

has failed to do any good in America and anywhere else it has been tried.' Catholics, and the great bulk of Protestants, believe that, to derive real spiritual benefit from the Bible, it does not suffice 'merely' to read it. It is necessary to learn it, to get at its true meaning, to store up and apply its sacred truths and principles. Both Catholics and the vastly greater part of Protestants acknowledge that 'mere' Bible-reading by children (which is the thing here in question) effects little or no good. This, for instance, was a ground of objection by Anglicans to the Bible-reading proposals of 1877 (as, for instance, in the meetings of July 30, 1877, in Dunedin). For 'mere' Bible-reading by children means any mechanical or half-mechanical or empty and unintelligent perusal—perhaps mere gabbling—of the printed words of the Sacred Volume. Catholics, and very many Protestants, too, hold that this 'mere' reading of the Bible may even be harmful, on account of the lack of reverence arising out of treating the Word of God as something less than a mere text-book, and devoting to it less intelligence and study and attention than children would give to the multiplication table or to the stories of Robinson Crusoe or of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves.

(c) 'R.W.'s quotation from the *New Zealand Tablet* of May 7, 1880, is—like every one of the many other quotations of his that I have tested—mutilated and in effect fraudulent. Here is what the *Tablet* actually does say: 'Mere Bible-reading has failed to do any good in America and anywhere else it has been tried, and from the nature of the case it could not have been otherwise; for, as Dr. Johnson said, "The New Testament is the most difficult book in the world, for which the study of a life is required." If one of the greatest minds, and one of the most learned men England ever produced, found the New Testament so difficult to be understood, what is to be said of the folly of thinking that any good can come of reading such a Book, without explanation, to little children? No, it is not by such a practice children are to be taught their duties to God, their neighbor, and themselves.' In the very same article the *New Zealand Tablet* declared that 'a Christian people ought to be educated as Christians'; it appealed, not for a 'mere' empty and unintelligent reading of the Bible, but for the English system of proper religious education in both the public and the denominational schools; and it denounced 'our godless system' as likely to 'lead to loss of faith and consequent loss of moral principle.' 'The scorner of Bible-reading' is thus, in reality, the advocate of intelligent, useful, and effective Bible-reading in the schools. The *New Zealand Tablet* has never regarded the Civil Government as a competent teacher of religion; it has nevertheless been all along in favor of the reading of the Bible in the public schools, so long as this can be done without violating the civil and religious rights of Catholics. I may add that the files of the *Tablet* are open to inspection by 'R.W.' or his representative, or by any responsible person interested in this discussion.

2. In a long experience of the meaner and meanest forms of No-Popery controversy I have never come across so outrageous a case of utter dishonesty of quotation as that with which 'R.W.' in the *Otago Daily Times* of March 6, 1909, sought to dishonor the grave and the memory of the late Dr. Grace, of Wellington—one of the finest specimens of true Christian manhood that ever adorned public or private life in New Zealand. 'R.W.', with his accustomed inaccuracy, makes the Pope create Dr. Grace a Count of the Holy Church—a title which, by the way, was quite unknown either to Dr. Grace or to the Pope. By a shocking mutilation and misrepresentation of Dr. Grace's noble and high-minded speech of June 16, 1886, 'R.W.' paints him to your readers as a modern Anti-Christ, a rabid and altogether diabolical enemy of the Bible. I place hereunder, side by side, the real sentiments of Dr. Grace, and the scandalous misrepresentation of them by his anonymous accuser. To *Hansard* 'R.W.' has appealed; to *Hansard* let us go:—

'R.W.'S' DR. GRACE.

'The *Tablet* editor did not know till I told him the discreditable part played by his clerical superiors in firing down the "flag of Christ" in the schools. I wish now to tell him the part played by his pupils in Parliament in trampling on the "flag" that was fired down by his superiors. Let us go to *Hansard* and find an illustration. On June 16, 1886, the Hon. Dr. Menzies, in the Legislative Council, moved the sec-

THE REAL DR. GRACE.

I have the greatest reverence for the Scriptures. I was educated in the knowledge of the Scriptures from the time I was a small child. The language and teaching of the Old and New Testaments form a background of poetry to my nature—it has become part of my being; but I think it is of more importance that our children should be saturated with a reverence of this kind rather than that they should

and reading of a bill that would permit the reading of the Bible in our schools, guarded by a conscience clause. The most vigorous opponent of this proposal was the most outstanding Roman Catholic layman in New Zealand—the Hon. Dr. Grace. Like Dr. Cleary, Dr. Grace was specially honored by the Pope, for he was created a "count" of the "Holy Church." Dr. Grace took up the position that if the Bible should be read in the schools, even with a conscience clause, the Roman Catholics, especially in the Auckland Province, would feel that faith had been broken with them as a class, and that they have been outraged in their finest feelings!" He was good enough to say that his boycott on the Bible would not be for ever, for he added that when the Roman Catholics had their own schools all over the land, then—"we may even, in the cause of Christianity, assist you to pass this measure, lest the knowledge of God—the very foundation of our civilisation—should die out amongst you, and you should bring on yourselves the curse all history shows to be the heritage of an infidel people!"

be accustomed to the irreverential repetition of Scriptural passages. However, so sincere and earnest is my belief in the extraordinary influence and benefit of acquaintanceship with the Inspired Writings, that I would vote for this bill were it not that, in doing so, I cannot avoid a gross injustice to others. . . . We cannot, as a Legislature, pass this bill without necessarily leading to the exclusion of all the Catholic teachers from the State schools. That would, perhaps, in the opinion of many, be but a small misfortune; but you cannot pass the bill without doing a very great injury to a very large proportion of the inhabitants of the Provincial District of Auckland, which they will certainly resent. . . . (Dr. Grace goes on to explain that in that province Catholics had shown "greater confidence in the good faith of the Government" than elsewhere, and had consequently "made no commensurate provision for the education of their own children." He added that the proposed measure would create "an immense revulsion against our system of State education." He then goes on as follows: "Have patience for a few years, and you may then pass this bill, because, as Catholics, we intend to make ourselves entirely independent of your system of education, even though the sacrifice involved should still further strain our resources and impoverish our people. We may even, in the cause of Christianity, assist you to pass this measure, lest the knowledge of God—the very foundation of our civilisation—should die out amongst you, and you should bring on yourselves the curse all history shows to be the heritage of an infidel people."—(The Hon. Dr. Grace's speech, from *Hansard, Parliamentary Debates*, June 16, 1886, vol. LIV., pp. 504-5; debate on the second reading of the Hon. Mr. Menzies's bill to introduce mere Bible-reading 'into the public schools.')

This is the noble-hearted Christian gentleman whom 'R.W.' represents as an Anti-Christ and a rabid enemy of the Bible! Be it noted: (a) Dr. Grace knew and studied and deeply loved his Bible. (b) He wished to see the children in the State schools 'saturated' with reverence for the Bible, instead of the 'irreverential repetition' that would probably result from the 'mere' reading of the Sacred Book proposed by the Hon. Mr. Menzies. (c) He would have voted for even the 'mere' reading of the Bible—and of the Protestant version of the Bible (which was the one intended—in the State schools, but for the wrong that this would have inflicted upon the Catholic teachers by excluding them all from those schools. In this he was fully borne out by the Hon. Mr. Swanson (*Hansard*, same volume, page 505). There was another grievous wrong to Catholics in this bill, which wrong Dr. Grace had sturdily opposed on a previous occasion. This was the sham conscience clause, with which, according to 'R.W.', Mr. Menzies's bill was 'guarded.' The 'conscience clause' in the Menzies bill (like those in the Bowen bill of 1877 and the bill introduced by Mr. Fulton in 1888) proposed nothing less than to make legally compulsory the proselytising of all Catholic children whose parents or guardians forgot or neglected to enter formal protests