

in Ireland," and by Archbishop Whately, "a professional proselytiser." "Certainly," the Cardinal added, "we cannot accept those gentlemen as general exponents of the religious opinions which should form part of the school system in this country; but, rather, we must look upon them as forced upon the country by those proselytising agents, who certainly had fell designs against the Catholic Church. It is not an ennobling feature of our system that those Scripture lessons, which have been cast out as unworthy from the Irish National schools, should be taken up and put into the hands of all our children." Statements similar in import were made on the same occasion by Archbishop Kelly. Archbishop Whately (said Cardinal Moran), "whilst openly disavowing proselytism, was privately boasting to his friends of his efforts to undermine the faith of the Irish Catholic people."

(3) In a telegram read in the Queensland Legislative Council on October 25, 1910, Cardinal Moran said of the New South Wales Scripture lessons: "Scripture lessons are avowedly Protestant and are condemned and denounced by me and all Catholics." Archbishop Kelly habitually refers to the New South Wales system as "a system of proselytism." This appears to be a rather common designation of the system among Catholics in New South Wales. (4) In a letter in the *Brisbane Courier* of November 1, 1910, Canon Garland (the League's organising secretary) described the opponents of the Bible-in-school system as being "under Cardinal Moran's banner" (quoted in the Queensland Legislative Council, November 1, 1910). (5) At the Catholic Educational Conference of New South Wales, held in Sydney on January 17-21, 1911, Cardinal Moran declared that the New South Wales system, "from its inception, had been hostile to the Catholic Church" (Report, p. 41); that it was "unsound in principle"; that its founder (Sir Henry Parkes) had declared its object to "be death to the calling of the priesthood of the Church of Rome" (Report, pp. 49-50); that the motto of the champions of Parkes's Bill was: "Give to the principles of Catholics no quarter" (Report, p. 50). "In the face of all this," added the Cardinal, "it was unjust to ask Catholics to send their children to schools which were avowedly for the purpose of destroying their faith" (Report, p. 50).

(6) At the same Conference Cardinal Moran reaffirmed the standing archdiocesan legislation that the clergy should on no account teach religion in the public schools, but should "bring the children to a neighboring church or house or elsewhere. He did not think," the Report continues, "they should enter the school except in the case of extremest necessity. They must make it plain that there was no peace with the system as far as Catholics were concerned" (Report, p. 40). "The reports of the Education Department," said he, "made it appear that they had paid 900 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 neighboring house, if available, or otherwise gathering them under a gum-tree" (Report, p. 31). But even if the Catholic clergy taught religion within the State schools of New South Wales, this would no more signify approval of that system than does similar work by the Catholic clergy in New Zealand imply approval of the secular system. (7) At the same Conference Cardinal Moran (p. 31) condemned "the entire State system" in New South Wales. Quite apart from any such Conference, and on well-known grounds of Catholic Moral Theology, Cardinal Moran strongly opposed the legal compulsion of State school teachers to impart a "general religious instruction" which their consciences forbade. As one intimately acquainted with his views on many subjects, I personally know, from his own declarations, that he both objected to

this and to the proselytising Irish conscience clause in force in New South Wales.

(8) From the condensed newspaper report, from the statement (which can be produced) of a teacher present, and from statements made by the Cardinal in my presence, he took up the two following further positions at the Educational Conference in Sydney in April, 1904: (a) As the law (to which he vehemently objected) stood, it would be a vast improvement—as being open to less abuse—to substitute "the four Gospels" for the Government Scripture extracts "garbled" by two notorious Irish proselytisers for the avowed purpose of proselytism. Most Catholics would agree that this would, indeed, be some mitigation or improvement in an oppressive and intolerable system of State proselytism. (b) The Cardinal suggested that "the four Gospels" should be supplied to the children. But he was particularly careful to declare, "in the matter of expense," "I do not think it is a matter in which the State should be called upon at all—I think each denomination would be able to present its own children with the necessary books." So runs the condensed newspaper report. The Cardinal always vehemently opposed what he believed to be the exclusive State endowment of Protestantism in the public schools, at the expense of the common purse. "For my part," he added, "I would be most willing to supply all our Catholic children with the four Gospels according to a revised Douay version" (not "the Revised Version," as was incorrectly reported) "to be read in our schools." New Zealand Catholics supply the Catholic version of the Gospels to Catholic children in Catholic schools, and, where feasible, also to Catholic children unavoidably attending public schools. But, faithful to conscience and to the laws of the Church in point, neither Cardinal Moran nor we could ever consent to Catholic children being taught Scripture lessons by State officials of all faiths and of no faith. For the rest, the Catholic Hierarchy of New Zealand, in their official pronouncements of 1904, made clear their willingness to agree to any reasonable scheme for imparting Biblical and religious instruction to the children of Bible-in-schools parents in the public schools. There is, therefore, no divergence, in substance, between Cardinal Moran's views and those expressed by me, and in 1904 by the New Zealand Catholic episcopate.

## Notes

### To Correspondents

During the past week or two we have had forwarded to us sundry articles, newspaper cuttings, etc., for insertion or comment. While thanking our correspondents for their courtesy, we have to intimate that just for the present Bible-in-Schools controversy makes the dominant demand on our time and space. There is urgent need for discussion and refutation at the outset of the movement, so that public opinion may be moulded in a right direction from the very first. In a little while matters will become more nearly normal, and correspondents' communications will receive their customary attention.

### For the Young People

We direct the attention of heads of families—with a view to their bringing the matter under the notice of the younger members of their households—to the 'Tricks and Illusions' column to be found this week in the page devoted to domestic reading and 'Family Fun.' These tricks are specially contributed to the *N.Z. Tablet* by an expert, and are simple, interesting, easy, and at the same time effective. They will supply pleasant recreation for the lengthening winter evenings, and should still further increase the value and attractiveness of the *Tablet* as a family paper.

### The Press and the Bible in Schools

In addition to publishing the excellent letter by Father Hunt—which we reproduce elsewhere—the

**Langford & Rhind**

(Late W. & H. LANGFORD), FUNERAL FURNISHERS & EMBALMERS  
LONDON STREET. 'Phone 689. Box 528.

Address—HERBERT LANGFORD, 19 London St., Richmond ('Phone 689).  
JOHN RHIND, 106 Montreal St., Sydenham ('Phone 1808).

**Christchurch**

Town Office—104 CASHEL ST.  
(Phone 812).