience clause, but it is very small. The Roman Catholic children do not go as a rule (only if their parents request it), so that proselytism cannot occur. What is called so by the Roman Catholic priesthood is the admission of Roman Catholic children at the request of the parents. They always assume that no such request is ever made by parents.

(7.) No, there is no conscience clause for the teacher. He is not asked his own private opinions in regard to religion any more than as to geography. He may believe the earth to be flat, but he has to teach that it is round. He may not be very sure of God, but he has to teach the lessons which assume that He exists.

(8.) Among other than Roman Catholics there is none. I do not know a single Protestant minister of any denomination who is not more than satisfied with the New South Wales system. As for the Roman Catholic agitation, that is perennial, because the claim of the priesthood to the complete control of education always persists. But in no State where Scriptural instruction is not given have the Roman Catholic priesthood proved more friendly than in this State, in my opinion, and as I think the above-mentioned action of Cardinal Moran shows, in no such State have they been so friendly.

With kind regards, I remain, &c.,

A. HARPER, D.D.,

Rev. B. F. Rothwell, Lyttelton, N.Z. Principal, St. Andrew's College.

MY DEAR BROTHER,— Newington College, Stanmore, Sydney, 24th May, 1911.

I enclose replies to your questions, with the regret that my answer is not more prompt. Perhaps you will understand that the case of a large establishment necessarily delays some things one would like to do. Under separate cover I forward a copy of my retiring address, which contains a section on education bearing upon the subject.

It is fair to say that I do not represent all in my views. We are disposed generally to be well satisfied with the present system. It has held the field for over thirty years, but the claims of the Roman Catholics may succeed in making themselves felt. It was thought at one time that the present Labour Government would do something. This seems unlikely at present; but if they do nothing the present support by the Roman Catholics of the Labour party may be withdrawn. If any Government should decide to do something for them the question will be reopened at all points. If the Roman Catholics got State support other denominations would at once claim it. Hoping to be of some service,

Yours faithfully,

C. PRESCOTT,

The Rev. B. F. Rothwell. Principal, Methodist College.

Reply to Questions re Religious Teaching in State Schools.

(1.) I am not aware of any trouble that has arisen from any teachers who are personally out of sympathy with religious teachings.

(2.) No difficulties that I know of have arisen from the minister's right of entry. Nor have I heard of any attempts to proselytize. A note is made of the religious denomination of each child. The minister of each can claim his own children but not others.

(3.) The Roman Catholic Church is opposed to the whole system of State public instruction, and does its best to get its own children into its own schools. Very inconsistently it does not object to its members being teachers. Many Roman Catholic teachers are in the service. As a rule the Roman Catholic clergy make no attempt to use the opportunity for giving religious instruction. Nevertheless I find that in 1909 (the latest statistics available) 936 visits were made by Roman Catholics for giving religious instruction. The other numbers are: Church of England, 24,977; Methodist, 8,301; Presbyterian, 6,920; other denominations, 4,542. The Roman Catholic attitude is unvarying. The Church refuses to accept the schools, and supports its own wherever it can. But it never loses an opportunity to insist that its own schools ought in justice to be subsidized by the State.

(4.) The practical workings of the system: In the city where the population is thick and ministers do not live at a great distance from the schools, it is comparatively easy to arrange for visiting them But in the country where population is small and schools are scattered a good many receive no visits. The Government Statistician reports that the provision for giving religious instruction "has not been used to a very great extent by the various denominations." "The visits by all the denominations taken together represented only a little more than 10 per cent. of the opportunities afforded." This is, however, less startling than it appears, inasmuch as it is open to religious teachers to claim one hour a day. It is obvious that no minister of a Church could possibly give that time. The usual amount of time given by those who visit is one period (one hour and three-quarters) a week.

(5.) As regards the lessons given by the teachers themselves, I think the Irish lessons are those in general use. The Statistician's report says, "In all schools administered under the Act the teaching is strictly non-sectarian; but the words 'secular instruction' are held to include general religious teaching as distinguished from dogmatic or polemic theology."

(6.) What percentage are withdrawn under the conscience clause? I have no information, but I imagine that no parent who enrols his child under a given denomination would think of objecting to his child's receiving instruction from the minister belonging to it. Here I might mention that sometimes arrangements are made by the ministers themselves that if a Presbyterian minister will take his own and the Methodist children one week the Methodist minister will take all next week; but such instances, I think, are rare.

(7.) I do not know of any conscience clause for the teachers They are required to give the Bible lessons, but how far these may be crowded out by the pressure of other lessons I cannot say.

(8.) There is a general feeling that the system is a good one. No serious effort is being made to alter it, apart from that already referred to under question 3. The weak spot in it is that the Churches find it impracticable to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded by it to the full. The average minister has his hands too full with his duties for Sunday—the case of his adult flock—to do as much as he would like. Accredited representatives supply his place in many instances, but the difficulty of providing for paying such is obvious. My own opinion is that it is far from a complete solution of the problem, and I have stated in public that my belief is that "whatever be our mind to-day, our State has not said its last word in the subject."

C. PRESCOTT.

Methodist Church of Australasia, Queensland Conference,
Toowong, Queensland, 30th May, 1911.

DEAR MR. ROTHWELL,—

In reply to yours of 6th instant concerning religious instruction in the State schools, little information can be given from this State as the result of experience of working the system which is only now being brought into operation. Following upon the highly successful referendum the necessary Act was passed last year. From the beginning of this year ministers of religion have enjoyed the right of entry, and it is being largely used. In some places ministers are working together so as to cover a wider area and taking one another's children. It is too early to say whether the Roman Catholic clergy will avail themselves of the right. Perhaps not. They oppose everything except their own schools with a subsidy.

Our general reading-books (Scripture) are being compiled, and are to be ready for use after the midwinter vacation. I cannot now say whether there is a conscience clause for the teacher, but no trouble is expected.

We regard the introduction of these lessons as a great boon, and in view of the large vote in favour have little fear of attempt to overthrow it. I hope you may be successful in your campaign.

Faithfully yours,

H. YOUNGMAN,
President General Conference.
(Three times President Queensland Conference.)

Central Methodist Mission, Brisbane, Queensland, 18th May, 1911.

DEAR SIR,—

Yours of the 6th instant to hand. The Queensland system of religious instruction has only recently come into operation, therefore it is early yet to pass judgment on the matter. I will hand your letter to the organizing secretary of our League, and he will give you the fullest information possible on his return to Brisbane after the end of the month.

I am working under the system, and visit the Central Schools for boys and girls respectively each week, and everything there is working harmoniously. I worked under the system in Western Australia for about twenty years, and there we had no difficulty whatever. I can answer your questions as they apply to Western Australia—

(1.) No.

(2.) No.

(3.) Always against the Act, but in Western Australia the Roman Catholic was passive; here it is active.

(4.) As far as possible the ministers work the Act.

(5.) General, not dogmatic.

(6.) Not 1 per cent., I think, in Western Australia.

(7.) No conscience clause for teachers. Why should there be when the instruction is of a general nature? Victoria is making a huge mistake in consenting to a conscience clause. That gives away the whole question and justifies to some extent the Roman Catholic objection.

(8.) None whatever in Western Australia. It is too early to say yet for Queensland. Our text-book is not yet issued. Our secretary will attend to the matter for you and also *re* New South Wales book, which, by the way, I hope you will not accept. I trust that our Church in New Zealand will go for the system. Don't be afraid of "bogeys." No real difficulty arises in practical working. There is no parallel to the Old Country, and it is outside the question to raise the Old Country difficulties. I trust you will all agree to join hands in securing for the children the Bible lessons. Any help we can give is yours to command.

With fraternal regards,

Yours sincerely,

G. E. Rowe,

Ex-President West Australian and Queensland Conferences.

Rev. and Dear Sir,— Brisbane, 26th June, 1911.

Your letter of the 6th May was handed to me by Mr. Rowe a few days ago. In reply thereto I beg to state:—

(1.) No difficulties have been experienced through teachers who are out of sympathy with religious instruction. The official testimonies are emphatic to this effect in New South Wales, Tasmania, and Western Australia. I may add that this is because teachers realize the assistance which this system of religious instruction gives to them in building up the characters of their pupils. A striking fact is that teachers who in Western Australia opposed the introduction of the system became warm supporters of it when they personally experienced some of its work after its introduction. The same thing is occurring here in Queensland, where not one teacher opposed to its introduction has made difficulties upon its becoming law. On the contrary, within my own personal experience, such teachers are showing cordial sympathy.

(2.) No difficulty arises with regard to the ministers' visits. Under the system no child receives a minister's instruction unless he belongs to that minister's Church, except in a case where the parent signifies his desire for the child to attend the instruction of some minister other than that of the Church to which he belongs. The official records state that there are no examples of attempts to proselytize. The ministers of the different Churches work in harmony together, frequently making arrangements by which they take each other's classes, but always subject to the parent's decision.

(3.) The attitude of the Roman Church is hostile, though no more so than where there is no system of religious instruction. In New South Wales the Roman children to the number of some twenty thousand accept the Scripture lessons from the State-school teachers. In Western Australia many of them are withdrawn. In Queensland they have been forbidden by their Church to accept them. In Queensland their Church has stated that their clergy will not visit the State schools. The attitude of the Roman Church is distinctly antagonistic, and nothing will satisfy them except grants to their schools. They are equally hostile whether there is religious instruction or not.

(4 and 5.) I do not quite understand what you mean when you ask about the "practical working" of the system. Scripture lessons are given from books provided by the State by the State-school teachers, who avoid all denominational instruction, teaching the Bible stories as history would be taught, so that the children learn the narrative. The ministers of religion avail themselves of the opportunity of giving more definite instruction on top of this, and naturally are able to do so better in the city.

(6.) The withdrawal of children from the State-school teachers' Bible lessons recently averaged 2 per cent. in New South Wales, Western Australia, and Tasmania.

(7.) There is no conscience clause for the teacher, nor is any such thing necessary, because the teacher is not required to give religious instruction.

(8.) Where the system exists there is no attempt to abolish it, but on the contrary the combination of Churches accepting it is so strong that the system becomes a bulwark against those who desire to destroy a national system of education.

Your own Church by its Australian General Conference has approved the system, as have also the Conferences of Western Australia and Queensland, and, I may add, so has the Presbyterian General Assembly of Australia.

It is impossible to send you copies of the text-books. I send you some specimen literature.

It is possible to argue that the Australian system of religious instruction may be improved upon, but the fact remains that this system, and it alone, neither more nor less, has proved

acceptable and has satisfied the majority of the people. When once introduced it has never been disturbed. It has stood the test of forty-five years in New South Wales and forty-three years in Tasmania. It is the only one which other States have agreed to introduce—Western Australia in 1893 and Queensland in 1910. You therefore have a strong case when you are able to say that it has worked well and stood the test of time and criticism, which you will be unable to say of something which individuals might say would be better.

I shall be glad to give you further information if you desire it.

Yours sincerely,

DAVID J. GARLAND,

Organizing Secretary, Bible in State Schools League, Queensland.

The Rev. B. F. Rothwell, Methodist Parsonage, Lyttelton, New Zealand.

METHODIST OFFICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS.

QUEENSLAND.

The Queensland Methodist Conference, 1907, passed the following resolution:—

"That this Conference records its conviction that in the interests of public morality and religion it is desirable that the system of primary State education should be amended by the restoration of Bible-reading lessons to the school curriculum, or the adoption of clauses 7 and 17 of the New South Wales Education Act, and cordially adopts the recommendation of the General Conference to support any measure calculated to secure this result."

Pastoral address unto the Methodist Church of Queensland Conference, 1908:—

"For many years the Bible has been excluded from our State schools. We have ever held this to be an unwarrantable exclusion, and, with due respect to those whose religious convictions make them think otherwise, we are in full sympathy with the general and organized effort that is being made to bring about a referendum on this most important subject. We commend this question to your serious and prayerful consideration, and cherish the hope that in the near future the Scripture lessons will be taught in our schools, and that reasonable facilities will be extended to ministers of all denominations for giving Bible instruction during school hours."

H. YOUNGMAN, President.

ISAAC CASTLEHOW, Secretary.

The Queensland Methodist Conference, 1909, passed the following resolution:—

"The Conference pledges its full support to the platform of the Bible in State Schools League, providing for (1) Bible-reading as part of the ordinary lessons; and (2) the right of ministers, or their accredited substitutes, to visit the schools and teach their own children during school hours. It directs the Connexional Committee to take such steps as may be found expedient to realize the aims mentioned above, and earnestly recommends our people generally to use their votes and influence to secure an affirmative decision when the referendum is taken."

Methodist opinion on ministers' visits: The Methodist Synod of West Moreton, Queensland, 1911, passed the following resolution, which was ordered to be forwarded to the Premier and the Minister for Education:—

"That this West Moreton Synod of the Methodist Church desires to place on record its appreciation of the privilege afforded by the present Education Act of the ministers visiting the State schools and imparting religious instruction to our boys and girls, and desires to assure the Minister for Education that, so far, the opportunity has been availed of, and has worked most harmoniously; and also to express its appreciation of and satisfaction with the suitability and excellence of the Scripture lesson-books introduced into our State-school curriculum, and trusts that no delay will occur in forwarding these books to all the schools of the State."

(The West Moreton Synod represents a country district where there are many one-roomed schools, and where if there were any danger of proselytism it very quickly would be felt. The resolution being passed within the first year's restoration of religious instruction, after it being forbidden for thirty-three years, is evidence that neither the ministers' visits nor the Scripture lessons created any difficulty with an existing system.)

AUSTRALASIA.

The Australasian Methodist General Conference at Adelaide, in 1910, passed the following resolution:—

"That the Conference records its profound satisfaction at the result of the recent referendum in Queensland on the subject of Scripture lessons in State schools, and earnestly hopes that equal success may attend the similar efforts in the Dominion of New Zealand and in the Australasian States in which the Bible is excluded from primary education."

(This was the Conference which granted New Zealand independence. There were twenty-four representatives present from New Zealand—twelve ministers and twelve laymen.)

Extract from the Book of Methodist Laws and Regulations, 1908, section 7, page 101, paragraph 441:—

"The Conference urges all people in those States where Bible-reading has been excluded from the State schools to give any movement for its reintroduction their warmest support."

(This resolution of 1908 is old and long-standing from previous Conferences. It spells unreserved approval of the Australian system, as it was the only system of Bible-reading in operation. In 1908 the Queensland movement was at its height, and the Victorian movement well to the front. Thus Conference urged, as it had urged for many years, the support of these move-

ments which included Scripture readings and ministers' visits as inherent parts of the Australian system, which moreover is the system to which the Methodist Church in Australasia has committed itself.)

Under the basis of union between the Methodist and Primitive Methodist Churches of New Zealand, endorsed by the Conference of both Churches last year, section 14, clause 1, reads: "The laws and regulations of the Methodist Church, with all alterations and amendments necessary to bring them into harmony with the provisions of this basis of union, shall be the laws and regulations of the United Church."

APPENDIX B.

Submitted by Rev. Canon D. J. GARLAND, representing the Bible in Schools League.

EVIDENCE FROM VARIOUS SOURCES.

JEWISH OPINION.

Extract from Department of Public Instruction, New South Wales, Conference of Inspectors, Teachers, Departmental Officers, and Prominent Educationists.

Held Tuesday, 5th April, 1904, and following days (page 94, Conference Report).

Mr. Cohen, B.A. (teacher, Hebrew School).—I believe I am the first speaker on this subject who cannot claim to be a clergyman. I am a layman, but I have had seventeen years' experience in the public schools of this city as a religious teacher, and I am very happy indeed to have the opportunity, by the kind permission of the Minister of Public Instruction, to express my satisfaction—and, of course, the satisfaction of my community—with the opportunities afforded us, such a small item in the general community, to give religious instruction from our own point of view in your noble schools. I am very happy indeed to have the opportunity of expressing our thanks to the Government and the teachers for the facilities afforded us. Mr. MacIntyre said that all civic, ethic, and moral teaching must be founded on Christianity. I wish to say that Christianity itself is founded on the Bible. The Old Testament teachings are fundamentally the same as those of the New. The ethical, civic, and moral teachings are identical. What do we teach? We teach the love of God, the love of our fellow-creatures, the love of the country that gives us protection; kindness to animals; honesty and truthfulness; cleanliness of mind, food, and houses; obedience to parents, teachers, and the laws of our country; reverence to the aged; and never to do to others what you would not have others do to you. For seventeen years I have had the happiness of teaching in various schools where our children "most do congregate" in this city, and I am delighted to be able to say that my work has been rendered easy, happy, and comfortable by the assistance of all you teachers. I am happy to say that we can confidently place any of our children under your instruction without having any of our religious susceptibilities hurt in any way. More than this, you afford us opportunities of teaching an Oriental language, which we consider necessary for the maintenance of our religion. You give us an opportunity of teaching Hebrew, in order that they may be able to read the Bible in the original, and pray in the language of our fathers. There is no restriction placed upon us—you give us the opportunities and the time and the space we require, and every help in your power. What reason have I, therefore, to do otherwise than support by every means in my power your system as it stands? Still more, we have to thank this particular Government, who allow us to take our children away for sometimes two hours in the week to our own Synagogue schools, in order to give them special instruction there.

Some twenty years ago we had in this city a denominational school. Well, we found by experience that the system of education introduced by Sir Henry Parkes, and the general facilities afforded by your public schools, satisfied us more than anything we could hope to produce in our denominational school, where we had to teach every subject. I believe the next subject to be discussed is the syllabus, and I consider I should not be doing my duty if I took up a moment of your time from that important matter. The time is so short and the work so great that I think I ought to say nothing more, with, perhaps, one exception, and that has nothing to do with religious instruction. I hope that the Conference will find it advisable to curtail, or rather abolish, in the primary schools the teaching of Latin grammar. The children leave at an average age of fourteen, and we find them with a very slight knowledge of the declensions of nouns, and perhaps of the conjugation of a regular verb. I would advocate that subjects of exact science should be substituted for that. I trust, finally, that you will find it convenient and necessary for the welfare of this State to continue the system of imparting religious instruction as it now stands.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, CANADA, AND SOUTH AFRICA.

Fuller information and details as to religious instruction in the world's educational system, which will be found in two volumes, "Moral Instruction and Training in Schools," by Professor M. E. Sadler (Longmans and Co., 1908), and which I recommend to those who wish to study the subject.

Great Britain.

In Great Britain religious instruction is regularly given in school hours, and the objection to any children attending such instruction is one of theory, not of practice. Few are withheld from such instruction—a percentage certainly not worth recording.

Under the London School Board religious instruction is given for half an hour every day, but it has been recently resolved that a thorough and detailed examination in Scripture knowledge should be held in each school once in three years, conducted by the Board's Inspectors. (Education Offices, Victoria Embankment, London W.C.)

In Birmingham, the original home of purely secular instruction, the Bible was for some years excluded by the Board from their schools, but it has since been reintroduced, and is now read daily.

Edinburgh: Information supplied by the Edinburgh School Board, dated 31st March, 1914:—

"By the Education (Scotland) Act, 1872, School Boards in Scotland are empowered to provide religious instruction for the pupils in attendance at the public schools; but all parents are entitled to withdraw their children from such instruction, wholly or in part, if they so desire. The Act further provides that such instruction must be given either at the beginning or end of the day's work, and that the pupils are not to be examined in this subject by the Government Inspectors. As nothing is said in the Act as to the nature of the instruction, School Boards are at liberty to provide such instruction as they think fit, or to dispense with it entirely. Religious instruction of some kind is, however, universal in Scottish public schools at present.

"In the Edinburgh schools instruction is given in accordance with the enclosed syllabus, no books being used beyond the Bible and the Shorter Catechism, and all classes are regularly examined by an Inspector appointed by the Board. Last session some fifteen hundred children, or 3·8 per cent. of the whole number in attendance, were withdrawn wholly or partially from religious instruction. No clergymen attend the schools for the purpose of giving instruction to the scholars of their particular denomination.

"Replies received from the Edinburgh School Board in 1906 in response to an inquiry circular:—

"Is the Bible read in your public or national schools attended by scholars aged from six years or fourteen years? If so—

"(1.) Is it optional or compulsory?—Optional.
"(2.) How many years has it been read in the schools?—Thirty-four years.
"(3.) Has it created friction or dissent with the parents or with religious sects?—No.
"(4.) Do you use text-books, the whole Bible, or selected portions of the Bible?—See syllabus enclosed.
"(5.) What time is devoted to religious instruction?—About thirty minutes per day.
"(6.) Do the teachers give any instruction during the Bible lessons, or are there any other religious exercises beyond simple Bible-reading?—See syllabus enclosed.
"(7.) Do parents provide the Bibles?—Generally provided by parents, occasionally by Board.
"(8.) Are they revised or the old version?—Old.
"(9.) Are the people as a whole satisfied with your present system?—Yes.
"(10.) Have you a conscience clause for teachers?—No.
"(11.) Have you a conscience clause for scholars, and is it taken advantage of?—Yes; yes.
"(12.) Is there any difficulty with Roman Catholics and secularists who are teachers?—No.

"Religious instruction has always been given in our schools, and no difficulty has been experienced in connection therewith."

(School Board Offices: Castle Terrace, Edinburgh.)

Glasgow: Extract from School Board of Glasgow Regulations regarding religious instruction in schools (October, 1897, and December, 1904):—

"Religious instruction shall begin with praise and prayer each morning at 9.15, and shall be continued till 10 o'clock. One written examination of all pupils in Standard V and upwards who have been securing religious instruction shall be held once a year. The Board provides a syllabus of lessons. The objects aimed at are: To secure that during their attendance at school the children shall be made acquainted with the contents of Holy Scripture and the cardinal truths of the Christian faith. In the memory lessons prominence is given to precepts and sayings in the Book of Proverbs and the Commandments, as well as other Scripture passages."

Another report states that—

"The Bible (old version) has always been taught in the Board schools of Glasgow, and there has been no difficulty. The people are satisfied with the system. There is no conscience clause for teachers. Scholars are exempted from attendance at religious instruction if they desire exemption, but comparatively few of such requests are made."

(School Board Offices: 129 Bath Street, Glasgow.)

Ireland.

Extract from Religious Instruction Rules and Regulations of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 1912, 1913, page 8:—

Clause 20: Opportunities must be afforded to the pupils of all schools for receiving such religious instruction as their parents or guardians approve.

Clause 21: Religious instruction must be so arranged—(*a*) that each school shall be open to children of all communions for combined literary and moral instruction; (*b*) that in respect of religious instruction due regard shall be had to parental right and authority, and accordingly that no child shall receive, or be present at, any religious instruction which his parents or guardians disapprove; and (*c*) that the time for giving religious instruction shall be so fixed that no child shall be thereby in effect excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords.

Clause 25: In vested schools such pastors or other persons as shall be approved by the parents or guardians of the children must have access to them in the schoolroom for the purpose of giving them religious instruction there. The times appointed for such instruction should not interfere unduly with the other arrangements of the school.

Clause 27: (*a.*) The patrons and managers of all national schools have the right to permit the Holy Scriptures, either in the "Authorized" or "Douai" version, to be read at the time or times set apart for religious instruction. (*b.*) And in all vested schools the parents or guardians of the children have the right to require the patrons and local managers to afford opportunities for the reading of the Holy Scriptures in the schoolroom under proper persons approved by the parents or guardians for that purpose.

Clause 28: The reading of the Holy Scriptures, either in the "Authorized" or "Douai" version, the teaching of the catechisms, public prayer, and all other religious exercises come within the rules of religious instruction.

Clause 29: (*a.*) Religious instruction, prayer, or other religious exercises may take place before and after the ordinary school business (during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend); and may take place at one intermediate time between the commencement and the close of the ordinary school business. (*b.*) No arrangement, however, can be sanctioned for religious instruction, prayer, or other religious exercises at an intermediate time in cases where it shall appear that such arrangement will interfere with the usefulness of the school by preventing children of any religious denomination from availing themselves of its advantages or by subjecting those in attendance to any inconvenience.

Clause 35: (*a*) No pupil who is registered by his or her parents or guardians as a Protestant can be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in case the teacher giving such instruction is a Roman Catholic; and (*b*) no pupil who is registered by his or her parents or guardians as a Roman Catholic can be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of religious instruction in case the teacher giving such instruction is not a Roman Catholic; (*c*) and, further, no pupil can be permitted to remain in attendance during the time of any religious instruction to which his or her parents or guardians object: (*d*) Provided, however, that in case any parent or guardian shall express a desire that the child should receive any particular religious instruction, and shall record such desire in the certificate-book provided for that purpose in the school, this prohibition shall not apply to the time during which such religious instruction only is given. (*e.*) The parent (the father, if possible) or guardian must append his name or mark to the entry in the book, and the signing of this certificate must in all cases be the spontaneous act of the parent or the guardian of the pupil. (*f.*) The certificate-book must not be removed from the schoolroom, and should be submitted to the Inspector whenever he visits the school.

As some doubts have arisen as to the interpretation of the rule attention is requested to the following note:—

"The object of the rule is more fully to carry out the general principle of the Commissioners that no child should receive any religious instruction contrary to the wishes of his parent. Accordingly the rule first provides for the case where the teacher is a Protestant and the child a Roman Catholic, or *vice versa*. In this case the dissent of the parent is implied, and no religious instruction can be given to a child by a teacher of the different creed unless the parent expressly requests it. But where the teacher and the child are both Protestants, whether of the same denomination or of different denominations, the dissent of the parent is not implied. In this case religious instruction in the Holy Scriptures or in his own catechism may be given to the child unless the parent expressly forbids it. In each case, however, the assent or dissent, whether implied or expressed, may be modified by an entry duly signed by the parent in the certificate-book of religious instruction; but no pupil should be permitted to be present whilst instruction is given in the catechism of a different persuasion from his or her own without the express sanction of his or her parent or guardian written on the form provided."

Canada.

Ontario Province (Population in 1911, 2,519,902).—Religious-instruction Regulations, Toronto, 1907:—

Clause 97: Every public and high school shall be opened with the Lord's Prayer and closed with the reading of the Scriptures and the Lord's Prayer or the prayer authorized by the Department of Education. When a teacher claims to have conscientious scruples in regard to opening and closing of the school as herein prescribed he shall notify the (school) trustees to that effect in writing, and it shall be the duty of the trustees to make such provision in the premises as they may deem expedient.

Clause 98: The Scriptures shall be read daily and systematically; the portions used may be taken from the book of selections adopted by the Department for that purpose or from the Bible, as the trustees by resolution may direct. Trustees may also order the reading of the Bible or the authorized Scripture selections by both pupils and teachers at the opening and closing of the school, and repeating of the Ten Commandments at least once a week.

Clause 99: No pupil shall be required to take part in any religious exercises objected to by his parents or guardians.

Clause 100: The clergy of any denomination, or their authorized representatives, shall have the right to give religious instruction to the pupils of their own Church, in each schoolhouse, at least once a week after the hour of closing the school in the afternoon.

NOTE.—A book of Scripture readings or selections is authorized for use in the high and public schools of Ontario Province.

Quebec Province (Population in 1911, 2,000,697).—Copy of letter received from the Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction, Quebec:—

"This province is classified for school purposes as Catholics and Protestants, the Protestants being in round numbers one-eighth of the whole. Without descending to details, I should say further that our schools are organized separately, both Roman Catholic and Protestant schools being State schools. The Roman Catholic schools are supported by taxation of the Roman Catholic property-holders and by Government grants, and Protestant education is similarly supported. The Government grants are divided between these two classes according to population. In all Roman Catholic schools religious instruction is given in a purely denominational way, the catechism being taught and the children generally being instructed sufficiently to enable them to be confirmed. Whenever Protestant children attend Roman Catholic schools they are excused from religious instruction and exercises.

"The Protestant schools are undenominational, and the following answers to your questions apply to them alone: The Bible is read compulsorily in our Protestant public schools always as a matter of practice, and probably twenty-five years as a matter of regulation. No friction or dissent with the parents or other religious sects has been created. Selected portions of the Bible are used, but they are read from the whole Bible. Half an hour a day is devoted to opening exercises and religious exercises, &c. Teachers give instruction during the Bible lesson. Parents provide the Bible. The old version is generally used. The people as a whole are satisfied with the present system. The State makes grants to denominational schools as explained above. It should be noticed, however, that although we have Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and other Protestant bodies we have no separate denominational schools for them. They unite under the term "Protestant." The Roman Catholics are seven times as numerous as the non-Catholics or Protestants. There is no conscience clause for teachers. Strictly speaking, there is no conscience clause for scholars, but rather one for parents—that is to say, no child is obliged to follow any religious instruction or to take part in religious exercises objected to by his parents in writing. This conscience clause is practically never taken advantage of. In the few cases in which Protestant children attend Roman Catholic schools, *or vice versa*, it is always observed. There is no difficulty with Roman Catholics who are teachers, and as for secularists, they are entirely unknown as such. Roman Catholic teachers only are employed in Roman Catholic schools, and Protestant teachers only in Protestant schools. Before qualifying as teachers they must produce certificates of character signed by the minister of the congregation to which they belong and by two members of a School Board. As an illustration of the harmony that exists between the different Protestant bodies I should like to mention the interesting fact that when this course of Bible instruction was brought before the Protestant Committee of the Council of Public Instruction for approval it was moved by the principal of the Wesleyan Methodist College and seconded by the minister of the Presbyterian Church here in Quebec that the course be adopted after being amended by the insertion of the Apostles' Creed in the memoriter work. The Anglicans were willing that it should form part of the course of study, but declined to suggest it themselves."

New Brunswick Province.—Regulations, 1913:—

22. It shall be the privilege of every teacher to open and close the daily exercises of the school by reading a portion of Scripture (out of the common or Douai version, as he may prefer), and by offering the Lord's Prayer. But no teacher shall compel any pupil to be present at these exercises against the wish of his parent or guardian, expressed in writing to the Board of (school) Trustees.

Replies to inquiry circular: "The Bible has been read in the schools for thirty years; it has not created friction or dissent with parents or religious sects. The whole Bible is used. No instruction is given—simple reading of a chapter without comment. The people are as a whole satisfied with the present system. There are no denominational grants to schools."

Saskatchewan Province (Population, 492,432).—The local Boards may permit religious instruction in schools. The following is a copy of the clauses of the School Ordinance relating to religious instruction in schools of the Province of Saskatchewan:—

"No religious instruction except as hereinafter provided shall be permitted in the school of any district from the opening of such school until one half-hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction permitted or desired by the Board may be given. It shall, however, be permissible for the Board of any district to direct that the school be opened by the recitation of the Lord's Prayer. Any child shall have the privilege of leaving the schoolroom at the time at which religious instruction is commenced as provided for in the next preceding section or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction that may be given if the parents or guardians so desire."

Alberta Province (Population, 374,663).—"The School Ordinance and Regulations do not provide for religious teaching, nor is such permitted except during the last half-hour of each school day. If the School Board so desires it may direct that certain religious teaching may be given during that half-hour. When such teaching is given any child whose parents or guardians so desire has the privilege of leaving the schoolroom or of remaining without taking part in any religious instruction."

British Columbia Province (Population, 392,480).—"The Lord's Prayer may be repeated at the opening of the schools."

Manitoba Province Public Schools Act (Clauses 247 to 257).—"Religious exercises in public schools shall be conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board. . . . Such religious exercises shall take place just before the closing-hour in the afternoon. If the parent or guardian of any pupil notifies the teacher that he does not wish such pupil to attend such exercises then such pupil shall be dismissed before such exercises shall take place. Such religious

teaching shall take place . . . and shall be conducted by any Christian clergyman . . . or by any person duly authorized by such clergyman, or by a teacher when so authorized. . . . Where the schoolroom accommodation at the disposal of the [school] trustees permits, instead of allotting different days of the week to different denominations for the purpose of religious teaching, the pupils may be separated when the hour for religious teaching arrives and placed in different rooms."

South Africa.

Natal Province.—"In all Government schools the daily session shall be opened with prayer, and not less than one hour and a half each week shall be devoted to the reading of the Bible, with simple and unsectarian explanations of the text, but any scholar may be withdrawn by his or her parent or guardian from such instruction without forfeiting any of the other benefits of the school. . . . All children who are required to attend special services held by their respective denominations may be exempted from attendance and marked as 'present.'"

The Education Department supply a syllabus of Scripture-reading to be used. Scholars learn the Lord's Prayer, Psalm xxiii, and the Ten Commandments.

"The map of Palestine should be freely used; and a few dates should be learnt, so that the children may have some idea of the order in which the personages occur and time elapsing between individuals. The stories should, as far as possible, be read in the Bible itself by the children themselves, the teacher giving such instruction only as is necessary for explanation of the text."

Transvaal Province.—Regulations, 1907, 1908, 1909:—

"The school day shall begin with prayer and the reading of a portion of the Bible. . . . There is a conscience clause for scholars, but none for teachers."

The question of drawing up a syllabus of instruction in Bible history was referred to a committee of clergymen. These gentlemen have come to the conclusion that the syllabus adopted in the London (England) County Council schools could not be improved upon. Scholars learn the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, Psalm xxiii, St. Matthew v, 1–12; St. Matthew xxiii, 35–40; Psalm cxxi, and other portions.

COUNTRIES UNDER BRITISH CONTROL.

India.

The Mysore Government has adopted a scheme for the introduction of moral and religious instruction in the State schools and colleges, by which Hindu, Mohammedan, or Christian pupils may be taught in their respective religions, provided their number is not less than twenty in each case.

Egypt.

Nine-tenths of the population of Egypt are Moslem. In Government schools one hour a day, or five hours a week, are required for studies in the Koran. The teachers are Moslem. Scholars are taught the necessity of religion to man.

VICTORIA.

(Regulations, 1905, p. 52, Nos. 362 to 370.)

Regulation XX.—Religious Instruction in State Schools.

1. (*a.*) With the view of affording facilities for giving religious instruction in State schools by persons other than State-school teachers, half an hour may be set apart for the purpose on one or two school days in each week. The time for such instruction when, with the approval of the Minister, it is to be given in the morning shall be from 9.15 to 9.45 a.m. When by direction of the Board of Advice and with the approval of the Minister such instruction is to be given in the afternoon the time shall be from 3.30 to 4 p.m. where the afternoon meeting begins at 1.30 p.m., and from 3.15 to 3.45 p.m. where the afternoon meeting begins at 1.15 p.m.

(*b.*) Notwithstanding anything contained in Regulation XIII, in schools in which religious instruction is given in the afternoon the afternoon meeting shall begin on days on which such instruction is given at such an hour as will allow of not less than two hours being devoted to secular instruction before the time fixed for religious instruction.

2. No child will be required to attend for religious instruction unless his parent or guardian has signified in writing his willingness to allow his child to receive such instruction.

3. During the time when religious instruction is given in any school no secular instruction shall be given to children not attending the classes for religious instruction.

4. On days of inclement weather the religious instruction, unless it is given during the last half-hour of the afternoon meeting, shall be omitted in schools in which there is no adequate outdoor shelter for the children and the accommodation is not such as to admit of the children who do not receive religious instruction being drafted into rooms other than those in which such instruction is being given.

Instructions.

Whenever a proposal to give religious instruction is made to the head teacher of a school he should suggest to the proposers that the application in the matter should be addressed, if the instruction is to be given before the morning meeting (*i.e.*, from 9.15 to 9.45 a.m.), to the Minister of Public Instruction, or, if after the afternoon meeting, to the Board of Advice for the district in the first instance. In any case the head teacher should at once report the matter to the Department, giving the following information: (1) The names of the voluntary teachers

and the name of the organization under which the work is to be carried out; (2) the days and hours of instruction proposed; (3) any other information it may appear advisable to furnish.

Teachers should exercise the greatest care and vigilance in carrying out the direction in clause 2 of the above regulation, that "no child will be required to attend for religious instruction unless his parent or guardian has signified in writing his willingness to allow his child to receive such instruction. Teachers are required to give out when requested such printed forms as may be sanctioned by the Minister to enable parents to signify their willingness that their children shall receive religious instruction. The forms on which parents have signified their willingness should be carefully preserved for production if required. Under no circumstances are any forms which have not received the Minister's sanction to be used. The head teacher must keep a record of the names of all children whose parents have signified in writing that they wish their children to receive the instruction, and should furnish the person giving the instruction with a copy of such list. When religious instruction is given before the commencement of the morning meeting teachers should assemble the children receiving such instruction and march them into the room or rooms set apart for them. Teachers should ascertain and keep a record of the number of children actually present at the lesson on each day on which the instruction is given, the length of the lessons, and the number of them given and omitted.

Visitors to New Zealand.

The Hon. H. Holman, Premier, New South Wales.

The following extracts give the opinion of Mr. Holman: It will be noted that his opinion having been questioned, he cabled to the Director of Education, and published the latter's reply as the authoritative statement of the position in New South Wales. The authoritative statement thus finally issued by Mr. Holman states that ministers were permitted to give religious instruction, that as part of the regular curriculum Bible stories were given and lessons read, that the measure of abstention was very small, there being practically no objections except from Roman Catholics.

"Mr. Holman was emphatic as to the general approval given to the Bible-in-State-schools system in vogue in New South Wales. 'Our system of education has been overhauled time and again,' he said. 'Practically nothing has escaped, but in all these remodelling processes the Bible instruction has stood untouched. If there is one thing which everybody takes for granted in New South Wales it is the Bible-in-State-schools system.'"—*Auckland Herald*, 10th February, 1914.

"A statement has been published elsewhere that the Hon. W. A. Holman, Premier of New South Wales, now on a visit to Auckland, gave expression to the remark, 'If there is one thing everybody takes for granted in New South Wales it is the Bible-in-State-schools system.' This, Mr. Holman explained to a *Star* representative this morning, is incorrect. The educational system in New South Wales is entirely secular, though provision is made for voluntary religious instruction if desired. Owing to some misunderstanding he had been made to say that the Bible-in-schools system obtained in New South Wales, whereas the reverse was the case."—*Auckland Star*, 10th February, 1914.

"Fear has been expressed by the Premier of New South Wales that his remarks concerning the Bible-in-State-schools question may be misinterpreted by some people. He wishes it to be understood clearly that the solution of the difficulty that has been allowed to stand unchallenged in New South Wales is that of allowing clergy to hold classes out of school-hours. These classes are attended only by the children of parents who desire their offspring to be given such instruction."—*Auckland Herald*, 11th February, 1914.

Mr. Holman's Final Statement.—"A copy of the above* letter was referred to the Hon. W. A. Holman this morning. The New South Wales Premier said that he had already been approached on the same subject by Dr. Averill (Anglican Bishop of Auckland). In particular Dr. Averill wished to know whether or not for the past forty years or more State-school teachers in New South Wales had given in the ordinary course of the school curriculum and in school-hours Bible lessons from text-books approved by the Education Department to all children whose parents did not take advantage of a conscience clause; whether the number of withdrawals of children under that class was practically a negligible quantity, and whether ministers of all denominations had during that period exercised the right given them by law of going into the State schools during school-hours for the purpose of giving definite religious instruction to the children of their own Church. On receiving the Bishop's letter Mr. Holman immediately cabled to the Director of Education at Sydney for specific information upon the question raised. In reply to Mr. Holman's cablegram the Director of Education at Sydney stated that ministers were permitted to give religious instruction during school-hours for not more than one hour each day. As part of the regular curriculum Bible stories were given to junior pupils, and lessons were read by senior pupils from the Irish National School Board Old and New Testament Readers. No religious instruction was given if parents objected, but the measure of abstention was very small, there being practically no objections except from Roman Catholics."—*Auckland Herald*, 13th February, 1914.

The Hon. Digby Denham, Premier of Queensland.

In addition to Mr. Denham's official letter printed later on giving his reply to the Roman Catholic Archbishop, Mr. Denham, when in Auckland, June, 1914, gave a statement to the newspapers as follows:—

"Personally I voted against the introduction of Bible-reading in State schools. I am a Free Church man, and inherently have an objection to what is called State aid. It seemed to

* A letter in the *Herald* dealing with Mr. Holman's statements.

me that this was an incipient form of State aid, and on this account I opposed it. When the referenda had been taken I was a member of the Administration that passed the Bill giving effect to the decision of the people. Now, as a result of all I have seen and of inquiries I have made, I am prepared to say that if the opportunity came to me again I should vote for the introduction of Bible-reading instead of opposing it, as I did on a former occasion."

This statement was subsequently challenged by opponents on the ground that Mr. Denham had voted for the introduction of Bible-reading at every division taken, reference being made to *Hansard*, 1910. It ought not to be necessary to point out that the votes referred to in *Hansard*, 1910, are votes on the Bill introducing religious instruction after the referendum had been carried. Mr. Denham, in speaking of his own personal vote against Bible in schools, referred to his vote at the ballot-box, where on the referendum he had voted against the proposal; but as a member of the Cabinet he supported the principle of giving effect to the will of the people, though it differed from his own opinion.

On his attention being drawn to the statement of opponents that *Hansard* reported that he had voted for religious instruction, he cabled on the 16th June, 1914 (see *Dominion* of that date)—"I opposed religious instruction in State schools as private individual, and voted 'No' at the ballot-box; but as Minister voted for the Bill, thus giving effect to the will of the people. From official information and personal observation am satisfied with working of Act."

Mr. Denham is an illustration of a case of one converted by actual experience. He had originally inherent objections to the proposal, and actually voted "No" at the ballot-box, but declares, as a result of his official and personal experience, that if the opportunity came to him again he would vote at the ballot-box for the introduction of Bible-reading instead of opposing it. The testimony of Mr. Denham as a one-time opponent is all the more valuable.

The Hon. A. H. Barlow, ex Minister of Education, Queensland.

The Hon. A. H. Barlow, who was six years Minister of Education in Queensland, was asked to give his opinion on the subject of the Bible in schools as likely to interest people in the Dominion, and is reported in the *Dominion*, 20th February, 1913, as follows:—

Mr. Barlow said, "There was a great deal of discussion about the merits of the case, and we had a very stormy time in Parliament getting the Bill through, as I remember very well, having been the Minister in charge of the Bill. In the Upper House the opposition was very determined from a certain quarter, but the Act finally passed with a two-to-one majority. This was in 1910."

"What has been the result since?—So far as I know no trouble has arisen in connection with religious instruction. I have heard no agitation against it. It runs smoothly, and there does not seem to have been any friction. Of course, it took a little time getting into working-order, but there has now been ample time to judge. As I have stated, one of the reasons why it works so smoothly is that there is no compulsion about it, the conscience clause making the lessons entirely optional. Yet there are very few withdrawals so far as I know, except by the Roman Catholics in large centres. In small places where they have no schools of their own the conscience clause seems to satisfy them. There was no attempt in the subsequent session of Parliament to create any agitation to repeal the Act.

"What about the State-aid aspect?—Religious instruction in State schools is not regarded as State aid to religion, but as lifting the barrier from the free exercise of religious liberty. There has been no increase in our educational votes in Parliament in consequence of the Religious Instruction Act. The expense of providing the reading-books has been comparatively trifling. The definite religious teaching given by the ministers of religion or the substitutes is paid for by their Churches, and the official instruction given by the teachers from the reading-books is of a character which cannot be reasonably objected to by any person who professes even the faintest form of Christianity. All the State has to do is to open the door to these accredited teachers (some of whom are laymen and women). My own opinion is that this Act has made State aid to denominational schools more unlikely than ever.

"But there is no claim for endowment?—Of course there is. The Roman Catholics, as always hitherto, are pressing for that, but this is nothing new. They were doing that during the thirty-three years we were without religious teaching in the schools on the ground that the schools had no religion. They now object because the schools have religion.

"What is the teachers' point of view?—As a member of the Cabinet I should have been sure to have heard if there had been any serious objection on the part of the teachers. I never officially heard a single complaint, neither do I believe there has been one from a solitary teacher in the whole of Queensland, nor in their conferences and association meetings has any hostile resolution been passed. The parents, even when not themselves religiously inclined, do not evince any disapproval of their children having religious instruction, excepting in the case of the few persons who hold secularistic views."

Mr. James Allan, M.L.A., Brisbane.

Mr. Allan stated in the *Nelson Mail*, 24th November, 1913,—

"Prior to 1910 State education in Queensland was secular. Under the old Act instruction could be given by representatives of religious bodies, under certain conditions, before or after school-hours; but this was practically unworkable and became a dead-letter. For some years later there was a latent growing feeling that the system was defective. The Roman Catholics, whose percentage number is nearly twice as many as in New Zealand, gave practical expression to their dissatisfaction by building schools of their own in all the chief centres. It was realized by the majority of the other Churches that a complete education must include

something more than mere secularism. The Bible in State Schools League was formed, and under a special Act of Parliament, passed with few dissentients, the question was referred to the people by a referendum, taken on the same day as the Federal general election in April, 1910. At that election the Labour party returned all the Senators and a majority of the representatives in the nine Federal electorates. The same electors carried the Bible-in-schools referendum by a majority of over seventeen thousand. In the following session the State Government brought in a Bill giving effect to the expressed wish of the people. It provided for a text-book, containing selected portions of Scripture, including the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes, and other portions, containing the essentials of the ethics of our common Christianity, reference to which is interwoven in our literature and art. The text-book is read by the scholars, and simply explained by the teacher. In addition to this, a certain time during school hours is set aside for religious teaching by clergymen or other authorized teachers, and the conscience clause exempted children whose parents may object to such teaching. The Bill met with strong opposition in both Houses. It was asserted that it would stir up strife and bitterness, and many other evils; but it has been shown after two years' practical experience that all these fears were imaginary and groundless. The system introduced is the same as in New South Wales, Tasmania, and Western Australia; but the Queensland text-book is slightly different in the selection of portions of Scripture."

Mr. Peet, a Visitor to New Zealand from West Australia.

"Mr. John T. Peet, of Perth, West Australia, has been passing through New Zealand on a holiday trip. Mr. Peet was formerly Government Land Agent for West Australia, and is now the head of a leading land-agency business. He is an active member of the Congregational Church in the City of Perth. Mr. Peet was asked whether he had any testimony to give as to the way in which the Bible-in-schools system works in his State. In reply Mr. Peet stated that he had resided in West Australia for nineteen years, covering, therefore, the whole period since that system had been introduced. He could therefore speak with full knowledge, and he declared that the Bible-in-schools system works smoothly in that State, and appears to give general satisfaction. He has never heard of any hitch. Ministers of all denominations take advantage of the system to visit the schools and give the lessons. The Congregational minister in Perth does this. There has never been any attempt to upset or vary the system. No such attempt would have the slightest chance of success. Even the Roman Catholics do not actively oppose the system, and there is no campaign against it by letters to the Press or otherwise. Mr. Peet said finally that he had been much surprised to learn that there were some ministers and members of the Congregational Church and certain other Churches who were actively opposing the scheme. It seemed to him that these people were doing a very wrong thing in using their influence to keep the Bible out of the schools of the land."—*Dominion*, 21st March, 1914.

Mr. J. H. Stanley, of Darling Downs, Queensland.

"Mr. J. H. Stanley, of the Darling Downs, a prominent squatter in Queensland, passing through Christchurch the other day, said, in reply to one of our reporters, that after a close experience of the working of the Bible in State Schools Act in Queensland no one could have any hesitation in saying that it is one of the best measures that has ever been passed in that State. And at the outset a high tribute of praise must be rendered to Canon Garland, the organizing secretary, who did yeoman work in the face of much opposition; but, aided by a gallant band of co-operators drawn from many denominations, the League succeeded in making its voice heard, and as a result of a referendum the people gave an overwhelming decision in favour of Bible-teaching in the State schools, and if to-day a referendum were taken for a repeal of the Act it would certainly be rejected by a very large majority. Of course, the detractors of the League prophesied all sorts of evil things—it would lead to friction between clergy and the teachers, it would lead to friction with parents, and probably a godless teacher would sneer at the lessons he was obliged to impart. As a matter of fact it works automatically and smoothly, and there is no friction whatever. As to the last objection, it is too absurd for consideration. No teacher would be so foolish as to make exceptions before his scholars of the various lessons for the day. He would know perfectly well that if he imparted, shall we say, a history lesson with all earnestness to the children, and shortly afterwards gave them a Scriptural lesson with flippancy and indifference, he would soon lose all control over the school. It is well to know that not a single teacher has made any objection to the new system. Of course, if a parent wants a godless child no difficulties are placed in the way, or if any particular creed is desired the remedy is quite simple. The child need not attend the lesson given by the clergyman, and the parent can impart his particular creed to the child at home (and one can imagine him doing so), or for the matter of that a parent can no doubt obtain a permit from the Department to enter the school and give instruction direct to the child. A well-known atheist, on being questioned why he sent his children to a clergyman for Bible instruction, said, 'I may not believe in it at all, and deeply do I regret that I cannot, but at any rate I will give my children a chance.' Reasonably the State may say the same. With the experience of Queensland as a guide the New Zealand Government should have little hesitation in adopting this system. If it were a plunge in the dark one might hesitate, but it is not so, and, furthermore, no objections can be brought against the system.

"So far the League has kept away from politics, but should it become an election cry, query if any Government, unpledged, could stand against the vote. Many electors are probably indifferent, and prefer to leave well alone, so long as they are not asked a direct question; but if at an election they are asked the simple question, 'Do you or do you not approve of the Bible

in State schools?' the majority are not prepared to have it on their consciences that they gave a negative answer.''—Christchurch *Press*, 15th June, 1914.

FROM HIS WORSHIP MR. J. H. PROWSE, MAYOR OF PERTH (A PROMINENT METHODIST).

"I have made inquiries of those well acquainted with the operation of our educational system, which permits authorized religious teachers to enter our State schools and give instruction to the children belonging to the Church of which the religious teacher is a member. Religious instruction by ministers or other persons duly recognized is also permitted in the secondary State schools. I speak also of my own knowledge. I take a deep interest in educational matters, and my own children are receiving instruction in the State schools either elementary or secondary.

"(1.) No difficulties have been experienced through teachers who are personally out of sympathy with religious instruction.

"(2.) (*a.*) No difficulties have arisen with regard to ministers' right of entry. (*b.*) In certain cases ministers of what may be called the free Churches have arranged to combine classes. This occurs (i) when classes are too small unless combined; (ii) in some of the larger schools one minister would take, say, Class 1, another Class 2, &c. (*c.*) No difficulties have arisen through attempts at proselytizing.

"(3.) (*a.*) In a few cases Roman Catholics have given instruction in State schools, but only in a few. The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church is consistent. They have their own schools, and maintain them efficiently. The Inspectors of the Education Department inspect and examine Roman Catholic schools. This inspection was at the request of the Church authorities. (*b.*) In very few cases the Roman Catholic clergy have availed themselves of the privilege to enter State schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction to the children of their Church, and that only when Roman Catholic children were too far away from Roman Catholic schools to have the chance of attending. (*c.*) The State schools and the Roman Catholic schools work amicably side by side. There is no open antagonistic attitude.

"(4.) (*a.*) In the cities the State schools are regularly visited, as a rule. The English Church avail themselves very largely of the privilege. The Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches also avail themselves of the right of entry, as far as I can say, in the order named. These three Churches now and again combine classes for mutual help. (*b.*) In the country schools the English Church has greater opportunities of entering the schools, and to their honour they largely avail themselves of the privilege, and other Churches for obvious reasons cannot avail themselves so frequently of the permission, but many ministers of these Churches in the country do their best to carry out their duty.

"(5.) The Education Department, in their curriculum, specify certain work to be done under the head 'Scripture and Moral Lessons,' and this is an integral part of the curriculum as much as the work specified in reading or any other subject. The Inspectors examine the children in the work set down as Scripture in each class. The Act under which the Department works sets forth that 'secular instruction shall be held to include general religious teaching as distinguished from dogmatic or polemical theology.' To show the exact work specified I quote the curriculum of the Education Department for Standards I and VII as set out in 1908:—Standard I: Scripture and Moral Lessons—Simple stories from the Book of Genesis; simple lessons on the leading facts in the life of our Lord; the Lord's Prayer to be learnt; simple lessons on good manners and conduct, and laws of health. Standard VII: Scripture and Moral Lessons—Lessons from the Book of Kings and Chronicles; study of St. Matthew, Chapters v, vi, vii, xiii, and xxiii; learn Psalm xc and Hebrews i. Lessons on health, temperance, and conduct.

"(6.) The percentage of withdrawals from the general religious teaching by the teacher, as distinguished from the special religious instruction by ministers and others, is very small indeed.

"(7.) Children may be exempted from the general religious instruction in the school curriculum by notification in writing by the parent or guardian to the teacher of the school. Further, 'no pupil is to be required to receive special religious instruction (by ministers of religion) if the parent or guardian of such pupil objects in writing to such religious instruction being given.'

"(8.) There is not the slightest agitation to abolish or change the system; in fact, it is very popular, and, in my opinion—founded on observations and from conversation with many parents—any such attempt would be strenuously opposed.

"I might mention, in conclusion, that I myself was educated in the New South Wales State schools, and during my schooldays was not conscious of anything approaching sectarianism. The Scripture lessons were simply taught as history might be taught, and none of the children availed themselves of the right of withdrawal. I trace my knowledge of Scripture to these lessons more than to any other instruction I received."

ANOTHER VISITOR TO NEW ZEALAND.

Inspector Gripp, of the Queensland Education Department.

"The Bible-in-schools movement has a staunch supporter in Mr. W. L. Gripp, an Inspector of State Schools in Queensland. Mr. Gripp is at present on a holiday visit to New Zealand, and last night he gave some interesting views on the progress of the system as introduced in the Queensland schools some two years ago. 'Everything is working very smoothly indeed,' he said, 'and there has scarcely been one objection to the system. Exactly the same bogeys were raised in Queensland before the Bible was introduced into the schools as are being raised here. The main objection to it from the few teachers who objected was that to introduce Scripture lessons would be overloading the curriculum. But as soon as the system was introduced this bogey disappeared. Half an hour a week is devoted to lessons from the Bible by the teachers, and the clergymen are free to enter the schools for one hour weekly to teach their particular denomina-

tional religion. The children need not go if their parents do not wish them to; the system is purely voluntary, and any parent who does not wish his child to take part need only send the teacher a written objection and the child is given other work.' Referring to the Scripture reading-books that were being used in the Queensland schools, Mr. Gripp went on to say that these had been compiled by a committee consisting of representatives of all denominations, and there had been no objection to their contents from any sect. 'No; in my opinion,' concluded Mr. Gripp, 'all objections which can be raised to the introduction of the Bible into the schools would vanish as soon as the system got into working-order. I am in thorough sympathy with the movement. The effect of it in Queensland cannot yet be gauged, but I am convinced it will work only for the good of the people.' "—*New Zealand Herald*, 13th May, 1913.

"Mr. W. L. Gripp, one of the senior Inspectors in the Department of Public Instruction in Queensland, was the guest of a number of Wellington teachers at Godber's rooms last evening, when an informal discussion took place on the subject of Bible lessons in schools as they are conducted in Queensland, in which State such lessons have formed part of the school curriculum for the past two years. Mr. George Flux, headmaster of South Wellington School, presided, and, when introducing Mr. Gripp, explained that their visitor wished it to be understood that he did not wish to take up a partisan attitude one way or the other—he was prepared to state facts in regard to the operation of the system as he had observed it in his official position. Mr. Gripp then gave a short review of the system which had been adopted in Queensland as the result of the referendum which had been carried by popular vote. Under the system teachers were required to give from half an hour to one hour per week to the reading of the prescribed text-book, while the clergy of the respective denominations had the right of entry for the purpose of imparting religious instruction on another hour in each week. As a matter of convenience to the school routine it was usual, in the larger schools, for all the ministers to come at the same hour, and take their respective adherents to separate class-rooms. In the smaller schools, where the accommodation did not permit of such simultaneous instruction being given, different arrangements had, of course, to be made. From his own observation he could say that there had been practically no friction, and the influence of these lessons upon the ordinary work of the school—in regard to the time taken from the school week to meet the requirements of the Bible lessons and clergymen's visits—was not appreciable. The Roman Catholic Church was represented at the conference which framed the text-book, but beyond that took no interest in the school lessons.

"In reply to a question Mr. Gripp said that the school syllabus had not been modified when the Bible lessons were first introduced, but the Department was now preparing a new curriculum, lightening the ordinary school-work a little.

"Mr. W. T. Grundy (headmaster of the Clyde Quay School) inquired whether any of the teachers had suffered any disability on account of conscientious objections to their lessons.

"Mr. Gripp pointed out that the Education Department in Queensland was highly centralized, and all appointments were made by the Minister. The question of local influence in regard to appointments, therefore, was not affected. He was not prepared to say whether that question would be affected by the introduction of the system into New Zealand, where the control of the system was decentralized. With regard to the position of the school-children in their relation to the clergymen who visited the schools, he could safely say that there was no proselytizing—the parents decided what classes their children should attend. In reply to further questions by various teachers, Mr. Gripp pointed out that in Queensland the teachers were Civil servants, and, as such, were not permitted to criticize publicly the policy of the Department.

"Mr. C. Watson (headmaster of the Te Aro School), indicating the text-book, referred to the inclusion of certain matter having relation to the miraculous—a subject upon which fierce differences of opinion existed even within the Churches. How was a teacher to deal with that?

"Mr. Gripp: As it is in the book—just as it is there.

"Mr. Grundy remarked that it would be difficult to treat the text-book as the other subjects of the curriculum would be treated by an intelligent teacher with modern ideas. The present idea was to encourage the child to ask questions. If a child asked questions, how was a teacher to get over it?

"'I do not know how he would get over it,' said Mr. Gripp.

"'Refer the child to the minister?'

"Mr. Gripp agreed that that would relieve the teacher of the responsibility.

"After the discussion, refreshments were handed round, and the talk passed on to general topics."—*Dominion*, 23rd May, 1913.

A Business Visitor in New Zealand.

Mr. C. J. Garland, of Kalgoorlie, the representative of Albany, Bell (Limited), a large business firm in Western Australia, is in New Zealand on a holiday tour. Mr. Garland, interviewed by one of our reporters, expressed himself only too willing to give information about the working of the religious-instruction system in Western Australia. He said, "I am a member of the Church of Christ, though not one of its ministers, and speak from that point of view. Kalgoorlie and Boulder have a population running into many thousands, having for their main industry gold-mining. It is easy to imagine the various elements constituting such a crowd; but whatever else there may be divided opinions upon, the community as a whole is satisfied with the religious instruction in schools."

"What about ministers' visits, to which objection is taken by some in regard to the New Zealand proposals?—There is a Clerical Association of the free Churches on the goldfields, who arrange amicably together what schools to visit. My own experience is with my own minister, who has no difficulty whatever in doing all the work he can in that direction; in fact, he

approached me on one occasion to see whether I could take a turn in assisting him, seeing that the principal of the firm that I am associated with visits one of the schools in the metropolitan area of Perth; but pressure of business prevented me from complying with his request.

"Do you find that any friction occurs between the Clerical Association and the representatives of the Church of England?—As far as I know, none whatever; in fact, Archdeacon Collick, I know, has only been too willing to agree with my own minister, so that clashing of engagements does not take place.

"Do you know anything about the Scripture lessons given by the teachers?—Nothing of special detail, except that a month or two back a Presbyterian minister whom I know took pains to supply all the children desiring them with a pocket edition of the New Testament for use in school, for which he found there was a great demand. This is an example of the way in which ministers and teachers co-operate. The reason I say I do not know much of the details is because no one ever hears anything in the way of controversy or friction about teachers' lessons. So far as I know, every teacher gives the lessons, and I certainly never heard of any teacher, no matter of what faith or want of faith, raising any difficulty. The main thing I know is that the system is elastic, and the Bible gets into the school, which is the chief thing aimed at. Even if there were sometimes just a tendency to sectarian feeling, it is well worth the risk to get the Bible there, for I am a great believer in the Bible getting into the hands of the people, no matter through what avenue."

Mr. Garland said to our reporter, "I notice you have Canon Garland here. What is he doing?" To which our reporter replied, and asked if Mr. Garland was any relation of his namesake. "None whatever; but I remember some years ago in Perth Canon Garland was engaged in public life, and is still remembered there for his work in getting this system into the schools. I hope that my own Church here in New Zealand is heartily supporting the movement."

New-Zealanders' Inquiries in Australia.

Miss Wilson's Personal Inquiries in Sydney.

Sir,—

That deputation which recently waited upon the Prime Minister in protest against those who want to improve our national education should do what I did. While in Sydney last month I thought it a good opportunity to go to a State school to see with my own eyes and hear with my own ears how the system of Bible in schools works there. I first went to the Department of Public Instruction and saw Mr. Board, the Director of Education, who gave me a card of introduction to the head masters and mistresses of any school in Sydney. I chose the Darlinghurst School, as it was the closest to the place where I was staying. It is a large school with an attendance of about six hundred children, built in the most up-to-date and modern style; in fact, it is quite a model school, and not long ago was visited by an architect from New Zealand who wished to study the plan for future use in this country. I was kindly received by the headmaster and mistress, who took a great deal of trouble to make my visit interesting. I was allowed to hear five different classes instructed in Bible and in moral lessons. A Bible lesson on the journeys of St. Paul was given to the senior boys; it was taught with map and blackboard like an ordinary history or geography lesson, the boys first reading verse about from the Bible text-book. I had a talk with the headmistress of the same school, and she spoke most warmly of the good influence in school the visits of the clergy had on the children. I asked her if any of the children ever used the conscience clause, and she could only remember one girl who said her father did not wish her to attend Bible lessons. At my request the headmistress put her opinion into writing: "Throughout a service of over twenty years in the public schools of this State I have never found any evidence of friction due to our system of religious instruction and moral teaching." Before leaving I wrote my name in the visitors' book in the headmaster's private room. I noticed the visitors' list during June and July included the names of ministers of Methodist, Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational Churches, and Jewish Rabbi, &c. The headmaster also spoke warmly of the success of the system, and seemed surprised that we in New Zealand had not admitted the Bible into our schools. He wrote the following: "The special religious instruction at Darlinghurst works very smoothly. Ministers of all Protestant denominations attend regularly and give an hour's lesson once a week. They work harmoniously. The State Scripture-books are read under the guidance of the teachers, and lessons in civics and morals are also given by them."

I am, &c.,

Lethenty, Bull's. Nancy Wilson.

(*Press*, Christchurch, 30th August, 1913.)

Letters to an Auckland Citizen from Methodist Ministers.

Dear Mrs. Costello,— The Parsonage, Penrith, N.S.W., 12th August, 1914.

I received your letter this morning, and as you request hasten to answer it by return of post.

Well, it does seem strange that anybody should imagine that the splendid system of religious instruction in schools should tend to increase crime. It tends altogether the other way. Do not the New Zealand people know that the people who are fighting against the privilege of giving religious instruction are the people who furnish the increase in statistics of lawlessness, &c.? There are many contributing causes to criminality and wrongdoing. The Controller of Prisons the other day said there was an encouraging decrease in adult criminals, but an increase amongst youths of a certain age, and this he said was owing to the quality of the picture-shows and other like contributing causes. Not a word about ministers giving religious instruction. The fact is that the ale-house—intemperate parents who neglect their children—

and immoral pictures and literature are the real causes of the downfall of our boys, which would be much worse if it were not for the warnings and instruction they constantly receive in our public schools and Sunday schools. The criminal statistics show a very encouraging decrease according to the recent and last statement of the Controller of Prisons.

I regard my hour with the children every week of the utmost value to them and their future welfare, and I hope New Zealand may follow the noble lead in this matter of New South Wales.

With kind regards, yours in His service,

J. TARN, Methodist Minister.

DEAR MRS. COSTELLO,— Parramatta, N.S.W., 12th August, 1914.

Your letter is to hand. I hope you will have great success in the good work you are assisting. I notice your reference to the effects of Bible-teaching in schools as reported by one evidently not in sympathy with such teaching. Of course, you know that our system of education in public schools is claimed by us, and admitted by others, to be one of the best in the world. The facilities for religious teaching are just and liberal. It has been my duty, and I have always esteemed it a great privilege, to give religious instruction in the schools for forty-nine years in various circuits. During the whole of that time I have maintained the most harmonious relationship with the teachers; I have had from them the most hearty welcome and every assistance I needed in that long term of service. The children seemed to me to appreciate the Scripture class, and many of them showed a great improvement in Scriptural knowledge, and I have reason to believe that the effect of this teaching was for their good in after-years of their life. Our Act leaves very little to be desired, and if they could get one like it in New Zealand the way would at once be open for the Bible.

An objection: you say, "People are more degraded, and there are more convictions since our Bible was introduced." The writer has really said nothing. I question the statement altogether; but if there are more convictions there are four times as many people to select the convicts from. If so, then it is surprising that our gaols are becoming more empty every year.

With very kind regards, yours sincerely,

CHARLES JONES, Methodist Minister.

MRS. NIELD'S PERSONAL INQUIRIES IN NORFOLK ISLAND.

A little over three years ago I was on a visit to Norfolk Island. The school building there for the children of the islanders—that is, the descendants of the former Pitcairn Islanders—is situated in a central part of the island. One day I noticed Dr. Comins (of the Anglican Church), Mr. Smith (of the Methodist denomination), and Mr. Mitchell (Seventh Day Adventist minister) wending their way to the school buildings. On inquiry I was informed that on an appointed day of the week (or two days) these pastors of each Church respectively went to the school to give Bible instruction to such children as belonged to each Church. Had I understood at the time what a large question the "Bible in schools" is I would have looked into it more thoroughly. I thought at the time that the idea is certainly one that should do away with all prejudice, and one to commend itself to those who make it a matter of conscience not to have the Bible in the public schools. I understood afterwards that the usage in the Norfolk Island School of giving the Bible lessons was, or rather is, known as the New South Wales system. In Norfolk Island the plan is an entirely satisfactory one.

Tasman Street, Wellington, 5th February, 1914. ROSALIND A. NIELD.

STATEMENT BY NORMAN RODERICK MCKENZIE, INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS, AUCKLAND.

In the years 1901–2 I paid an extended visit to Australia and made careful inquiries regarding educational matters, including the question of religious instruction in the State schools of New South Wales. As I had official letters of introduction I was afforded special facilities for investigation. Since then I have kept in touch with educational movements in Australia. A long and varied experience as student of education, teacher, and Inspector has convinced me that religious instruction is urgently needed in the public schools of New Zealand, and my Australian experience has persuaded me that the system in force in four States of the Commonwealth is well suited to the requirements of our Dominion. I have learnt that the system is favoured by a vast majority of parents and guardians, that it causes no more difficulty to the teacher than any other school subject, and that it gives rise to no sectarian bitterness among the pupils. It does not lead to overloading the syllabus. A wide course of reading is recognized by experts as a distinct advantage to the children, and the Bible merely takes the place of some other book of less literary and moral value. I did not find any evidence that any denomination attempted to "capture" the schools for its own ends. On the contrary, I was forced to the conclusion that the charges in this connection made against a certain branch of the Church are quite baseless. I may add that, prior to my study of the Australian education system, I was opposed to religious training in public schools. A first-hand knowledge of that system and of the needs of our own schools has fully convinced me of the vital importance of introducing some such system into New Zealand.

21st July, 1914. N. R. MCKENZIE.

LETTER TO AN AUCKLAND CITIZEN FROM AN AUSTRALIAN TEACHER.

DEAR MRS. DUNNINGHAM,— Claremont, West Australia, 17th April, 1914.

In reply to your letter of the 23rd ultimo, inquiring about religious instruction in the schools of this State:—

There are two kinds of religious instruction, "special" and "general." The former is given only by ministers or authorized delegates of the different Churches. It is not a matter

of departmental supervision or examination. For half an hour a week in the schools visited by special religious instructors we hand over our scholars to their care. Children are withdrawn from these classes only on the written authority of the parents; without this children must attend the class held by the minister or delegate of their Church. In my last school, an agricultural centre, the visiting ministers were Rev. Father Reidy (Roman Catholic), Rev. Mr. Dundas (Methodist), Rev. Dr. Parish (Church of England), Rev. Mr. Gilman (Baptist), and Rev. Mr. Smith (Presbyterian). Their coming did not disturb our work, because it was arranged for on the time-table, and their visits I always regarded as beneficial to the general interests of the school. Besides the advantage to the scholars of contact with educated men other than teachers, I gained the support of five persons who were from personal experience acquainted with the life of the school, and were thus able to further the general interests of the scholars in non-departmental matters. My school was the richer in many ways for the unofficial and certainly unofficious help which these gentlemen so cheerfully gave us.

"General" religious teaching is given from the Bible by the ordinary school staff. The curriculum for each class is enclosed herewith. Dogmatic teaching is prohibited. The parents' wishes on the subject are expressed in writing when filling in the child's admission form, one question on which being "Do you object to your child receiving general religious instruction from the teacher?" When the answer is "Yes" the child is withdrawn from class during this lesson. Speaking from fifteen years' experience as a headmaster, I find that of the Christian sects Roman Catholic children are usually, though by no means invariably, withdrawn from this class. Of the remaining Christian Churches, less than 1 per cent. of the aggregate number of children who have been my pupils have been withdrawn from "general" religious teaching.

As to the attitude of the teachers themselves towards this subject, we have a strong and active union and a fearless outspoken teachers' paper. Neither union nor paper has to my knowledge found it necessary to suggest any alteration in our present system.

Personally I should deplore the absence of Bible teaching from my curriculum. Since one of the most, if not *the* most, important functions of a school is character-building, the Bible is invaluable as furnishing the best possible material for this work. Further, there are outstanding Bible characters and portions of Bible teaching so universal and fundamental in their application that it would be foolish to keep children in ignorance of these or to fail to take practical steps to secure their being taught.

I sincerely hope that success may reward the efforts of those endeavouring to introduce the Bible into the schools of your country, and that a method may be found which will satisfy all reasonable people who have taken sides on the question.

Yours faithfully,
C. R. JAMES.

LETTER TO A WELLINGTON CITIZEN FROM AN AUSTRALIAN TEACHER.

Seymour Street, Croydon Park, Croydon, N.S.W., 6th May, 1914.

MY DEAR MR. COCKS,—

In reply to yours of the 1st instant I have pleasure in stating that, after an experience of fifty years as a teacher, I can speak with the strongest conviction upon the questions submitted by you. I have taught in the following schools: Newcastle (pupil-teacher), Fort Street Model (assistant), Mudgee (headmaster), Wagga Wagga, Young, and Croydon Park. There is but one opinion among teachers, and that a unanimous one as to the beneficial effects of the religious instruction given in the public schools of New South Wales.

As you have submitted a list of questions I feel it is due to you to answer them categorically:—

(1.) Has it led to any sectarian feeling?—Emphatically, No.

(2.) Have the teachers felt any conscientious difficulty in imparting the instruction?—None whatever.

(3.) Have the visits of the clergy or accredited teachers caused any difficulty in the school arrangements?—None whatever.

(4.) In your opinion has the system made for all-round good among the scholars?—Most emphatically, Yes.

I remain, &c.,
JOHN DART.

LETTERS RECEIVED BY A CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER IN AUCKLAND FROM AUSTRALIAN TEACHERS.

Girls and Infants' State School, Toowoomba North, Queensland, 2nd October, 1913.

To the Rev. W. A. Keay.

I FEEL sure that the Scripture lessons, when given regularly by the ministers, are a great power for good in the school.

F. E. YARDLEY, Head Teacher.

State School No. 499, Toowoomba East, Queensland, 1st October, 1913.

DEAR MR. MOFFATT,—

I promised to give you briefly my opinion on the matter of ministers of religion giving religious instruction in State schools.

I am of opinion that it is beneficial for the children to come in contact with trained educated ministers of religion; it is good both morally and intellectually. Also, the special subject of instruction, the Bible, is, as a classic, not sufficiently read by the young people as a rule in Australia, and on this account the visits of ministers of religion to the schools, as giving an impetus to the reading of the Bible, should be encouraged.

Yours very truly,
J. E. FOWLER

Rev. W. L. Moffatt, Congregational Church, Toowoomba.

FROM MR. J. A. JOHNSON, M.A., FORMERLY OF NEW ZEALAND, PRINCIPAL HOBART TRAINING COLLEGE.

DEAR MR. STINSON,— Hobart, 21st November, 1912.

I am very pleased to give you the information you ask for in regard to Bible-reading in the State schools of Tasmania. The system works splendidly, and as far as I know no difficulties arise in the actual working. Accustomed as I was to hear the usual bogeys raised in New Zealand, I was and am more than gratified at the results as seen in actual practice. I might say that I see the system at work only in the Practising School, the largest and best in the State, but I am told that it works well everywhere. I saw a Scripture lesson given the other day by one of my young students, a Roman Catholic. It was a simple Bible story to young children, told and illustrated beautifully. The teachers and children seem to me to like the lessons.

The system simply is this: half an hour after assembly every morning is given to Scripture. In the Practising School the clergy of the different denominations come, taking their children in separate rooms two mornings out of the five, the teachers taking the others. No difficulties arise in connection with this separation. On the other three mornings the teachers take their own classes for Scripture. The clergy may come every morning if they choose.

You ask if there are any practical difficulties. Yes, I have heard of one case. A young Methodist minister was particularly good with children, a most interesting teacher, and the little Anglicans from the adjoining class-room used to sneak in to the "popular" man without the teacher's knowledge! As this is the only difficulty I have to relate after six years' experience, you can understand how smoothly everything works.

The points to be noted are—(1) Daily Scripture lessons are on the time-table; (2) if a clergyman comes his children go to a separate room under his charge; (3) to simplify matters the clergy arrange to come on the same mornings; (4) the teachers give the lessons just as they give other lessons on the time-table; (5) the Bible narratives are mostly dealt with, and much care is taken to make the teaching vivid, as in the case of, say, the English lesson or literature lesson.

I may mention that hymn-singing is a very popular feature in the schools here. Often between two lessons a minute's breathing-space is given by singing a simple hymn.

After my experience here I have no hesitation in recommending New Zealand to adopt the Tasmanian system. It works smoothly, raises no friction between the children, and brings no trouble between teachers and parents. The lessons are not only Scripture lessons, but provide material for excellent language lessons as well.

I shall see from New Zealand files how you succeed. Yours, &c.,

JNO. A. JOHNSON.

THE REV. HERBERT COATES, PRESBYTERIAN MINISTER, RENWICKTOWN, MARLBOROUGH.

Personal Experience of the System in Tasmania and New South Wales.

I have read carefully in Auckland and Wellington papers the pros and cons in connection with the Bible being introduced into our national schools in New Zealand. But I have failed to see why the teachers or those opposed to it have taken the stand they have in the face of what Australia can produce. However, to be brief, I wish to state facts clearly in the matter of Bible-teaching in schools in New South Wales and Tasmania. I laboured for three years in Tasmania and visited the schools there twice weekly, first in the Deloraine district and afterwards in the North-east district, and went into a great number of schools regularly and had every opportunity of viewing the position from all sides as a Victorian, and my verdict is this: In no single instance did I observe any ill feeling on the part of teachers or parents and even from our sister Church of Rome in the matter of religious instruction in the schools I visited; and, furthermore, during the time I resided in Tasmania I never heard or saw in the papers anything in variance to the Word of God being taught in the national schools. I came in touch with teachers belonging to all Churches, and my weekly visits were always welcomed.

I may add this: Of all the different States I have lived in Tasmania has always appealed to me as a country that honours God and His Word, and reverence amongst the youth of the land is something to be admired and proud of. I attribute this to the teaching of Scripture in the schools. The same thing applies to New South Wales, where the Bible has been taught for nearly half a century. During the few periods I worked in this State I had every opportunity afforded me to review the system at work not only in Sydney but in the far northern parts of the State. And I am loud in my praise and admiration of the way teachers received me in the many different schools visited. Even Roman Catholic teachers in the schools there welcomed my visits with as much kindness and brotherly fellowship as did Protestant teachers. One large school I used to attend twice weekly; the headmaster was an agnostic, and yet I was always welcomed to the school in the kindest possible manner. Never in all the course of my work either in Tasmania or New South Wales did I see or hear of any strife caused by the introduction of Scripture into the work of the school. I can testify to this, for I have lived in both States and have watched carefully the system in both places. I have a deep interest in the progress of this young country, and naturally long to see our children enjoying the same Christian privileges enjoyed by our children across the sea. I was astonished to find on landing in this progressive land that God is not taught in the national schools.

I would be pleased to answer any inquiries by letter or personally.

A NEW SOUTH WALES TEACHER IN NEW ZEALAND.

Interview with Mrs. Attwater.

Since the question of the Bible in schools looms so very large upon the New Zealand horizon, it may be of some interest to readers to learn (states the *Dominion* of the 17th February, 1913)

what Mrs. Attwater, an Australian lady at present touring New Zealand, has to say concerning its operation in Australia. Mrs. Attwater, who has retired from the Department, and now lives at Grafton, was a teacher in New South Wales for fifteen or sixteen years, and was for some time upon the staff of the Model School in Fort Street, Sydney, so that it is out of her own personal experience and knowledge that she speaks.

The time that the Bible was not brought into the schools is a time she cannot remember hearing of, as it seems to have been there from the early days of the colony's history, and there is no State school in which it is not read. The Model School, of which she speaks particularly, is a very large State school, and is attended by about two thousand scholars. It is divided into three departments—primary, for the young children; secondary, for those more advanced; and the high school, attended by students studying for bursaries, university degrees, and so forth.

All religious denominations are represented by the children attending the school, and religious instruction is given twice a week, one hour for the primary school on one day, and an hour for the more advanced departments on another day. This instruction is given by acknowledged religious instructors, representing the different denominations, and if the parents of the children do not wish them to attend these lessons they are sent into another room and take some other branch of their curriculum. They are never compelled to attend them. If it can possibly be arranged, all the different religious instructors come upon the same day and at the same time, giving their lessons in different rooms, but if that cannot be done by one or other it is fitted in to another time. There was never any friction or trouble experienced in fitting it in. Mrs. Attwater said that the only ones who did not attend the classes were the children belonging to Roman Catholics. Many of the children belonged to that faith. In addition to these two hours a week a portion of the Irish National Text-book is read by the teachers to the children every morning, with explanations by the former. "It is, in fact," said Mrs. Attwater, "a Scriptural history lesson, nor is there any objection made to it either on the part of the teachers (no matter what their own religion may be, or lack of it), nor on the part of the children's parents."

Another thing is that the children appear to be thoroughly interested in their religious lessons. Asked as to whether any unruly behaviour resulted from having an outside instructor for these lessons, sometimes one whose life-work does not lie in teaching children, Mrs. Attwater replied to the contrary. In all her experience she had only known of one case, and that was in a school in a rough district. Nor was there any loss of discipline, or noise, or waste of time when children who did not wish to attend the Scriptural lessons were leaving the room to attend another lesson.

Mrs. Attwater gave an emphatic denial to a question as to whether the matter of religion played any part in the matter of appointments in school. The Department made no distinction whatever, and did not know the religious convictions of its teachers or their lack of them. If by any chance they did know it was not allowed to influence the heads, and they made their appointments upon merits alone.

A Queensland Teacher in New Zealand.

Miss Halstead has been for twelve years a teacher at Brisbane, teaching in the same school, which has an average daily attendance of a thousand children. Asked about Bible in schools, she said that there was a great deal of controversy in Queensland about the system before its introduction, and many difficulties were anticipated. She herself had some fears, but its introduction was made with so little difficulty that it seemed to come into the school on oiled wheels, and in a week or two she found that her own fears had been perfectly groundless.

"Does the right of entry emphasize sectarianism?—Certainly not; we do not know what it means. In my school the ministers come together on the same morning of the week, the whole school is assembled as usual, and the only difference that morning is that the headmaster calls out 'Religious instruction'; and the children, instead of coming to me or their ordinary teachers, go to their religious instructors, and see no more difference in going to them than they would in coming to us for some other lesson.

"Does it interfere with the time-table?—The school-hours are just the same now; the syllabus had to be revised. We teachers consider that the visits of the ministers help us in creating a tone in the schools and bring an enlargement of the children's minds. That the ministers are welcomed by the children is apparent by their faces, and that they are also welcomed by the parents is shown by the withdrawals from ministers' visits being so few that they might be counted on your fingers. Ministers' visits are not more disturbing to the order of the school than the visits of the doctors and dentists who come to inspect and examine the children periodically.

"What about the Bible lessons and the teachers?—I have thirty fellow-teachers in my school. I do not know the religions of all of them, but I do know that some of us differ in our religions; but there was not one of us that found the least difficulty with the lesson-books. As a matter of fact, I think every one of us has welcomed the substitution of a Scripture reading-lesson for some of the matter which is displaced in our syllabus. Here again the withdrawals are very few, except the Roman Catholic children, and these latter go on with some other subject in which they may happen to be weak. There is not the slightest friction or ill feeling in regard to the matter.

"Teachers here are urging that there are political and religious disabilities imposed on teachers in Australia in consequence of religious instruction?—All I know on this point is that regulations published thirty years ago imposed political and religious disabilities on the teachers

of Queensland—that is more than a quarter of a century before there was any religious instruction in the State schools—consequently religious instruction is not responsible for these disabilities. As a matter of fact, the disabilities are not imposed upon us as teachers, but as members of the Civil Service, to the whole of which these regulations apply. I have heard very few teachers resent these political disabilities; certainly they do not interfere with our attending political meetings, or exercising our franchise, or attending church. They would prohibit us making a political speech, but they do not interfere with our religious interests. Teachers are churchwardens, elders, circuit stewards, and are prominent in speaking as members of assemblies, conferences, and synods, and of every other kind of ecclesiastical organization. They take part in services, and are organists, Sunday-school teachers, and choir members. I myself am the head of a Church Girls' Club. The regulations simply hinder us being used to do the proper work of a regular minister of religion.

"And what about the teachers?—I would prefer to say nothing about their attitude, because I cannot think they would oppose it if they had my practical experience of it; but what does surprise me about the teachers is the number of people who have mentioned to me their objections to the teachers having anything to do with the lessons. This week at a public gathering a lady, whom I do not know, got into conversation with me, and told me there were too many of the teachers whom she did not trust. Similar remarks have been made to me in the train and in every town I visited. During the whole of the controversy in Queensland not one person ever spoke to me in a similar strain about our teachers there. I have met some of the New Zealand teachers, and they were just as good as ours, which makes the prejudice I have heard quite incomprehensible to me."—*Dominion*, 17th February, 1913.

State Aid to Roman Catholic Schools.

Letter from the Premier of Queensland to the Roman Catholic Archbishop, read in the Queensland Parliament, 25th October, 1911 (*Hansard*, 1911, page 1770):—

My Lord,— Chief Secretary's Office, Brisbane, 3rd August, 1911.

I have received your letter of the 8th July, but have been prevented from replying sooner by pressure of public business consequent upon the opening of Parliament, and I trust that you will overlook the delay.

Incidentally your Lordship refers to the action the Government have taken to improve the health of the children, particularly in the west, where the prevalence of eye troubles rendered some such action most desirable, and I think you scarcely do the Government justice in regard to this matter. In any case let me state the lines on which the Government are acting and will continue to act. We have erected wire gauze on windows and doors on many of our schools, but we cannot undertake to erect or maintain gauze on privately owned school buildings, whether belonging to religious denominations or to private individuals. We have also arranged for medical examination of the children and for the giving of advice, and in some cases of remedies, free, and those advantages are equally open to all the children who present themselves at the times and places appointed (when available, hospitals) whatever school they attend.

Your Lordship also complains of recent legislation permitting Bible lessons in State schools. As to this I assume the following facts are not in the controversy:—

(*a*.) The Bible lessons were introduced into the State schools as the result of a referendum majority of 17,547 upon a vote of 130,909, 7,651 votes being informal.

(*b*.) The lessons which I send you for your perusal have been framed with the most scrupulous care to exclude any denominational, sectarian, or controversial matter, and are such as, in my opinion, cannot fail to be conducive to the moral and religious improvement of those who study them.

(*c*.) The clergy of your denomination have the right of free access to the State schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction to the children of that denomination under regulations framed in accordance with law.

Under these circumstances I contend that there is no just ground for complaint against the decision of the people being given effect to, nor do I see any special connection between this subject and the subject of endowment.

Your Lordship's main purpose, however, is to ask me whether the Government have any intention of proposing endowment to your schools. In reply I may say that the Government have no such intention, as they are of opinion that a majority of the people of this State are opposed to grants of public money to any religious denomination for educational purposes.

I have, &c.,

D. Denham.

Queensland Education Department, September, 1913.

Question 1: Is the system acceptable to your Department and the teachers generally?—Answer: The Department has loyally fallen in with the decision of the people as expressed through the referendum in regard to religious instruction. The regulations on the subject have been very carefully drawn up, and the interests of all have been safeguarded as far as possible. Every effort has also been made to administer the regulations tactfully and judiciously. A copy of the regulations and of each of the various forms is attached.

Question 2: Do any teachers object to give the lessons?—Answer: No applications to be excused from giving the lessons have reached the Department.

Question 3: Are any scholars withdrawn from the lessons?—Answer: The Department has no particulars. Under the regulations any parent or guardian desiring to withdraw his child

who is in attendance at a primary school from all religious instruction at that school is required to notify in writing the head teacher, and on receipt of such notification the head teacher exempts the child from attendance at religious instruction and issues a certificate of exemption. The teacher is not required to furnish the Department with information as to exemptions.

Question 4: Has any sectarian feeling been engendered between either teachers or scholars in carrying out this system?—Answer: Not so far as is known to the Department.

Question 5: Is the permission to visit schools generally availed of by ministers of religion?—Answer: The attached extract from the annual report of the Department for 1912 affords particulars.

Question 6: Can you give the number of visits annually made by the ministers of each religious denomination for the purpose of imparting religious instruction?—Answer: (*a.*) The Scripture lessons are given by the State-school teachers. (*b.*) The extent to which ministers of religion availed themselves of the opportunity to visit the schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction may be gauged from the attached copy of a return which was furnished to the Legislative Assembly in July last.

Religious Instruction in State Schools during School Hours, Queensland.

* Return for the Twelve Months ended the 31st December, 1912.

Totals for 1912.

Jan.	Feb.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
5,782	24,573·8	26,727·2	26,081·1	27,125·7	24,580·7	28,135·1	28,845·2	28,738·75	28,744·57	29,865·03	20,512·2

Totals for 1911.

Jan.	Feb.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
—	949·1	4,438·8	7,161·1	10,147·1	16,280·26	21,033·25	23,607·8	25,995·28	26,634·15	26,560·13	21,426·8

Totals for 1913.

Jan.	Feb.	March.	April.	May.	June.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
15,239·1	27,200	28,557·8	28,048·2	30,695·4	29,690·2	30,121·3	31,048	30,316·6	31,228·2	30,526·8	17,526·6

[NOTE by D. J. G.—The totals for 1913 were obviously not included in the return sent out for 1912, but are now added by me to bring the information up to date. The figures for 1913 will be found on p. 31 of the departmental report submitted to Parliament, 1914.]

ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 2ND MAY, 1912.

R. H. Roe, Inspector-General of Schools, and Chief Professional Adviser, Queensland:—

5,343. Has the curriculum been extended during recent years?—Yes, considerably. In the new schedule, which was introduced about five years ago, nature-knowledge was substituted for the old object-lesson, and it is a much wider subject, of course, embracing many lines of science. Civics and morals were introduced, and manual work was extended in the direction of brush drawing, and we have gone in for advanced needlework and cookery for the senior classes. We do not do the latter work in the schools, but we send scholars to the technical colleges where they exist, and pay for such pupils. Kindergarten work was also introduced, and during the last year or so we have had Bible lessons introduced, and religious teaching by the ministers, who are allowed to come in. That takes part of the school-time. Further, we have physical drill and authorized games introduced, and the Junior Cadet universal service training. All this has involved inroads upon the time which the teacher had available for the teaching of the old subjects, and the difficulties have had to be overcome by more effective teaching and by dropping unnecessary parts of the old curriculum, but mainly by effective teaching on the part of those managing the schools.

What do you do here in the matter of religious teaching in schools?—There are two reading-books that were compiled by the Department, one junior and one for senior classes. The junior class-book consists of the stories of the Bible—Joseph, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, &c.—given, as far as possible, in the language of the Bible. In the senior class-book are selections on the most beautiful Bible passages. These are read for at least one half-hour, generally for two half-hours, a week in the schools by the children under the supervision of the teachers. The teacher is expected to take this like any ordinary reading-lesson—that is to say, he will question the children as to their proper understanding of the words and as to point of the moral involved, but he is not supposed to go in for dogmatic teaching or to preach a sermon, but to deal with the question of the literary beauties and proper understanding of the text. The Inspector will ask him what passages he has read. The teacher has to keep a record of them. He need not read the books right through; he may choose his own lessons. A knowledge of what has been read is expected from the children at the Inspector's test, which is for the ordinary reading-book.

5,351. The Inspectors examine them on the reading?—Yes.

5,352. How do the Roman Catholics deal with this question: what do they think of it?—They have not said. They denounce the whole system. Their children are withdrawn during the Bible lessons, and the Roman Catholics have made these lessons an additional reason for advocating the establishment of separate schools for the teaching of their children and an additional ground for claiming Government aid for their primary schools.

5,353. Is it compulsory for the child to be present during the Bible lessons?—No. Any child bringing a note from its parents can be withdrawn from the teaching of the Bible lessons.

* This return gives the number of children instructed by ministers or their substitutes.—D. J. G.

The number of such applications has been comparatively few, except in the case of the Roman Catholics.

5,354. Are there any objections by the Roman Catholic teachers to reading the lessons?—No.

5,355. And the system is working well?—On the whole there has been wonderfully little friction. It has gone far more easily than was anticipated.

Have you any means of checking the standard of education at private primary schools?—Yes; they are inspected. Primary Roman Catholic schools and private Church of England schools are inspected by our Inspectors at their request. The Roman Catholic authorities are very glad to get their inspecting done for them, and so are the Church of England people. Reports are furnished to the Department and also to the private-school authorities, but we take no action on the reports. If the state of the school is unsatisfactory we do not censure the teachers or anything of that sort. If you offer Government inspection of your private schools I think they will be glad to get it.

New South Wales Inspectors.

Extracts from Reports of Education Inspectors in New South Wales for the Year 1912 from the Public Instruction Gazette, *30th April, 1913.*

Mr. Senior Inspector Thomas (Moss Vale District) says: "Direct Scriptural instruction finds its place in every school, and is supplemented by a course of moral lessons drawn either from the Scripture lessons or from other suitable sources. The teachers' efforts are well supported by the local clergy and accredited lay teachers working under them, many of whom visit the schools with commendable regularity."

Mr. Senior Inspector Friend (North Sydney District) says: "Morals and Scripture are satisfactorily dealt with, as a rule. The reading of Scripture in the upper classes, however, sometimes encroaches too much upon the periods which should be devoted to oral instruction in the subject. Temperance teaching receives proper attention in most schools, and the development of manly and womanly qualities in the pupils receives the earnest effort of many teachers. The moral atmosphere of the bulk of the schools is very satisfactory. Steady uniform control, acquiescent obedience, and a capital working-spirit obtain in nearly all schools. The personal authority of the bulk of the teachers is exercised wisely; the government is kindly, and corporal punishment enters little into the management."

Mr. Senior Inspector Blumer (Bathurst District) says: "Scripture and moral lessons: These receive regular attention. In one-teacher schools it is found best to give these lessons as narratives, illustrative of Divine power, wisdom, and benevolence. Where there is more than one teacher the elder scholars read the prescribed Scripture books. Every facility for special religious instruction is afforded to visiting clergymen and accredited teachers. Most of the indirect moral teaching is by story-telling and by special lessons as occasion demands."

Mr. Senior Inspector McKenzie (North-west Sydney District) says: "The Old and New Testaments of the I.N.B. are read regularly, and religious teaching of a non-sectarian character is given as required by the syllabus and by the Public Instruction Act. The whole trend of the teaching has a moral tendency, and the teachers never miss an opportunity for emphasizing moral truths leading to a respect for everything which is good, and especially to a reverence for and trust in the Deity."

Mr. Senior Inspector Walker (Southern Newcastle) says: "Scripture: This subject, with associated moral stories, is excellently treated in infant schools. A special feature of infant-school work is the graphic manner in which stories are related. In the hands of some of our teachers the characters live in the words of the teller, and pupils listen intently, showing in their faces the effect on their minds as the story progresses. The power to tell a story well is a great gift, and the teacher who possesses it should never fail to rivet the attention of the class."

Mr. Inspector Reay (Tamworth District) says: "Moral teaching receives regular attention both by lesson and example. I have known of no school where the teacher is careless in this respect. The authorized Scripture books are regularly read, and the pupils are familiar with the leading incidents in sacred history."

Mr. Inspector Grieve, B.A. (Southern Sydney District) says: "Scripture lessons as moral instruction receive due attention, but the Scriptures as literature are not as fully appreciated as they might be. Some of the Psalms and prophecies, and the more beautiful passages in the New Testament, are learnt by some pupils. The practice might be more generally adopted. The authorized Scripture lessons are read and the authorized religious instruction is carried out in every school in the district by visiting clergymen and teachers."

Mr. Inspector Kennedy (Grafton District) says: "Scripture: The prescribed books are regularly read, and the universal truths they contain are still further impressed by the sound, healthy, inspiring stories of self-sacrifice, heroism, attention to duty, and love of country."

Mr. Inspector Fraser (Taree District) says: "The regular reading of the authorized Scripture lessons is well carried out."

Mr. Inspector Lynch (Bega District) says: "Moral training and religious instruction: The moral tone of the schools in this district is distinctly good. This is largely due to the personal character and influence of the teachers and the conscientiousness with which they discharge their responsibilities. Moral instruction receives regular attention, and general religious instruction is given regularly. The authorized Scripture books are used and read by the pupils in class, and to the lower classes oral Scripture instruction is given."

Mr. Inspector Campling (Broken Hill District) says: "Religious teaching and moral instruction: The prescribed Scripture books are regularly read by the senior classes. Too often, how-

ever, there the matter ends. Many teachers fail to test the acquirement of the subject-matter. Biblical stories are interestingly told by the teachers to the junior pupils. Scripture is well taught in the Infants' School by means of suitable pictures. The little ones enjoy the lessons. During the year visits from the clergy have been frequent and beneficial."

The New South Wales Government and Bible in Schools.

The report for the year 1913 of the Minister of Public Instruction, New South Wales, was submitted to Parliament on the 6th April last. In the course of the report the Chief Inspector states, under the heading "Scripture and Morals," "Apart from the indirect, but none the less potent, influence of the school atmosphere, definite moral instruction, including the reading of authorized Scripture lessons from the Old and New Testaments, is regularly given in all schools. To what is done by the teachers must be added the work of representatives of various religious denominations. The number of visits made by these visiting religious teachers during the year shows very considerable increase." In addition, the Minister, in referring to the Girls' Industrial School and Training Home, says, "Religious instruction is a matter which receives at all times the closest attention. Prayers are held daily, night and morning, and Thursday afternoons are specially reserved for visiting clergymen. Every facility is afforded to enable girls to receive that religious training so necessary in the case of children, and the efforts of the visiting clergy are ably seconded by the members of our own staff."

Question 1: The number of State schools visited by clergymen for the purpose of giving religious instruction for the four quarters ending 30th June, 1913?—Answer: 570.

Question 2: The number of individual visits made by clergymen?—Answer: Average, 25.

Question 3: The number of children who attended for the purpose of religious instruction?—Answer: Monthly average, 30,596.

Question 4: The percentage of the enrolment in the State schools of children who attended for the purpose of religious instruction?—Answer: 39·5 per cent., based on the average daily attendance for 1912.

New South Wales.—Return of Religious Denominations of Pupils and Visits paid for Special Religious Instruction during the Year 1913.

—	Number of Children on Roll, December Quarter, 1913.						Number of Visits paid during Year.					
	C.E.	R.C.	Presb.	Meth.	Others.	Total.	C.E.	R.C.	Presb.	Meth.	Others.	Total.
High schools ..	1,840	342	748	544	352	3,826	..	..	..	..	..	..
Public primary schools, Metropolitan District	53,357	7,988	9,305	10,093	8,452	89,195	12,836	192	2,491	3,802	3,828	23,149
Newcastle and Maitland District	11,103	2,008	2,522	6,229	1,833	23,695	2,456	44	728	1,445	629	5,302
Other country districts	62,573	20,895	15,423	16,303	5,293	120,437	15,666	597	4,703	5,667	2,237	28,870
Subsidized schools	2,179	1,320	603	330	149	4,581	..	..	..	..	..	..
1913 totals ..	131,052	32,553	28,601	33,499	16,079	241,784	30,958	833	7,922	10,914	6,694	57,321
1914 totals ..	123,190	31,313	26,992	31,768	15,266	228,529	27,229	887	8,074	9,956	6,737	2,883

Late Opinions from Education Departments of New South Wales and Queensland.

The Rev. R. Taylor, secretary of the Scriptural Instruction in Schools League, South Australia, published in Adelaide in August, 1914, the following information then obtained by him:—

"I addressed the following questions to the Ministers of Education in New South Wales and Queensland, and received the following answers:—

"Question 1: What means are adopted to ascertain to what religious denomination each school-child belongs?—Answer (New South Wales): This information is obtained by the teacher when the child is enrolled, and is recorded in the school records. Answer (Queensland): A column for religious denomination is included in the admission-register, which is used in every school in this Department, and in such column the teacher enters the religious denomination of each pupil after receipt of advice from the parent or guardian as to the child's denomination.

"Question 2: Are there any cases where the religious denomination of school-children is not known?—Answer (New South Wales): There should not be, in view of the foregoing practice. The teacher is not called upon to determine the class to which a child shall attend for special religious instruction, as visiting clergymen are only entitled to give instruction to children of their own persuasion. Answer (Queensland): There is no record of any case where it has not been practicable to ascertain the religious denomination.

"Question 3: Do the religious clauses of the Education Act work smoothly?—Answer (New South Wales): Yes. Answer (Queensland): Yes.

"Question 4: Have you any complaints about sectarian differences or proselytism?—Answer (New South Wales): No. Answer (Queensland): No."

WEST AUSTRALIA.

The following table gives the report of the working of the system in Western Australia for the year 1912, taken from the parliamentary report, page 42:—

(A.)—*Special Religious Instruction.*

Churches.	Number of Schools visited.	Number of Visits made.	Total Number in Average Attendance.	Number withdrawn in accordance with Parents' Written Request.
Church of England	277	5,549	11,235	33
Methodist	111	2,059	4,570	4
Presbyterian	37	606	1,637	3
Congregational	21	326	911	...
Baptist	26	387	521	...
Roman Catholic	45	406	573	1
Church of Christ	6	171	262	...
Salvation Army	...	...	114	...
	523	9,504	19,823	41

NOTE.—Denominations: When two or more religious denominations authorize the same instructor or instructors to give religious instruction, the children who attend such are entered in records and returns as if each such denomination formed a separate and distinct class. For convenience sake, the heads of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist Churches have agreed that clergymen belonging to any one of these denominations may be considered as the authorized delegate of the other three. Therefore, the attendance by a clergyman is credited to the denomination whose minister imparts instruction.

Special religious instruction has been given in 314 distinct schools.

[NOTE by D.J.G.—Study of the report will show that 32,959 children were in average attendance, of whom 19,823 were taught by their ministers, including 573 Roman Catholic children, who received 406 visits from forty-five Roman Catholic religious instructors. That the ministers' visits meet with approval is shown by the withdrawal from them of only forty-one children out of 19,823. The report also shows that 314 distinct schools were visited by ministers, the total number of schools in Western Australia being 536, of which only 236 average an attendance of over twenty. It may be taken that the remainder are single-room schools.]

For the general religious instruction, Table B shows that out of 32,959 children in average attendance, only 1,851 were withdrawn from the Bible lessons by the teachers, as follows:—

(B.)—*General Religious Instruction.*

This instruction, which excludes dogmatic or polemical theology, is given in all schools. The number of children withdrawn from it in accordance with the written request of parents amounted to 1,851, made up as follows:—

Roman Catholic	1,611
Hebrew	166
Methodist	17
Church of England	15
Presbyterian	10
Seventh Day Adventists	8
No denomination	6
Agnostic	5
Freethinkers	4
Church of Christ	3
Greek	2
Baptist	2
Mohammedan	1
New Jerusalem	1
Total	1,851

TASMANIA.

SIR,— Education Department, Hobart, Tasmania, 12th September, 1913.

In the absence of the Director, who is now in Sydney, I have the honour to acknowledge your communication of the 9th instant, in relation to Scripture instruction in State schools, and in reply to furnish you with the following answers to questions and other information:—

Question 1: Is the system acceptable to your Department, and the teachers generally?—Answer: Our system in relation to the subject mentioned is acceptable to the Department, and, as far as is known, to the teachers generally.

Question 2: Do any teachers object to give the lessons?—Answer: I am not aware that any such objection has been made. The teaching of sacred history is part of the work prescribed for all State schools.

Question 3: Are any scholars withdrawn from the lessons?—Answer: I am not aware that any scholars have been withdrawn from the lessons.

Question 4: Has any sectarian feeling been engendered between either teachers or scholars in carrying out this system?—Answer: It does not appear that any sectarian feeling on the part of teachers or scholars has been engendered in carrying out this system.

Question 5: Is the permission to visit schools generally availed of by ministers of religion? —Answer: Yes, especially in the city schools and the larger country schools.

Question 6: Can you give the number of visits annually made by the ministers of each religious denomination for the purpose of imparting Scriptural instruction?—Answer: The visits made by the ministers of religion for giving religious instruction are recorded in the visitors' books of the respective schools, but we have no returns reporting the number of such visits.

I have, &c.,
J. MASTERS,
Secretary for Education.

W. Hutchinson, Esq., State Parliament House, Melbourne.

P.S.—For your further information I send you herewith a copy of our prescribed course of instruction, having marked the various references to Scripture history (see especially page 31).—J.M., Secretary for Education.

OPPONENTS' INQUIRIES AND THE RESULT.

DEAR SIR,— Baptist Manse, Sydenham, Christchurch, New Zealand, 29th May, 1914.

Doubtless you are aware that the Bible-in-schools party, led by Canon Garland, is agitating in New Zealand for the adoption of the Queensland system of religious instruction in State schools. The party would have us believe that that system is generally accepted, and works without friction and sectarian influence wherever it has been adopted. So if you would kindly give me your opinion and experience of the working of the system in Queensland in the form of answers to the ensuing questions I should be greatly obliged:—

(1.) Is the system generally accepted as an equitable and final solution of the question?
(2.) Has the working of the system tended to cause sectarian bitterness and strife?
(3.) What is the attitude of the State teachers towards their own compulsory "general religious" teaching? (*a.*) Have any conscientious teachers been forced out of the schools?
(4.) Have there been instances of friction—(*a*) Between ministers and School Committees; (*b*) between objecting parents and teachers; (*c*) or in any other respect?
(5.) Is there a growing public opinion that State Protestant religious teaching in State schools should, in equity, be followed by grants in aid to denominational schools, and to Roman Catholic schools in particular?
(6.) Is there any other point you would care to mention?

I realize that I am presuming somewhat in troubling you, but if you could let me have your reply without undue delay I should be greatly obliged. If you would have any objection to the public use of your name, your feeling would be scrupulously respected.

Thanking you in anticipation, I beg to remain,
Yours sincerely,
T. A. WILLIAMS, Baptist Minister.

DEAR SIR,— 100–108 Queen Street, Brisbane, 18th June, 1914.

In reply to your inquiry of the 29th ultimo, reply to which has been delayed owing to my absence from town, I have pleasure in stating that the Bible-in-State-school system referred to, as adopted in Queensland, is generally accepted by the public, and by the various Churches, with the exception of the Roman Catholic. It is now over three years since the Bill was passed. It took about a year to get the necessary books prepared, but since the introduction the experience has been that the system works without the slightest friction.

During a recent visit to the Dominion I formed the impression that the Queensland system was not really understood in New Zealand.

The Department of Education have prepared two text-books for the use of junior and senior divisions. These books were compiled by a committee of the most experienced school-teachers and Inspectors, including some of the Roman Catholic faith, and they have been admitted to be an improvement on the text-book used in New South Wales, which was drawn up and adopted many years ago. The text-books include some of the finest literary passages in Holy Writ, and the essential points on which all Christians are agreed. These books are read in the usual course in the school, and the teacher simply asks questions to ascertain if the scholar understands the passage read. Nothing in the nature of dogma or sectarian interpretation is permitted.

Where circumstances permit ministers or other duly accredited religious instructors are allowed to enter the schools during fixed hours and give special religious instruction. This provision is availed of in the larger centres of population only, but in the sparsely settled districts, where no special religious training is available, the school text-book is the only religious teaching which the children receive, and without such simple instruction they would grow up in entire ignorance of the great facts of common Christianity.

As regards our Roman Catholic friends, they have been agitating for many years for State endowment for their schools. On a percentage basis this body is about twice as large in Queensland as it is in New Zealand, but as far as I can judge from public opinion there is not the slightest chance of our State reverting to the denominational system, and the Roman Catholic religious teachers have the same opportunity as any other Church in giving instruction in the State schools.

Referring to your questions in their order, I have to state—

(1.) The system is generally accepted as a fair and equitable way of meeting what the majority of our people believed to be a weakness in our previous system. In the referendum which was taken on the matter before the Bill was introduced the principle was affirmed by a majority of over seventeen thousand, and if a referendum was again taken I am confident that it would be affirmed by a much larger majority.

(2.) During the debate when the Bill was before the House, and the discussion in the Press at the same time, stress was laid on the point that the introduction of the system would cause sectarian bitterness and strife. The actual results of experience have shown that there was no foundation for such fears, and some of those who were opposed to the system now frankly admit that they were mistaken.

(3 and 4.) Personally, I have not heard of any friction arising *re* your questions (*a*), (*b*), (*c*), and from a general talk which I had with the Under-Secretary some three months ago I understand that the whole scheme is working very smoothly. The attitude of the teachers, many of whom are Roman Catholics, is friendly. No teachers have been called upon to resign for this cause. I am not aware of any friction between religious teachers and School Committees. There can be no trouble between parents and teachers, as, under the conscience clause, no child is compelled to attend special religious instruction against the wishes of the parent.

(5.) In my opinion there is not a growing public opinion in favour of giving the denominational grant, the trend being in the opposite direction. The Roman Catholics have the same opportunity as other religious bodies in our State schools.

Under our system of State-school scholarships any boy or girl under fourteen years of age who is able to secure over 50 per cent. of examination-marks is entitled to a State scholarship, and during recent years, and before the present system of Bible-teaching was introduced, it was decided that these State-school scholarships would be available in any public grammar school or other high school approved by the State, controlled by any denomination, and in many cases the holders of State-school scholarships have elected to go to institutions controlled by the Roman Catholic Church. I believe that in this direction we have gone as far as possible.

I will be pleased to give you any further information, and I have no objection to my name being used. The State has been my home for thirty-five years. I have visited nearly every part, and I have just returned from an extended tour in the far north and extreme north-west, covering over five thousand miles, in the course of which, along with the Home Secretary, I have been present at the inspection of schools, and have met teachers and ministers of various Churches. While other matters of local interest were brought up by deputations of School Committees, in not a single instance was the slightest adverse criticism made on the working of the Bible-in-State-schools system.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES ALLAN,

M.L.A. for Kurilpa, one of the Metropolitan Electorates.

Rev. T. A. Williams, Baptist Minister, Sydenham, Christchurch, N.Z.

THE 1904 REFERENDUM, VICTORIA.

The analysis of the voting which took place at the general election of 1904 was published in the *Argus* of the 18th January, 1905. The three questions and the replies given to them were as follows:—

1. Are you in favour of the Education Act remaining secular, as at present?—Yes, 89,047; No, 62,867. Majority in favour of the present secular Act, 26,180.

2. Are you in favour of such legislation as shall cause the scheme of Scripture lessons recommended by the Royal Commission on Religious Instruction to be taught in State schools during school hours to children whose parents desire the teaching (such lessons would be given subject to a conscience clause exempting teachers who object)?—Yes, 78,936; No, 69,875. Majority in favour of Royal Commission's Bible lessons, 9,061.

3. Are you in favour of the prayers and hymns selected by the Royal Commission being used?—Yes, 79,143; No, 69,696. Majority in favour of prayers and hymns, 9,447.

Analysis of the Voting.—Yes, No, No, 53,084; No, Yes, Yes, 49,599; Yes, No, 285; Yes, No, 580; Yes, Yes, Yes, 16,175; Yes, Yes, 320; Yes, Yes, 526; Yes, 3,025; Yes, No, Yes, 2,615; Yes, Yes, No, 1,989; No, Yes, 164; No, Yes, 218; No, No, No, 3,819; No, No, 127; No, No, 105; No, 662; No, No, Yes, 552; No, Yes, No, 716; Yes, Yes, 1,370; Yes, 280; Yes, 214; Yes, No, 101; No, Yes, 91; No, 134; No, 94; No, No, 540; informal, 3,725

STATEMENT ISSUED BY THE SCRIPTURE CAMPAIGN COUNCIL, VICTORIA, 17TH FEBRUARY, 1905.

The history of the referendum is doubtless losing clearness in many minds, and it is desirable to recall the main points. It was the Premier, Mr. Bent, who proposed it, and in doing so he undertook to draw up the questions in consultation with the Council of the Scripture Campaign. It was finally, in complete opposition to the earnest protests of the Council, that he adopted the three questions, which ran as follows:—

1. Are you in favour of the Education Act remaining secular, as at present?
2. Are you in favour of such legislation as shall cause the scheme of Scripture lessons recommended by the Royal Commission on Religious Instruction to be taught in the State schools during school hours to children whose parents desire the teaching? (Such lessons would be given subject to a conscience clause exempting teachers who object.)
3. Are you in favour of the prayers and hymns selected by the Royal Commission being used?

The Council strongly objected to the first of these questions, as it covered contradictory meanings and must create confusion. The *Age* supported this contention, and advocated one clear direct question only, and the Council urged Mr. Bent to adopt the question in the form suggested by the *Age*. But their request was fruitless, their objections were ignored, and the subject was referred to the electors in the form we have stated.

The Result.

It was found that 151,914 persons answered questions more or less fully. The answers were as follows:—

Question 1.—Yes, 89,047; No, 62,867: majority, 26,180.
Question 2.—Yes, 78,936; No, 69,875: majority, 9,061.
Question 3.—Yes, 79,143; No, 69,696: majority, 9,447.

Here was a sufficiently perplexing result. Apparently there was a majority of 26,180 electors in favour of the Act "remaining secular as at present," and yet there was a majority of 9,061 in favour of introducing the Scripture lessons. The Council pointed out that, since the first question was perplexing and the second plain, the answer to the second question ought to be regarded as decisive. And that position they still maintain. The Council further contended that these figures on any reasonable analysis showed that not less than sixteen thousand electors must have answered "Yes" not only to the question, "Are you in favour of the Act remaining secular, as at present?" but "Yes" also to the question, "Are you in favour of Scripture lessons?" thus showing that while they were in favour of a secular system of education, they did not interpret the word "secular" in such a sense as to make unsectarian Scripture lessons impossible. They interpreted the first question, that is, in a different way to Mr. Bent, and they were within their rights as electors in doing so. This was, however, only an inference. It could be sustained or disproved, and the whole meaning of the referendum made clear, if a complete and authoritative analysis of the voting-papers were made. Accordingly an enormous number of petitions, signed by more than sixty-two thousand persons, asking for such an analysis, was presented to Parliament, and the analysis has accordingly been made. The result is appended to this letter. It shows that the inference of the Scripture Campaign Council that over sixteen thousand electors had voted "Yes" to each of the questions, thus declaring in favour of the Act "remaining secular as at present" and also of unsectarian Scripture lessons being given, was absolutely verified. No less, indeed, than 18,484 persons voted "Yes" to both the first and second questions.

Smaller points may be ignored. The whole issue turns on the way in which the votes of these eighteen thousand electors are to be assessed by Parliament and their fellow-electors. There are only three possible ways of dealing with them: (1.) They may be counted on both sides of the controversy; but that cannot possibly have been the intention of the voters themselves. To treat their votes in this way is to disfranchise them—to treat as non-existent, that is, one-ninth of the whole votes cast. There is no example of such a step in our political history. (2.) They may be counted on the purely secular side of the dispute. But since these 18,484 electors have said that they desire Scripture instruction in State schools, to count their votes against that policy is to trifle with them. It is in effect to call them fools, who did not understand the English language sufficiently well to know what their own "Yes" meant. (3.) Their vote of "Yes" to the first question may be interpreted by their vote of "Yes" to the second question. This is the only reasonable course. It acknowledges that these eighteen thousand electors are sane, and gives their votes their rightful value in settling a great national question. Their second "Yes" is a plain answer to a plain question. There can be no doubt as to the meaning of their vote. They say they desire unsectarian Scripture lessons to be given by the teachers in the schools. If it is asked how could they also say, in answer to the first question, that they desired the Act to "remain secular as at present," the reply is because the word "secular" has in educational history, and even in connection with our own Education Act, various shades of meaning. When the present Education Act was introduced it was intended that lessons in Bible history should be taught in the schools, although the Act was secular. Such lessons were actually taught in the schools for several years after the Act came into force. That the word was understood by many as permitting unsectarian Scripture instruction is plain from the fact that the Scripture Campaign Council actually proposed to head the referendum question with the statement, "The Education Act is and remains free, compulsory, and secular." "Secular" thus, to the mind of these eighteen thousand electors, was a word that did not exclude unsectarian Scripture lessons, and accordingly they voted both for keeping the Act secular and for the introduction of such lessons. This is a perfectly reasonable way of explaining how these eighteen thousand voted. Any other reading assumes that this great army of voters were fools, and disfranchises them. This is the view taken of the vote by an authority so detached and so authoritative as the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*.

These eighteen thousand votes, then, are in favour of unsectarian lessons, and must be deducted from the number opposed to these lessons. According to the analysis, the total number of those who voted "Yes" to the first question is 78,599. From that number must be deducted those who said "Yes" to the second question, and who are thus on the side of Scripture lessons. This leaves the total number of votes against Scripture lessons 60,115. But those who voted "Yes" to the second question, and thus are in favour of Scripture lessons, is 70,434. We contend that no other interpretation of the voting is rational and just, and the analysis shows

that there is a majority of not less than 10,319 voters in favour of the scheme of lessons proposed by the Royal Commission being given in State schools to children whose parents desire it.

More than twenty thousand of the voting-papers, it will be remembered, remain sealed, and both sides agree to accept their exclusion, but logically the same proportion of votes must run through those twenty thousand papers, and so the majority in favour of Scripture lessons will be proportionately increased.

We should be delighted to have the value of the analysis settled authoritatively—say, by a Judge of the Supreme Court. But, meanwhile, the man in the street may judge the reasonableness of our contention, and we urge that a deliberate and public vote by the electors generally on this long-debated question is not to be evaded by a quibble, or dismissed as a trifle. The referendum was a serious Act, and its results ought to be taken seriously, and on the evidence of those results we claim with the utmost confidence a place in the State schools of the colony for the scheme of unsectarian Scripture lessons prepared by the Royal Commission.

Methodist Opinion.

Methodist Conference of New South Wales: Cable from the President.

The Rev. F. Colwell cabled (25th February, 1914) that on the first day of the Conference sitting in Sydney it heard with interest of the Bible-in-State-schools movement in New Zealand to secure the same advantages possessed in New South Wales of direct religious instruction by ministers, and Bible lessons by teachers, under public-instruction system of that State. Conference expressed its hopes that the movement will speedily achieve complete success in New Zealand.

[This cablegram from the Methodist Conference of New South Wales shows that the Methodist Church, after forty-eight years' experience, is not apprehensive of Methodist children being "proselytized" under the religious-instruction system.—D. J. G.]

The West Australian Methodist Church.

The Methodist Conference of West Australia cabled to the New Zealand Conference—

"Methodist Conference West Australia prays for your success in advocacy religious instruction in State schools—privilege enjoyed in this State for many years, greatly valued by Churches, parents, and general community, and works most harmoniously.—Jenkins, Secretary of Conference.—Perth, 4th March, 1914."

The Queensland Methodist Church.

The Methodist Conference of Queensland cabled to the New Zealand Conference in Dunedin, 26th February, 1914, "expressing its sympathy and assuring the New Zealand Conference of the prayers of Queensland Methodists in the noble struggle in New Zealand to obtain the same privileges for the young people of the Dominion as were enjoyed in Queensland in religious instruction and the right of entry into the State schools."

The Rev. A. G. Smith, ex-President of Queensland Conference, writes,—

"Having been an advocate of the introduction of Bible lessons into the schools of this State, I have naturally been pleased to find that in the working-out of the scheme my hopes have been realized, and the fears expressed by many have been proved to be groundless. While the attendance at the schools—I work three each week—is a tax upon one's time, I have come to regard it as a priceless opportunity for influencing the minds of my own boys and girls. It has meant, too, the drawing-together of the ministers of the various Churches. We meet at each school each week, and when such questions as Sabbath observance or temperance have been claiming special attention, we have adjourned to one or other of the parsonages and discussed matters, and thus have been enabled to present a united front. The fact that Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministers and Salvation Army officers can send letters to the newspapers over their joint signatures, can by common consent preach on one subject on one particular Sunday, and can stand on one platform, each having the utmost confidence in the other, has attracted not a little attention, and had it not been for the intimacies engendered by the Bible-in-State-schools work I doubt if this would have been possible.

"I enclose letter from Mr. Porter addressed to myself. Mr. Porter is the head teacher of the principal school in this town, and is one of the oldest, best-known, and most respected teachers in the service.

"Trusting you may have every success in your work in New Zealand.

"Methodist Parsonage, Warwick, 18th February, 1914."

Central School for Boys, Warwick, Queensland, 17th February, 1914.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—

We have now had sufficient experience in the matter of Bible-reading in State schools to be able to express an opinion as to the working of the scheme. As I at the beginning was a mild antagonist of the movement, you will be pleased to find that my fears have not been verified, and I can say that I look forward to the day of Scriptural instruction by the ministers of various denominations with interest, and I am sure the children enjoy these lessons. There is absolutely no friction, but we teachers gladly and cordially welcome the ministers, and I for one fully appreciate their work.

Jas. Porter, Head Teacher.

The Rev. A. G. Smith, Methodist Parsonage, Warwick.

A PERSONAL TESTIMONY FROM MRS. HARRISON LEE COWIE TO THE PARLIAMENTARY EDUCATION COMMITTEE.

SIRS,—

As you are taking evidence about the Australian system of Scripture instruction in public schools, I should be glad if you will accept my assurance of the real benefits of the system.

For over a quarter of a century I have been conducting missions all over Australia. Part of my work has been the visiting of schools to give addresses to the children. In Victoria, my native State, I had a Government permit to speak on temperance only, carefully eschewing all reference to God or our Redeemer. In New South Wales I was able to go in company with clergymen of all denominations, or instead of them, and give Bible lessons on any subject. The religious teaching was such an accepted part of the children's education, I did not dream of questioning its value or otherwise.

Last year I spent six months in New South Wales, and knowing the difficulties that had been suggested here in New Zealand, I made careful and persistent inquiries in all directions to find if any sectarian strife followed, or any other undesirable result. Instead I found ministers of various denominations meeting together to prepare conjointly the quarter's syllabus of Bible lessons. I found denominationalism largely broken down, and harmony and brotherly love animating the various sections of the religious teachers. I found the State-school teachers cordially welcoming the clergymen at the appointed time, and in many cases gladly rendering help. In other places they went on with other classes during religious-instruction time. In remote country districts it is largely impossible for ministers to visit all the schools, but there the children have Scripture lessons from the State-school teachers.

There may have been cases where the teachers objected, but if so I did not find one; nor in all my travels from end to end of the State did I hear of a single case of a teacher objecting.

Of course, I met with Roman Catholic teachers. These have almost all entered the Department during the years religious instruction has been part of the curriculum. They entered with their eyes open, quite understanding their duties, but I have never heard of one who made religious instruction a barrier to entering on his chosen profession.

I have been asked since returning how Jewish, Roman Catholic, and infidel children are treated. For these the conscience clause is in operation, and they simply go on with other lessons. I may say that all over Australia, even where there may be no religious instruction given, Roman Catholics try to withdraw their children from State schools. In my own State of Victoria they build their own schools, and try to get all their children to attend, on the plea that the Victorian system is a godless one. I find the same argument applies in New Zealand. Roman Catholics by hundreds are withdrawn from New Zealand State schools now, although the system is secular, so I do not see how they can carry any weight in the present contest.

If there are any other points that my evidence may be of any value on I shall be very pleased to give fuller testimony to the immense value of Scripture instruction in State schools.

BESSIE LEE COWIE,
World's Missionary, W.C.T.U.

Amethyst Hall, Invercargill, N.Z., 15th August, 1914.

P.S.—I sent to a personal friend at Tamworth for evidence about Bible in schools there, and now enclose the answer. Surely, surely, with such unbiased tributes to the value of our cause there will be no further opposition. The evidence you have is so convincing and varied, any one ought to aid our efforts.

Tamworth, N.S.W., 14th September, 1914.

We, the ministers of religion and lay readers of Tamworth and district, most willingly bear our testimony to the great success of the New South Wales system of religious instruction in public schools. Our experience is that the children receive week by week systematic religious training which they very much appreciate. We unhesitatingly aver that, with hardly an exception, the teachers afford us great help by providing every facility whereby we can teach in comfort. Our experience is that they always welcome the authorized agents of the different Churches.

We remain, yours sincerely,

ARTHUR JOHNSTONE,
LEONARD GABBOTT,
H. E. TAYLOR.
(Church of England Clergymen).
T. JAMIESON WILLIAMS,
M. JAMIESON WILLIAMS.
(Presbyterian).
JAS. B. PENMAN.
(Methodist Minister).
H. WALKDEN BROWN,
(Methodist Evangelist).

APPENDIX C.

Submitted by Professor Hunter, representing the National Schools Defence League.

THE SECULAR EDUCATION LEAGUE.

President—Lord Weardale, of Stanhope; secretary—Mr. H. Snell, 19 Buckingham Street, London W.; honorary treasurer—H. S. Leon, Esq., J.P., Bletchley Park, Bucks.

MANIFESTO ON SECULAR EDUCATION BY CLERGY AND MINISTERS OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

THE following manifesto, signed by 557 clergy and ministers of all denominations, is issued in order to give the signatories an opportunity of stating what they mean by "secular education" and why they support it. While not necessarily committed to every point of view expressed therein, the Secular Education League issues it as a valuable contribution to the discussion now proceeding, and believes that it is likely to have an important bearing on the discussion of the religious problem in national education.

We, the undersigned Christian clergy and ministers, desire to make clear the grounds upon which we support what is commonly known as the "secular solution" of the education question. By the "secular solution" we mean that religion should not be taught in the public elementary schools in school-hours nor at the public expense. We have not arrived at this conclusion through underrating the importance of religion in the education of our children. On the contrary, we consider it to be of paramount and vital importance, and we hold that education in the truest sense is impossible without it. But we hold equally strongly that it is not the function of the State to impart such teaching. We hold that it is contrary to the principles of justice and righteousness either that Catholics should be forced to pay rates in support of Protestant teaching or that Protestants should be forced to pay rates in support of Catholic teaching; while it is equally unjust to force freethinkers and rationalists to pay rates in support of any religious teaching whatever. The only solution of this difficulty is that no religion at all should be taught at the public expense.

But, further, even were it possible, without injustice, for the State to teach religion, we believe that the attempt would be fatal to the best interests of religion itself. Religion can only be effectively taught by religious people, and the only bodies qualified to give such teaching are the various Christian denominations which exist for that very purpose. So far from the secular solution endangering or enfeebling religion, we believe that its direct effect would be to awaken the Churches to a sense of the duty and responsibility which are theirs and theirs alone. We are too deeply convinced of the vitality of the Churches of this country to deem it for one moment probable that they would not rise to what would in reality be their great opportunity.

Adams, David.
Adams, Francis.
Allen, Chas. Llewn.
Amey, Alfred.
Anderson, A. W.
Anderson, Isaac.
Anderson, K. C.
Anderson, W. G.
Anderton, Jos.
Andreae, Alex. R.
Andrew, W. I.
Angel, J. Clement.
Antliff, S. R.
Archer, J. K.
Archer, Timothy.
Arthurs, Eli A.
Ashworth, Alexr. O.
Atack, W. E.
Atkin, F. W.
Auchmuty, A. C.
Auchterlonie, R.
Austin, Henry.
Avery, W. J.
Aylard, Charles.
Ayre, George.
Baart de la Faille, S.
Bache, William B.
Bainton, George.
Baldwin, Geo.
Ball, Edgar.
Ballantyne, John C.
Bamford, Alfred J.
Barker, Samuel.
Barlow, T. Herbert.
Barrett, George.
Barrow, Edwin P.
Barwell, William Morton.
Bass, J. Mason.
Bawtree, Stanley R.
Baxter, James.
Beal, Frederick W.
Beaven, Arthur.
Bedford, John H.,
Belcher, Jno. H.
Bell, John, T.
Bennett, William.
Bibby, Jos. Hy.
Bicheno, G.
Biggs, Joshua.
Bilbrough, William.
Binns, John.
Binns, Ottwell.
Birks, John.
Birks, William.
Bishop, J. W.
Bishop, William.
Blackmore, Allen S.
Bloomfield, W. G.
Bollard, Edwin Henry.
Bond, Kenneth.
Bonney, Thomas.
Bouser, Wm.
Bowen, O.
Bowen, S. G.
Bowie, W. Copeland.
Bowler, G. B.
Bradley, John.
Brady, Thomas Arthur.
Brain, Thos.
Branch, W. G.
Bremner, Eustace W.
Brewis, John.
Bridge, William.
Briggs, B.
Briggs, Henry.
Briggs, J. H.
Bright, T.
Brinkworth, Jabez Amther.
Brotherton, William R.
Brown, Edward H.
Brown, F. Henderson.
Brown, Francis George.
Brown, J. Marcus.
Brown, John.
Brown, Nathaniel.
Bryant, Evan.
Bryant, Wm. A.
Bullock, John.
Burnett, Percy.
Bury, Henry.
Bushrod, Walter Thos.
Butterworth, John.
Button, Frank S.
Byles, A. Holden.
Campbell, Owen D.
Campbell, R. J.
Cankwell, Thos. B.
Cannings, John W.
Cannon, Arthur.
Cannon, Walter.
Cantrell, E. W.
Carlisle, H. H.
Carlton, Sydney T.
Carpenter, J. G.
Carrier, Wm.
Carter, George.
Carter, Lawrence G.
Carvath, James.
Cater, F. Ives.
Chadburn, James.
Chalmers, Andrew.

Chalmers, Humphrey.
Chamberlain, Henry.
Chambers, Charles.
Chappell, Wm. John.
Child, Edwin.
Clark, Frederick H.
Clark, Henry W.
Clark, James.
Clarke, Charles J.
Clarke, C. W.
Clarke, Thomas.
Clarkson, J. Rhenius.
Clarkson, Wm. F.
Clayton, Francis M.
Cleal, W. J.
Clennell, John.
Cole, J. Cowden.
Coleman, E. Ernest.
Coller, W. E.
Collinson, E. C.
Connell, J. M.
Constable, B. C.
Cook, Charles Harvey.
Cook, E. Hampden.
Cooke, Alfred.
Cooke, David.
Cooper, Daniel C.
Cooper, William.
Corbold, Edwin.
Cordon, Ernest J.
Cousin, Isaac.
Cowling, Henry.
Crabtree, Charles.
Craddock, Charles.
Craig, Robert.
Crispin, Wm.
Critchley, George.
Crofton, Ll. F.
Crook, George V.
Crookall, Lawrence.
Cross, Henry.
Crossley, James.
Cubbon, Henry.
Cull, Fred. L.
Cutts, Samuel.
Dale, John.
Dann, John.
Darby, W. Evans.
Davenport, Henry.
Davidson, W.
Davies, B. Carolan.
Davies, Charles.
Davies, David.
Davies, D. C.
David, D. P.
Davies, D. R.
Davies, E.
Davies, E. T.
Davies, Edward.
Davies, Gwilym.
Davies, Ivan T.
Davies, James.
Davies, John.
Davies, John Beynon.
Davies, J. Park.
Davies, T. Witton.
Davies, W. Jones.
Davis, Geo. D.
Davis, G. Herbert.
Dawson, William.
Dawtrey, Henry.
Devenish, Edwin Isaac.
Dickinson, James.
Didcock, Henry R.
Dobinson, Matthew.
Dodd, Samuel.
Dodwell, Jabez.
Dolman, William.
Dolphin, A. H.
Drummond, Robert B.
Duff, Archd.
Duffield, Walter.
Dunbar, Michael S.
Dunham, Charles.
Dunkerley, Thomas.
Dunster, Fred W.
Duxbury, C.
Eastlake, W. H.
Edwards, Eliasaph.
Edwards, T. E. M.
Edwards, Wm.
Elliott, Thomas.
Ellis, John.
Emmett, Ernest S.
Emmitt, George.
Evans, Ben.
Evans, D. B.
Evans, D. Jenkin.
Evans, D. Tudwal.
Evans, Edward.
Evans, E. Gwilym.
Evans, George.
Evans, John.
Evans, Joseph.
Evans, Rowland.
Evans, Yomer.
Farley, R. P.
Farquharson, Alexander.
Farrington, Silas.
Featon, Thos.
Featonby, George.
Felstead, John.
Ferguson, George Argyll.
Field, William.
Firth, Samuel.
Forson, J. Mathieson.
Forster, John.
Fox, A. Cunliffe.
Fox, John.
Free, Richard.
French, John.
Fry, Francis J.
Gasquoine, Thomas.
Gelley, William.
George, Enos.
George, T.
Giddins, George H.
Gillender, Robert.
Ginever, C. Arthur.
Golland, Arthur.
Goodall, Arthur E.
Goodall, Colin C.
Goodwin, R. B.
Graham, John.
Graham, Thomas.
Graham, Walter B.
Greaves, Cyril A.
Grieve, Alex. J.
Griffin, James.
Griffith, David.
Gorton, James.
Gorton, Thomas A.
Grainger, Joseph.
Gray, Alick.
Grosvenor, James.
Hall, Alfred.
Hall, Arthur.
Hall, William C.
Halsey, Joseph.
Hamilton, John A.
Hanger, Thomas.
Hankinson, Frederick.
Hargrove, Chas.
Harris, William.
Harrison, John.
Harrison, Robert.
Harrison, Thomas.
Harrison, W.
Harry, Samuel.
Hart, E. Charles.
Harwood, James.
Hastwell, Wilbye.
Hatten, Jesse.
Hawkes, H. W.
Hawkins, Joseph.
Haworth, James.
Haycocke, Harry E.
Headlam, Stewart D.
Heape, Frederick E.
Heathcote, Henry John.
Hicks, E. Savell.
Higham, J. Bellamy.
Hill, A.
Hirst, J. Crowther.
Hitchings, W. Wilson.
Hoatson, John.
Hocking, Silas K.
Hoddinott, C. A.
Hodges, E. Rattenbury.
Hogg, George R.
Holden, A. M.
Hole, Donald.
Holman, Warwick R.
Holmes, John.
Holmes, M.
Holmes, Thos. Wm.
Holmshaw, W.
Holt, F.
Holt, Peter.
Homer, Fred. A.
Hopkins, Fred J.
Hopps, John Page.
Horne, John T.
Howgate, George H.
Howlett, J. Herbert.
Hoyle, R. Birch.
Huddlestone, Robert.
Huffington, William.
Hull, Harry Moore.
Humphris, T.
Hurn, Arthur.
Ingrem, Chas.
Jacob, James W.
James, J. Ernest.
James, William.
Jefferson, N.
Jenkins, E. O.
Jenkins, John.
Jenkins, T. Josef.
Jenkins, W. C.
John, Jacob.
Johnson, Matthew.
Johnson, R. Alex.
Johnson, Samuel.
Johnson, T. Miller.
Jones, D. M.
Jones, D. Picton.
Jones, Isaac Iwan.
Jones, J. Fisher.
Jones, J. Volonder.
Jones, Owen J.
Jones, R. C.
Jones, R. Eifion.
Jones, R. Jenkin.
Jones, Samuel.

Jones, Simon.
Jones, Stephen.
Jones, T. Lloyd.
Jones (Ap Rhys), William.
Keen, Edward.
Kelly, J. A.
King, Geo. W.
Kirkland, William J.
Lacey, Ernest.
Lambelle, W. H.
Lambley, R. H.
Lancaster, Alfred.
Lanceley, Walter.
Langdon, F. E. W.
Lansdown, George.
Lapham, H. A.
Larkman, Charles S.
Lawson, William H.
Laycock, M.
Leach, John.
Leach, Wilfrid.
Lee, Richard.
Lees, Ambrose G. A.
Lees, David S.
Litten, George.
Livens, H. M.
Longhurst, Caleb Mark.
Lovell, Edward E.
Lowe, Albert.
Lucas, Ernest.
Maddock, E. G.
Malton, W. H. C.
Mantripp, Joseph Close.
Marchant, A. J.
Mare, A. S. Le.
Markwell, Thos.
Marsden, W. G.
Marshall, Thos. L.
Martin, D. Basil.
Martin, Thomas H.
Mason, W.
Mason, Wm. H.
Mathers, John S.
Matthews, Charles.
Mayes, David.
McDowell, John.
McGee, Robert.
McLuckie, Geo.
McMullan, William.
Meeson, J. A.
Mellone, S. H.
Mellone, W. E.
Millard, Benjn. A.
Mills, Herbert V.
Mincher, Samuel.
Miskimmin, Joseph A.
Mitchell, John.
Mitchinson, John Bishop (Master of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Canon of Gloucester).
Moll, W. E.
Moore, John.
Morley, Henry John.
Morris, D.
Morrison, John.
Mummery, Jno. S.
Musson, William J.
Newell, Richard.
Newns, William.
Newsome, Edwin.
Noel, Conrad.
Norton, John.
Otty, John E. S.
Overend, Fredk.
Owen, Walter.
Pain, A. Thurston.
Parnaby, Henry.
Pattison, Mark.
Paxton, Thos.
Payne, George A.
Peach, Charles.
Pearce, Mark P.
Pearson, J. Arthur.
Pegler, George.
Perris, Harry S.
Perry, Herbert E.
Petzold, Gertrude von.
Phelps, G. Leonard.
Pickering, William.
Pickles, Alfred.
Pigott, F. W.
Pinchard, Arnold.
Pollard, Joseph.
Pollard, John Channing.
Pollard, Thomas Geo.
Pond, Wm. Jno.
Pope, W. W. Chynoweth.
Portnell, Bertram B.
Price, William G.
Price, W. Jones.
Prime, Priestly.
Pringle, Edward.
Pringle, James.
Rawlings, H.
Read, G. Sutton.
Reason, Will.
Reaveley, Edgar.
Redfern, R. Stuart.
Redhead, John.
Reed, Charles E.
Reed, F. Teasdale.
Reeve, Robert.
Reynolds, Fredk. W.
Reynolds, Walter.
Richards, Philip E.
Richards, W. Alva.
Richardson, John.
Ridge, F. Morgan.
Ridley, John T.
Roberts, R.
Roberts, Thomas.
Robinson, Hugh.
Robinson, J. Cartmel-.
Robinson, Thomas.
Robinson, William.
Rose, Richard.
Rosling, Wm.
Rump, Alfred E.
Rushton, Adam.
Russell, E. T.
Russell, Robert W.
Rutherford, Joseph.
Ryder, Amos.
Ryland, Arthur.
Sadler, John.
Sainty, Francis J.
Schofield, James Thomas.
Schroeder, W. Lawrence.
Sealy, Edward W.
Shakespeare, Thomas.
Shakspeare, Wm.
Shanks, W. Rose.
Sharpe, G. C.
Shields, Ralph.
Shirley, H. J.
Short, H. Fisher.
Skemp, Chas. W.
Skemp, Thomas Rowland.
Smith, Geo. Hy.
Smith, H. Bodell.
Smith, W. S.
Smyth, Wm. Rodger.
Sneath, Charles J.
Softley, William G.
Soulsby, Joseph G.
Spedding, Thos. P.
Spooner, W. L.
Steinthal, S. Alfred.
Stephens, Wm.
Stewart, David F.
Stoddart, Wm.
Storr, Ernest B.
Street, C. J.
Street, George.
Street, James C.
Tayler, Hugon S.
Taylor, Arnold D.
Taylor, H. J.
Taylor, John.
Taylor, Joseph A.
Thackray, E.
Thomas, E. L. H.
Thomas, Halliwill.
Thomas, T. Arthur.
Thompson, Alfred.
Thompson, Eustace.
Thompson, George.
Thompson, John Day.
Thompson, Saml.
Thornley, William.
Tongue, E. J.
Topping, W. G.
Travers, Chas.
Turland, Ephraim.
Turner, George W.
Vaughan, Thomas.
Vaughan, W.
Veal, J. Henry.
Voysey, Ellison Annesley.
Wain, J.
Walker, B.
Walker, C. W.
Walker, Joseph.
Wallace, Hugh C.
Walsh, Walter.
Walters, David.
Warcup, Alfred.
Ward, William James.
Wardle, W. Lansdell.
Warschauer, J.
Watts, Nathaniel.
Weatherall, J. H.
Weatherall, Wm.
Welbourne, Geo.
Welford, Wm.
Whitaker, J. T.
Whitaker, W.
Whiteman, J. Morgan.
Whittingham, G. Napier.
Wilkinson, Wilfred R.
Williams, D. J.
Williams, F. Haydn.
Williams, Lewis.
Williams, Nestor R.
Wilshaw, Thomas.
Wilson, J. Bastow-.
Wilson, Jesse.
Wintle, E. A.
Wood, Joseph.
Wright, William H.
Wrigley, Isaac.
Wycherley, R. F.
Younger, William.

DEFENDERS OF THE (STATE) SECULAR SOLUTION.

MEMBERS (112) OF COUNCIL OF SECULAR EDUCATION LEAGUE.

General Council.

[The asterisk* denotes members of the Executive Committee.]

Anderson, Rev. Dr. K. C.
Applegarth, R.
Balgarnie, Miss Florence.
Beesly, Professor E. S.
Begbie, Maj.-Gen. Elphinstone.
Belcher, Rev. J. H.
Bell, Richard.
Bloomfield, Rev. W. G.
Bonner, Mrs. Bradlaugh.
Bowerman, C. W., M.P.
*Burrows, Herbert.
*Burt, The Right Hon. T., M.P.
Bury, Professor J. B.
Buxton, Charles Roden.
Campbell, Rev. R. J.
*Cohen, Chapman.
Clodd, Edward.
Collier, The Hon. John.
Conybeare, Mrs. C. A. V.
*Cotton, Sir Henry.
Darby, Rev. Dr. W. Evans.
Didcock, Rev. H. R.
Doyle, Sir Arthur Conan.
Ellis, Havelock.
Evans, Rev. Rowland.
Fenwick, C., M.P.
*Foote, G. W.
Gasquoine, Rev. T.
Gimson, Sydney.
Glasse, Rev. Dr. John.
*Gould, F. J.
*Greenwood, George, M.P.
*Hankinson, Rev. F.
Harcourt, A. Vernon.
Harris, Rev. Dr. J. Rendell.
Harrison, Frederic.
*Headlam, Rev. S. D.
*Henderson, Arthur, M.P.
Henderson, Vice-Admiral W. H.
Hird, Dennis.
Hobson, J. A.
Hocking, Silas K.
Hodge, John, M.P.
*Hogg, The Rev. Geo. R.
*Hole, Rev. Donald.
Johnson, W., M.P.
Jones, Rev. D. M.
Jones, Rev. L. Jenkins.
Jowett, F. W., M.P.
Kibblewhite, E. J.
Knight, Charles F., M.D.
Knight, Holford.
Lamb, Edmund G.
Lea, Hugh Cecil.
Lewis, Rev. E. W.
*Levey, Sir Maurice, M.P.
Luttrell, H. F.
Macdonald, J. R., M.P.
Mackenzie, Professor J. S.
Masterman, C. F. G., M.P.
Maude, Aylmer.
McCallum, John, M.P.
Mitchinson, The Right Rev. Bishop.
Moll, Rev. W. E.
Morgan, J. Lloyd.
Nesbitt, Rev. J. C.
Otty, Rev. J. E. S.
Peach, Rev. Charles.
Phillpotts, Eden.
Pope, Rev. W. W. Chynoweth.
Price, J. A.
Reid, Dr. G. Archdall.
Richards, T. F.
Roberts, G. H., M.P.
Roberts, Rev. R.
Robertson, John M., M.P.
Rose, Rev. Charles S.
Rossetti, W. M.
Russell, Earl.
Russell, Countess.
Rutherford, Dr. V. H.
Ryland, Rev. A.
Saleeby, Dr. C. W.
Salt, H. S.
Scott, A. H.
Scott, A. M., M.P.
Shackleton, D. J.
Smith, Rev. H. Bodell-.
*Smith, Mrs. Miall.
*Snell, H.
Snowden, P., M.P.
*Stewart, Halley.
Strauss, Rev. Dr. J.
Street, Rev. C. J.
*Swinny, S. H.
Thomas, D. A.
*Thompson, Rev. John Day-.
Udale, Stanley.
Verinder, F.
Wadsworth, J., M.P.
Wallas, Graham.
Walsh, Rev. Walter.
Wardle, George J., M.P.
Warschauer, Rev. Dr. J.
Weardale, The Right Hon. Lord (ex-President).
Wells, H. G.
Whittaker, Rev. J. T.
Whittingham, Rev. G. N.
Wilkie, Alexander, M.P.
Williams, Rev. T. Rhondda.
Williams, Rev. F. Hadyn.
Williams, W. Llewellyn, M.P.
Wilson, Rev. J. Bastow.
Zangwill, Israel.

Among the deceased members of the General Council may be mentioned the names of Mr. Pete Curran, M.P., Dr. F. J. Furnivall, Rev. John Page Hopps, George Meredith, and J. Allanson Picton.

MANIFESTO (ISSUED APRIL, 1907).

Every attempt made to settle the education question in England and Wales has conspicuously failed. The reason of this failure is that partial and partisan lines have been followed. The Act of 1902 erred in one direction; the Bill of 1906 erred as badly in another direction. Every one sees that a further attempt, to be successful, must proceed upon fresh lines altogether, and it is with a view to this new departure that the Secular Education League has come into being.

The Secular Education League aims at binding together in one effective organization all who favour the "secular solution" of the education problem without reference to any other convictions—political, social, or religious—that they may entertain.

The fundamental principle of the League is expressed in the resolution that was carried at the crowded inaugural meeting which took place at the *Tribune* rendezvous on Monday evening, the 4th February, under the chairmanship of Mr. George Greenwood, M.P.: "That this meeting, recognizing that the sole responsibility for religious education rests with parents and Churches, expresses its conviction that there can be no final solution of the religious difficulty in national education until the Education Act is amended so as to secure that there shall be no teaching of religion in State-supported elementary schools in school-hours or at the public expense."

According to this resolution religion must not be taught in the national elementary schools either at the public expense or by means of the public machinery. Upon this basis a wise and just educational system could be established which would necessarily prevent religious tests being imposed upon teachers, give absolute security to religious rights of parents, and infuse serenity and efficiency into the intellectual and moral atmosphere of the schoolrooms.

The wisdom and equity of confining the teaching in public elementary schools to secular subjects were admitted by the late Mr. Gladstone. They have also been admitted by various political leaders still living, such as Lord Rosebery, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, and Mr. John Morley. But many who recognize that secular education is ideally right declare that it is impracticable. They assert that the nation will not have it. Yet they offer no proof of this extraordinary statement. The truth is that the people have never had a clear issue laid before them. Only at trade-union congresses has a popular vote been taken, and on every occasion the skilled workmen, through their official representatives, have registered overwhelming majorities in favour of secular education.

It cannot be questioned that the religious controversy has been a serious hindrance to national education. England will never take her proper place in the van of educational progress until the State leaves religion in the hands of those who should care for it, and organizes education on a scientific civic basis.

Certainly the religious controversy shows no signs of abating. Passive resistance, pursued by Nonconformists, is now being threatened by Anglicans and Catholics. Even if a majority were to agree upon a compromise it would still excite the passionate resentment of the minority. There is, indeed, but one way of peace—the way of secular education.

The Secular Education League neither professes nor entertains any hostility to religion. It simply regards religion as a personal and private matter, which all should be free to promote in voluntary associations, but which should never come under the control of the State. The League takes its stand on the principle of citizenship, with freedom and equality for all in matters that lie beyond.

It is with confidence that the Secular Education League appeals for moral and financial support. A number of distinguished names are already included on its General Council, and more will assuredly be added in the immediate future. What is now sought is a great accession of members, who give the motive power to every organization. The way into the League is easy. Only the essential points of principle and policy are insisted upon, and the member's contribution is purely voluntary, each being left to subscribe according to interest and opportunity.

With the issue of this first manifesto the general work of the Secular Education League begins, and the battle opens for the victory of "the secular solution."

VIEWS OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS ON SECULAR EDUCATION.

The *Rev. Dr. Fairbairn* in the *Daily News* on the 11th January, 1907:—

"I do believe that the grasp of any Church or clergy round the throat of the State is in the highest degree dangerous. If, therefore, we are faced by a multitude of men who threaten to lead our schools into ecclesiastical controversies I for my part would see no option save adopting the 'secular solution.' The secular may be non-ecclesiastical, but it is not, and need not be, anti-religious. The State is to me a body little competent to legislate in religion. It may be more competent than any known Church, but this is a small matter compared with the awful impertinence of those who plead for intervention by the State between the man and his conscience or the conscience and its God."

Principal Henderson, President of the Baptist Union, in his presidential address before the Spring Assembly meetings, April, 1907 (*Baptist Times*, 26th April), said,—

"It has never been held by us that majorities can righteously compel minorities to support common religious beliefs, and now that the Free Churches have become powerful are they ready to repudiate those principles of justice for which, when they were weak, they fought and suffered? It is irreligious to be unjust to any man. The Cross, I repeat, stands for righteousness. The Churches cannot wisely delegate their duties to the civic authorities. Even if all our resources were exhausted there would be the greatest objections to the principle that the State, as such, should determine what prayers are to be addressed to God, and what religious ideas are to be taught the people, old or young. We shall land ourselves in deeper and deeper bogs if there is persistence in the present course. It is in the interests of religion that the civil power should leave it entirely alone. Non-interference is the best service that Parliament can render to the Christian cause, and the best service the Church can render to the nation is to be true to itself, to abide by its own ideas, and to discharge its own duties."

The *Rev. J. H. Jowett*, addressing the National Council of Free Churches, said,—

"The present attitude of the Episcopal Bench can have but one issue. The man in the street has a short and sharp way in matters of this kind. When he sees that there is this prolonged and growing contention, and that many vital things are suffering, he will tumble both denominationalism and undenominationalism into the street. That is the present purpose and temper of the Labour party, a party destined to exercise an increasing influence in the State. But there is an increasing body of enlightened judgment which believes that in the interest of truth and perfect fairness it would be better for the matter of controversy to be removed clean out of the public schools, and that religious instruction should be committed to the Churches, who are primarily responsible for it."

The *Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell, (Daily News*, 15th April, 1907).—

"The sooner the present sectarian system of education is broken down the better, so that the nation may be driven to the only sound policy. The State school must be restricted to national and moral education, and religious teaching of all kinds must be thrown upon the Churches, in private hours, at their own cost, and by their own agents."

What *Dr. Parker* thought about secular education (reprinted from the *Times*, 18th October, 1894):—

"As a Nonconformist I believe that no education can be complete which does not include thorough religious training, but I am a citizen as well as a Nonconformist, and as a citizen I deny that it is the business of the State to furnish a complete education. That is a distinction which I hold to be vital. Under some circumstances the State may undertake to furnish an elementary education, which is a very different thing—so different, indeed, that it may include neither algebra nor theology. In such a matter as education it should be the business of the State not to see how far it can go, but how soon it can stop; and, for one, I venture to think that the State might very well stop when it has paid for a thorough knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Thus I would not exclude religion, I simply would not include it. Why? My reason for not including religion in rate-supported schools is simply the old Nonconformist reason that religion is personal, sacred, varying its aspects and claims according to various convictions, and that to support it by rates and taxes, and thus by possible penalties, is to vex and offend its characteristic and essential spirit."

DEFENCE OF STATE SECULAR EDUCATION.

An Appeal by Nonconformists to Nonconformists.

The Secular Education League, without committing itself to the views expressed by the signatories of this manifesto, issues it as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the principle of the education provided by the State in elementary schools.

1902, and after.

Ever since the passing of the Education Act of 1902 you as Nonconformists have had a burning grievance. By the provisions of that Act you are taxed and rated for the support of schools where the religious teaching is contrary to your beliefs. You have no effective control of the expenditure of your money in these schools, and, though you are taxed to pay the salaries of all the teachers, you and your children are debarred by a religious test from the highest posts in the teaching profession so far as these schools are concerned.

Hope deferred.

So keenly did you resent this unjust legislation that, when the time came for electing a new House of Commons, Nonconformist feeling throughout the country was undoubtedly one of the main factors among those which helped to return the present Government to power with a record majority. If anything might have been taken for granted it was that within a twelve-month at most of the general election the grievance of Nonconformity would be redressed—that was the clear mandate with which you sent your representatives by hundreds to Westminster. If any one could have prophesied that after three years of Liberalism in office the educational position would be still unchanged, that this issue would be as far from settlement as ever, that passive resistance would still remain as a thing in being, the forecast would have been dismissed with angry derision. Yet the seemingly impossible has happened in this instance. The Government has brought in Bill after Bill, yet in each instance only to meet with failure. Mr. McKenna's Bill shared the fate of that of Mr. Birrell, Mr. Runciman's that of Mr. McKenna's, and that in spite of the fact that each of these attempts at a solution of the difficulty went further than its predecessor in the direction of concession to your opponents. "Right of entry" and "contracting out" could hardly be accepted by you without the most serious misgivings, yet they were accepted, not light-heartedly, but in the hope and for the sake of peace. And still the desired end remains unattained, concessions and sacrifices have proved unavailing, and Nonconformity finds itself in the humiliating position of being no nearer a just settlement with a majority than with a minority in Parliament. No doubt you feel sore and indignant at the actual state of affairs; is it too much to hope that on reflection Nonconformists will read the lesson of these three years of disappointment?

Compromise impossible.

That lesson, to our mind, is a plain one. Free Churchmen were, in the first place, actuated by a sincere—but, as the results show, mistaken—belief that a compromise could be come to with Anglicans on the basis of what is called simple Bible-teaching. Such a plan was bound to fail, because it overlooked the repugnance to this form of religious instruction entertained by Catholics, both Roman and Anglican, whose attitude towards religion as a subject to be taught differs fundamentally from that of Protestants. It is really this stubborn fact which has frustrated all the well-intended attempts at conciliation, and it should be obvious, after the last of a series of fiascos hardly equalled in political history, that future attempts along similar lines will be no more successful than those made in the past. Surely by this time it must be clear to all who are prepared to learn from experience that a solution of the religious difficulty by means of a compromise is impossible even if Anglicanism and Nonconformity were the only factors to be considered.

At this juncture, then, we venture to recall to the memory of Free Churchmen some truths which in their desire for a settlement of a long, embittered, and calamitous conflict have been too largely forgotten.

Equality and Equity.

(1.) Free Churchmen believe in religious equality for all. They must therefore recognize that the issue does not rest solely between themselves and the Established Church, but that there

are many others outside these particular communions who, as citizens and ratepayers, have a right to be considered. It is simply no use to legislate on the assumption that the community is made up of members of Christian Churches, still less can we imagine Free Churchmen arguing that non-Christians have as such no claim to elementary justice in matters affecting religious belief or disbelief. Since Christians and non-Christians alike are made to contribute to the cost of education, it is surely not to be tolerated that the latter should be penalized by having to pay for a kind of instruction which runs counter to their convictions. This is precisely the Nonconformist grievance. Is it conceivable that Nonconformists should be willing to inflict the same grievance upon others, simply because those others may happen to be in a minority?

The State and Religion.

(2.) Free Churchmen are such because of their fundamental principle that the State has no business to meddle with the religious faith of its members. For this conviction they have made immense sacrifices in the past, sacrifices which are the pride and glory of Nonconformity. But if the interference of the State with the religious opinions of the citizen is not to be tolerated from the Free Church point of view, how can it be tolerable that the same State should have power to frame and impose a form of religious teaching upon its citizens in the making? And if the only proper agency for the giving of religious instruction to adults is the Church to which they may belong, must not the same hold true of the religious instruction given to children?

The Policy of Justice.

Some among the most consistent and widely honoured Nonconformists of the past—men like Spurgeon, Parker, and Dale—held to the view which we are expressing, and among those Nonconformist leaders who utter the same conviction to-day it may suffice to point to Dr. Robertson Nicoll and Mr. Alfred E. Hutton, M.P. Do you not think, after all the failure and disappointment of these last three years—with the proved impossibility of establishing a form of religious teaching acceptable to all, and the obvious injustice of endowing some form unacceptable to any—you might yet once more consider the claims of the only policy which inflicts hardship on none, and which goes by the name of "the secular solution"?

Objections.

We have heard it often and glibly stated that while this is no doubt the logical solution, "the world is not governed by logic," but, since it is very evident that the world in this instance declines to be governed by compromise, would it not be as well if for once logic—which in practice means fair play for all and privilege for none—were given a chance? Again, we have heard it said with constant reiteration that "the time is not ripe" for the secular solution. The answer to this is that the time, as the recent vote of the Welsh Baptists shows, is rapidly ripening, and that it behoves earnest men and women, as distinct from mere political opportunists, to hasten this process. It is urged that the secular solution will mean that the children will grow up unacquainted with the Bible. We can only express our surprise that such a fear should fail to excite the liveliest indignation among the Churches, Free and Established alike, with their tens of thousands of Sunday schools devoted to precisely this work, nor can we understand why the Churches should expect the State to fulfil one of their chief functions. Finally, a great deal of prejudice against the secular solution is due to an inexact habit of speech, which confuses secular education with secularism. It should be plain, however, that the two things are absolutely different, secular education meaning solely that the teaching given in the public schools and at the public expense is to be confined to secular subjects. To imagine, say, Mr. Spurgeon in favour of propagating secularism would be simply grotesque. The fact that he strongly urged the cause of secular education should save that cause from this particular misinterpretation.

In Conclusion.

Nonconformists, you have shown how great is the power you can wield. We appeal to you, precisely because of your historic principles, to wield that power effectively by throwing your immense influence in the scale of the secular solution. In so doing you will be true to your best traditions. Let the State confine its activity to the secular part of education, and let parents and Churches show the reality of their religious beliefs by providing the religious part of education themselves.

We plead, not on behalf of an abstract theory, but above all on behalf of the nation's children, who cannot but suffer educationally while the present state of warfare lasts. If the chapter of inglorious and wearing conflict is to close at last, and a new chapter of justice, peace, and educational efficiency is to open, the secular solution is "the only way."

W. J. Henderson, B.A. (Baptist), Baptist College, Bristol.
E. E. Coleman, M.A. (Baptist), 37 Ebury Road, Sherwood Rise, Nottingham.
R. J. Campbell, M.A. (Congregational), City Temple, London E.C.
J. Warschauer, M.A., Dr. Phil. (Congregational), Anerley Road, London S.E.
Hugh C. Wallace (Congregational), Anerley Road, London S.E.
Archibald Duff, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (Congregational), 9 Selborne Terrace, Bradford.
Joseph Wood (Unitarian), Birmingham.
J. Page Hopps (Unitarian), The Roserie, Shepperton-on-Thames.
W. Copeland Bowie (Unitarian), Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, London W.C.
G. Bicheno (Primitive Methodist), 28 Birklands Road, Shipley, Yorks.
John Day Thompson (Primitive Methodist), 86 Palatine Road, Blackpool.
George W. King (Primitive Methodist), 11 Summerseat Place, Bradford.
Silas K Hocking (Free Methodist), 10 Avenue Road, Highgate N.

DEFENCE OF STATE SECULAR EDUCATION.

An Appeal by Churchmen to Churchmen.

The Secular Education League, without committing itself to the views expressed by the signatories of this manifesto, issues it as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the principle of the education provided by the State in elementary schools.

Among the many forcible arguments which have been adduced in favour of the "secular solution" there would seem to be comparatively few which deal with the subject on distinctly Church lines. The object, therefore, of this appeal is to offer Churchmen a few reasons why they before all others should support the cause of the Secular Education League. And be it noted that the phrase "secular education" by no means implies hostility or indifference to religion but simply restriction, on principle, to secular subjects in the education which is provided in schools supported by the State.

If there is one thing which differentiates a Churchman it is surely the second of the three baptismal vows by which he is under obligation to "believe all the Articles of the Christian faith." These, according to his catechism, are summed up in the twelve clauses of the Apostles' Creed. He cannot, therefore, be satisfied with any religious instruction other than that which is based on these formulæ, and which, obviously, cannot be given in schools which are as much the property of those who do not believe them as of those who do.

"Simple Bible-teaching," as it is called, does not provide him with his religious knowledge, which is not derived primarily from the Bible, but from the teaching of the Church whose doctrine is anterior to the books of the New Testament, and was at first transmitted by "oral tradition." Cardinal Newman, in "The Arians of the Fourth Century" (written fourteen years before he left the English Church), says, "Surely the Sacred Volume was not intended, and is not adapted, to teach us our Creed, however certain it is that we can prove our Creed from it, when it has once been taught us, and in spite of individual producible exceptions to the general rule. From the very first that rule has been, as a matter of fact, that the Church should teach the truth and then should appeal to Scripture in vindication of its own teaching."

The converse of this is likewise a necessary axiom, for, just as the Bible vindicates the teaching of the Church, so also the teaching of the Church interprets the Bible, which otherwise might be misunderstood, for "No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 Pet. i 20). Hence, for the Churchman religious instruction is based upon the teaching of the Church plus the Bible—the two cannot be separated—for, according to the Articles, while (Article viii) "the Church hath authority in controversies of faith," yet (Article xx) "whatsoever is not read (in Holy Scripture), nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith."

This being the case, it stands to reason that in education provided by a State which is bound to respect the convictions of those who adhere to all sorts of beliefs, and of those who adhere to none, a Churchman cannot recognize a *pro rata* system of religious instruction.

And, further, supposing that some contrivance could be discovered whereby the State might authorize the teaching of Church doctrine in all its fulness, he could not conscientiously be a party to it; for, according to his theory, there is only one body divinely commissioned to decide what is to be taught, and that body is not the State, but the Church, and there is only one set of persons qualified to teach it—viz., those who are duly authorized by the Church and are fully persuaded as to the truth of what they teach.

Ever since the Divine command to "Go and teach all nations" there has been laid upon the Church the obligation of providing for the religious instruction of the people. It is an obligation which cannot be transferred to an external body like the State, which, although it may be composed of those who profess Christianity, yet may include those who do not, and which does not in any way assume itself to be ecclesiastical. To hand over the right of imparting religious instruction to such an institution is to surrender one of the most sacred trusts committed to its charge, and one which from the first age of its existence has ever been most jealously guarded. For the history of the methods employed by the leaders of the early Christian Church is an evidence of the extreme caution with which they proceeded in the matter of religious education.

It is sometimes asked how the Church is to fulfil this obligation without being subsidized in some way by the State. The principal requisite is greater faith in its divine mission. If the bishops and clergy had a stronger conviction that what they are divinely commissioned to undertake they will be divinely assisted to fulfil, this question need not be suggested. The first teachers of the Christian religion performed their task without either rate aid or State aid, and the result of their labour is still to be seen: whereas now the object of leaders of religion seems to be to get done for them what they ought to do for themselves. Apropos of this it may be well to quote an utterance of the Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Gore). Speaking to the Society of the Catechism in the Church House he said, "We are now, more or less, in the middle of a crisis. We are always in the middle of a crisis. This crisis is about the religious question in our day schools. I would ask you, then, to get at the root of our difficulty. What is it? The heart of our difficulty is partly that we have shifted on to the wrong shoulders the central function of teaching children: secondly, that we have so lost the idea of what the teaching of the Church is and the meaning of religious education that we are considered by the public to be unreasonable and uncompromising people if we are not disposed to admit that the County Councils can settle the standard of sufficient religious knowledge for everybody."

The difficulty as to means might be overcome to a considerable extent if the Church would mind its own business and leave to the State what the latter can do so much more effectively—and there is historical precedent for this—*pace* those who assert that education of all kinds can only be given in "a Catholic atmosphere." "During the first three centuries the Christian

parent justified himself in sending his sons to pagan schools on the ground of simple necessity, and while Christian doctrine was taught by Christians secular knowledge was sought in the ordinary channels . . . and even the recognition of Christianity by the State does not appear to have produced any sudden change in these conditions. The 'Schools of the Empire,' as they were termed, not only continued to exist, but maintained their traditions of education unmodified" ("Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," Smith and Cheetham; article "Schools," Vol. ii, p. 1847).

(It is not to be assumed that either Cardinal Newman or Bishop Gore would avowedly uphold the secular solution, but, being both men of integrity and sound common-sense, they have made admissions which tell very strongly in its favour.)

Most assuredly then is it to the highest interests of Churchmen that they should unite with men of good will, who, although differing in their views of religion, are at one in their desire to promote peace and justice in the upbringing of the future generation.

W. BUSBY, M.A., Rector St. John's, Maddermarket, Norwich.
G. K. CHESTERTON.
C. HALLETT, M.A., Vicar St. Barnabas, Oxford.
STEWART D. HEADLAM, B.A., L.C.C.
GEORGE R. HOGG, M.A., St. Albans, Holborn.
DONALD HOLE, A.K.C.
SELWYN IMAGE, M.A.
D. C. LATHBURY, M.A.
J. MITCHINSON, D.C.L., Bishop, Master of Pembroke College, Oxford.
W. E. MOLL, M.A., Vicar St. Philip's, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
CONRAD NOEL.
GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL, M.A.
W. A. SPENCE, M.A., Vicar St. Frideroide, Oxford.

NEW ZEALAND NATIONAL SCHOOLS DEFENCE LEAGUE.

Wellington, N.Z., 26th October, 1914.

The New Zealand National Schools Defence League respectfully submits the following facts to the Education Committee, and asks that, in justice to the Schools Defence League, this letter be recorded in the report of the proceedings before the Committee:—

(1.) The Secular Education Defence League was established on the 11th October, 1910.

(2.) The Wellington National Schools Defence League was not organized until the present Bible-in-schools campaign was begun. It was established on the 6th December, 1912.

(3.) The New Zealand National Schools Defence League was established on the 6th February, 1913.

I am, &c.,
HUGH MACKENZIE,
Hon. Sec. N.Z. National Schools Defence League.

APPENDIX D.

NOTES BY CANON GARLAND ON BISHOP CLEARY'S STATEMENT.

Read by him before the parliamentary Education Committee.

I GATHER from Bishop Cleary's lengthy statement that the Roman Catholic Church is totally opposed to the Bible in State Schools League's proposal, and equally opposed to ascertaining the will of the people by means of a referendum, and is determined to press its claim for State aid to its denominational schools whether there is religious instruction or no religious instruction in the public schools. This, in my judgment, sums up his fifty-eight pages of typewritten statement, and I should be content to leave it at that but that it might be considered his many assertions were conclusive facts.

I have endeavoured to make my notes as brief as the circumstances permit, and in a desire to save the Committee's time I have omitted attention to the mere trivialities as they seem to me, many of which would involve mere recriminations.

ALLEGED PETITION.

It is a mistake to speak of the League as presenting a petition. The League approached the Government, submitting the requisition of the governing courts of the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and the Salvation Army, asking that a referendum should be taken upon the proposal agreed upon by those Churches. In support of its request it shows a membership of over 153,000 electors or persons qualified to be electors, but not in any sense of the word did they sign a petition to Parliament. Their request was formulated in the following language:—"Bible in State Schools League of New Zealand: I am in favour of the system of religious instruction in State schools described on the other side, and request a referendum to be taken thereon." But it will be seen by the card submitted herewith that they did not address a petition to Parliament.

The League considered that a request coming from the Churches named was in itself sufficiently weighty to command the attention of the Government and the consideration of Parliament, and adduced the membership of the League as a proof that the representative character of the Church courts had truly voiced the desire of a great body of the electors. The League is of opinion that members of Parliament will consider such a request from the Churches as sufficiently weighty in itself. In the judgment of the League a petition to Parliament need not carry much weight. Any one may sign a petition, whether an elector or not—such as youths under their majority, and casual passers-by in the streets, as we are informed and believe has been the case. In contrast to this our membership has been rigidly restricted to electors and persons qualified to be electors, and the cards of membership were, in the deputation to the Prime Minister on the 1st September, 1913, offered for any inspection the Government might choose, or for the examination of the members of Parliament in their respective electorates. A petition, moreover, affords no guarantee that many may not have signed more than once, while our membership carefully guards against any such procedure.

As the League regards its opponents as entitled to conduct their business in their own fashion, so it claims the same freedom for itself. The League has never in any official literature, nor, so far as I am aware, have any of its speakers, said that the League will work detriment to, or even wreck, the national system by establishing a rival system of denominational schools. The League has pointed out, however, that should the moderate proposal it is making, which has proved permanent when introduced elsewhere, and has prevented any combination for State aid, be refused submission to the people the danger would be that many people, in despair at not obtaining from Parliament the opportunity of saying what should be done in the people's schools, supported by the people's money, would consider that rather than parents should any longer be denied for their children freedom from a compulsory secularism the building of Church schools would become inevitable. They desire to avoid this, which would wreck the national system, and surely they are doing the fair thing in pointing out the consequences which seem to them to follow upon a refusal to even allow the people a vote upon the question. In other words, the wrecking would be caused not by the League, but by those who refuse to allow the people of the Dominion an opportunity of saying whether they wish the national system so improved by the League's proposal that the national schools will be placed upon as permanent a basis as in those States where the League's system is at work. It should now and for all time be clearly understood, and beyond a doubt, that the League prefers the national system of education as compared with denominational schools under ecclesiastical control and yet supported by the State. The only improvement the League seeks is that which, in its judgment, will make the system truly national by adding the keystone which will make the national system so firm that it will resist the assaults of those who would wreck it in favour of a State-aided denominational system.

Bishop Cleary says that no case has been recorded of even one clergyman removing his children from the schools, and that thereby they have condoned "the very heathenish, &c. . . . of which they now complain." So far from this being an argument against the League, it shows that the Churches constituting the League have honestly stood by the national system in preference to denominational schools supported by the State, trying all along, as repeated efforts since 1877 witness, to get the one thing added to the national school system which the League thinks is essential to ensure its stability.

Bishop Cleary says that under the present secular Education Act facilities, such as they are, are offered to the clergy and others for religious instruction outside of school hours. I reply that I have been unable to find a single clause in the Education Act offering any facilities, even outside school hours, to the clergy and others for religious instruction. It remains, therefore, for this assertion on the part of Bishop Cleary to be supported by a reference to the clause in the Act which offers to the clergy and others facilities for religious instruction outside of school hours.

Bishop Cleary's own opinion of the value of the facilities offered to the clergy and others for religious instruction outside of school hours is set forth in a pamphlet published by him in 1909 entitled "Secular *versus* Religious Education," on pages 28 and 29 of which is found a reprint of an article by the editor of the *New Zealand Tablet*, as follows: "As regards the implied permission to teach about God and His law outside the hours devoted to the system, that provision serves only to emphasize the exclusion of God from the actual working of the system. Christians might conceivably have been permitted to do as much in Notre Dame, Paris, at the close of the revolutionists' worship of the Goddess of Reason. During school hours our law has put God out of calculation, it has excluded all doctrinal references to Him, or to moral duties towards Him or in Him to the children's neighbours or themselves. It compels the earnest Christian teacher to check his best thoughts and muzzle his tongue and play a part. Bishop Neligan, of Auckland, described God as 'an extra' in our secular system. But 'extras' are provided for by the system—God is not. If He is brought into the working of the system, He is brought in surreptitiously and as a stowaway, and all teaching regarding His law is as contraband as pipe-opium. And if He is smuggled in as the God of Jew or Christian to-day, He may equally well (as in France) be smuggled in as the myth-god of the atheist to-morrow. If the system is (and legally it is) truly secular, it has no personal God and no spiritual message; if it has a God or a spiritual message it is not secular. But who is its God, and what is its message of the other world? It has neither. The term 'godless' is not an agreeable one to apply to a system of training Christian children in a Christian land. But the truth and justice of the designation make it wholesome."

Bishop Cleary speaks of there being only a very occasional verbal protest against the secular system, and asks what the clergy have been doing during the past thirty-seven years, and why they do not urge their people to go to the cost of inaugurating, as the Roman Catholic Church has

done, a system of primary Christian schools. This question is practically a repetition of the Bishop's former statement. I again answer it by stating that the League prefers a national system, if the one thing essential is added to it as has been done elsewhere—*i.e.*, a system of religious instruction affording equal facilities to all, including the Roman Catholic Church, and special privilege to none.

If from the "strong heart" of the Roman Catholic Church goes up no appeal to Cæsar or Parliament to relieve her of part of her divinely imposed burden, yet with the loudest possible voice—and we may assume from her heart—has gone up a persistent cry and appeal to Cæsar and to Parliament to provide money for the education of her children segregated away from the rest of the community, and brought up entirely under her ecclesiastical control, though by funds which she claims shall be provided by the State; while from other Christian Churches have gone up with all the strength of their hearts—and it required strength of purpose in the face of persistent refusals—an appeal that in the national schools God should no longer be "brought into the working of the system" surreptitiously and as a stowaway, and all teaching regarding His law be "as contraband as pipe-opium." And with that cry for liberty and justice those Churches have shown their loyalty to the national system by not building schools—for which State aid is sought—to deplete and ruin the national schools as far as it was possible to deplete and ruin them.

The terms "referendum" and "plebiscite" are a matter of indifference to the League, but the term "referendum" follows good precedent inasmuch as in South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland the procedure of ascertaining the wishes of the people has there been called a "referendum." "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," and if Bishop Cleary's objection, and the objection of the National Schools Defence League, to allowing the people to say what should be done in their schools were to be removed by the substitution of the word "plebiscite" for "referendum" this League would see not the least objection.

The form of the ballot-paper, Bishop Cleary states, is misleading; but the fact is that the League is not asking, as a separate entity, for any one of the things dissected by the Bishop. It would not look at any one of these, even if separately put, as representing its request, any more than it would regard all the bones of the human body, disjointed and disarticulated, as representing the human body. The League is asking for an entire entity to be submitted to the people—a particular system of religious instruction as a whole—and desires that that system, and not a variety of systems or disarticulated bones, having no necessary connection with each other, be submitted.

The objection by Bishop Cleary to *selected* Bible lessons I meet by asking if he will state that his objection will be withdrawn if the League is prepared to meet him by asking that the Bible be substituted for selections from the Bible. To show how willing I personally should be to meet the wishes of the Bishop, I now say that I would urge our followers to accept the whole Bible—the Roman Catholic children to read the Douai version—provided this would remove the Bishop's objection to the Roman Catholic children reading the Scriptures in the State schools. If the Bishop does not agree to this, then I do not see with what right he can object to parents of other children reading from any selection with which they are satisfied.

But, as a matter of fact, all this talk about "mutilated Bible lessons," "mere extracts," "emasculated caricature" could be applied by controversialists to the selection of Scriptures used in the Churches themselves. The League in advocating selected Bible lessons does so in order to meet the wishes of those who consider that certain passages of Scripture are unsuitable for children, not necessarily implying thereby that it is improper to place the whole Bible in the hands of any individual, small or great. In taking this course the League followed the precedent of many educationists to-day who use a syllabus or a text-book of Scripture lessons. Moreover, they found themselves in admirable company in doing so—the company of all Churches which either liturgically or in practice read selections of Scriptures in public worship. The Roman Catholic Church itself in Holy Mass follows this practice, and makes what controversialists would term, though I would repudiate, "mutilated extracts" to suit itself. As a matter of fact, I have the greatest admiration for the passages of Scripture chosen in the Roman liturgy for reading at Mass, and here again I would make the offer that I would use my influence with our followers to persuade them to accept as a basis that selection of Scriptures to be read in English, if such a selection as that would overcome Bishop Cleary's difficulties. I believe our followers would accept that if it meant that Roman Catholic authorities withdraw their objection to their children doing in the New Zealand schools that which, with few exceptions, they do in the schools of New South Wales—*i.e.*, read the Scriptures in common with the rest of the children.

There is, however, a higher authority than even Bishop Cleary on this subject, and one who, if it were possible, was more hostile to the national schools than Bishop Cleary—His Eminence Cardinal Moran—who expressed himself at a conference of Inspectors, teachers, departmental officers, and prominent educationists held in Sydney on the 5th April, 1904, under the presidency of the Minister of Public Instruction. His Eminence there showed that while he took exception to the actual wording of the lessons he recognized the principle that Scripture lessons could be read in the schools by Roman Catholic children under the supervision of the State-school teachers. His words on that occasion were, "It is the desire of all, as far as I can see, that our system of education should, in its various details and in all its departments, be worthy of our State and worthy of our Commonwealth. Now, it appears to me that the Scripture lessons read in the schools are not worthy of Australia, nor worthy of this State, for this reason: they are but garbled extracts from, we will say, the Old and New Testaments, and I would venture to suggest, as a vast improvement (both for the teachers and for the senior pupils), that the four Gospels be substituted in their stead. If any difficulty were presented in the matter of expense I think that could easily be got over. Indeed, it does not appear to be a matter in which the State should be called upon to bear any expense at all. Each denomination would be able to present

its own children with the necessary books. For my part, I would be most willing to supply all our Catholic children with the four Gospels according to the corrected Douai version, the same as will be read in our religious schools. . . . It would be a great improvement if the revised Gospels were to take the place of those garbled lessons at present in use in the schools."

For my part, if that would meet the objection of the Roman Catholic Church, I would once more make a proposal with that object in view: I would urge our League to accept, as a compromise, that the four Gospels be substituted in their entirety, instead of a series of selections from Scripture, the Roman Catholic Church to withdraw any objection to their children reading any passage chosen by the State-school teacher from the four Gospels.

The Bishop speaks of the denial of the Virgin birth in the Queensland text-books, but he might as well say that the Virgin birth is denied in the Gospel according to St. Mark and St. John, simply because the account of the Virginal conception of our Blessed Lord is not to be found in either of these, nor, indeed, specifically mentioned in any other part of the New Testament except in some verses of St. Matthew and St. Luke, which, it is true, were omitted from the Queensland Bible-lesson books. Here again I will make a further proposal to the Bishop. I will undertake, on behalf of the League, after the referendum is carried, to join with the Bishop in a request that the verses referred to from St. Matthew and St. Luke should be included in the New Zealand Scripture-lesson books. Members of the Bishop's communion were on the departmental Committee which prepared the Queensland lesson-books, and I have no doubt they would be much surprised if they learned that Bishop Cleary considered that the extracts they chose implied that there was any denial of the Virgin birth. Moreover, it is never pretended that the Scripture-lesson books are to teach a complete scheme of Christian doctrine. They are to give the child a reasonable knowledge of the Bible. If there are points of doctrine omitted, such as that of the manner of the Virgin birth, they can well be taught by the Churches who will send in their representatives. Bishop Cleary's clergy would have the same privilege as any others of doing this, and could teach that doctrine fully to their own children, as I have no doubt other Christian Churches would do to theirs. The Virgin birth of our Lord is not "denied"—it is only the history of the "manner" or "mode" by which it was accomplished which is omitted from the Queensland books, after the example of St. Mark's and St. John's Gospels.

Clergy Visits.

The right of entry objected to by Bishop Cleary is availed of by his own Church in New South Wales and Western Australia. It is believed also that the Roman Catholic clergy enter the schools in Tasmania, though there are no statistical records kept of clergy visits in that State.

It is not claimed that the Roman Catholic clergy enter the schools because they approve the religious-instruction system therein, but the very fact that while thus disapproving the system of religious instruction and advocating all the time State aid for segregated schools, yet that they do enter the schools, is a proof that they can do so if they will, and that, when it suits them to do so, they do take advantage of the opportunity. The New Zealand League, in asking for the right of entry, is asking for it for the Roman Catholic clergy equally with all other denominations. It can hardly be said that the League is doing an injustice to the Roman Catholic Church when it is seeking for equal opportunities to be given to that Church with every other Church.

That the clergy would be constituted State teachers for the time being is no more true than saying that the Medical Inspectors, or Physical Instruction Inspectors, or other persons entering the schools for special purposes, are constituted State-school teachers. It is being more and more recognized by educationists that the schools are no longer exclusive preserves of the State-school teachers, but that outside influences and persons are brought in. No educationist worthy of the name contests this practice.

The same argument applies to the Bishop's statement that the State schools would thereby be made denominational for a portion of their working-time, no more than they would be made medical schools by the visits of the doctors, or dental schools by the visits of the dentists—dentists' visits being the accepted practice in advanced educational systems of to-day.

There is no proportional advantage to the denominations that have most money and men. On the contrary, simply because they have more children the strain on them is greater. Under the working of the system the smaller Churches usually group together so that, say, a Congregational minister does not go round to a number of schools taking a few children in each, but he takes all the children of the small denominations (always subject to the consent of the parents) in one school, while, say, the Baptist minister will take a similar group in another school, and thus things are more than equalized. To deny a right of entry merely because some denominations are larger than others would be to penalize the majority, while at the same time depriving the smaller denominations of opportunities which the smaller Churches show they value when the right of entry is given them.

Proselytism.

Bishop Cleary has to go a long time back to find ever so thin a support of his claim for anxiety on the part of the Church of England to proselytize; he goes back to the fifth Anglican Synod in Sydney in 1880, and quotes the President, but omitted to tell the Committee that the year 1880 was the time when the whole educational system of New South Wales was in the melting-pot. That Parliament feared no proselytism is shown by the fact that when in the same year it passed an Act which abolished State aid to denominational schools, so far from modifying the right of entry, much less casting it out, it re-embodied it in its new statute after its previous fourteen years' experience of it. Parliament evidently did not fear proselytism or it would not have reaffirmed the right of entry. I for one am quite sure that the President of the Anglican

Synod in no sense desired that the Church should be guilty of proselytism, and was apparently dealing with the objection to the arrangement by which parents could send their children in to another minister than their own if the parent so desired—an arrangement which, being under the parents' daily control, could not lend itself to proselytism. Naturally, any Christian minister would do as the president of the synod—repudiate, as the result of extreme sensitiveness approaching to jealousy, a want of sympathy with children who desired to read the Scriptures, and even to learn the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, under such well-safeguarded conditions. It is obvious to those who do not desire to misconstrue his words that he was answering the objections of those who were opposed to the right of entry, just as I and others have dealt with those objections in the present campaign in New Zealand.

However that may be, the fact is clear to-day that the Churches accepting the system—and that is practically all the Churches excepting the Roman Catholic—work thereunder in harmonious relation together. It has been shown repeatedly that, so far from the Churches fearing proselytism, they willingly enter into arrangements with each other, subject always to the consent of the parents of the individual children, which in itself is quite sufficient safeguard against any proselytism. Indeed, it may be taken for granted by any one of intelligence that the Presbyterian Church and the Methodist Church, for example, would not be such strong supporters of this proposal, much less would a smaller body like the Salvation Army, if their experience taught them there was any danger of their children being proselytized. The testimonies of the attitude of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches in Australia to this effect are voluminous, some of which will be found elsewhere in these pages. I will quote a pastoral letter written by the moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Australia:—

"General Assembly, Presbyterian Church of Australia, St. Stephen's Church,
Sydney, 27th December, 1909.

"Re *Bible in State Schools Legislation.*

"DEAR SIR,—

"At the meeting of the General Assembly of Australia, held in Melbourne in September of this year, the following finding was unanimously recorded: 'Approve of the action of the ex-moderator in issuing a circular to the Church in Queensland on the Bible-in-State-schools question; commend the Churches in the States in which the law permits to make full use of their opportunities for giving Bible instruction to our children in the State schools; and urge the ministers and people in Victoria and Queensland to aid to the full measure of their influence the securing of a like boon in their States.'

"Having regard to the great importance of this matter as relating specially to the State of Queensland, I have been instructed by the Public Questions Committee to issue a circular containing the foregoing finding of Assembly, and to urge upon the ministers and people in Queensland to act together in this matter, and to advance the efforts of all *re* endeavouring to secure Bible instruction for children in the State schools, so that the object aimed at may be speedily attained.

"Allow me to emphasize the clause which was put before you by my predecessor—namely, that 'the knowledge of the Word is the foundation of our Protestant faith and practice, and without such knowledge the work of the Church is made increasingly difficult from year to year.'

"By the formation of a branch of a Bible in State Schools League in your district, or by supporting such branches already formed, and by other means which you may think of, you may be able to do effective work in your particular district for the advancement of the common cause.

"With fraternal greetings, I am, yours sincerely,

"JOHN FERGUSON,
"Moderator, Presbyterian Church of Australia."

And this was not the only occasion on which such an official statement from the president of that Church was made. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia at successive Assemblies within recent years was absolutely unanimous in supporting the system. Such testimony would therefore be convincing to those who are willing to look at all the facts.

Bishop Cleary, instead of quoting in an erroneous sense, torn from the context of its surrounding circumstances of thirty-four years ago, a solitary phrase of an Anglican prelate, should, to prove proselytism, produce protests of to-day from the Churches upon which it is inflicted. This he cannot do, for the simple reason that, save his own, all the Christian Churches, and the Jewish Church also, testify to their happy satisfaction, and therefore to the absence of proselytism. Or Bishop Cleary could do still better to prove his charge of proselytism—produce cases of those who had proselytized, and of those who had been proselytized. If there were such an evil in fact he should have no difficulty, out of the hundreds of thousands of children liable to the danger in nearly half a century, in finding a thousand or even a few more to prove his wild assertion. Until he does so his statement remains an unproved assertion.

OPPOSITION TO CLERGY IN SCHOOLS.

With reference to Bishop Cleary's charge of inconsistency against the Rev. Dr. Gibb, the latter supplies me with the following statement:—

"Dr. Cleary need be in no doubt as to what the League stands for at every part of its programme. That has been made plain again and again, and it is only wilful blindness that fails to perceive the extent and the precise nature of our demands. Suppose that a charge of inconsistency could be proved against me—that I formerly opposed the proposals now made by the League in the matter of the right of entry and now support these—what has that to do with the clarity of the League's programme or its essential justice? Proof of inconsistency on my part

may be a sorry thing for me, but it passes ordinary intelligence to grasp the bearing of defects in my character on the League's proposals.

"But I repudiate the charge of inconsistency. I stand where I stood in 1903 in my intense dislike of the English Education Act, and if the proposals of the League contemplated a state of matters in the faintest degree resembling the situation in England I should offer them the most strenuous resistance. At the time I made the remarks quoted by Dr. Cleary I was of the opinion that to allow ministers of religion to enter the schools would not indeed exactly reproduce the English conditions in New Zealand, but would probably tend in that direction. I was much more cognizant of the working of the Education Act in England than of the Education Acts in Australia, and the overwhelming testimony to the smooth and satisfactory working of the latter came under my attention at a later period. In plain terms, it is the discovery that the right of entry in Australia, so far from inflicting injustice on any, even the smallest Church, is universally regarded as a boon of incalculable worth that has led to my change of attitude. I thought that if the right of entry were accorded there would be friction, discord, and heart-burning in the Churches. I find that peace and mutual good will are promoted among ministers of religion and Churches by their joint efforts to give religious instruction to the children in the public schools. And finding this, I had no option but to withdraw from my former position and take my stand, as I now most heartily do, with those who demand the right of entry for ministers or their duly accredited representatives."

Bishop Cleary referred to single-roomed schools, and quotes a correspondent of his who informed him that the system worked very unsatisfactorily in the twenty-six one-roomed schools in his parish. I presume that his correspondent is a Roman Catholic priest, whom one would not regard as in sympathy with any system of education except that endorsed by his own Church. I submit that a mere expression of opinion unsupported by substantiated facts ought not to weigh against the outstanding fact that for half a century the system has been at work in single-roomed schools, and except for such a protest on the part of a Roman Catholic, no complaint has been brought forward. One-roomed schools are much more numerous in Australia than in New Zealand, and in almost half a century in two States, and nearly a quarter of a century in a third State, there would have been plenty of room for difficulties over one-roomed schools had they really existed. As a matter of fact a little common-sense prevents any hitch of the sort occurring, which can easily be guarded against in New Zealand by regulations.

Conscience Clause.

In reply to Bishop Cleary I cannot do better than quote the remarks on this point by the Bishop of Wellington in his synod address, 1914:—

"I gather that what our opponents condemn is a formula which should require all parents who desire partial or complete exemption for their children to signify the same to the headmaster in writing. I must confess that some such formula seems to me entirely reasonable. Both classes of our opponents take strong exception to it; but whether on the same or on different grounds is not clear. The Defence League, I gather, virtually demands that the conscience clause shall apply not to the minority, but to the majority—that is, that it is the parent who desires religious teaching who shall be compelled to signify the same in writing, not the parent who declines such teaching. This proposal discloses a most odd conception of the function of conscience clauses. The very idea and meaning of conscience clauses is to protect minorities against oppressive action of majorities. Majorities do not need protection. Theoretically all laws are assumed to represent the prevailing mind of the community, and as a general rule everybody is expected to accept them. In certain cases, however, it is felt by modern communities to be a just and reasonable concession to individual liberty to permit persons who do not approve of the law to claim exemption from its scope. But for the sake of public dignity and order this exemption must be applied for according to prescribed form. Public dignity and order forbid that people should exempt themselves without due notification to the proper authorities. Accordingly such laws contain a conscience clause, which concedes the right of exemption and prescribes the procedure. This is the universal use of conscience clauses: they protect minorities. The Defence League, as I understand, proposes to put the conscience clause to the very opposite use, and to require those who approve of the law and wish the benefit of its provisions to take the trouble of making formal application. Who ever heard of such a thing? I' faith, the Defence League genius who conceived the idea of protecting the law-approving majority by a conscience clause must be a countryman of my own! In fact, the Defence League wishes it assumed that the prevailing mind is opposed to the law until the contrary is shown by individual written approval! The absurdity is especially glaring in the present case. For while, owing to the party system and the opportunities it affords for temporary coalitions between small parliamentary groups, it sometimes happens that laws are enacted which by no means represent the prevailing mind of the community, our procedure by referendum infallibly secures that our system shall not be legalized unless it do represent not in theory only, but in fact, the prevailing mind. We shall not have to assume, we shall know that the majority approve it. And were it an ordinary law all would be expected, without more ado, to observe its provisions. But in this matter of religious education it is just that parents' liberty should be respected; hence a conscience clause is provided for conscientious objectors. National defence is a parallel case. Not those who approve of it, but those who on certain specified grounds disapprove, are required to signify the same to the authorities. Yet national defence was never submitted by referendum to the direct and specific vote of the people.

"The Roman petition describes the assumed conscience clause as 'odious' and 'disreputable.' Its words are, 'The proposed so-called conscience clause for children is a peculiarly odious

and disreputable formula; it falsely pretends that all parents desire for their children the proposed form of Government religious instruction unless such parents protest in writing against it.' This rigorous and vigorous sentence is open to much criticism, as—*e.g.*, the scornful epithet applied to the religious instruction—'Government religious instruction'—quietly ignoring the fact that the religious instruction will be given by the Churches, including the Roman Church, if it so desire, without Government let or hindrance. Inasmuch, however, as in the petition the clause 'in writing' is printed in capital letters, we must presume that the odiousness and disreputableness are chiefly to be found in the procedure by written letter, the capital letters being employed to visualize to the eye the huge enormity of this method. What other procedure, then, would the petitioners suggest? Would they think it consonant with the dignity and good order of the national schools that it should be left to the children to bear verbal messages from their parents on this most important subject? Or do they wish to impose on parents the trouble—in many country districts the appreciable trouble—of themselves interviewing the teachers? And do they think that either of these methods would be a more effective safeguard than the written and signed letter against the proselytism which they go on in the petition to express their exceeding dread of? I suspect, however, notwithstanding the capital letters, that what these petitioners disapprove is not the mere method of procedure, whether by letter or otherwise, but that the minority should have to claim exemption by any method whatever, and that they are at one with the Defence League in its absurd demand that the conscience clause should apply to the majority."

Controversial Concealments and Contradictions.

It is admitted that in Australian Acts the term "general religious instruction" is applied to that part of the system with which the State-school teachers are concerned. The New Zealand League, however, modified the position in that respect in order to meet the teachers as far as could be done practically, and is quite content as to that part of the system if in New Zealand the Scripture lessons are used as literary and moral lessons, reserving the religious instruction to be given by the Churches through the representatives whom they send in. The League is satisfied, so far as that part of the system is concerned, if every child is given the opportunity of access to the Bible in the shape of reading-lessons selected therefrom; and this has been made perfectly clear. Never once has the League in its official documents made the request that the teachers shall be asked to give religious instruction, not that it regards the teachers as incompetent or unqualified, but in order to meet as far as possible the objections of those who would be unwilling to undertake such lessons.

Change of Mind.

I deny that the League has in any sense of the word adopted the so-called Irish conscience clause. Whatever its source may have been, it has stood the test of time, and has given such satisfaction that, except from Roman Catholics, there has been no protest against it. It still stands as firm in those Australian States as on the respective dates on which it was adopted by them. The League asks for a conscience clause giving control to the parents, and not to ecclesiastics; to be exercised in the same fashion as any conscience clause—*e.g.*, in legal oaths where provision is made for the exemption of the minority. The New Zealand Parliament will frame the conscience clause, about which it will find no difficulty from the League if it follows the established precedent.

The Cost.

With a long list of words Bishop Cleary conjures up a fearful picture of unfortunate taxpayers groaning under an unjust taxation. Very wisely, however, while quoting a guess at the cost of the work at £100,000 he expresses no opinion thereon, but confines himself to the principle, and uses the Boston tea-tax as his illustration. The Boston tea-tax was imposed upon a people a minority of whom were willing to pay it and the majority unwilling, and is thus the reverse of that which the League claims will be the case after the referendum is taken. Assume that there is a small minority which objects to English children in English schools who are learning the English language being provided at the expense of the whole people with the highest specimens of English literature, is there any gross injustice? Would not one, on the contrary, say that there is only pity for a minority which objects to contribute its small share to that which is necessary if the children are to receive an English education? Moreover, the principle already exists, and must continue to exist so long as we live under present mundane conditions. Many people object to the Defence Act from strong conscientious principles, yet while they rightly are exempted from military service against their conscientious scruples, no one would dream of applying the same exemption to them in regard to their share in contributing through the taxes for the training of others and to that which the majority regard as being for the benefit of the country. The same principle applies in many other things, of which one illustration must suffice. Many people object, on principles no less strong than that of the Roman Catholics in regard to this proposal, to the running of trams and trains on Sundays; yet where the trams are municipally owned and the trains State-owned they have to bear their share of the liability in the loans raised for those undertakings. Moreover, the principle is already adopted in regard to the Bible itself. Bibles are provided for the use of members of Parliament, for the use of Judges, jurors, and witnesses in the law-courts, for the use of prisoners and criminals in the gaols. These Bibles are paid for by the whole people whether they believe in the Bible or not, and there has been no complaint of unjust taxation.

The League's position is that the same principle should be extended to the schools which is applied to Parliament, the law-courts, and the gaols. Bishop Cleary compels me reluctantly to remind him that the people of New Zealand are contributing to the cost of Roman Catholic

education. The salaries of Inspectors, the railway fares of children attending Roman Catholic schools, some of which children pass by national schools, are borne by the whole people. Many people are of opinion that by doing so they are directly propagating Roman Catholicism, to which they would not willingly contribute. In addition to this compulsory financial assistance to Roman Catholic schools, a huge expenditure is incurred through the organization of the non-Roman Churches in building and maintaining Sunday schools, and an expenditure which cannot be estimated because of its greatness is made in the sacrifice and energy of the many thousands who devote themselves to the development of better citizenship through the religious instruction they impart in the Sunday schools, Bible-classes, and suchlike. The material for Sunday-school work alone involves an ever-increasing outlay. It is not the Roman Catholic Church which is the only body spending large sums of money in providing for the religious instruction of the future citizens. But there is this difference: that while such expenditure is cheerfully borne by these Churches, they make no demand for State aid either under the specious cover of public service rendered, or for the day schools, by which they also render public service. These Churches only ask to be allowed to continue their loyalty to the national system, provided there is restored to it on a practicable basis that which Sir C. Bowen said nineteen-twentieths of the people desired should be there. The League believes that its proposal supplies that basis on a system which would prove as permanent here as it has proved elsewhere.

Trusting the Teachers.

It is hardly fair of Bishop Cleary to quote the Penal Code. I for one would agree with him that its provisions were odious. I think it is possible that some of the friends supporting him in opposition to this movement might be found more in sympathy with the provisions of that Penal Code than the members of the League. There is no comparison between the provisions of the Penal Code and the proposals of the League. That Penal Code prohibited the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion; it placed a price on the head of Roman Catholic priests; it prevented the child being taught not only the faith of his fathers but the very language of his fathers, often the only language which the father could speak. Contrast those odious impositions with the proposal of the League: there is, for instance, no prohibition of the Roman Catholic faith, no suggestion that its schools shall be closed or its churches razed to the ground. On the contrary, so far from banishing the Roman Catholic clergy, the League's proposal gives to the Roman Catholic clergy that which they do not possess to-day—the right to go into the schools during school-hours and teach their own children the faith of their fathers and in the language of their fathers. The League's proposal, instead of punishing the parent as the Penal Code did, by taking away parental rights, gives to the parents a full and clear right to say whether the child should read the Bible lessons or not; and if—as I anticipate would be the case—many Roman Catholic parents, in obedience to their hierarchy, would withdraw their children from the Scripture lessons, so far from the children being penalized, they would receive, instead of Bible lessons, their ordinary school lessons. Assume, for the sake of argument, that an hour a week were given to the reading of the Bible lessons by other children, the Roman Catholic children in the State schools would have an extra hour at secular subjects of which the children reading the Bible lessons would fall short. There is therefore no comparison between the Penal Code of Ireland and the League's proposal. That the Roman Catholic Church, if the League succeeds, could send its priests in by law has not been denied, and that they do so is not denied either, though it is claimed, and justly claimed, that they do so only in a number of cases proportionately smaller than that of which they might avail themselves. But the fact remains clear that in Western Australia and in New South Wales (there being no records for Tasmania) the Roman Catholic clergy do go into the schools. There must be some advantage or they would not use a system which their Church so much dislikes. The advantage is usually taken in the country schools, and, to my mind, I would welcome the thought of the Roman Catholic priest seeking his children out for confirmation, preparation for Holy Communion, and other things which that Church values. In a proposal affording such opportunities there is nothing corresponding to the Penal Code, which proscribed and prohibited the Roman Catholic religion.

Teachers' Conscience Clause.

The absence, referred to by Bishop Cleary, of a conscience clause for teachers in the present proposal compared with that of 1905 is very easily explained. Seven times Bills have been introduced into the New Zealand Parliament, all intended to deal with the subject of religious instruction. Up to the last attempt the promoters had honestly believed that by including a conscience clause for teachers they would so meet objections that their proposals would be agreed to. But every such proposal being rejected by Parliament, and the people refused even an opportunity of voting thereon, the promoters looked for some other system which they hoped would prove more acceptable, and have brought forward a system by which the work demanded of teachers is so small (and in which the promoters have abandoned the teachers' share of the work as religious instructors) that there is no necessity for a conscience clause for the teachers. Moreover, in the four Australian States where the system is at work there has never been any protest on the part of teachers against, or application for exemption from, Scripture lessons on the ground of conscience. It may be said that in New South Wales and Tasmania teachers know before they enter the Department what they have to do, and make up their minds accordingly; but, on the other hand, I point out that in Western Australia in 1893 and in Queensland in 1910 the teachers were already in the Department, and not one was found who resigned or made any difficulty in consequence of oppression of conscience. The fact is all the more striking in the case of Queensland, where for thirty-three years the teachers had entered the profession under a purely secular Act.

Proportionately, and actually numerically, the number of Roman Catholic teachers in the Australian States must be greater than in New Zealand if we take the census proportions. In Australia, for instance, there are 921,425 Roman Catholics, equalling 20·68 per cent. of the population. In New South Wales alone there are 375,391 Roman Catholics, equalling 25·54 per cent. of the population; while in New Zealand there are only 126,995 Roman Catholics, equalling 13·97 per cent. of the population. It is a fair assumption that both numerically and proportionately the Roman Catholic teachers are in larger numbers in the Australian States than in New Zealand. Yet even though there is a larger number from whom difficulties might be expected, they have yet to be put on record. I do not for a moment accept the alternative that they are hypocrites and sell their souls for bread-and-butter. I have too much experience of my many Roman Catholic friends amongst Australian Inspectors and teachers to listen to such a suggestion even for a moment. On the contrary, every Roman Catholic teacher I know welcomes the Bible lessons, encourages the ministers' visits, and values the religious instruction of the system. I say, as others have said, that if any section of the teachers could be singled out for the reverence and carefulness with which they give their own lessons, and for the cordiality with which they welcome the ministers of all denominations, I would single out the Roman Catholic teachers.

The conscience clause is for the protection of the child. It operates on him, though, for natural causes, it is called into operation by the parent. The statement is a mere fallacy that a teacher, as parent, can take advantage of the conscience clause, while as teacher he would not have the advantage of the conscience clause. The object of the conscience clause would be attained by the parent even if he happened to be a teacher. His child would remain exempt if the teacher-parent so wished. There should be a great difference between the mind of a child and the mind of a grown-up person like a teacher. The child's mind is in a most plastic and receptive state. The parent is entitled to say that he does not wish his child to receive indelible impressions from the Bible or from a religious instructor. The teacher, on the other hand, has a formed character and convictions, and if he wishes can prevent himself from being influenced by the Bible just as he can do to-day without a conscience clause when he is teaching history which opens the way to sectarian interpretation or when he is teaching passages in the school literature which have either Christian, Mohammedan, or heathen references.

Natural Rights.

It is exactly because the League claims the natural right of the parent to freedom from being coerced into doing anything which his conscience tells him is not morally allowable that we are seeking to have freedom substituted for the present coercion by which the parent is denied the right of having his child taught the Bible or receiving religious instruction. The natural law demands that the parents' rights should prevail over the State, and, the League claims, over any Church.

The point is beyond dispute that Roman Catholic teachers in New South Wales, Tasmania, Queensland, and Western Australia give the Scripture lessons, while the fallacy of the argument that they have to choose between their bread-and-butter and refusal is shown by the fact that they continue to enter the Department, knowing perfectly well what is in front of them, although every avenue of life is open to them at the same time, including possibly employment in their own Church schools. It is incredible to imagine that this great number of Roman Catholic teachers have sold their consciences.

In Queensland the Roman Catholic teachers were called upon to do that which they had not done previously (unless having been in the Department for over thirty years they had used the Bible lessons in their earlier days), yet not one Roman Catholic teacher was heard of who entered any protest. Bishop Cleary has alleged a violation of the Roman Catholic teacher's conscience if he is called on to read or supervise the reading of lessons from the Bible, but he stands in singular contrast to the action of Cardinal Moran, who was prepared to supply copies of the Gospels for use in the State schools, and who, with all his vehemence against the State schools, never once, so far as I have been able to learn, uttered a word against Roman Catholic teachers giving Bible lessons. Nor indeed have I heard of any other of the Roman Catholic Bishops in Australia doing so, although thousands of Roman Catholic teachers have been giving these lessons during the last half-century. On the contrary, an official pronouncement was made by Archbishop Duhig, Co-adjutor to Archbishop Dunne, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Brisbane, in his Lenten pastoral delivered as Roman Catholic Bishop of Rockhampton and reported in the *Age*, the organ of the Roman Catholic Church, 4th March, 1911. The following is Archbishop Duhig's statement: "As servants of the State Catholic teachers in public schools are free to give the Scripture lesson provided for in the curriculum, and we feel it is not necessary to impress on them that in doing so they should be most careful to abstain from any sign or word that would cast the least reflection on the religion of any of their pupils."

The fact then remains clear that Roman Catholic teachers have been giving, and continue to give, the Bible lessons. Whatever the objections may be from a theoretical point of view, they disappear in practice, and are so little found that the Roman Catholic teachers in the profession have been singled out for praise as to the reverent manner and faithfulness with which they fulfil this duty. Bishop Cleary has referred to this work as not "morally allowable." But he is the first Roman Catholic Bishop I have heard of who has applied such a term to that part of education which Archbishop Duhig declares those teachers are "free to give." I cannot imagine either Archbishop Dunne or Archbishop Duhig, both of whom I respect, countenancing anything which was not "morally allowable."

Minorities must suffer.

Bishop Cleary quotes me as saying (*Dominion*, 27th May, 1914) that the Government must adopt certain theological views of one section of the people and reject certain theological views of another and minority section. The Bishop is not quite fair to me here, unintentionally, I would trust. The theological views to which I referred are the views put forth so loudly and frequently by Bishop Cleary that a referendum is not applicable to our proposal because this is a religious question. This, I say, is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church which I for one am not prepared to accept, and which I believe a majority of the people of this Dominion are not willing to accept. We claim the right of freedom to judge in religious matters for ourselves, and not at the dictation of any Church. That is a very different thing from accepting the doctrine that because a matter is stated to be a religious question, or intrudes upon the religious domain, therefore some one else is to decide it for us, and that we are to be refused the British right of self-government which extends to all matters.

The position taken up by the League is that the majority is suffering and has been suffering, but the only way of finding out whether it is a majority or a minority will be by taking the referendum, the result of which, even if in the affirmative, will not compel a solitary child to read one line of Scripture lessons or to have one word said to him by a visiting minister.

The security of the "weaker groups" and the liberty of conscience are effectually secured under the conscience clause asked for, which effectually secures the "weaker groups" of children, and even every individual child, from reading the Bible if his parent objects.

Opinions of Experts.

Bishop Cleary speaks of our producing only ninety-eight opinions, but I should like to know how many more would convince him. At any rate, he has not produced ninety-eight opinions from educationists who have experience of the working of the system which he can set against those published by the League. In addition, the League draws attention to various other opinions expressed by people who are not teachers and by those who are retired teachers, and claims that until its opponents bring forward similar evidence both in quantity and reliability equal to that of the witnesses on the side of the League, and brings it forward, as the League has done, of people who have had personal experience, the League's evidence stands uncontroverted.

Bishop Cleary draws attention to requests from the Education Department, New South Wales, reminding the clergy that they had the right of entry. The League claims that this is a strong proof that the Department is satisfied with the system of religious instruction, and finds the ministers' visits helpful, else it would not complain that there are not sufficient visits paid. If the Department found the visits objectionable it would seek to discourage them, instead of urging upon the clergy to co-operate with the Department by visiting the schools. Had all the bogeys of sectarian strife, interference with school routine, and suchlike any foundation in fact, it cannot be imagined that the Department would be anxious to encourage the clergy to come into the schools to develop these difficulties. The clergy are thus encouraged by the Department, because in addition to the educational value of intercourse between the children and cultured, educated clergymen of all denominations, the schools are made more popular in the eyes of the parents and the people generally, to say nothing of the children themselves and the teachers welcoming these visits.

Bishop Cleary alludes to what he describes as "organized political and politico-religious fanaticism" in New South Wales, which he has studied for over a quarter of a century, and asks what the education system has done to mitigate it; and I would say it has done much, as is shown by the fact that he cannot produce evidence that this "organized political and politico-religious fanaticism" exists inside the school-walls. Supposing that some such thing does exist in New South Wales, which I neither admit nor deny, then I would say it is a proof of the efficacy of the religious-instruction system in schools that this feature is not found therein.

The Bishop asks, what has the education system done to mitigate it? It is equally pertinent for me to ask, what has the greater proportion and number, compared with New Zealand, of Roman Catholics in New South Wales—25 per cent., with at least half their children brought up in their own schools—done to mitigate this "organized political and politico-religious fanaticism"? I do not say that the greater proportion of Roman Catholics or the segregation of half their children in separate buildings have produced it, but what have these two factors done to mitigate "organized political and politico-religious fanaticism"?

Bishop Cleary refers to a report of the Church of England Committee of Religious Instruction in the Sydney Synod, 1913. The Archbishop of Sydney, writing to me under date 3rd September, 1913, said, "With regard to the statement that something occurred in the last Diocesan Synod which showed that religious instruction had failed, I am not aware to what the reference could be—we are all so convinced that ours is the best system if it is not possible to have separate denominational schools. We are, of course, always anxious to make the fullest use of our opportunities, and from time to time we naturally express the wish that our funds were larger so that we might pay some special instructors who could assist the clergy in the splendid work they are doing in the schools. It was probably such an appeal that has been distorted into the misleading statement you quote."

Mr. James Hole, secretary of that committee, wrote to me under date 6th September, 1913: "The Church of England in New South Wales is not in the slightest degree dissatisfied with the system of religious instruction in force here. I cannot conceive that any member of our Church would wish for its alteration. Some may wish for denominational schools, but they do not wish the public schools to be godless. What we have to be dissatisfied with is the support given by the Church people to the committee appointed by synod to carry on the work committed to their care."

Light will be thrown upon the point by remembering that this committee is appointed by the synod to develop the work of religious instruction in State schools, chiefly by raising money in order that lay teachers may be employed in the State to visit schools which the clergy cannot reach in consequence of the schools being too many. This committee has been in existence for some thirty-five years, and it is quite natural that, being in earnest about their work, they would seek to impress the necessity for maintaining it, and use language as strong as possible; but as the Archbishop of Sydney said, "it was probably such an appeal that has been distorted into the misleading statement" with which I am dealing. From reports in my possession I see that the following sums of money were raised by this committee: 1905, £609; 1907, £588; 1908, £563; 1909, £557; 1911, £597; 1912, £633. An organization which lays itself out to raise close upon £600 a year to promote religious instruction, in addition to having invested capital to produce income for the same purpose, can hardly be regarded as anything else but the clearest evidence that the Church of England is whole-hearted in the matter. And this is a committee in one diocese only. There are similar committees throughout Australia. I know of one maintained by the Congregational Church of New South Wales. The very language which Bishop Cleary quotes is a proof of earnestness of purpose to increase their subscription-list in order that the work of religious instruction in State schools may be pursued to its fullest extent.

Bishop Cleary quotes the names of one Presbyterian and three Anglican clergymen as lamenting the widespread decay of vital religion among people trained in the oldest League-type schools. It would be indeed strange if the clergy of all Churches did not at times in all countries and places warn their flocks of defects; but it does not follow that therefore there is a vital, if any, connection between those defects and the system of education, unless indeed Bishop Cleary is prepared to argue that the segregation of Roman Catholic schools produces a higher type of religion than is to be found elsewhere, because such a conclusion would force comparisons which I am reluctant to make between countries of which the Roman Catholic Church has had exclusive control and others in which her power has been limited.

Of his quotations one, that of Mr. Chambers, which the Bishop quotes from the *Catholic Press* of 23rd July, 1914, does refer critically to the religious-instruction system. Let Mr. Chambers speak for himself in the following letter, which shows how sadly Bishop Cleary has misinterpreted the purpose of the sermon:—

"The Rectory, Dulwich Hill,

"Rev. and Dear Sir,— "Sydney, New South Wales, 17th August, 1914.

"My attention having been drawn to the fact that a sermon on 'The Church and Education,' preached by me in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on the 19th July last, is being used to favour the exclusion of the Bible from State schools, I should like to say that the object of the sermon was quite the contrary. It was to emphasize the value of the Bible as an integral and absolutely necessary part of any system of education, and to plead for a truer observance of our present Act. The fault, whether intentional or unintentional, here lies with the administration of the Act, and that was what I tried to point out. I am a firm believer in having the Bible read in State schools as part of the ordinary curriculum, and in allowing the clergy to impart special church teaching to the children during school-hours. This is the law in New South Wales, and is largely availed of and generally appreciated by the parents of the scholars. My desire is for more of the Bible in our schools as the only sure means of building up and developing the character of our future citizens.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"G. A. Chambers, M.A.,

"Rector of Dulwich Hill,

"The Rev. Canon Garland." "Warden of Trinity Grammar School, Sydney.

As a further illustration of the corporate opinion of the Church of England and of the views of her clergy, the following letter from the Primate of the Church of England in Australia will effectually dispose, in the mind of any unprejudiced person, of any idea that the Church of England authorities can be quoted by Bishop Cleary in support of his case. The Primate's letter may be taken as the latest word on the subject after the many years working of the system:—

"Dear Canon Garland,— "Bishopscourt, Sydney, 17th August, 1914.

"I am not surprised that the Roman Catholic Bishop whose evidence you quote to me has endeavoured to prejudice the parliamentary Committee against the New South Wales system of religious teaching in public schools. We quite understand that they do not want Bibles in the hands of the people. I can only say that he is entirely in error in thinking that our system is a failure. On the contrary, I myself have very large evidence at my disposal and am convinced that the system is excellent and effective, and I hope that you may be fortunate enough to establish something like it in New Zealand. I may add that the remarks of the Rev. G. A. Chambers were entirely misunderstood; he supports our system as a valuable means of religious instruction in public schools. "Yours sincerely,

"John Charles Sydney."

I draw attention to the action of the Newcastle Diocesan Synod, New South Wales, as reported in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, 4th May, 1912, when Archdeacon Regg moved, "That, in view of the recent extension of the high-school system, synod respectfully requests the Minister for Public Instruction to take steps to allow the same facilities for special religious instruction to be given in the high schools as are now allowed in the public schools of the State, and requests the Religious Education Committee to take the matter into consideration, also the question of the appointment of salaried teachers, and to report to the next session of synod." In support-

ing the motion Archdeacon Regg said, "The educational policy of the present Government was one with which in the main he was in agreement. The extension of the high-school system was a question with which they of the Church of England were largely concerned, because there were 113,000 of their children attending the State schools of New South Wales. The charge had been brought against the public-school system that it was a godless one. Every provision was made in the public schools for giving instruction in the Holy Scriptures. That redeemed the State-schools system from the charge of being godless. If it were godless it was due to the fact that those who had the opportunity of giving that instruction failed to provide it. But special religious instruction in the high school was not allowed.

"'Now,' continued the Archdeacon, 'I know there has been an outcry against the policy of the Government. It has been spoken of as a concession made to benefit the Church of Rome, but that, I think, is quite unfair. It is a concession made to all who choose to avail themselves of it. I do not wish to overlook this fact, that probably the Church of Rome will be in a condition to avail itself more largely of the concession than any other body, but that only stands to the credit of the Church of Rome.'"

Here it will be seen that the synod was absolutely unanimous, and I venture to say that never in any synod of the Church of England in Australia is there any other but a unanimous vote whenever the question of religious instruction in State schools is under discussion.

An example of Church of England opinion is found in the following editorial note of the *Church Record for Australasia and New Zealand*, 21st August, 1914:—

"*Bible in State Schools League.*

"In the Dominion of New Zealand, in Victoria, in South Australia, those who desire that children should become familiar with the teaching of the Book of Books are conducting a vigorous campaign for the introduction of the Bible into the Government schools. Their objective is the New South Wales system, which includes Scripture instruction by the teachers during school-hours (from which children may be withdrawn by parents who have conscientious objections), and also facilities for the accredited representatives of the different religious denominations to enter the schools and give instruction to their own children.

"We should give all the support we can, both by prayer and sympathy, to those who are fighting the battle. The experience in New South Wales is all in favour of the system. Both from the point of view of the Education Department and from that of the Churches it has worked exceedingly well. The number of children withdrawn under the conscience clause is very small, and evidently the vast majority of parents desire that their children may receive some instruction from the Word of God. In our opinion the New South Wales system is the most satisfactory solution of the religious question which has been devised. It produces satisfactory results without in any way breaking up the system of State education. It enables the wishes of the majority to be carried into effect, while providing fully for the conscientious objections of the minority. We hope that before very long the whole of Australia and New Zealand may rejoice that God's Holy Word is being adequately taught in all the State schools.

The Ven. Archdeacon Gunther, late Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Sydney, and nearly fifty years a clergyman of that diocese, testifies the attitude of the clergy of the Church of England "is decidedly favourable" to the system.

Letter published in the *Church Standard*, a Church of England paper, Sydney, 23rd August, 1914, by the Venerable Archdeacon Gunther, late Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Sydney:—

"SIR,—It was with much pleasure that I read in your last issue the letter signed 'Churchwoman' and the circular attached to it. Though the information is meagre, I hope that we may regard the proposed effort to be made as an evidence of increased interest in the supreme importance of the religious instruction of the young, of appreciation of the generous facilities given by the State of New South Wales for carrying out that work in our public schools, and of the calamitous consequences to the individual and the nation if it is neglected. That voluntary workers can be obtained I have long been convinced, if a hearty welcome is extended to them and means provided for proper training and instruction in what to teach, how to teach, and in maintaining discipline. If this is not given, whatever qualifications and whatever knowledge may be possessed, our teachers are at a great disadvantage, knowing that the children readily institute unfavourable comparisons between them and their regular teachers. We have at present in the diocese of Sydney some seventeen voluntary helpers in our work, who take thirty-four classes weekly. With this effort we cannot be satisfied, though thankful for it. May I point out that there is, I believe, material available for a large increase without delay. There are a large number of retired clergymen—at least twenty in the diocese of Sydney—some of whom, I doubt not, are qualified, able, and willing to assist, and also a large number of retired teachers, who have shown much interest and sympathy with our work. It might, of course, be necessary to pay a small amount for travelling-expenses in some cases. What efforts have been made to obtain voluntary workers, men and women? What efforts have also been made to obtain liberal support for our paid teachers? I pointed out in a letter to the Press some time ago how sadly our funds have been falling off of late years, and how small the number of regular subscribers is. I have suggested to the committee of the Sydney Synod means for largely increasing them. Why should we not ask the Educational and Book Society, the Home Mission Society, and the managers of some of our trust funds to undertake to support a teacher? This would give us three additional helpers, and by means of a shilling fund from the parents we might annually obtain a large amount. I am convinced that many parents would support this. The assessment of parishes, as suggested by the committee and brought forward in the last Sydney Synod, cannot be entertained. Other organizations, especially those supporting home and foreign missions, would have as strong if not a stronger claim. That something should be done

is generally admitted, and that "something" should be a distinctly forward movement. The last report presented to the Sydney Synod showed that 72 per cent. of our children are reached, but the lesson is only weekly, and this is not sufficient surely to inspire and elevate the daily work of the children, while the infants, who should be caught young, are generally left out in the cold. Years ago I suggested in synod the formation of a Board of Education for the province, and I still think we ought to aim at that. "W. J. GUNTHER."

Further Letter from Archdeacon Gunther.

"259 Walker Street, North Sydney,
"19th September, 1914.

"DEAR CANON GARLAND,—

"I received your letter yesterday, and am glad to see you appreciate my communication to the *Church Standard*. It is one of many written at different times about religious instruction in public schools. I claim, as a clergyman of nearly fifty years' standing in this diocese, to know something of what the Church of England has attempted to accomplish, and in the various official positions I have occupied and still occupy it has fallen to my lot to have special opportunities of gaining information. Further than that, I have availed myself of the generous facilities given by the State to take an active interest in the religious education of the young. In the early seventies I was assisted in the visitation of the public schools in my parish by a keen admirer of the system that obtained, and our work was acknowledged by the teachers, the parents, and the children in various ways. The gentleman I refer to was the Rev. G. F. McArthur, headmaster of the famous and historic school, the King's School, Parramatta. My interest has not lapsed, but considerably increased since those days. You ask what the attitude of the clergy is at present towards the system that obtains in New South Wales. I answer, from all that I have seen and heard it is decidedly favourable. According to the last published report no less than 120 clergymen out of our 131 parishes personally teach. The Inspectors and teachers have at different times spoken very favourably of our work. If the voice of criticism is sometimes heard among us it comes from those who wish for the revival of the denominational system, or those who use strong language to awaken our people to a sense of their responsibilities and the supreme importance of our work and the need of supporting it more liberally. You will see from my letter that I hope some forward movement will soon take place. Though I am, and always have been, a warm supporter of our New South Wales Public Instruction Act, I am not blind to its defects, and hope the day may come when some scheme may be devised for those not availing themselves of its benefits. We have a very large number—I believe, twenty thousand—growing up without any education. Wishing you all success in your great work.

"Yours faithfully,
"W. J. GUNTHER.

"You are aware, I think, that I have been connected with the work of our various schools, and am the senior Fellow of St. Paul's College, University of Sydney, and, as the senior member of the Council of the King's School, very generally preside at its meetings.—W. J. G."

The Rev. Canon Charlton, Rector of St. Barnabas's, Sydney, and twenty-five years a member of the Diocesan Committee for Religious Instruction in State Schools, in an article in the *Church Record*, a Church of England paper, Sydney, 4th September, 1914, writes:—

"The education of the young is too serious a matter to be made the experimenting-ground for theories, however excellent. Over thirty-three years' trial has proved the value of our educational system in New South Wales, the envy and model (with its clauses 7 and 17) of other States. The late Sir Henry Parkes, the framer of the Act, said, 'In the construction of this Act the words "secular instruction" shall be held to include general religious teaching, as distinguished from dogmatical or polemical teaching. . . . What is aimed at is that the child should be considered as belonging to a family, forming part of the population of this free and fair country. The child of the poor and the child of the rich may sit side by side in their tender years when they receive the first rudiments of instruction, and when there is no occasion certainly for any material distinction.'

"Men and women to-day can testify that when as children attending our public schools they fairly and freely competed with one another, and have been saved from that narrow secularism which separates and tends to disintegrate society. Speaking of the Roman Catholic opposition, Sir Henry said, 'If this Catholic religion depends—and I do not say it does—upon religious teaching being added to secular instruction in the common schools, that contention carries with it an admission fatal to the vital administration of the sacred offices of the clergy of the Catholic Church.' This certainly is applicable to others. Bishop Pain (Bishop of Gippsland), at an annual meeting in 1906, said he had examined many systems of education and had never found any to compare with that of New South Wales in regard to the advantages given for religious instruction. It was not a question of State aid to religion, but of religious aid to the State, and the people should be seized with the greatness of the idea. This seems to me to be the key to the position of all who are like-minded with the Bishop, and is attested by them. From an official report of the working of the New South Wales Act I extract the following: 'With a view of obtaining a wide expression of opinion upon the question as to whether the Irish National Board Scripture lessons are advantageous in promoting the moral and intellectual education of the pupils in public schools, a circular was addressed to all Inspectors of Schools under this Department, requesting them to state their views upon the matter. The following extract from the report of one of our most experienced Inspectors may be taken as representing the true value of the lessons: "In cases where teachers deal with the books as they would with ordinary class-books, giving an intelligent exposition to what extent the pupils comprehend its scope and meaning, and dwelling with judicious force and impressiveness upon such points of religion and morals as these lessons inculcate, there can be no doubt whatever of the benefits accruing."'

"For over twenty-five years I have been connected with the Committee for Special Religious Instruction in Public Schools, organizing and examining, and the consensus of opinion received from headmasters, mistresses, and teachers is that where clergy and teachers prove efficient as instructors the influence brought to bear upon the children is effective and far-reaching. When undertaking the work in the High School for Boys in Sydney the address the headmaster gave in introducing me to the senior boys was the most powerful and eloquent I have ever listened to. He told them that the basis of true education was to put 'first things first—God,' &c.—and for that reason he gave me a most cordial welcome. With such men one need not fear that our public schools will be godless, nor that the coming men of our State, preparing now for various positions in life, will lack the essential element that goes to make a complete education.

"I own, if the Church day school does nothing else, it presents to the world a witness of the ideal of education. It is our duty to set that ideal before Christian people. We have no right to expect the State to care for or pay for an ideal which it never has and never can believe in. We must be prepared to give time, trouble, and money to keep that ideal alive. As Mr. Birrell once said, 'Let us as long as we can in this prosaic age preserve any idealism we can lay our hands on. Where no vision is the people perish.' Meanwhile let us realize the importance of what we have: that it is religious aid to the State."

Let me add that Bishop Cleary quotes Archdeacon Irvine as if in support of the Bishop's contention. But will it be believed that Archdeacon Irvine was speaking to the Minister with a view of obtaining greater facilities for religious instruction—that is, access to the high schools? When Oliver Twist asked for more it can hardly be imagined that it was from a desire to have less of that for which he sought.

Bishop Cleary's idea that the Church of England in Australia is anywise dissatisfied with the system of religious instruction (where it prevails) proves to be wholly imaginary, if not distorted. The latest information I receive from Sydney (as these notes go to press) is of the formation of a voluntary association of members of the Church of England for the training of suitable persons to act as delegates where and when the clergy cannot overtake the work. This training is being undertaken by a State-school teacher outside his regular school-time. A testimony, in addition to the existence of the Diocesan Committee for promoting Religious Instruction in State Schools, of the wholeheartedness of the Church of England on the matter. No less is it a testimony to the attitude of the teaching profession when one of their number, over and above his daily hard work, is surrendering his leisure in order to train persons for the purpose.

The Church of England, in common with Christian Churches and the Jewish Church, the notable exception being the Roman Catholic Church, evinces only one desire—to maintain the existing system of religious instruction and to take increasing advantage of the opportunities which it affords to all without distinction.

APPENDIX E.

NOTES BY CANON GARLAND ON PROFESSOR HUNTER'S STATEMENT.

Professor Hunter professes to give the detailed result of thirty-seven years' experience of the secular system in New Zealand. His historical sketch is defective from its omissions. He ignores entirely the fact that the best friends of our national system of education have protested against its inadequateness in excluding the Bible from the curriculum of our schools. The demand made that the Bible should form part of our school syllabus is no new claim. It is one that has been made by leading citizens of New Zealand and by nearly every section of the Christian Church since 1877, when the Bible was excluded. The Hon. Mr. Bowen, who had charge of the present Education Act when it was a Bill before the House of Representatives, was an earnest advocate of the Bible-reading as part of the syllabus. He had a special clause in his Bill legalizing prayer and Bible-reading. In one of his speeches on the Bill he spoke as follows: "I feel certain that it is the desire of nineteen-twentieths of the people of this country that the Bible should not be absolutely excluded from our public schools. . . . It is proposed in the Bill that school shall be opened every morning, at a fixed hour, by the reading of the Bible and the Lord's Prayer."

The religious clause, however, in Mr. Bowen's Bill was met with hostile criticism by some members of the House, and it was rejected by a majority vote in the House of Representatives. The Legislative Council, however, restored the religious clause in part, but persistent opposition in the Lower House led to its rejection. The Rev. C. S. Ross, in his "Education and Educationists in Otago," says, "It was believed that, had the Government nailed their colours to the mast and carried the question down to the constituencies, a majority of these would have pronounced with emphasis against the vote of the House. But no opportunity of expressing their opinion on the subject was afforded to them, and the system of barter and compromise which so often characterizes party politics in these new lands led at the last moment to the excision of the Bible-reading clause."

It was in these circumstances that the Bible was excluded from the schools of the land. The protest against this exclusion began in 1877, and it has continued till the present time, and it will continue until the people have an opportunity of saying at the ballot-box that they wish

the Bible restored to the schools. In proof of illustration of this affirmation the following witnesses may be cited:—

I. The Protest of New Zealand Statesmen.

The following may be cited, but the number could be increased indefinitely:—

Sir William Fox (founder of the New Zealand Temperance Alliance): "I think it is an indignity offered by ourselves to ourselves—if I may say so—that, in a country at least nine-tenths of the inhabitants of which profess a religion of some sort or another based upon that we know as the sacred Scriptures, the sacred Scriptures themselves should be the only book that is interdicted in our schools." (House of Representatives, 14th July, 1880.)

Sir John Hall protested against the banishing of the Bible in 1877 thus: "It not only fails to provide for any instruction in the principles of religion, which are the essential basis of all education, but excluded from the schools to be maintained under its provision any recognition of the Christian religion, or even of a Supreme Being. We believe that such a law is not only wrong, but is opposed to the general views of the people of New Zealand."

II. The Protest of Education Boards.

The following may be cited:—

Southland Education Board.—In the Education Report for 1880 (H.-1A), presented to Parliament on the 5th June, 1880, by the Hon. the Minister of Education, the following paragraph appears on page 85 in the report of the Southland Education Board for the year ending 31st December, 1879: "The Bible in schools: This question was brought before the Board at a meeting held on the 6th June, and, after considerable discussion, a motion was carried almost unanimously declaring it to be the opinion of the Board that the Bible should be read daily in the public schools without comment. Copies of this motion were forwarded to the Government, and also to all the School Committees, accompanied in the latter case by a request that they should give an expression of their opinion on the subject. Of the fifty-five Committees then existing, thirty-seven expressed themselves in favour of the resolution and eight against it. The remaining ten were either neutral or failed to make any return."

Otago Education Board.—At a meeting of the Education Board of the Provincial District of Otago held on the 26th day of June, 1879, the following resolution was passed with only one dissentient: "That in the opinion of this Board it is very desirable that the Education Act be amended with the view of allowing the introduction of Bible-reading in the public schools."

III. The Protest of Educational Experts.

(1.) The New Zealand Government in 1883 appointed Dr. R. Laishley to report on the systems of State education in Great Britain, the Continent of Europe, and the United States of America, and under date November, 1886, Dr. Laishley submitted to Parliament his report on the same, which was published in 1886 by the Government Printer in Wellington. Dr. Laishley called attention to the incompleteness from the moral standpoint of our educational system, and asked Parliament to note that "In the New Zealand system it is noteworthy that even 'morale' is not in the programmes." Dr. Laishley wrote as follows: "I recognize that grave changes should not be proposed without grave causes, and the wisdom of the injunction, 'Never prophesy unless you know.' But the results of my investigations, coupled with my knowledge of education and finance as existing in this colony, induce me to believe that at no distant date public opinion —that omnipotent factor which upholds our Constitution and dictates its mandates—will decree that the following propositions and questions be seriously considered. Although experience indeed teaches that 'knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers,' and that 'faith—fanatic faith—once wedded fast to some dear falsehood hugs it to the last.'" Among the questions to be thus reconsidered was the introduction of Bible-reading in schools.

(2.) Inspector Hill (of Hawke's Bay), in his report for 1879 addressed to "J. D. Ormond, Esq., Chairman Hawke's Bay Education Board," wrote as follows: "Now that the Bible has been expunged from the list of school-books as issued by the Department, practically there is no standard of morality to be recognized by the teachers; but I sincerely hope that the present educational machinery, good as it is in many points, may be perfected by permitting the introduction of the Bible as a reading-book into the public schools, guarded only by the adoption of a conscience clause, similar to that adopted by the Home Government."

(3.) Mr. James Reid, ex-Principal of the District High School, Milton, is an earnest advocate for Bible-reading outside the hours of the syllabus, but he found that this ended in failure, and testified as follows: "The end of the whole matter is this: Bible-reading to succeed must be part of the school curriculum. The voluntary system has broken down with me because the teacher has no control of the attendance of the children, and because the children are able to evade the supervision of their parents."

IV. The Protest of the People through Voluntary Plebiscites.

Since 1877 the people in various parts of New Zealand whenever they have been consulted have voted in large majorities against the exclusion of the Bible and favour its restoration. The proof of this statement might be given from various parts of New Zealand, but the following may be quoted as examples of extensive evidence:—

In 1881, for example, the Bible in Schools Association, by permission of the Otago Education Board, issued voting-papers to the parents through the schools, asking parents to declare for or against the daily reading of the Bible in the schools, guarded by a conscience clause. A very general interest was taken in the question, and the result of the returns was as follows: Total

number of children whose parents replied "Yes," 11,884; total number of children whose parents replied "No," 1,613.

In 1902 the people of Otago were again consulted by voluntary plebiscite, and on the matter of the use of the Lord's Prayer and Bible lessons in schools, and the vote was as follows: In favour of prayer and Bible, 32,456; against, 4,243.

V. The Protest of Christian Churches of the Land.

Nearly all the non-Roman-Catholic sections of the Christian Church in New Zealand have from 1877 protested against the exclusion of the Bible from the syllabus:—

(1.) The Right Rev. Bishop Nevill, who is now the Primate of the Church of England in New Zealand, as far back as 1887 took an active part in a Bible-in-schools agitation. On the 29th July of that year he addressed a large public meeting in the old Knox Church, Dunedin, on the Bible in schools, and warmly commended this educational reform. At the close of his address Mr. James Fulton moved a hearty vote of thanks to Bishop Nevill, and in doing so said that at the next general election they should be largely influenced in their votes by the following consideration: "Will this man who seeks my vote guarantee to support the proposed amendment in the Education Act which a large majority desires for the re-establishment of Bible-reading in the public schools?"

(2.) The Presbyterian Church in its Otago Synod in 1879 declared in favour of the Bible in schools, and appointed a committee to work for making the system truly national by including the Bible. Year after year this Committee reported to synod the work that it had done in the way of meetings and petitions to Parliament. In 1889 this committee reported that sixteen out of twenty-four among the Otago members of the House had declared in favour of the Bible in schools, and it also reported that the largest vote had been given during the year in Parliament in favour of Bible in schools. In 1890 it was reported that a Bible in Schools Bill had passed its second reading in the Legislative Council. The northern section of the Church held the same position as the Otago section.

(3.) The Presbyterian Church in Otago has a very special reason for protesting against the exclusion of the Bible. In Otago, under the old provincial system before 1877, the Presbyterians were so satisfied with a system of education in which the Bible had its place, and moral and religious teaching given of an undenominational character, that they actually gave to the colony their special denominational educational income—that is to say, they, with the consent of the old Provincial Council, diverted their own educational trust-money from the purpose for which it was legally destined—viz., schools in connection with the Presbyterian Church—to the Otago University to pay the salaries of professors there. Probably £50,000 of such money has been thus diverted, and every year at least £1,800 is paid to three teachers. In 1877, when the provincial systems of education were abolished and the present secular system was set up, the Bible was flung out of the schools without the people ever having been consulted. Had the Otago Presbyterians foreseen that the Bible would have been banished from the schools they probably would never have parted with one penny of their educational trust-money. The Rev. James Chisholm, in his "Fifty Years Syne," being the history of the Otago Presbyterian Church, urges a strong complaint against the State for thus requiting with ill the generosity of the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Chisholm's complaint is as follows: "The Church might fairly enough have provided in the Act of 1866 for instituting a college of her own in which the truths she reverenced would have had an honoured place. Instead of that, she has sacrificed her own immediate interests in order that no one may be debarred from the means of culture which she has provided. She has done this for the good of the State, and it does not seem a very courteous acknowledgment of her generosity on the part of the State to banish the Bible from the primary schools, and thereby render signally ineffective for moral ends the educational system in which, perforce, the Church must commit her children.'"

Professor Hunter's statement must be considered in the light of the foregoing historic facts. This historic protest makes the reason for a referendum so strong that only a man hopelessly biased can withstand its force.

I deny that amongst Anglican, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministers many can be found dissenting from the decision of their own Church courts, and in sympathy on this matter with the National Schools Defence League and the Roman Catholic Federation. Professor Hunter can mention only two Anglican clergymen, one of whom it is well known is engaged in secular work and has been so for many years, and therefore is hardly to be taken as representative. Professor Hunter emphatically states many Presbyterian ministers are strongly opposed to the proposed scheme. He gives eleven names out of a possible of 322 names, the number of Presbyterian ministers recorded in the Year-book, page 159. A vote of the last Presbyterian Assembly showed eleven ministers in opposition.

Professor Hunter says a similar dissent is found among Methodists. Here again he gives seven names out of a possible 248. (New Zealand Year-book, 1913, page 159.)

We admit that Roman Catholics, Seventh Day Adventists, and Unitarians are totally opposed to our proposal; but I deny that Congregationalists, Baptists, and Churches of Christ are opposed in Australia, or are unanimously opposed in New Zealand. These three last support the system where it is at work. Ample testimony as to the attitude of Congregationalists and Baptists will be found in these pages, and may be taken as typical of their general attitude in Australia. The Churches of Christ at their annual conference for South Australia, where the system does not exist, passed the following resolution as recently as the 17th September, 1914, with only one dissentient: "That this conference of Churches of Christ heartily supports the Scripture Instruction in State Schools League in their effort to secure a referendum with a view to the introduction

of Scripture lessons into the State schools on the basis of the system now in use in New South Wales, Western Australia, Tasmania, and Queensland." This is practically a testimony in favour of the smooth working elsewhere of the system, because members of this conference are in a position to know of its working in other States.

The petition lodged by ministers in opposition was the result of a circular which said, "a large and ever-increasing number of ministers are opposed to the platform of the Bible in Schools League," and that the circular was being sent to "a large number of Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational ministers." I have drawn attention already to Professor Hunter's own statement about the small numbers amongst Presbyterian and Methodist ministers; while the grand total of eighty-six signatures, even when some few more Seventh Day Adventists are added, hardly corresponds (if words mean anything) with the language used by Mr. Caughley, a school-teacher, as "a large and ever-increasing number of ministers," and further shows a very small result from a circular "being sent to a large number of Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and Congregational ministers." Let it be hoped that Mr. Caughley in his school-work applies language with a fuller sense of the meaning of the words he uses.

I submit with emphasis that the position of education in England and Australasia is not similar. In England the Church of England, and to a lesser degree other Churches, originally provided education at their own expense, and as a result of such expenditure claimed control of the buildings and of the education given therein, denying the right of any other person to enter to give religious instruction. With that denial I am wholly out of sympathy, especially when, as in modern times, those Churches accepted State aid for their schools. The Church of England in Australasia is happily in agreement with all other Churches except the Roman Catholic and the Seventh Day Adventists, and does not seek State aid, but claims that all Churches (including the Roman Catholic) should have the right of access to their children during school-hours to give them religious instruction, in addition to a knowledge of the Bible as a matter of literature in the ordinary school curriculum. I believe there is a growing feeling in England in favour of a system there by which ministers of all Churches, or teachers on their behalf, will be admitted to denominational schools supported by the State, the same right being given equally to all ministers to enter the Board schools. The National Union of Teachers in England passed a resolution last year in sympathy with this, as the following cablegram shows: "The *Church Guardian* states that a considerable proportion of the National Union of Teachers favours a solution of the religious-education question on lines similar to the New South Wales system." (*Dominion*, 7th February, 1914.)

I am not aware of the Church of England receiving any privileges as distinct from other Churches in New South Wales; indeed, it is the first time I have heard of it. I know that State aid was given to all the Churches until modern days, and expired with the last clerical survivor drawing a State stipend. In the distribution of land in the early days similar recognition of all Churches was the case. I very much doubt whether it will be found that at any time one-seventh of the whole territory, as stated by Professor Hunter, was ever the property of the Church of England; at any rate I should desire to see the authority before accepting his mere statement. I do not reflect on Professor Hunter's honesty, but I very much doubt whether he inquired into the accuracy of the statements supplied to him. The fact is that before the State concerned itself at all with education the Church of England bore the whole expense of education in New South Wales, providing buildings and teachers from her own resources. Other denominations followed her lead, all with something worse than limited success until the final abolition of State aid to denominational schools in 1880. I do not for a moment imagine that Professor Hunter intended to mislead the Committee, and through it the public, when referring to the Church of England, only he speaks of the proportion of State aid to the clergy. I would rather think that through his occupation in other matters he had not time to correct the copy from which he read. The Church of England clergy received no State aid which was not proportionately at the disposal of all other Churches.

I need not deal with the corrections, which Professor Hunter accepted in such a kind manner from me, as to the dates from which the system operated in Australia, beyond saying that the fact that the system has existed so long and has never been disturbed once since it was introduced, but has been strengthened by legislation, outweighs every argument brought against it as a practical solution of the problem. I noted with pleasure that Professor Hunter corrected his statement that text-books were used in all the States with the exception of Tasmania, the exact position being that text-books are used in New South Wales, Tasmania, and Queensland, and the Bible itself in Western Australia.

The Irish text-books: As I pointed out, we have not asked for the New South Wales books. Without criticizing them we agree with educationists that they are not in accordance with modern ideas of text-books for children's use. We prefer as a pattern to follow the Queensland text-books, though by no means binding ourselves to the matter existing therein or to the omissions of matter therefrom; but we contend that if Queensland could produce books which were received with so much satisfaction and without one solitary objection from any teacher, New Zealand will be able to do no less, and we hope will improve on the Queensland text-books, if there is room for such improvement.

I recognize that there are many definitions of the word "religion" as applied to religious teaching, but our position as a League has been perfectly distinct. We shall be content with Bible lessons used as reading-lessons in the same way as any other beautiful passage of literature would be used, the moral and literary beauties therefrom being all that we ask teachers should be called upon to deduce. This is by no means ideal, and is not so much as is expected elsewhere; yet we have accepted this in order to reduce to a minimum any reasonable objections from a teacher's point of view. We do not believe there is one solitary teacher in the whole of New

Zealand who could not hear the children read a Bible lesson and give it himself in that manner. There need be no more difficulty in this respect than exists already in the casual references to the Christian faith and religion which now are in the reading-matter of the children, and which, I believe, are there entirely against the interpretation of the Act, which says that teaching shall be "entirely secular." Our claim is that when Scripture reading-lessons are properly provided as a part of the curriculum there will be less room for embarrassment on the part of teachers who might be agnostic than arises now with references that are alleged to be contrary to the spirit of the Act.

The Rev. Mona Jones is a Baptist minister who was at Newcastle. He admits that his Church favours the system, stating that, "under pressure from his Church he availed himself of the right of entry for a year." This pressure would not have been the case if Baptists generally agreed with the Rev. Mona Jones. Against this solitary statement I draw the attention of the Committee to the evidence of other Baptist ministers from New South Wales, printed in full in my supplementary statement attached hereto, and which I could amplify indefinitely.

The Wilkins Circular.

Professor Hunter alleges a circular was issued in the name of Mr. W. Wilkins, Secretary of National Education, Sydney, on the 15th July, 1900. Leaflet No. 7 by the National Schools Defence League purported to publish this "circular." The full text of that leaflet, so far as it refers to the circular, is here reprinted, followed by the full extract on the matter from the Queensland *Hansard*, 9th November, 1910:—

[Extracts from Leaflet No. 7.]

"*Issued under the Auspices of the New Zealand National Schools' Defence League.*

Australian Evidence against the Australian System of State Religious Instruction in State Schools.

Read and be convinced."

* * * * * * *

"Proselytism or Sheep-stealing."

"Mr. W. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on the 15th July, 1900, issued the following circular to the teachers in the State schools. It speaks for itself:—

"*Religious Instruction in Public Schools.*

"The following is a copy of the circular issued to all State schools in New South Wales for guidance in the matter of giving religious instruction in such schools. The italics in the second clause are intended to add emphasis to the directions given, because some clergymen consider themselves at liberty to take any children that will come to their class" [this bears out the evidence already given by the Rev. Mona Jones] "and if that were sanctioned there would be obvious opportunities for proselytism."

Then follow the instructions, to the effect that such instruction may be given "to the children of any one religious persuasion by the clergyman or other religious teacher of such persuasion." "It will be your duty to see that no children are allowed to be present at the special religious instruction given by any clergyman or religious teacher, except those registered as belonging to his persuasion." A further saving clause allows the children of a different religious persuasion to attend such class provided the parents' consent is given. The opportunity for proselytism here will be obvious.

Despite this official warning against proselytism, we have the witness of one teacher—Mr. A. E. Reay, of Auburn, New South Wales—as recently as the 6th November, 1908, to its nullity. He says, "On the occasion of the absence of one clergyman I have had no trouble through asking the other clergyman [present] to combine the two sections and instruct them."

Queensland Parliamentary Debates.

Second Session of the Eighteenth Parliament, 1910 (*Hansard*, page 1985).

"Hon. A. A. Davey: The referendum in reference to the Bill was taken on the general question of introducing religious instruction in State schools. Dealing with the possible difficulty of a number of ministers of religion being anxious to give religious instruction, the Hon. Mr. Gibson assumed it to be almost a certainty that one minister would be found acting for all denominations. That would be very desirable, if possible, but it was not at all probable. And if such an arrangement were allowed, the alleged benefits to accrue to the children could not eventuate, because they were to be taught the doctrines of the faith of their parents. In connection with this matter he would like to read the following:—

Religious Instruction in Public Schools.

The following is a copy of the circular of instructions issued to all State schools in New South Wales for guidance in the matter of giving religious instruction in such schools. The italics in the second clause are inserted to add emphasis to the direction given, because some clergymen consider themselves at liberty to take any children that will come to the 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 to their classes:—

"The Council of Education requests your careful attention to the following directions respecting the special religious instruction to be given under the provisions of section 19 of the Public Schools Act.

"By the terms of the Act such instruction may be given to the children of any one religious persuasion by the clergyman or other religious teacher of such persuasion. It will therefore be your duty to see that no children are allowed to be present at the special religious instruction given by any clergyman or other religious teacher except those registered as belonging to his persuasion. Should any parent desire that children not so registered may attend the instruction given by such clergyman, you should permit them to do so on being furnished with a direction to that effect in writing.

"3. The time at which special religious instruction may be given will be the first hour of the morning session, or, if more convenient to the clergyman, the last hour of that session.

"4. The class-room is to be used for the purpose whenever practicable. If no class-room be provided, or the number to receive instruction be too great, the schoolroom may be used. Upon this and other matters of detail the Council desires that you will co-operate with any clergyman who may attend at the school under your charge for the

purpose of giving special religious instruction, and that you will afford him all the assistance in your power in making satisfactory arrangements. Such arrangements must in fact depend greatly upon the mutual good-feeling and convenience of the clergyman and yourself, inasmuch as owing to the varying circumstances of different schools it is not practicable to lay down any uniform rule upon the subject.

"5. The requisite books and apparatus for special religious instruction will be provided by the clergyman giving the instruction; but the ordinary school appliances may be used for this purpose, if no inconvenience is produced thereby in the general conduct of the school. The religious books employed in the special-religious-instruction class must, however, be strictly confined to the time and place of such instruction, and care must be taken that they be not accessible to the children not attending the class. I have the honour to be, &c.,

Council of Education Office, Sydney, 15th July, 1900. W. WILKINS, Secretary."

From that it appeared that they took a great deal more care in New South Wales than was provided here for the protection of children attending State schools; and it would be wise to accept the amendment, because it was necessary that some definite time should be stated during which secular instruction was to be given."

[It will be noted that the quotation-marks in the Queensland *Hansard* begin at the words, "The Council of Education requests," and end with the words "W. Wilkins, Secretary." Therefore the introductory paragraph from which the opposition League quoted is not part of the circular, nor is the date 15th July, 1900, included in quotation-marks.]

It will be noted first that the heading "Proselytism or Sheep-stealing," put into capitals in opposition League's leaflet No. 7, does not exist, nor is the word "proselytism" once even used in the alleged circular itself. It further will be noted—(*a*) That the opposition League leaflet states emphatically "Mr. W. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on 15th July, 1900, issued the following circular to the teachers in State schools. It speaks for itself"; (*b*) that the paragraph beginning "Religious instruction in public schools" and ending with the words "opportunities for proselytism" in leaflet No. 7 has no existence whatever in the alleged Wilkins "circular" itself.

The cablegrams already published to and from the Director of Education are as follows:—

"Director Education, Sydney. "Wellington, 2nd July, 1914.

"STATEMENT published that Wilkins, Secretary Education Council, July, nineteen hundred, issued circular against ministers proselytizing in visiting classes. Please cable date Wilkins's death, date circular referred to and its purport. "CANON GARLAND."

"Canon Garland, Wellington. "Sydney, 7th July, 1914.

"MR. WILKINS retired eighteen eighty-four, died eighteen ninety-two, could not therefore have issued circular referred to by you, which cannot be identified.

"P. BOARD,

"Director of Education, Sydney, N.S.W."

This cablegram from Mr. Board clearly shows that if some document were issued it certainly was not in 1900, because Mr. Wilkins was eight years dead and had left the Department sixteen years.

An examination of Mr. Davey's speech in Queensland *Hansard* will show that the introductory paragraph (embodied by the opposition League as a part of the Wilkins "circular") beginning with the words "The following is a copy of the circular of instructions issued," ending with the words "admitting children of other denominations to their classes," was not part of the Wilkins circular read by Mr. Davey. Yet the opposition League in leaflet No. 7 says, "Mr. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on 15th July, 1900, issued the following circular to the teachers in the State schools. It speaks for itself." And there quotes as Mr. Wilkins's circular a paragraph taken from some other and unknown source (probably the opinion of an opponent in a letter to a newspaper) as if this opinion were part of the text of the Wilkins "circular."

Why did not the opposition League print the "circular" from the original of one of those circulars of which they say (*Dominion*, 11th July, 1914) "opponents in New Zealand received copies from the Education Department, New South Wales, under date 15th July, 1900, when (the Committee are informed) the Wilkins circular was reissued"? Why did not the opposition League give the name and address of the authority who forwarded the "copies" of the circular? Why did not the opposition League give the name and address of the authority who informed them it was "reissued" 15th July, 1900?

I venture to think that they did not give the name and address of the authorities forwarding the copies of the circular or who informed them that it had been reissued on the 15th July, 1900, for the very good reason that it was not then reissued, and was not received by them from the Education Department. Moreover, the Director of Education sent the following cable: "Could not identify circular from information given in your cable last week, as Wilkins died in ninety-two. Circular printed in Queensland *Hansard* doubtless issued, but date nineteen hundred obviously wrong. Original not traceable now, but evidently issued by Council of Education between sixty and seventy-nine before existing Act passed. No record of any such circular since eighty. Table thirty-six has no connection with Wilkins circular.—P. BOARD, Director of Education." This later cable plainly shows that the statement that the circular was reissued 15th July, 1900, does not agree with the facts.

Mr. J. Caughley, in the *Lyttelton Times* of the 11th July, 1914, states categorically, and after the publication of Mr. Board's cable of the 7th July that "The date 15th July, 1900, was the date on which the Wilkins circular was reissued by the Council of Education."

At the time the controversy occurred I was unaware that I was in possession of the following letter, dated 26th November, 1906, from the Under-Secretary, Mr. Board, which says, "that the instructions referred to by Mr. Rice are obsolete, having been issued about thirty years ago by the late Council."

"REVEREND SIR,— "Department of Public Instruction, Sydney, 26th November, 1906.

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 10th instant, forwarding a clipping from the *Courier* of 18th September, containing a letter from Mr. Geo. M. Rice, in which it is suggested that proselytism has been indulged in in connection with special religious instruction in schools of this State to such an extent that this Department was forced to issue the instructions he quotes in order to cope with the evil.

"In reply, I have to point out that the instructions referred to by Mr. Rice are obsolete, having been issued about thirty years ago by the late Council of Education under section 19 of the Public Schools Act of 1866. This Act was superseded twenty-six years ago by the present Public Instruction Act of 1880. The sections of the existing Act that deal with religious instruction in public schools are 7, 17, and 18, and the regulations and instructions given in the accompanying paper are those now in force bearing on the question. It will be seen that these regulations are provided simply for the effective carrying-out of the provisions of the Act.

"I have, &c.,

"P. BOARD, Under-Secretary.

"The Ven. Archdeacon Garland, Organizing Secretary, Bible in State Schools League, 5 Darragh's Buildings, Brisbane, Queensland."

It may be suggested that there has been some reason for holding back the information which would authenticate the original Wilkins "circular," and possibly some reason clear to the opposition League for presenting to the public a garbled, specially edited, and wrongly worded version; but, whatever it was, I am prepared to accept an assurance that the opposition League put forth the statement in the Queensland *Hansard* as if it had been an authentic document of 1900, and were mistaken in so doing.

The whole tenor of the "circular" itself, as printed in Queensland *Hansard*, was intended to deal not with "proselytism or sheep-stealing," but to facilitate the smooth working of the ministers' visits: *e.g.* (paragraph 4), "Upon this and other matters of detail the Council desires that you will co-operate with any clergyman who may attend at the school under your charge for the purpose of giving special religious instruction, and that you will afford him all the assistance in your power in making satisfactory arrangements." A very different thing from leaflet No. 7, which says explicitly, "The following is a copy of the circular issued," and then gives not a copy but an opinion of some unknown person on the Wilkins "circular" with a line or two only from the "circular" torn from its context and so manipulated as to convey an idea—as far removed from the "circular" (according to the text printed in Queensland *Hansard*) as the east is from the west—that the circular was issued to make the teacher a watchdog against "proselytism or sheep-stealing." The opposition League suppressed the fact that the Queensland text of the Wilkins circular expressly enjoined on the teacher the duty of co-operation with any clergyman, and of permitting children, under the parents' direction, to attend a class held by a minister other than their own. That this is so will be seen in paragraph 2 of the Wilkins "circular," which explains the Act as follows: "No children are allowed to be present at the special religious instruction given by any clergyman or religious teacher, except those registered as belonging to his persuasion." But expressly shows the teacher in the same paragraph 2, "But should any parent desire that children not so registered may attend the instruction given by such clergyman you should permit them to do so on being furnished with a direction to that effect in writing." It will therefore be seen that the "circular," so far from having any reference to "proselytism or sheep-stealing," showed such confidence in ministers of religion that definite provision was made thereunder for children of one religious persuasion attending the class of a minister of another religious persuasion, and the teacher directed to see that the children should so attend when the parents so desired. That this is not proselytism, which is done by the parents themselves, but a testimony to the way in which, while preserving denominational rights, yet sectarian divisions can be overcome.

I am somewhat surprised at the selection of statements made from the Queensland *Hansard*. Sir Harry Rawson himself, though he spoke of sectarian strife, was a strong supporter of the New South Wales system, and testified publicly to the fact, though I admit I should have to inquire in New South Wales for verification of my statement. But, at any rate, my statement as to the attitude of one with whom I was personally acquainted is just as good as Professor Hunter's, who does not give his authority for his quotation.

The Queensland members of Parliament quoted by Professor Hunter were all strong opponents, and they can hardly be said to give impartial testimony. As I have pointed out elsewhere in my statement, if there is sectarian strife in New South Wales its connection with the school system has not been proved; while, on the contrary, the statements of witnesses are innumerable that sectarian strife is not caused in the school or by the system. Professor Hunter has made such a study of the Queensland *Hansard* that I am surprised he failed to quote pages 752 to 758 of the Queensland *Hansard* of the 13th and 14th September, 1906. I think the references, if made by members of the parliamentary Committee themselves to that *Hansard*, will be sufficient to discount the evidence of at least the gentleman whom Professor Hunter considers worthy of a first place.

The statements made by Messrs. Hardacre and Theodore are more than balanced by the statements of the Hon. Digby Denham and of Mr. James Allan, M.L.A., the Hon. A. H. Barlow, ex-Minister of Education, Inspector-General Roe, and the Queensland Education Department.

Professor Hunter accepted in a gratifying manner my correction that the New South Wales Commissioners in their report of 1904 did not recommend the introduction of the French system, and I thank him for this courtesy, which has saved the time of the Committee. What is clear is (*a*) that Mr. Knibbs, *one* of the Commissioners, recommended the introduction of the French

system of ethics, under the head of "Ethical Instruction," not under the head of "Religious Instruction" (see page 27 of Commissioners' report); (*b*) that Mr. Turner, his fellow-Commissioner (see page 73 of Commissioners' report), spoke of the State of New South Wales making the best attempt to solve the difficulty of religious instruction. The Commissioners' joint report (page 3) showed that each was responsible only for his own statements and not for that of his fellow. The Department of Education in New South Wales, under date 19th September, 1913, writes: "No alteration in the system of ethical or religious instruction in this State was made as the result of Mr. Knibbs's recommendation." It therefore follows that Mr. Knibbs's recommendation is his own personal opinion, which was not accepted by the Department, notwithstanding the Conference of 1904, of which he was a member and at which he spoke, and at which the question of the system of religious instruction was discussed by the heads of Churches with the educationists present. It further follows that the opinion of Mr. Turner is that which was accepted by his Department and Government.

Criminal Statistics.

Professor Hunter claimed that both Victoria and New South Wales "have had their much-talked-of birth-stains"—*i.e.*, the convict element. This is not the first time such a statement has been made in New Zealand by opponents of the Bible-in-schools movement. Unfortunately this class of statement has brought ridicule upon the teaching profession in New Zealand, an Australian paper making the following cutting reference to Mr. John Caughley, another member of the National Schools Defence League, who made a similar statement at an earlier date: "Mr. Caughley asks us to believe that for thirty-five years before a house was built in Melbourne Victoria was 'equally affected by convict settlement' with New South Wales, which began with a consignment of 900 convicts, and which, two years after Phillip hoisted his flag at Sydney, out of a population of 1,715, counted 1,260 convicts. The gentleman who makes this assertion is a teacher. Let us hope, for the sake of his pupils, that he does not teach history—or, at least, Australian history."—*Southern Cross*, Melbourne, 18th July, 1913.

It has remained for a University professor to so father this fictitious history that the doubt upon the educational qualifications of teachers in New Zealand will now be expanded to University professors.

There is not a scintilla of evidence in support of the contention that Victoria or any part of it was at any time a convict settlement. Professor Hunter claimed that historians supported his view, but he failed to give the names of any. On the contrary, both the official records and also the historical writings, numerous in themselves, all alike testify that Victoria never was a convict settlement, but that the two occasions on which bands of convicts were taken to Victoria were followed by their almost immediate withdrawal. That Sydney and the country now known as New South Wales was the seat of the convict settlement is shown by His Majesty's despatch: "His Majesty has thought it advisable to fix upon Botany Bay." (Bonwick, "First Twenty Years of Australia," page 2.) In 1788 the convicts arrived in what is now New South Wales. In 1803, 9th October, Lieut.-Governor Collins arrived at Port Phillip with a party of convicts and soldiers, coming not from New South Wales, but direct from England. On the 26th November, 1803, the Governor of New South Wales wrote to Colonel Collins that "Port Phillip is totally unfit to remain at . . . removal from it will be most advisable." On the 16th December, 1803, Collins reports arrangements for leaving Port Phillip for the Derwent (Tasmania). On the 27th January, 1804, Port Phillip was abandoned by Lieut.-Governor Collins and his party. On the 15th May, 1804, the Governor of New South Wales reports to the Colonial Office in London that Colonel Collins had fixed his colony at the River Derwent, Tasmania. ("Historical Records," Vol. v, pages 263, 280, and 375; and "Victorian Year-book," year 1913, page 45; "Empire Builders in Australia," E. Ralph, 1911, page 101; "Port Phillip Settlement," Bonwick, pages 74 to 80.)

Bonwick, page 80, "Port Phillip Settlement," writes, "After the retreat of Colonel Collins in 1804 the land had rest for twenty years. Excepting a call for wood and water by passing vessels, and occasional visits of sailors and whalers, Europeans left the Port Phillip blacks and their white friend Buckley in peace. The next interruption came, not in the neighbourhood of Port Phillip, but of Western Port." This was in 1826, when, on the 11th December, a further attempt was made to settle the country with a party of convicts, but on the 23rd January, 1828—that is, a little more than twelve months—the following official communication, telling the public of the new settlement being abandoned, was made: "His Majesty's Government considering it inexpedient to continue the settlement on Western Port under present circumstances, I have the honour to inform you that the 'Isabella' . . . proceeds thither for the purpose of removing the whole establishment."

The Sydney *Australian* of the 7th March, 1828, thus notices the end of this ill-fated settlement: "The settlement formed during the beginning of the past year at Western Port is now altogether abandoned. The Government vessel, the 'Isabella,' has brought away every person lately settled there on the Government establishment. Thus ended the second attempt to colonize Port Phillip. Verily the stars in their courses fought against it." (Bonwick, "Port Phillip Settlement," pages 102 to 103.)

Ralph, in "Empire Builders in Australia," page 101, sums up the situation: "For thirty years more, however [after 1803] the Natives were left masters of Port Phillip, but when next the white men came to those shores they came to stay."

The records show that of the six convicts who escaped in Victoria during Collins's three-months settlement, five were accounted for before he left, the sixth being found in 1835 amongst

the blacks. There is no room even for the wild suggestion that the "birth-stain" of Victoria could have been created by escaped convicts.

These facts are so well known that it is an astonishment any one, even an opponent of Bible in schools, should assert otherwise. Some more information is useful. The first permanent settlement in Victoria was founded 19th November, 1834, at Portland Bay, by Henty. Batman, with three other white men, arrived the following year; and Fawkner, with his party, founded Melbourne also in 1835, in which year for the first time what is now Victoria was proclaimed as part of New South Wales. It was not until 1836 there were sufficient people to justify the establishment of a regular Government in Victoria. (See Victorian Year-book, 1913, page 45.) In 1837 Port Phillip had no more than thirty-six males and thirty-eight females. (Ralph, pages 167 to 177.) Not until 1839 Port Phillip had 3,000 persons (Ralph, page 183). Almost at the same time—*i.e.*, in 1840—the transportation of convicts to Australia ceased. (Commonwealth Year-book No. 5, page xxxv.) The records are perfectly clear that up to that date the only attempt to establish convicts in Victoria was abandoned. (See "Historical Records," Vol. vi, page 289.)

Jose, in his "History of Australasia," page 92 (a text-book in use in colleges), says, "Port Phillip took its orders very unwillingly from a Department three weeks distant, and the inhabitants of Melbourne occupied their time in drawing up petitions for separation. The Sydney-siders, they said, were tainted with convictism"—a statement hardly likely to have been made if open to the *tu quoque* argument. Recognized historians up to the present would wonder with astonishment that any one could imagine Victoria had similar birth-stains to New South Wales, and the historian of the future will only understand University professors and school-teachers of New Zealand as putting forward such an opinion on an entire failure to inquire into facts.

There is still further information to be had on this point. The "Historical Records" include the returns of inhabitants on the "eastern coast and out-settlements of New South Wales" as furnished by the Governor to the Home authorities. In none of these is any statement recorded of any places now included in Victoria, though places so far away as Hobart Town and Norfolk Island are included. In 1807 the total population of the above eastern coast and out-settlements is given at 9,129. Though I cannot dissect the number of convicts in that population, the arrival up to that year of 8,470 convicts will give an idea of the proportion of convicts to the population after allowing for deaths; and it was on this proportion of convicts to free persons that New South Wales was founded. As further showing the unhappy foundation of New South Wales, the first arrival of 1,015 people had as many as 742 convicts amongst them, the remainder including children. That out of such a black beginning New South Wales recovered itself is one of the most striking things in social progress and in history. It speaks volumes for the fact that never was there in New South Wales an educational system without religious teaching being provided.

Professor Hunter is not the first of the League's opponents who has made an incursion into statistics in order to bolster up the opposition to religious instruction in State schools. There is a remarkable resemblance on the part of such excursionists in that they fail to exhibit any knowledge of statistics as a science. To quote one statistician only, Mr. G. H. Knibbs, Commonwealth Statist for Australia, writing under date 6th February, 1913, said, "You will, however, have noted from the remarks on pages 911, 913, 918, and 920 of Official Year-book No. V that comparisons in criminology between the different States based on the bare figures are liable to be misleading, since various important factors have to be taken into consideration, and from the nature of the case it is impossible to represent these statistically." The same thing is laid down by every statistician; yet in his statement-in-chief comparing Sydney with Melbourne, Professor Hunter actually dared to say that the "only essential divergence is in the State system of national education, Victoria having adopted the secular system in 1873. Then let the comparative criminal statistics bear their witness." He then proceeded to give figures, but in his examination by me he departed from his carefully prepared statement. I asked him if he really expected people to accept bare figures as evidence of an increase or decrease of crime as a test of morality, and he replied, "It depends on the figures, on the way in which the figures are quoted, on the way in which they are arranged, and on the source from which the figures come," all problems which lie at the base of statistics. I then asked him, on the other hand, if he would not accept figures unless he knew all about them, and he replied, "On their source and the way they are arranged." His statement-in-chief and his examination flatly contradict each other. He appeals in his statement to bare figures, but in his examination he admits the necessity of ascertaining other facts. To deal with the subject effectively requires an amount of time and space of something more than he devoted to it, as well as a knowledge which should be as scientific as is required for any other abstruse subject.

Professor Hunter appealed particularly to Victoria. Let him go to it. In the Year-book of that State for 1912–13, page 333 *et seq.*, compiled by the Government Statist, Mr. A. M. Laughton, who therefore may be taken on such a point as an entirely impartial critic (from which I make the briefest extracts), Mr. Laughton points out. "A proper comparison of crime cannot be made between different States and countries unless several considerations are taken into account. The first point necessary is that criminal law, in the places compared, should be substantially the same; the second, that it should be administered with equal strictness; and the third, that proper allowances are made for differences in the age and sex consideration of the population. The last consideration is one that must also be taken into account in comparing crime in recent years with that of previous periods when the population was very differently constituted in regard to age and sex. The returns of the States and the Dominion of New Zealand do not afford sufficient data to enable one to allow for these differences; but, in regard

to the first two points above mentioned, the basis and main provisions of the criminal law are the same in each State, and it must be presumed, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that the law is administered with equal strictness in each State. The relative proportions in the various States of charges under the head 'Other offences' is not of much value on account of the difference in the laws of the States in these matters, and of the large proportion of offences which are not crimes but mere breaches of various Acts and by-laws. To enable a comparison to be made of the relative criminality of the population at different ages it is necessary to separate the sexes of arrested persons, to divide each of the sexes into age groups, and to show the number of charges laid against males and females in the different groups between ten and sixty per 10,000 persons living in each group. Religious instruction was struck out of the curriculum of the State schools in 1873, and many attempts have been made to ascertain the effect on the community as revealed by statistics of crime. No definite conclusion can be arrived at by merely examining these statistics for a number of years."

Professor Hunter and his colleagues have no hesitation in rushing in where a trained statistician like Mr. Laughton feared to tread and arriving at a definite conclusion by merely placing bald figures in opposition to each other, wholly indifferent to the circumstances which a scientific statistician would bring to account with them. "In comparing criminal records of different periods many factors must be taken into account, some of which have a tendency to increase and some to decrease the number of arrests and summonses issued. A comparison goes to show that crime in Victoria decreased in 1910, whilst in New South Wales there was an increase. Taking a comparison of the figures for the two States it will be seen at once that the difference between the totals of these States is accounted for in drunkenness almost entirely, whilst the difference between 'other crimes' is very small between the States."

Mr. Laughton in his previous Year-book, 1912–13, commenting on the figures (see page 356), says, "The percentage of convictions in Victoria for drunkenness was much less than in the other States and in the Dominion of New Zealand, nearly every case resulting in a conviction in the latter places, and about one out of every two cases in the former. These figures seem to denote a comparative leniency on the part of Magistrates in drunkenness cases in Victoria, but investigations show that in that State an offender on his first appearance is generally discharged, and that those who have been arrested on a Saturday and detained in custody until Monday are similarly dealt with. In some cases also, when an offender has been admitted to bail after arrest, he is discharged on putting a donation in the poor-box. In all these cases no conviction is recorded in Victoria, but in the other States a conviction is entered on the records in nearly every case, whether any punishment is inflicted or not."

The Government Statistician, Mr. J. B. Trivett, in a report furnished to the Minister of Justice, 7th February, 1914, in dealing with a comparison of criminal statistics between New South Wales and Victoria, called attention to the fact that the figures relate to offences charged, and not to distinct persons convicted, which it is impossible to ascertain. "According to some statistics more or less reliable of a few years ago, every ten persons brought before Magistrates in New South Wales are charged with about eighteen offences, as against fifteen offences in Victoria. This fact alone would increase the Victorian rates by 20 per cent. . . . I am not altogether confident that the law is administered with equal strictness in each State. Drunkenness, for example, in Victoria is not treated so seriously as in New South Wales or the other States. It is found that in any of the other States in 99 per cent. of cases of drunkenness a conviction follows, whereas in Victoria only 57 per cent. of cases are convicted. . . . Another factor to be taken into account in criminal statistics is the attitude of the Magistracy and the police towards certain classes of offences. For instance, in the case of liquor laws or laws connected with vagrancy or gaming the views of Magistrates and the instructions issued to the police may be responsible for considerable variations in the returns. The views of the Magistracy towards crime in Victoria are apparently lenient, as of the cases brought before them no less than 28 per cent. are discharged, the highest ratio in any other State being 14 in Tasmania. In New South Wales the proportion is 12 per cent. If the views of the Magistracy in Victoria are more lenient towards crime than in New South Wales, as would appear above, may it not be assumed that the police of Victoria take a more lenient view and ignore offences which are taken into account by the New South Wales police? Another factor operating in connection with the comparison of criminal statistics in the two States is variation, too, in the classification of offences; and here again the method adopted in Victoria favours that State. For example, in regard to persons arrested minor offences are excluded, and only that charge which throughout the hearing of the case has been most prominent is considered, but in regard to summons cases the unit is each separate charge. In New South Wales the unit is each separate charge, both as regards arrest and summons cases. Again, the offences 'Assault and robbery' and 'Assault with intent to commit robbery' are in New South Wales included in 'Offences against the person,' and in Victoria they appear to be included as 'Offences against property.' In the Victorian tables 'Assaulting the police' is, in combination with 'Resisting or obstructing the police,' placed under 'Offences against good order'; whereas the charges of 'Assaulting the police' are in New South Wales included under 'Offences against the person.' Taking the above matters into consideration, and speaking generally, the criminal statistics of the two States are not comparable, as the conditions in the two are different. The population of New South Wales is 425,000, or 30 per cent. greater than in Victoria, and, a most important factor, Victoria has sixteen persons per square mile, as against six in New South Wales. New South Wales has a large floating population, caused by the nature of its industries—pastoral and mining—and by the works, railway and others, in course of construction. Moreover, Sydney is a large terminal shipping port, and consequently contains a larger and more irresponsible floating population than Melbourne."

It therefore will be seen how much has to be taken into consideration, which is ignored by those who quote bare figures without any calculation of the circumstances necessary for an understanding of those figures. In my judgment the nearest approach which can be made to a test, though by no means a perfect one, is to be found in the decrease of crime in a community. Mr. Trivett, in the Year-book of New South Wales, 1912, page 391, gives the following paragraph and table:—

"*Decreasing Prison Population.*—The total prison population recorded at the close of 1911 —viz., 1,249—represents the lowest level over a period of thirty-seven years, and the following table, showing the relative position of general to prison population, and the gaol entries at intervals since 1875, proves that while the strength of the general population has been trebled the prison population as between 1875 and 1911 has decreased by 14 per cent. The gaol entries below represent convicted and unconvicted persons:—

Year.	General Population at Dec. 31.	Gaol Entries during Year.	Gaol Population at Dec. 31.	Ratio of Gaol per 10,000 of General Population.
1875	594,297	11,832	1,453	2·44
1885	949,570	20,740	2,562	2·70
1895	1,262,270	18,552	2,460	1·95
1905	1,484,078	13,380	1,678	1·13
1910	1,639,722	9,849	1,320*	0·81
1911	1,693,374	9,532	1,249*	0·74

From these figures it will be seen that since the passing of the Public Instruction Act, 1880, crime has decreased enormously in New South Wales, as the above figures amply show both absolutely and relatively; but, unlike our opponents, I am not so rash as to say that this decrease of crime is or is not a result solely of the Education Act providing religious instruction. I submit, however, that, as our opponents have appealed to the Cæsar of figures, the Cæsar of figures answers them with a remarkable diminution of crime.

To go farther back into history would be interesting, but a glance is all that is possible in the time available. Major Arthur Griffiths, himself an expert in criminology, an English Inspector of Prisons, states in his "Memorials of Millbank" that in the early days of New South Wales "Sydney was a perfect den of thieves, and these being selected from the whole felonry of England were masters of their business and stood at the head of the profession. The report of the Police Magistrate of Sydney, printed in October, 1835, gives a nice picture of the town: 'Of the whole population of twenty thousand a large proportion are prisoners, past or present, whose passions are violent, and who have not been accustomed to control them. It includes a great number of incorrigibly bad characters who, on obtaining their freedom, will not apply themselves to any honest mode of earning their living, but endeavour to support themselves in idleness and debauchery by plunder. There is more immorality in Sydney than in any other English town of the same population in His Majesty's dominions. It contains 219 publichouses, and there were besides sly-grog shops innumerable.' Sir Francis Forbes, the Chief Justice of the colony, endorsed these statements. That this is a true description of the actual state of Sydney cannot be denied."

Professor Hunter speaks of New South Wales as having the blackest record in Australasia, but has there ever been any case in the annals of crime where out of such terrible conditions there has been a reduction at such a rate as the last printed table discloses? Though in the copy furnished me of Professor Hunter's statement-in-chief I have not found his reference to New South Wales as the most drunken State in Australia, yet in his examination he admitted he made that statement. This was not original on his part, but emanated from an organization with which, however much we may sympathize, yet we could not regard it as any more impartial than if the liquor party's organization had issued a statement to say that New South Wales or any other country was the least drunken State. Against that must be set a report furnished by the Inspector-General of Police, New South Wales, in reply to statements made by the New South Wales Alliance (see *Evening News*, Sydney, 20th May, 1914), where he says, "He is not prepared to admit that there has been any startling increase in drinking, and is convinced that the figures quoted by the Temperance party are not a proper guide to the amount of individual drinking that comes under the notice of the police. As a matter of fact, the figures quoted show a decrease in the number of convictions recorded. In 1912 the number was 32,977, while last year it stood at 32,459. . . . I take it that in every case in which a person is arrested for drunkenness a conviction is recorded independent of whether or not the person signs the pledge. Figures are not always a proper guide with regard to drunkenness. . . . I do not think the people of New South Wales are nearly as much given to drink as they used to be. . . . To my way of thinking there has been a satisfactory decrease in drinking, a condition of affairs which inebriate statistics fail to reveal. Anyhow, I do not think it fair to describe New South Wales as the most drunken State."

I have pointed out already and clearly that the teachers in Australia are not "muzzled and bound hand and foot"; but even supposing they were, there are instances of teachers who are members of Parliament, and also of retired teachers, on whom such regulations would no longer be binding. It would be more to the point if Professor Hunter and those associated with him, instead of relying upon imagination, brought forward statements made by such retired teachers in the privileged walls of Parliament or elsewhere. We, on the contrary, have brought

* Exclusive of inebriates detained.

forward statements from retired teachers, and they testify both to the working of the system and to the fact that teachers are not "muzzled and bound hand and foot" by the regulations.

Our claim is that the State is teaching a religion now, teaching the children by inference and by a process of negation which ethical masters say are more effective than positive assertions, that God has no place in their lives. We ask not for the establishment of any religion or for State aid to any of the Churches, but that God, according to the conception of Christians, may no longer be as "contraband as pipe-opium" in the schools. We ask that the Churches may be permitted to aid the schools by going to the expense, the labour, and the trouble of sending their ministers and other special teachers to assist the State in the work of character-building of its future citizens on the only basis which from a Christian point of view can be effective, the basis of revealed religion. However much we may differ from each other, those of us in the League are agreed upon this, and further agreed that not only for ourselves, but for all our opponents and any other form of religion, the same facilities should be granted.

We deny entirely that the present system is strictly neutral. That is not neutrality where secularism prevails. The only neutral system will be equal opportunities for all and special privileges for none.

We are not asking the power of the State to compel attendance at religious lessons, but we ask that the power of the parent shall not be any longer interfered with by the State. Over and over again we have reiterated to weariness that under our proposal no child can be compelled either by the teacher or by a minister, by State or Church, to attend one solitary lesson. We complain that the power of the State is used now to prevent the child having as part of its education that which, we contend, so many parents desire it shall have—some religious teaching.

APPENDIX F.

NOTES BY CANON GARLAND ON MR. CAUGHLEY'S STATEMENT.

The League, so far from asking for a revolutionary change, is asking that a revolutionary change which was made without consulting the people may be referred back to the people to ascertain if they wish to return to the condition of things normal to the British Empire. It was admitted at the time that New Zealand was then making a departure from the customary procedure of making some definite provision for religious teaching as part of the school system. The suggestion that it is "outside the powers of average electors" to vote on such a matter is a reflection on the intelligence of the electors of New Zealand. The League is willing to trust the electors, but Mr. Caughley, a vice-president of the opposition League, and the representative of those teachers who are opposed to the League's proposal, said such a vote was outside the powers of the average elector. Again, Mr. Caughley, speaking for the Teachers' Institute, reflects on the electors of New Zealand when he speaks of "mechanically handing over the whole matter to the irresponsible decision of individual electors to whom these vital matters would be non-existent." I would ask, where does the responsibility lie if it does not lie with the electors as a whole ultimately, as with any matter affecting the Government under the British Constitution? Surely if the electors are competent to give a responsible decision by electing members of Parliament to legislate on a hundred-and-one different things, the electors themselves are no less capable of the responsibility of expressing an opinion on one of these points in a direct manner.

We join issue completely with Mr. Caughley and his friends by stating emphatically that in our opinion a secular system of education is secularist and teaches dogmatic secularism, and accordingly is anti-religious in spirit. However, notwithstanding the intention of the Act, public opinion has proved too strong to allow an "entirely secular" Education Act to be construed in such a sense that as in France, and one time in Victoria, the very name of God was deleted from the children's school-books.

It is exactly because the Bible is like no other book in its origin, its contents, its teachings, its claims, and its authority that the League wishes it, or at the least extracts from it, placed as reading-lessons in the hands of the children. We are not asking that the teachers shall teach it as exhaustively as they teach any other subject. We contend that under our proposal the demand upon the requirements of the teachers is reduced to the lowest possible minimum. We admit it is by no means ideal, but it will be ten thousand times better than the law of the land declaring in effect and in practice, "You may read a lesson from the precepts of Confucius or on the life of Mohammed in school-time, but you may not read the Ten Commandments or the Sermon on the Mount, and you may not read the story of the life of Jesus." Through no fault of the "entirely secular" Act, casual references to God still remain in the children's hands in their reading-books. They would present the same difficulty as those suggested by Mr. Caughley, but I have never heard of them in practice, nor does even he allege that these difficulties have arisen. The teaching of a special nature would be given by a specialist wherever it was practicable. That is why the system works so well elsewhere. The special teaching thus desiderated is given by those appointed, and no demand is made on the teaching profession for that purpose.

The fact is clear that a way has been found by which the State provides for religious instruction being given to the satisfaction of practically all the Churches. It may be they do not fully avail themselves of it, but if so it is their own fault, and not the fault of the State, as at present in New Zealand, and however many their own omissions may or may not be yet they are per-

fectly satisfied with the provision made. The statement made that the only way for the State to give religious instruction without creating denominational schools would be to find a system that would satisfy every denomination is equivalent to saying that until every denomination is satisfied there must be no religious instruction; and we know exactly what that means. The Churches constituting the League are determined to push the matter until the will of the people is ascertained as to whether they will be satisfied with the proposals submitted by the Churches constituting the League.

In stating that in the Queensland campaign the League used the phrase, "Vote for God and the Bible," Mr. Caughley is stating what is not a matter of fact. I have no recollection of any such phrase being used in any of our documents, nor have I ever heard of it being used in any of the speeches made by our supporters. I believe that it is true that in one ballot-booth somebody wrote it up in pencil, and that fact was mentioned in the Queensland Parliament as if it had been a general cry, which it was not. The point I take exception to, and take it very strongly, is that Mr. Caughley often states as facts things that were mere hearsay on the part of some one else, and exaggerates some casual actions, such as this instance was, as if they were universal, and puts forward unsupported statements made by our opponents as if they were substantiated facts.

The constant charge made by Mr. Caughley and those thinking with him, Bishop Cleary and Professor Hunter, that our cards are signed under misrepresentation is a reflection both on the honour of our great band of workers and on the intelligence of the people of New Zealand who signed. It is quite clear and emphatic, however, that a person appending his signature to a card appends it to what is on the card and nothing else. We also on our part could make similar complaints; cards have come into our possession and information alleging improper representation by our opponents, but we treat this as of small importance. The real question is not whether some individuals have signed cards for or against the referendum, but whether the people of New Zealand desire the system proposed. There is only one way of getting a definite opinion of the people, and that is by a direct referendum. The allegations made against the value of signatures obtained by an organization or individual becomes an argument in favour of obtaining the opinion of the whole people, not through any organization, but by the authority of Parliament under a legislative enactment which would place the votes of the people beyond the reach of doubt by either friends or opponents, and outside any suggestion of misrepresentation.

Criminal Statistics.—I have elsewhere in this statement made some reference to the use of criminal statistics, but one of the most astonishing things I have heard in my life is Mr. Caughley's dogmatic and positive statement. "We know that the dispersal of convicts from New South Wales and Tasmania during the great Victorian gold rushes fairly equalized this convict influence." I have not had the advantage of reading Blair's History, on which Mr. Caughley seems to rely, but as I have pointed out elsewhere all other historians of Australia with whom I am acquainted leave no room for any such conclusion. The following figures will show how little ground there can be for the idea that the dispersal of convicts from New South Wales and Tasmania to Victoria fairly equalized this convict influence. Out of a population in Victoria of 364,324 in 1855 no less than 259,000 arrived by sea. Doubtless some of these came by sea from New South Wales and Tasmania, but it is equally clear they came also from every other part of the world. Arrived at Victoria goldfields by sea: 1851 (July to December), 15,000; 1852, 94,000; 1853, 1854, and 1855, (nearly) 250,000: total, 259,000: to which must be added the immense number which left Melbourne, reducing it so close to evacuation that the public service was reduced to abject inefficiency, and the Governor to a condition of absolute powerlessness, ruling with hardly any to obey his behests.

It is true to add there were many who could have been easily spared, fugitives from justice, adventurers from California and the South Pacific, escaped convicts and disguised bushrangers, sharpers and professional gamblers from every city on the "Continent" (of Europe) or in the States (U.S.A.). (See "The Seven Colonies of Australia," by T. A. Coghlan, 1902.)

It is not a fair deduction, however, that "many that could have been easily spared" amounted to a considerable portion. New South Wales, even if all her living convicts had left her borders and migrated to Victoria in 1851 to 1855 (eleven to fifteen years after transportation had ceased), had not enough of them to contribute any appreciable proportion of convicts, or any number sufficient to leaven the 364,324 people of 1855, or the 541,800 people in 1861. New South Wales in its infancy, in its first instalment of inhabitants, received 742 convicts out of a total of 1,015 people, and after nineteen years' settlement had, in 1807, a population of 9,129, to which had been contributed during that nineteen years 8,470 convicts. No unprejudiced person can see in these facts, or in any others within my knowledge, any parity of "birth-stains" between the two States, or any contagion sufficient to produce an appreciable effect on the happier genesis of Victoria. On the contrary, it will be for all time a marvel requiring explanation how out of such unpromising material New South Wales could to-day rise to the high position which she occupies in the Empire. Intelligent people will draw their own conclusions as to whether it may or may not have been a contributing factor that from her beginning until this day her school system has never denied a place to the teaching of that righteousness which alone exalteth a nation. I know of no similar instance in the history of nations, and for my part I am proud to express my strong conviction, after a long and careful study of the subject, that such a happy result would have been impossible had it not been for the splendid educational system in which has been included always a definite recognition of God and the teaching of His laws. I am not suggesting the absence of other factors, but all else would have been minimized, in my opinion, if the State had by a process of negation taught its children that God is of less account than arithmetic.

The cablegram below will show that the opinions expressed to this parliamentary Committee would not commend the learning of New Zealand if those opinions were representative:—

"Hon. Hutchison, Minister of Lands, Melbourne. "13th October, 1914.
"STATEMENT yesterday to Parliament Committee dispersal of convicts from New South Wales, Tasmania to Victoria during Victorian gold rushes fairly equalized convict influence. Blair's History quoted. Please cable whether such convict influence fairly equalized New South Wales Victoria. "CANON GARLAND."

"Canon Garland, Wellington, New Zealand. "Melbourne, 19th October, 1914.
"REGARD statement preposterous. Victoria never convict settlement, and fully three-fourths of new population through gold rush came from overseas. "W. HUTCHISON."

Mr. Caughley quotes Inspector Holmes, England, a great deal. I have not had time to examine Inspector Holmes's book, but have been supplied with the following information by one who has read it, and which I believe to be correct. Inspector Holmes in no way condemns the proposals put forward by the League. He objects to the undue length of Scripture lessons not in the Council or Board schools of England, but in the Church schools supported by the State—a very different thing, and which by omission of fault-finding would imply he saw no reason to find fault with the Scripture teaching in the Board schools. These are his words: "The first forty minutes' morning lessons are given in almost every elementary school to what is called 'religious instruction'; this goes on morning after morning and week after week."

Inspector Holmes objects to faults of method, as any other Inspector would object, in imparting religious instruction. His objection is not to religious instruction; his desire is that it should be given still better, not that it should be excluded from the schools as part of the ordinary curriculum. His words are, "It is not matter for wonder that many of the glaring faults of method and organization which the examination system fostered in our elementary schools between the years 1862 and 1895, and which are now being abandoned, however slowly, reluctantly, and sporadically during the years of secular instruction, still find a refuge in the Scripture lesson. Overgrouping of classes, overcrowding of schoolrooms, collective answering, collective repetition, scribbling on slates, and other faults with which Inspectors were only too familiar in bygone days, are still rampant while religious instruction is being given."

So far from Inspector Holmes being in sympathy with the views put forward by Mr. Caughley and Professor Hunter, he states, on page 300, "If any of my readers have imagined that I am an advocate of what is called 'secular education' they will, I hope, now realize that they have misread this book. Far from wishing to secularize education, I hold that it cannot be too religious. And, far from wishing to limit its religious activities to the first forty minutes of the morning sessions, I hold that it should be actively religious through every minute of every school session—that whatever it does it should be to the glory of God."

Inspector Holmes therefore goes farther than the League proposes.

The case of Inspector Holmes is on all-fours with that of other educational authorities. The very fact that so many of them go much farther than the League's proposals is a proof of the moderation of the requests made by the League, and in no way detracts from but rather increases the value of their opinion when they see such necessity for a place being found for religious instruction in the ordinary curriculum of a school. We in no way have advocated any of the methods proposed by such educationists; we have advocated only the very least minimum, as contained in our proposals, much as so many of us might desire a great deal more. But many of us have subordinated our greater desires in our wish to meet each other and to find a common ground for agreement upon which, here as elsewhere, the great majority can enter.

Mr. Caughley says, "Teachers and the public generally are amazed that our system of education and the neutrality of the State in religion and the rights of conscience and the normal processes of education should be attacked by a body of such a character as the League." I reply that there is only one way of ascertaining the opinion of the public, and it is the public alone in the person of the electors who have the right to decide what shall be done in the schools, not the teachers or any Church or combination of Churches constituting or opposing the League. Unless the referendum asked for by the League is taken there can be no way of ascertaining whether the people generally are "amazed" or otherwise. Our information is that they are very much amazed at the action of Mr. Caughley and some of the teachers. Our information is also that members of the Presbyterian Church generally are "amazed" at the action of Mr. Caughley, who evidently carries so little weight amongst the laity of his own Church that he could only find one other layman to vote with him in the General Assembly; in his own session, as he admitted in his cross-examination, he found himself the only elder holding his amazing opinions. That the ministers of his Church are "amazed" at him is shown by the very few who responded to his circular calling on them to express their opinions against the League's proposals.

But all this, whether expressed by one side or the other, is entirely beside the point. It is not whether Mr. Caughley is right that the public are "amazed" at the League, or whether I am right that the public, especially of his own Church, are "amazed" at Mr. Caughley. The real point is that the opinion of the public, all sections and all denominations, advocates and opponents, can be ascertained effectively only by the authority of Parliament providing for a direct vote surrounded with legislative precautions.

If the public are "amazed," as Mr. Caughley states, then the answer will be very clear against the League when they have an opportunity of voting. That will show whether the Churches of the League are truly representative of the opinions of their people, or whether, for instance, Mr. Caughley in his own Church, and Mr. Bates and Mr. Hobday in the Church of England, are representative of the opinion of those Churches.

APPENDIX G.

NOTES BY CANON GARLAND ON REV. D. C. BATES'S STATEMENT.

I MUST put my protest on record against the action of Mr. Bates in applying the term "agitator" to myself. I had asked him a perfectly courteous question, which did not warrant in any degree his vulgarly calling me names in reply. I claim that a clergyman who, as Mr. Bates has done, for twelve years has followed a secular vocation is not a representative clergyman of the Church to which he may belong. Further, I desire to show that the opinions of such men as the Primate of Australia, Archdeacon Gunther, late Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Sydney, and for fifty years a clergyman in Australia, and the opinions of synods are far more representative of the Church than the obviously hostile opinion of a clergyman who for so many years has pursued a secular calling.

For example, the latest information from the Diocese of Sydney is afforded in this statement. On the 1st October, 1914, the Rev. Dr. Radford moved, "That in the opinion of this synod, in order to make the fullest use of the facilities for special religious instruction in public schools, steps should be taken to form a diocesan roll for the enlistment of voluntary teachers, and also to make the diocesan provision for the adequate training of all persons giving such special religious instruction, whether clergy or paid or voluntary lay teachers." The motion was seconded by a layman, Mr. W. M. Fairland, and carried unanimously. At the same time appreciation was expressed of the assistance given by the State-school teachers.

I submit that an opinion by the clergy and laity in synod assembled is fully representative of the Church concerned, as compared with that of a clergyman who for so many years has been cut off from Church work and who has been absent from New South Wales for sixteen years.

The following statement published in the Sydney Diocesan Directory, 1913, with the imprint "Published by Authority," and which is issued by the Sydney Diocesan Registry, is the official attitude and statement of the Church of England in the Diocese of Sydney:—

"For a few years after the passing of the Public Schools Act of 1866 the work of special religious instruction, as permitted by the Act, was carried on by only a limited number of the clergy. The importance of the work became in time more fully realized. Attention was frequently called to it by the late Bishop Barker in his addresses to the synod, and at length, on the 5th December, 1878, the following resolution was carried: 'That in the opinion of this synod the great importance of imparting religious instruction to the young in public schools, now spread so widely throughout the diocese, renders it necessary that some more effectual steps should be taken for imparting such instruction at the times sanctioned by the Public Schools Act.'

"A committee was formed to consider and report upon the best mode of giving effect to it, and at the next session a very comprehensive report was submitted, containing a series of important recommendations. These were adopted by the synod, and a committee was formed to carry them into effect. It has been in existence ever since, and has now completed the thirty-fourth year of its labours.

"The work has steadily progressed in extent and efficiency. There are now eight salaried teachers employed, and an expenditure of about £600 per annum is incurred. The following table will give an idea of the extent of the work of special religious instruction as carried on in the diocese, and of the responsibility resting on the members of the Church." [I draw attention to the comparison between 1880 and 1913 as showing that the Church of England increasingly avails itself of the oportunities.—D. J. G.]

	1880.	1913.
Parishes	68	131
Returns received	62	120
Number of schools in the diocese	160	470
,, schools taught	85	315
,, classes taught	116	633
,, clergy teaching	48	123
,, classes taught by clergy	98	408
,, catechists teaching	5	20
,, classes taught by catechists	5	44
,, voluntary teachers	4	17
,, classes taught by voluntary teachers	4	34
,, paid teachers	2	8
,, classes taught by paid teachers	9	147
Total number of teachers		163
,, classes taught weekly		633
,, lessons given in a year		25,200

"The average number of children under instruction during the year ended 30th June were—In boys' classes, 7,600; in girls' classes, 7,200; in mixed classes, 23,300: total, 38,100. This shows that nearly 72 per cent. of Church of England children, exclusive of infants, attending the public schools in the Diocese of Sydney are receiving special religious instruction from representatives of the Church. Were the 2,300 children who are receiving daily religious instruction in our Church schools added, and the records of those clergy who have failed to send returns available, it is probable that a total of considerably over 40,000 would be reached, and the percentage proportionately increased. Your committee feel it is a cause for sincere congratulation, and

should serve as a stimulus to further and greater efforts to compass the whole of the work laid upon the Church in this State.

"On the ground of what has been already accomplished, together with the urgent need of further extension, the committee ask for a fuller recognition of their work by the members of the Church generally, and for a wider and more liberal support. They earnestly appeal to their fellow-churchmen for at least £2,000 per annum to enable them to reach all the Church of England children (about 53,000) in the public schools in the Diocese of Sydney. Eight salaried teachers employed. Income for 1912–13, £564 12s. 9d. Income required, £2,000. Donations and subscriptions may be sent to the honorary secretary or the honorary treasurer."

Mr. Bates states, "The Government provides the Irish National Scripture-books as part of the school equipment, but though I made earnest inquiries I personally never heard of a teacher who used them. . . . The books were shut away all the time in the cupboards and never looked at."

As against this I set the emphatic, clear, and official statement of the Chief Inspector of Schools in his report submitted to the New South Wales Parliament in 1913, where he says that, "In accordance with the Act the reading of the authorized Scripture lessons from the Old and New Testaments is regularly given in all schools." I submit that if Mr. Bates is correct then the official departmental report is absolutely wrong. This latter is untenable, simply because no official would commit himself to such a statement in public; unless indeed it may happen that over sixteen years ago Mr. Bates never knew a teacher who used the books, and that to-day things have changed so that the Chief Inspector is able to state accurately and authoritatively, "The reading of the authorized Scripture lessons is regularly given in all schools."

It is impossible to imagine this statement, which was laid on the table of Parliament, being allowed to pass without question if he deviated from the facts. If it should be argued that there has been a change since Mr. Bates's experience (which at any rate is not so extensive as that of the Chief Inspector), then there is no ground for stating that the teachers shirk the lessons, inasmuch as the latest and official statement proves no school can be found in which the Bible lessons are not read.

The diocese of Goulbourn, in which I believe Mr. Bates worked, passed the following resolution at its session this year, according to a copy supplied to me by the Registrar of the diocese under date the 8th July, 1914: "This synod, realizing that the public-school system for the imparting of religious instruction is the soundest and most equitable that could be in force where denominational religion is not recognized by the State, pledges itself—(*a*) To use to the utmost advantage the concession granted to the clergy in the Act of 1880, section 17; (*b*) to most strenuously oppose any attempt to expunge or interfere with the privileges granted in section 17 of the Act of 1880, it having worked beneficially and harmoniously since its inception."

The diocese of Newcastle, in which Mr. Bates worked for some years, at its session in 1912, according to a report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of the 4th May, 1912, passed the following resolution: "That, in view of the recent extension of the high-school system, synod respectfully requests the Minister for Public Instruction to take steps to allow the same facilities for special religious instruction to be given in the high schools as are now allowed in the public schools of the State, and requests the Religious Education Committee to take the matter into consideration, also the question of the appointment of salaried teachers, and to report to the next session of synod."

In supporting the motion Archdeacon Regg said, "The educational policy of the present Government was one with which in the main he was in agreement. The extension of the high-school system was a question with which they of the Church of England were largely concerned, because there were 113,000 of their children attending the State schools of New South Wales. The charge had been brought against the public-school system that it was a godless one. Every provision was made in the public schools for giving instruction in the Holy Scriptures. That redeemed the State-schools system from the charge of being godless. If it were godless it was due to the fact that those who had the opportunity of giving that instruction failed to provide it; but special religious instruction in the high school was not allowed.

"Now," continued the Archdeacon, "I know there has been an outcry against the policy of the Government. It has been spoken of as a concession made to benefit the Church of Rome: but that, I think, is quite unfair. It is a concession made to all who choose to avail themselves of it. I do not wish to overlook this fact, that probably the Church of Rome will be in a condition to avail itself more largely of the concession than any other body, but that only stands to the credit of the Church of Rome."

Mr. Bates's experience, such as it was, was sixteen years ago. These are the testimonies of the opinion of his former dioceses at the present time, and are constitutionally and, in fact, representative of the real opinion of the Church of England.

From quite another source, the *Church Record*, 21st August, 1914, I extract the following editorial statement, and draw attention to the fact that this Church of England paper states, "the experience in New South Wales is all in favour of the system." "In our opinion the New South Wales system is the most satisfactory solution of the religious question which has been devised." The statement in full runs as under: "In the Dominion of New Zealand, in Victoria, in South Australia, those who desire that children should become familiar with the teaching of the Book of Books are conducting a vigorous campaign for the introduction of the Bible into the Government schools. Their objective is the New South Wales system, which includes Scripture instruction by the teachers during school-hours (from which children may be withdrawn by parents who have conscientious objections), and also facilities for the accredited representatives of the different religious denominations to enter the schools and give instruction to their own children. We should give all the support we can, both by prayer and sympathy, to

those who are fighting the battle. The experience in New South Wales is all in favour of the system. Both from the point of view of the Education Department and from that of the Churches it has worked exceedingly well. The number of children withdrawn under the conscience clause is very small, and evidently the vast majority of parents desire that the children may receive some instruction from the Word of God. In our opinion the New South Wales system is the most satisfactory solution of the religious question which has been devised. It produces satisfactory results without in any way breaking up the system of State education. It enables the wishes of the majority to be carried into effect, while providing fully for the conscientious objections of the minority. We hope that before very long the whole of Australia and New Zealand may rejoice that God's Holy Word is being effectively taught in all the State schools."

I submit that this is a far more representative opinion of the Church of England than that of a clergyman who has not worked in the schools for sixteen years, and who has been deprived of the opportunity of visiting the schools during that period.

Mr. Bates says he asked an Anglican clergyman about the use of the text-book in the New South Wales schools, and that clergyman was not even aware of its existence. It would be worth while knowing the name of this clergyman. My personal experience in the schools of New South Wales goes back to 1889, 1890, 1891, and again in 1902, and I testify solemnly I never heard of a school in which the Scripture lessons were not given by the teachers. I have lived in New South Wales and visited State schools in Grafton, others on the Clarence River, in Broken Hill, in Quirindi, Narandera, and in Sydney, sometimes daily, teaching in the course of that experience alone some thousands of different children. I never heard of an instance in which the Scripture lessons were not in use, nor did I ever come across a solitary clergyman of my own Church or of any other Church who indicated to me the contrary. From my personal experience, which, as the places named show, included small country schools as well as large metropolitan schools, I should have been in a position to hear of any such omission, and I venture to express the opinion that had such an omission taken place there would have been an outcry not from ministers only, but from the parents of the children. I have always found amongst the Anglican clergy strong enthusiasm for the system, even amongst those who, like myself, at one time believed that the only solution of the difficulty was to be found in denominational schools. Mr. Bates is the first clergyman of my own or any other Church with whom I have come in personal contact who, after a personal acquaintance with the system, takes such a course as his.

Mr. Bates states a Queensland member of Parliament said that 90 per cent. of the teachers in New South Wales are against the system. The value of that statement is at once discounted as that of an opponent who made, like our opponents here, an assertion which he did not substantiate by facts. I submit my own is worth quite as much after my lengthy acquaintance with the teaching profession and the maintenance of friendships which to my joy continue to this day. I say emphatically that I should be surprised to find 10 per cent. of the teachers against the system; at any rate, I never met one, but I have met many teachers who have expressed themselves in the strongest terms of approbation, and always of regret whenever they found any ministers of religion slack about the opportunities afforded them. My own experience in three States was that so far from being looked upon as a privileged intruder I was asked to increase my visits. Or on quite casually visiting country schools I had not to ask to be allowed to give lessons, but was very cordially invited by the teacher to do so.

I was very much struck both in Western Australia and in Queensland with the splendid attitude of the teachers in both those States immediately after the introduction of the system there. Let it be remembered that up to one day ministers had no right whatever to go into the schools during school hours in either case. When the day came for them to go I have no doubt there was an amount of nervousness on the part of the many teachers who had heard of the bogeys similar to those which have been raised in New Zealand; but I emphatically state that I never remember one teacher making any difficulty. On the contrary, ministers were received with the greatest welcome. Still more I found that after the system was introduced, teachers who had been opposed to it expressed to me their surprise and their gratification at the absence of difficulties, and the assistance to the school life. I remember one such teacher in Queensland, the headmaster of a school of over a thousand children, who had been, in a most honourable, courteous, and fair manner, sincerely opposed to our proposal, and in legitimate ways used against the proposal his influence, which was very great, inside and outside school circles. In one of my last conversations with him he expressed his sense of approbation and gratification. I remember another instance in Queensland of a Roman Catholic teacher, most devout and ardent in her faith, who thanked me for my visits to her school of many hundreds of children, and used herself to take the most active interest in my teaching, and frequently encourage the children by a kindly remark at the beginning or close of the lesson to pay attention. Her school was visited by two other ministers simultaneously with myself; all of us had the same kindly welcome from her, nor did I hear of any difficulty about the Scripture lessons in her school. But I did hear of a great deal of appreciation on the part of parents as to the manner in which the lessons were given in that State school by the teachers under that headmistress. I could give many other instances of my own personal experience, all of which would go to show that whoever might say that 90 per cent. of the teachers are opposed to the system cannot have had my experience.

I regret to see the remarks incorporated by Mr. Bates on the part of Mr. Hobday. I was present at the Wellington Synod, and during the discussion on the motion relating to Bible in schools there was no reflection made whatever upon Mr. Bates. I am informed and believe that on quite another subject a layman criticized Mr. Bates, but there was no connection between such a criticism and the Bible-in-schools matter. I must confess to my surprise that Mr. Hobday and Mr. Bates should suggest otherwise. In the same way it is not correct to say there was unfair treatment meted out to Mr. Bates because he "wanted to show synod the uselessness of the system

in New South Wales." I was present when Mr. Bates, having made a speech, transgressed the rules of order by attempting to make another speech after he had been heard as long as he wished to speak. That the Bishop of Wellington, so well known and so esteemed in the community, could have allowed anything unfair, as suggested by Mr. Bates and Mr. Hobday, is incredible. But even if it were probable it would have been impossible if Mr. Bates and Mr. Hobday had been on that occasion in their conduct and contentions truly representative of the Church of England.

When Mr. Bates says that "all grants to denominational schools ceased and the Church of England primary schools were voluntarily converted into State schools in New South Wales," he omits the fact that the schools of other Churches were similarly converted, excepting, of course, the Roman Catholic denominational schools. That the proviso for religious instruction had been in force sixteen years before such conversion is a clear proof that the opportunity was not a price paid for that conversion.

Mr. Bates says, "The Church of England has been against Bible portions or scraps, and has stood for the entry of the clergy." I give this an emphatic and flat contradiction. It is well known that the General Synod of the Church—its highest court—and all the Diocesan Synods except that of Dunedin approved the proposal for Bible lessons only by teachers. Dr. Gibb has stated in public that the Church of England proved herself, by her financial assistance and her active work, thoroughly loyal to that proposal. It was not until the action of Parliament threw the Churches back on themselves by refusing an opportunity to the whole people to decide the matter that the Churches then brought forward the present proposal.

The fact that Mr. Bates is capable of making such a statement shows that he is not a representative clergyman of the Church of England.

Mr. Bates's quotation from the *Guardian* that "The Church of Italy suffers sorely from many plagues but she has been spared undenominationalism," is no proof that the Church of England in Australasia is not willing, under the conditions which exist here, to accept undenominational Scripture lessons which indeed to-day are included in the proposal which she—in common with the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Lutheran Churches, and the Salvation Army—agrees to accept in New Zealand as in Australia as a solution of the problem of religious instruction in State schools.

APPENDIX H.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES BY CANON GARLAND.

Latest Presbyterian Pronouncement.

At the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia held at Brisbane, September, 1914, the following resolution was unanimously carried (the text was cabled by Professor MacIntyre, convener of the Business Committee of the Assembly): "Assembly reiterates its profound sense important biblical instruction in public schools of those States where this privilege is granted, and urges all ministers in those States to take full advantage of this opportunity, conscious as Assembly is of value such work. At same time would encourage all its faithful people in other States to persevere in efforts to obtain similar privileges, so that in every school in Commonwealth the Word of God may be taught and Christian instruction given.—Carried unanimously."

Baptist Opinion.

As this statement goes to press I receive from Brisbane a report of the meeting of the Baptist Assembly of Queensland, held in Brisbane 25th September, 1914. The Brisbane *Courier*, 26th September, 1914, reports the Baptist Assembly as dealing with the Bible-in-schools question as follows: "Another resolution expressed gratitude to the ministers and other members of the denomination who, in the highest interests of the children, were availing themselves of the opportunity afforded them of imparting regular religious teaching in the State schools. 'We have learned from various sources,' the motion added, 'of the satisfactory and frictionless working of the system so far as it has been employed.'"

This is a characteristic example of one of the smallest denominations encouraging its ministers and other members of the denomination in their work of visiting the schools. It is quite apparent there is no fear amongst the Queensland Baptists of the "right of entry" crowding out a small Church, but on the contrary it gives them an opportunity of which they avail themselves "in the highest interests of the children." An ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory.

The foregoing is not an isolated example of Baptist opinions. The same body in the year 1911 passed the following resolution: "That this Assembly desires to express its appreciation of the Scripture readings published by the Department of Public Instruction for the use of State schools, and urges the ministers of the denomination, as far as possible, to take advantage of the opportunities offered to them for the religious instruction of the young by regularly visiting the schools in their respective districts." (Brisbane *Courier*, 9th September, 1911.)

From this resolution it will be seen that the Assembly equally approve the Scripture lessons given by the teachers as well as "right of entry" by the ministers.

That Baptists in Australia generally hold the same view as above on the subject of religious instruction in State schools cannot be questioned, many of them taking active part in its working, or in seeking to obtain its introduction. In Queensland three out of the four founders of the Bible in State Schools League were ministers of the non-Episcopalian Churches, one of them being the late Rev. W. Whale, a prominent Baptist minister, who, after his death, was succeeded on the executive of the League by his son. In South Australia the first organizing secretary of the present movement, the Rev. A. Metters, was a Baptist minister, and was succeeded by the Rev. R. Taylor, also a Baptist minister.

I have in my possession, handed me by a Congregational minister, replies to inquiries which he addressed from Queensland during the campaign there to every Baptist minister in New South Wales, asking for advice as to how the inquirer, the Rev. Loyal Wirt, himself a Congregational minister, should act and vote on the Bible-in-schools question. Those replies were favourable and some enthusiastic—*e.g.*, "Vote for it, labour for it."

I print all the replies. Unlike the National Schools Defence League, I do not consider myself at liberty to withhold those which, having come into my possession, will guide the public in forming an opinion from witnesses.

The facts shown are worthy of some consideration by those Baptist ministers who signed a petition to Parliament against the League's proposal. They are opposed to something of which they have no personal knowledge, whilst those who have practical personal experience say—*e.g.*, "It is the best Act I have ever heard of."

Opinions of Baptist Ministers.

(Obtained by the Rev. Loyal L. Wirt, B.D., Congregational Minister, Brisbane, in response to his inquiries.)

"The Manse, Waverley, 26th September, 1906.

"I have had over fifteen years' experience of the working of the New South Wales Education Act *re* religious instruction in State schools. It works here admirably, and gives entire satisfaction to the Protestant denominations. Yes, if I were to become a citizen of Queensland I would vote for its adoption; I would do more, I would labour for it. Wishing you all success,

"JOHN MACAULEY."

"Baptist Manse, Dulwich Hill, 17th September, 1906.

"I have not previously taken advantage of the privileges given, but I believe it to be a wise and happy solution of the education problem. Yours for Him. "SAMUEL HARRISON."

"Hobart, Tasmania, 24th September, 1906.

"Your note reached me here to-day, and I have pleasure in expressing my satisfaction with New South Wales Education Act over that of Victoria. I teach classes at 9.30 in one school and 10.15 in another, and have every encouragement from the teachers. I think, religiously, that the teachers of New South Wales are in advance of those in Victoria. "C. MULES BELL."

"Dulwich Hill, Sydney, 29th September, 1906.

"I am glad to bear my testimony to our splendid Education Act. You cannot do better than secure its advantages for your young people in Queensland. "J. STRAUGHIN."

"Parramatta, 17th September, 1906.

"Strongly urge the adoption of the New South Wales Education Act, and particularly that section of it relating to religious instruction. It is, in my judgment, the most effective solution of a difficult problem. It works well and produces good results. "J. WORBOYS."

"Baptist Church, Bathurst Street, Sydney, 25th September, 1906.

"During my four years' residence in New South Wales I have given some attention to the working of our educational system. My own opinion is that on the whole the religious instruction provided by the State is of great benefit to many children who neither attend Sunday schools nor are allowed to partake in the special teaching given by the clergy under the Act. The lessons given by the public-school teachers are most carefully imparted and free from sectarian bias.

"The Churches do not avail themselves of their opportunities as they might, and therefore I am glad that some measure of Scriptural teaching is provided for by the State, and certainly I would advocate a similar system if I were in Queensland. "JAS. BARKER."

"Baptist Church, Tamworth, New South Wales, 26th September, 1906.

"I believe the New South Wales Education Act which provides religious instruction in State schools is excellent. By it every sect has the same privileges, thereby making it impossible for honest complaint. Only a Church with 'an axe to grind' does object. I would certainly vote for its adoption as a citizen of Queensland. "G. M. BULL."

"Granville, New South Wales, 22nd September, 1906.

"Having only recently come to New South Wales I have not personally had experience of the provision for religious instruction in State schools. But as far as I know of it it is certainly better than none. I prefer, however, the Victorian system. At Castlemaine, five ministers visited the State schools (North and South), two every Friday at one, and one at the other. The school in the South was divided into two classes, and a minister took each. There was no division according to denominations, and the scheme worked harmoniously during the eight years and a half I was there. Personally I regret the denominationalism that is brought into New South Wales schools. "H. D. ARCHER."

"Blattsburg Baptist Church, 18th September, 1906.

"I visit the public school for the purpose of giving religious instruction, and can conscientiously say it is of the utmost importance, and in my experience I find it works splendidly.

Of course, the teachers also give Scripture lessons, and from information gained in conversation with my own children can say it is useful in imparting a knowledge of Scripture to the children. I would advocate such a system for your, or any, State. "J. E. Leach."

"Harris Street, Baptist Church, Sydney, 21st September, 1906.

"The Act you refer to is held in the highest esteem by all Protestants in this State. I would vote for its introduction into Queensland believing it to be an unqualified blessing, first, to the community, inasmuch as it permits Bible instruction to be given to the coming generation; second, to the children, by assisting to surround them with helpful influences; third, to Christian ministers, by providing them with golden opportunities for doing good; and fourth, to the school-teachers, by relieving them of a responsibility which they cannot discharge.

"L. H. Field."

"The Manse, Wellington, 21st September, 1906.

"I think the New South Wales Education Act is an ideal one. Were I in Queensland I should certainly vote for its adoption. "Fred. J. Dunkley."

"Ashfield, 20th September, 1906.

"In reply to your query, as far as I know the New South Wales system is satisfactory. One drawback is very evident; it means more work for the busy minister, and if he omits the work it is often entirely neglected. On the whole I think I would vote for our method in preference to any other I have seen worked. "W. M. Cartwright."

"The Manse, Pinecliff, New South Wales, 21st September, 1906.

"I. Have never known a Protestant minister complain of the Act in question who avails himself of its provisions.

"II. Have personally found it work well considering the conditions surrounding us.

"III. Have never had any obstacle put in the way of visiting our own children, and often—as in the case here—all the children in the school I visit.

"IV. Should if living in Queensland not only vote for but throw all my influence in the balance to secure it. "William Coller."

"North Sydney, Baptist Church, New South Wales, 26th September, 1906.

"In answer to your question of 12th September, if I were a citizen of Queensland at the present moment I would do all in my power to introduce that portion of the New South Wales Act under which we teach the Bible in our State schools. It is the best Act I have yet heard of; it works exceedingly well. "David Steed."

The Rev. T. Porter, D.D., who was in charge of the Baptist Tabernacle, Brisbane, during February, 1910, on learning of the proposal for Bible in State schools, wrote:—

"Petersham, New South Wales, 3rd March, 1910.

"My Dear Archdeacon Garland,—

"Just a line to say how much I rejoice to know that you are giving time and influence in pleading for the introduction of the Bible and religious instruction in the schools of your State. My experience of thirteen years in this State of New South Wales confirms me in the judgment that the thoughtful and good citizens of Queensland will never repent giving their vote and influence to have the Bible and religious instruction in the State schools of Queensland as in the schools of New South Wales. I have known only good results and perfect harmony among the ministers of the various denominations taking part in this work. Wishing the blessing of God in your efforts, "I am, dear Archdeacon, yours heartily,

"Thomas Porter."

Testimony given by Senior Inspector Willis, New South Wales.

(Not addressed to the League nor obtained by it, but independently of it, at a conference of educationists.)

Senior Inspector Willis, speaking at the Education Conference held in Sydney, April, 1904, said (see Conference Report, p. 107):—

"We laymen have been teaching the Scriptures out of the Scripture extracts for all these years, have been doing it to the satisfaction of all the different religious bodies in this community. We have heard no complaint from even those who are not working with us now; the Roman Catholics have found no fault with the way the laymen have been teaching the Scripture lessons, and I say that is a fruit of our labours that certainly deserves to be counted to our credit—that we laymen should teach those Scripture lessons, and all the doctrines included in those books, without offending the religious sensibility of one member of the community. If that be the case I say it certainly is an encouragement to go and do better. We must not halt where we are. Personally, I thank the Minister for inviting all the clergy, and not only that, I thank those clergymen for coming. It seems to me a glorious thing that here on this platform, for the first time in the history of Australia, we have had not only the evangelical clergy, not only those who reckon themselves to be on the Protestant side, but also those who have up to the present time not seen their way clear to work with us. May we not regard this meeting here of the clergymen on this platform—and I think we can—as a favourable omen? I hope it may lead to the union of all parties in the State, so that we may all work together under one grand national system, and then we shall be able to do ever so much better work educationally than we have hitherto done. I will close by repeating three lines of a poet whom the Principal of the Riverview College is very fond of, and I address the first line to our Roman Catholic brethren: 'Let the dead past bury its dead; Act in the living present: Heart within, and God o'erhead.'"

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF IRELAND INTRODUCED IN THE NEW SOUTH WALES SCHOOLS BY A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

The Under-Secretary for Education in New South Wales, Mr. Bridges, speaking at the Education Conference, Sydney, April, 1904, said (see Conference Report, page 106),—

"I do not rise to take any active part in the discussion of the important subject before us, but simply to give a little historical information. We were told yesterday afternoon that Sir Henry Parkes was the introducer of the public-school system. Now, it was in operation seventeen years before Sir Henry—then Mr.—Parkes touched the question of education. The national system of Ireland was introduced into New South Wales, and, in the general principles and the mode of working, that system is in existence to-day. If there is any man who deserves credit for introducing the national system into New South Wales that man was an Irish Roman Catholic—the Hon. John Hubert Plunkett—and no better man ever stood up in Australia. He was loved and esteemed by every one who knew him, and to this day his memory is revered by the members of the Catholic Church. Mr. Plunkett was the Chairman of the Commissioners of National Education, and as such he manifested a firm belief in Scripture lessons. Mr. Wilkins, our first headmaster, was somewhat dubious about anything that emanated from Ireland, and he was not in love with those lessons. Mr. Plunkett issued a regulation that they were to be read every day in every national school, and he was so much in earnest that he visited the schools frequently himself in order to see that that was done. One of the first questions he would ask a teacher would be, 'How often do you teach the Scripture lesson?' I remember an incident in 1853—I was a pupil-teacher then, and, as Professor Knibbs would say, a mere child teaching children. Mr. Plunkett came into the school and sat on a form beside the class during the whole time the lesson was being given. I will say this, that that lesson was the first impetus I got on my path as a teacher. Some remarks have been made with regard to the influence of the teacher upon the children committed to his care. For many years, as a teacher in various parts of the State, I had to teach children of all denominations—Roman Catholic among them—and some Roman Catholic boys I taught are now priests of the Roman Catholic Church. I do not think they suffered either in religion or morals from the contact. I think it is a matter worthy of record that the first native-born Australian made a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church was a public-school boy. No matter what text-books we may have, the one thing necessary is the personal influence and example of the teacher. Be what you would like your children to be, and then good must follow. Let your light so shine before your pupils that they will follow your example and glorify your Father which is in Heaven."

APPENDIX I.

NOTES SUBMITTED BY THE RIGHT REV. HENRY W. CLEARY, BISHOP OF AUCKLAND, ON THE COMMENTS MADE BY CANON GARLAND ON HIS (DR. CLEARY'S) EVIDENCE, 26TH OCTOBER, 1914, AND CORRESPONDENCE RELATING THERETO.

(The page numbers are those of Canon Garland's evidence-in-chief, as presented to the Committee.)

Page 134: Canon Garland writes, "The League has never, in any official literature, nor, so far as I am aware, have any of its speakers, said that the League will work detriment to, or even wreck, the national system by establishing a rival system of denominational schools." In addition to the evidence cited by me in my chief statement, the following may be referred to: (1.) The *Hawera Advocate* of the 2nd August, 1913, reports Rev. Dr. Gibb (a League vice-president) as stating that "the League . . . would have to take a leaf out of the Roman Catholic Church's book and start schools of its own. What would become of the national system if all the strong Churches went in for a denominational school system?" (2.) In a League publication of his Wanganui lecture said, "The day may come when the Churches will be compelled to provide primary schools for their own children." For a fuller list of quotations in point, see Catholic Federation Series No. 6, pages 7–10, copies of which were supplied to the Committee and Canon Garland.

Page 136: The Nelson system was not mentioned in the criticism of it which Canon Garland credits me with on this page. See my cross-examination on this point by Professor Hunter.

Page 139: Cardinal Moran's attitude on the question of Scripture lessons in the public schools has been seriously misdescribed, owing to the omission of the following particulars which were published in about seventy daily papers of this Dominion in May, 1913, in reply to Canon Garland, and were mailed (registered) to the League executive, and to many of its individual members over sixteen months ago:—

"A misleading impression of the views of my late illustrious friend, Cardinal Moran, is conveyed in a League pamphlet and in a recent telegraphed report in your columns, with pointed reference to me personally. (1.) The late Cardinal firmly held the Catholic teaching which denies a fundamental League doctrine—that it is the moral right and duty of the Government to teach religion, or (in legal phrase) to impart 'religious instruction' and 'general religious teaching' as a class subject. (2.) At the Educational Conference in Sydney in April, 1904, Cardinal Moran denounced the New South Wales Government Scripture lessons as 'garbled extracts' compiled for proselytizing purposes by Archbishop Whately, 'a professional proselytizer,' and Rev. Carlile,

'the very worst proselytizer in Ireland.' (3.) In a telegram read in the Queensland Legislative Council on the 25th October, 1910, he said those Government lessons are 'avowedly Protestant, and are condemned by me and all Catholics.' (4.) In a letter quoted in the Queensland Legislative Council on the 1st November, 1910, the League organizer described the opponents of his scheme as being 'under Cardinal Moran's banner.' (5.) At the Catholic Educational Conference in Sydney on the 17th–21st January, 1911, Cardinal Moran declared that the New South Wales system 'from its inception' was hostile to the Catholic Church; that its founder, Sir Henry Parkes, had declared its object to be 'death to the calling of the priesthood of the Church of Rome'; and that 'it was unjust to ask Catholics to send their children to schools which were avowedly for the purpose of destroying their faith.' (Official Report, pp. 41, 49–50.) He reaffirmed the archdiocesan law against the clergy teaching religion in the public schools; they should 'bring the children to a neighbouring Church, or house, or elsewhere. . . . They must make it plain that there was no peace with the system as far as Catholics were concerned.' (Official Report, p. 40.) 'The reports of the Education Department,' said he, 'make it appear that they had paid nine hundred such visits last year. Those visits were in the remote country districts where there were no Catholic schools, and where the children were obliged to attend State schools. The priests merely called at the schools to assemble the children for preparation for the sacraments, but did not actually teach them in the schoolroom, taking them to a neighbouring house, if available, or otherwise gathering them under a gum-tree.' (Official Report, p. 31.) (6.) I personally know that Cardinal Moran objected vehemently to the League's Irish proselytizing clause, and (on grounds of Catholic theology) to compelling teachers to impart 'general religious teaching' which their consciences forbade. (7.) I know from the Cardinal personally, from a teacher present (whose evidence is available), and from the condensed newspaper report, that he took up the following attitude at the conference of 1904: (*a.*) As the law (which he bitterly resented) stood it would be 'a vast improvement' (as mitigating somewhat the dangers of State proselytism) to substitute 'the four Gospels' for the Irish proselytizers' 'garbled extracts.' (*b.*) 'In the matter of expense,' said he, 'I do not think the State should be called upon at all; I think each denomination would be able to present its own children with the necessary books.' The Cardinal sternly opposed objectors having to pay for the endowment of Protestant 'religious teaching.' He offered to supply at his own expense (as we do where we can) 'Douai' Gospels to the Catholic children; but, faithful to conscience and Church law, he never contemplated Catholic children being taught Scripture lessons by State officials of all creeds, and of none. Like all Catholics, he believed in religious instruction for public-school children on fair-all-round conditions. There is no divergence, in substance, between his views and those expressed by me, and, in 1904, by the Catholic hierarchy of New Zealand.

"I am, &c.,

"HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.,

"Bishop of Auckland."

Page 140: "Members of the Bishop's communion were on the Departmental Committee which prepared the Queensland lesson-books." This is incorrect. There was only one Catholic on that Committee, and he, being a departmental employee, had either to do as he was told or take the consequences. The statement that there were two Catholics on the Committee was authoritatively denied by the Hon. F. McDonnell in the Queensland Legislature on the 9th November, 1910 (page 1991). This has been in the Press and before the public of New Zealand (through me) for over twenty months past.

Page 141: Canon Garland writes, "The right of entry objected to by Bishop Cleary (page 28)." This refers to page 28 of my (typed) evidence-in-chief. Bishop Cleary nowhere "objected" to the right of entry (of clergy) on page 28 (typed) of his evidence. Later on, under the heading, "Opposition to Clergy in Schools," I wrote, "Speaking personally, I would not object to it, provided that the rights of conscience of parents, teachers, and pupils were properly safeguarded."

Page 150: Canon Garland writes, "Never once has the League in its official documents made the request that the teachers shall be asked to give religious instruction." The answer to this is contained in the League's card, in its leaflet on the Religious Instruction in Schools Referendum Bill, and in the Catholic Federation pamphlet No. 5, pages 14 and following, supplied to the Committee and to Canon Garland.

Pages 154–155: The Committee and Canon Garland have had before them (in Catholic Federation pamphlet No. 3) a statement of the Catholic doctrinal, doctrinal-moral principles, and the disciplinary laws of the Church, which regulate the following matters: (1) Strictly requiring all versions of the Scriptures by Catholic writers to be "approved by the Holy See, or issued under the care of bishops, with notes taken from the Holy Fathers of the Church and from learned Catholic writers"; (2) strictly prohibiting the use, by Catholics, of all versions of the Scriptures by non-Catholics (such as are used in the four Australian States); and (3) allowing the use of such versions, not to teachers in primary schools, but, on certain conditions, "to those only who are engaged in theological or biblical studies" (Constitution on the Prohibition and Censorship of Books, Section 1, Chapters ii and iii). Other things shown to be prohibited are the following: (4) The teaching of the Bible and religion to Catholic children by non-Catholics or otherwise than by Catholics (decree of Council of Trent); (5) "common" teaching of biblical and religious lessons to Catholic children along with children of other faiths, and of the so-called "fundamental," or "unsectarian," or "undenominational" teaching (various decrees cited). See also the details given in my cross-examination by Professor Hunter on the 4th August, 1914, and Canon Garland's admission on the same date that "these so-called unsectarian Bible lessons are opposed to Catholic principles." In my cross-examination of the 4th August I pointed out that it is not in the power of any Bishop to set aside Catholic principles and laws mentioned above, and that any such setting-aside would be *ultra vires*. Canon Garland makes me say

that "the alternative" for Catholic teachers in the Australian Bible-in-schools States is "that they are hypocrites, and sell their souls for bread and butter." This is a vastly different statement from that made by me, and the various alternatives clearly set forth by me. The same remark applies to the similar statement made by the Rev. Mr. Cook. The reader is referred to my actual words of the 24th July and the 4th August.

Pages 160 and following: My quotations were taken direct, and with their proper context, from the official copies of the Sydney Anglican synods, and from the reports, therein contained, of (among other things) the Church of England Committee on Religious Instruction. They are open at any time to inspection by the Committee or Canon Garland. The testimony of Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A., Warden of Trinity College Grammar School, Sydney, were attributed to the *Catholic Press*. They were in reality (as quoted) taken direct from the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of the 20th July, 1914. The sort of effort to discount this evidence is clearly indicated in these words of the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney in reply to the Canon's unquoted letter: "I am not surprised that the Roman Catholic Bishop whose evidence you quote to me has endeavoured to prejudice the parliamentary Committee against the New South Wales system of religious instruction in public schools." The Rev. Mr. Chambers's reply to Canon Garland's letter contains an equally significant remark. He writes that his sermon "preached by me in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on the 19th July last is being used to favour the exclusion of the Bible from State schools." As regards Archdeacon Irvine (p. 170 of Canon Garland's evidence), I correctly quoted his specific declaration as to the "materialistic" tendency in the public schools of New South Wales, and I expressly quoted it in refutation of the League's story as to the "success" of the New South Wales system. The accuracy of the quotation is not questioned. The secretary of the Archdeacon's committee, who followed, spoke strongly to the Minister of Education regarding the clergy's neglect of their opportunities for religious instruction in the public schools, and of the manner in which, "for eighteen years, the provisions of the Act had not been carried out in public schools, as was intended" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th May, 1913). These series of evidences of the partial failure of the legalized "general" and "special" religious instruction in the New South Wales public schools were rendered all the more telling by the following facts: (1) They were given by prominent Church people, lay and clerical; (2) they were laid before the Minister of Education with all the deliberation becoming a formal deputation; and (3) they were advanced as arguments to sustain a demand for further opportunities for denominational religious instruction in the State high schools. All this has been before the Committee. It has been before the League for the past sixteen months or more.

Catholic children attending State biblical lessons: In his statements before the Committee Canon Garland has all along assumed that, where parents fail to send written notifications to withdraw their children from such biblical lessons, such children, as a matter of fact, actually do attend them; and according to the law they would be required to attend. Canon Garland quotes Mr. Board, then Under-Secretary of Education, New South Wales, to this effect: that "such notifications are so few that, for statistical purposes, they may be said not to exist." We may be prepared to accept Mr. Board's testimony on this matter, even though the very same letter in which this statement occurs has been shown to the Committee, by the plan of parallel columns, to be chiefly made up of a public document mutilated and garbled in nine separate places, each such mutilation and garbling being, without exception, to the benefit of the League's contentions. But the general neglect of such written notifications by parents—even if admitted—would by itself by no means justify Mr. Board's sweeping statement that "the general outcome of the instruction is that all pupils receive a substantial knowledge of Scripture history," &c. Nor would such neglect of notifications (even if admitted) by itself justify Canon Garland in his positive and repeated assertion that practically all the Catholic children in the State schools of New South Wales (nearly 32,000) actually and in point of fact do attend the teachers' biblical and "general religious lessons." That Protestant children may generally—or almost universally—attend the "general religious instruction" by the teachers (where the teachers give it) may or may not be true. But even the League's own literature and evidence, as laid before this Committee, contains statements to the effect that there is, on the part of Catholic children, a general abstention from those Government "general religious" lessons. See, for instance, the 24th, 87th, and 96th letters of the League publication, "Opinions of Educational Experts." See also page 6 of the evidence of the Rev. G. Cook before this Committee, and page 13 of his exhibit, entitled "Methodist Church of Australia and Bible in State Schools." Canon Garland (page 109) quotes Mr. R. H. Roe, "Inspector-General of Schools and Chief Professional Adviser, Queensland," as saying that the Roman Catholics "denounce the whole system. Their children are withdrawn during the Bible lessons," and so on. And the president of the Catholic Federation of New South Wales wrote in the *Catholic Press* (Sydney) of the 10th September, 1914, "It is a rule in all public schools that the Catholic children are not detained for Scripture lessons. The Act provides that the children may be kept, unless the parents object 'in writing.' The good sense of the teachers, however, neutralizes this very objectionable clause." The negative conscience clause, devised by Irish proselytizers for proselytizing purposes (as shown in my principal evidence), has, according to evidence quoted, proved largely unworkable, so far as Catholic children are concerned, in New South Wales. See also the evidence from various sources to the effect that the Irish Scripture lessons, imposed by law upon the public schools of New South Wales, are frequently not used there; that the legal provisions in regard to "general religious instruction" by teachers are widely neglected; that lessons on "civics," &c., are often substituted for the Scripture lessons, and so on.

On pages 26–27 of his evidence Canon Garland prints a grave and unwarranted reflection on my personal honour in connection with the amazing statement of a former Director of Education in Tasmania (Mr. Neale) that "the system existing in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty." The following vital facts, omitted by

Canon Garland, were published in about seventy New Zealand daily papers, and in the *Outlook*, in the course of a controversy on the subject with Canon Garland. The matter quoted hereunder was also mailed to Canon Garland and to the chief members of the League executive. The following sample copy is from the *Dominion* of the 20th January, 1913:—

"SIR,—I have just now (17th January) received from a friend in Wellington a copy of your issue of the 15th, containing an excited communication by the reverend organizer of the Bible in Schools League.

"In a Bible-in-schools pamphlet the following shockingly untrue statement was credited to the late Director of Education in Tasmania, Mr. Neale: That the Bible-in-schools system in that State is 'accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty.' This amazing assertion was flung at me in controversy, and gave rise to the following two issues: (1) The question of its authorship, and (2) the question of its objective truth.

"(1.) Information received by me from Tasmania (the accuracy of which I could not, of course, guarantee) was to the following effect: (*a*) That the quoted statement was certainly signed not by the Director of Education (Mr. Neale, then alleged to be absent), but by a secretary to the Director; (*b*) the secretary was understood to be the author of the statement so signed by him; (*c*) it was made to appear at least doubtful that so flagrant an untruth was fathered by one so well acquainted and sympathetic with Catholic educational grievances as the Director of Education was known to be.

"On the 16th November the organizing secretary of the League asserted in your columns that the statement quoted above was signed by 'the secretary of the Director of Education.' This obviously left the mystery of its authorship precisely where it had been before. So did two communications received by me from the present Director of Education (Mr. McCoy), on my return to Auckland just before Christmas Eve. He failed to give a specific solution to these two doubts: (*a*) Was this cruel misstatement made by its signer (the secretary) as his own personal view, or (*b*) was it dictated, written, or approved by the Director of Education?

"On the 3rd January my esteemed neighbour, the Rev. Mr. Jolly, published in the *Auckland Star* a letter in which the present Director of Education (Mr. McCoy) affirms that his predecessor actually twice wrote with his own hand the statements in question. Here, for the first time, we had a clear, express, and categorical statement in point, which (as acknowledged by me in the *Star* of the 4th January) set at rest the question of authorship, and proved that my informants were mistaken in their grounds for supposing that the signer of the statement was also its originator.

"No charge of forgery was laid at any time or by any person in this connection. This charge was illogically deduced as the only working inference; yet there were no fewer than four quite innocent inferences which ought to have been taken into consideration before fixing on one that involved a grave criminal accusation. May I be permitted to remind the reverend organizer of the League that I am amenable to the laws, which provide a speedy remedy for any one against whom a charge of forgery is improperly made or implied. May I furthermore add that, in the case of the present alleged charge, the questions of fact would be decided by a jury composed wholly or in great part of my Protestant fellow-citizens.

"In my letter of the 4th January in the *Auckland Star* I stated that I had already planned to utilize the correspondence 'in hand' and 'expected shortly' 'in a public pronouncement arranged for at an early date.' What may possibly be an important communication in this connection is still awaited. Those who know me will have no fear that I shall herein be lacking either in candour or in personal honour.

"(2.) I now come once more to the question of the objective truth of the statement that the Bible-in-schools system in Tasmania is 'accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty.' Not to mention Jewish and other objectors, Catholics hold a very important place in the list of 'all denominations' in Tasmania. How do they view the system?

"(*a.*) The Catholic denomination in Tasmania, as elsewhere, notoriously denies the moral right of the Government to impart what the law in several Australian States terms biblical and 'general religious teaching.' (*b.*) The Catholic denomination in Tasmania, as elsewhere, publicly and notoriously objects to paying tithes (in the shape of taxes) for the exclusive establishment and endowment of a form of biblical and 'general religious teaching' at variance with the religious convictions of its adherents. (*c.*) On specific and oft-stated grounds of doctrine and discipline, Catholic teachers cannot, without at least a material violation of their conscience, impart the sort of biblical and 'general religious teaching' referred to above. An authoritative statement on this subject has been before the public of New Zealand repeatedly, at least since October. Catholic teachers in Tasmania are forced by law either to forfeit their bread-and-butter or violate their conscience, and do, at State expense, work which properly belongs to the Bible-in-schools clergy and parents. (*d.*) For over two months past there has been before the public of this Dominion a declaration by the official head of the Catholic denomination in Tasmania of the wrongs which Catholics there believe they have been suffering under the sham 'protection' of the Irish proselytizing conscience clause which has found favour with our Bible in Schools League.

"Yet, in spite of these well-known facts, the League is still officially circulating the notorious and cruel untruth that the Bible-in-schools system in Tasmania is accepted by Catholics 'as a happy solution of the religious difficulty.'

"Once more—for, I think, the fifth time—I thus direct the League's attention to this grave matter.

"17th January." "HENRY W. CLEARY, Bishop of Auckland."

As the Committee were unable to get into touch with the Rev. G. S. Cook on the 26th October, for cross-examination by me, I am permitted to put in a statement in regard to his evidence. I am, however, limiting this statement to the following two points:—

On pages 7–8 of his evidence the Rev. Mr. Cook states that "the Yass Convent School makes a special feature of coaching candidates for the entrance examination," said examination being

described as "the first teachers' examination" (page 7). The following are copies of cable messages sent and received in connection with the above-quoted statement of the Rev. Mr. Cook:—

"The Convent, Yass.—Following statement made before Parliament Committee: 'The Yass Convent School makes a special feature of coaching candidates' for 'the first teachers' examination.' Do you make, or have you made, special feature of such coaching? Kindly reply any time to-day. Matter urgent.—Bishop CLEARY, Boulcott Street, Wellington."

"Bishop Cleary, Boulcott Street, Wellington.—We have not and do not make coaching candidates a special feature of our schools.—Sister DE SALES, Yass."

The high level of general education imparted in that great school is sufficient to account for any success of the Yass Convent pupils at such examinations, without resorting to the theory of specialized coaching.

On page 8 of his evidence the Rev. Mr. Cook credits me (of course, inadvertently) with attributing to Bishop Gallagher, of Goulburn, statements which, in point of fact, I never yet attributed to him. The reader is asked to compare with the Rev. Mr. Cook's words those which I actually handed to the Committee and to Canon Garland on the 4th August, and which were taken by the Committee as an exhibit: "No educationist in Australia has probably so intimate a knowledge of the Catholic teachers' hearts of New South Wales as Bishop Gallagher, of Goulburn, who is in constant touch with them. In a letter to me he declares that the Catholic teachers in his wide jurisdiction positively 'hate the lessons' from those sectarian mutilations of the Scriptures which (devised by Carlile and Whately for the avowed purpose of proselytizing Irish Catholics) had to be banished from the national schools of that unhappy land."

APPENDIX J.

MISCELLANEOUS CORRESPONDENCE.

SIR,— Wellington, 29th October, 1914.

This afternoon I received from the New Zealand Catholic Federation a copy of a supplementary statement by Bishop Cleary which, I understand, has been forwarded to the Committee. Mr. Girling Butcher, who forwards me the statement, states he learns a copy was forwarded me by the Committee, but if so it has not reached me up to the moment of writing.

In consequence of the lateness it is impossible for me to traverse the Bishop's statement as I should be quite prepared to do, but one point catches my eye—his quotation (on page 1 of the supplementary statement) of Dr. Gibb's speech at Hawera. I enclose a copy of the extract of the full paragraph from the report of what Dr. Gibb said, and which bears out my statement in rebuttal of Bishop Cleary's accusation that the League had threatened to wreck the national system. The full context shows that from the bottom of their hearts the League stands for the national system, and that if the Scripture is barred then the national system would be in danger.

I have, &c.,

DAVID J. GARLAND.

G. M. Thomson, Esq., M.P., Chairman, Parliamentary Education Committee,
Parliament Buildings, Wellington.

[Extract from the *Hawera Advocate*, 2nd August, 1913.]

The League, continued Dr. Gibb, did not wish to break up the national education system, and on the whole the speaker approved of the syllabus, though it was a little overcrowded, and more interest appeared to be devoted to the entrails of a frog than to the soul of an archangel. From the bottom of their hearts the League stood for nationalism, and it would be a great grief to it if the national system were impaired—but it could not be. The great opponents of the national system were the Roman Catholics, though just now Bishop Cleary, with the prickly brood under him, was not anxious to obtrude the fact that he and his Church did not love this national system. The League was said to be assailing the national system, but some of those who said so hated the national system with a great and bitter hatred. Without desiring to threaten, the speaker continued, he might say that the League would not tolerate the barring-out of Scripture, and if it did not get its rights would have to take a leaf out of the Roman Catholic Church's book and start schools of its own. What would become of the national system if all the strong Churches went in for a denominational primary-school system? God forbid that such a time should come, as the League desired to retain the national system.

SIR,— Wellington, 27th October, 1914.

I enclose original letter of even date received from the Assistant Secretary of the General Post Office, by which you will see that the copy of the cable message (received from Mr. Board on the 14th July, 1914) was not certified through an inadvertency in the General Post Office. None the less was the copy supplied to me as a certified copy by the General Post Office and was correct. I regret that even an opponent of the Bible-in-schools movement should have drawn attention in the manner in which he did to the absence of a formal certificate.

I have the honour to request that the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Post Office be placed on record.

Your obedient servant,

DAVID J. GARLAND,
Organizing Secretary.

G. M. Thomson, Esq., M.P., Chairman, Parliamentary Education Committee,
Parliament House, Wellington.

SIR,— General Post Office, Wellington, 27th October, 1914.

It having come to my knowledge that through inadvertence in this office a copy of a received cable message* delivered to you upon your application of the 24th instant was not certified to before issue, I beg to forward you the attached certified copy of the cable message as received in New Zealand, at the same time expressing regret for the omission of an officer of this Department.

Yours obediently,
F. V. WATERS,
Assistant Secretary.

Rev. Canon Garland, Wellington.

* Certified copy cable message, Sydney, sub. 14th July to Canon Garland, Wellington, signed "P. Board, Director of Education."

SIR,— Education Department, Wellington, 28th October, 1914.

On page 11 of Canon Garland's evidence touching the petition now before the Committee occurs the following passage: "In the Maori day schools under the 'entirely secular' Education Act the Bible is read and religious instruction given. I have made inquiries, and have not heard of one Maori school to the contrary; but within the last few months I have heard of the closing of a Maori school near Huntly, the children of which had been accustomed to their Bible-reading and religious instruction, but on crossing over to the pakeha school found they were deprived of these advantages." This conveys a wrong impression of the facts, and places the Department in the false position of appearing to permit in Native schools what the Education Act does not allow in public schools.

(1.) The Maori village schools (or "Native schools," as the Education Act calls them, or "day schools," as the witness calls them) are conducted under the same rules in respect of the character of the teaching as the ordinary public schools—that is, Bible-reading and religious instruction are not included in the subjects of instruction, and cannot therefore be taken within school-hours. The law is, as far as I know, faithfully observed by all our teachers—and my impression is confirmed by a telegram from the Chief Inspector of Native Schools to the following effect: "Nuhaka, 23rd October, 1914.—Canon Garland's statement that Bible is read and religious instruction given in Maori day schools has absolutely no foundation in fact, and should be withdrawn."

Some Native-school teachers, I have no doubt, give Bible lessons outside school-hours, and at many places Sunday school is held in the school building, the teachers being free to assist if they so desire. Many schools, again, are used for church purposes on Sundays and on other days, although not during school-hours.

(2.) The Rakaumanga School, near Huntly, owing to the opposition of Mahuta, was closed in September, 1908, six years ago. Some of the buildings are now let on lease to the Church Missionary Society.

Evidently the witness has been misinformed. Probably he will see his way to withdraw the statement. If not, I ask that this letter should be attached to the evidence.

I have, &c.,
G. HOGBEN,
Inspector-General of Schools.

The Chairman of the Education Committee, House of Representatives.

SIR,— Wellington, 29th October, 1914.

I am in receipt to-day of a communication from the Inspector-General of Schools with regard to the statement in my evidence that in the Maori day schools under the "entirely secular" Education Act the Bible is read and religious instruction given. The Inspector-General comments that "The law is, as far as I know, faithfully observed by all our teachers," and quotes a telegram from the Chief Inspector of Native Schools that my statement has absolutely no foundation in fact. The Inspector-General also says he has no doubt some Native-school teachers give Bible lessons outside school-hours.

I see no contradiction of facts. I nowhere suggested that the law was not faithfully observed by all our teachers. Yet, according to my information, I could not hear of any Native school in which the Bible was not read. It may be that the instruction is not given within the *legal* school-hours, but so far as the children are concerned there appears to be no difference in their eyes, notwithstanding such instruction is not provided for in the Act.

I have, &c.,
DAVID J. GARLAND,
Organizing Secretary.

G. M. Thomson, Esq., M.P., Chairman, Parliamentary Education Committee, Parliament House, Wellington.

Mr. Hogben given leave to add:—

That in Native schools where Bible lessons are given I believe that in every case they are given before the school is assembled or after the school has been dismissed. Those, at all events, are the instructions to the teachers.

By Authority: JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1914.

Price 2s. 6d.]