

For this purpose he professes to quote 'official statistics of New South Wales' to show that 'Roman Catholic priests' there have been 'visiting and instructing' in seven years an annual average of 31,423 Roman Catholic children in the public schools. The seven genuine sets of 'official statistics' have each a column headed 'Number of children enrolled' (in the public schools). Over 31,000 Roman Catholics are set down among the 'number of children enrolled.' In each of these seven separate statistical returns the League writer strikes out the words 'Number of children enrolled'; he inserts in their place 'children instructed' ('by Roman Catholic priests'); he follows this up with an even more amazing statistical paragraph flatly contradicting the 'official statistics.' I have, open to inspection, the 'official statistics' from 1903 onwards. In the *Presbyterian Outlook* of March 4 these statistics were denounced by me as false; also by Mr. John Caughley, M.A., with deadly detail, in the *Lyttelton Times* of March 17, and in various papers about a fortnight later. According to a League writer in the *Lyttelton Times* of April 2, the falsity of these statistics was then well known to the League's organising department. Driven at last by direct letter-inquiry, the League organiser privately replied that the false 'statistics'—not the falsely alleged 'accusations' by Bishop Cleary—were corrected. This statement is untrue. It is true that (over the figure column) the falsified words 'children instructed' have been replaced, in small, thin type, by the words 'children enrolled,' and no attention is called to the alteration. But the text following expressly states, in heavy, black type, the same old falsehood that all these thirty-one thousand odd children are being 'visited' and 'instructed' by 'the Roman Catholic' Church. Another previous statistical falsification is plainly suggested again in the 'corrected' statement 'that all the schools cannot be visited by the priests.' The League's officially 'cooked' statistics are thus cunningly repeated in a manner which precluded all possible doubt as to the perfect deliberateness of the falsification. These are, unfortunately, only one small group of hundreds of misrepresentations about which I have opened communications with the League Executive. In the same official leaflet the League organiser makes it an unpardonable sin to delay wilfully 'for one single minute' open confession of even unwitting misrepresentations. So far as I am concerned, the incident of this unworthy attack on me will close with the fair and honorable amende which the occasion demands—but not before.—I am, etc.,

* HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.,
Bishop of Auckland.

In connection with the above, copies of the following letter have been forwarded to the Executive of the Bible-in-Schools League and its organising secretary by his Lordship Bishop Cleary:—

'I greatly regret that in necessary self-defence I must bring before your Executive another series of grave misrepresentations that appear in the League leaflet, *Methods of Opposition*. Here are clear and undeniable instances of falsification of seven separate official returns, perpetrated with seemingly full deliberation for controversial purposes, ostensibly published with the League's official sanction, and actively circulated long after its public exposure. I am strongly convinced that the members of the League Executive can have no conscious sympathy with such methods; but their own undoubted sense of personal honor does not absolve them from a grave measure of responsibility for permitting their movement to associate itself, without proper investigation or restraint, with such truly deplorable misrepresentations.

'The same leaflet makes it an unpardonable offence to delay 'for one single minute' the retraction of even an unwitting error reflecting unfavorably on others. I trust to the honor of your Executive for the full and frank amende which the occasion demands.'

'I remain,

'Faithfully Yours,

* HENRY W. CLEARY,
'Bishop of Auckland.'

ARCHBISHOP MURRAY ON BIBLE-IN-SCHOOLS

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—It is literally true that the Irish Scripture Lessons in use in the New South Wales public schools were compiled by Irish proselytisers for avowedly proselytising purposes.

These mutilated caricatures of the Bible were devised for the Irish 'national' education system inaugurated by Chief Secretary Stanley in 1831. Irish Catholic children could hitherto receive education in publicly aided schools only at the cost of systematic proselytism. Stanley declared that the 'national' system would be one 'from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism.' Seven nominees Education Commissioners were appointed. Only two of these were Catholics—Archbishop Murray (Dublin) and a Government official, Mr. Blake.

At their first regular meeting (December 1, 1831) it was proposed to supply, at cost price, the Protestant Authorised Version of the New Testament to Protestant children, and the Catholic version to Catholic children, for separate religious instruction. The two Catholic members agreed. The Protestant members refused—unless the Catholic Testament was printed, in the Protestant manner, without note or comment. They well knew Catholics must reject this on an underlying doctrinal principle and a specific ecclesiastical law. (Report of 1836, cited by the Irish statesman, Isaac Butt, *The Liberty of Teaching Vindicated*, Dublin, 1865, pp. 42, 80-81). 'In consequence of this refusal,' adds Butt, 'no copy of the Holy Scriptures has ever been supplied to a national school. The Scripture extracts were prepared as a substitute' (p. 42).

They were compiled by the paid Commissioner, Rev. Dr. Carlile, a noted proselytiser, aided by Commissioner Archbishop Whately (Dublin), an ardent proselytiser, and another Protestant. Before the Lords' Committee of 1854 Archbishop Whately said that Carlile 'suggested' the Scripture extracts, 'prepared' them with 'assistance' from 'some of the other Commissioners,' and that they were 'acceded to by Archbishop Murray' (Butt, p. 50). This is a vastly different story from the one attributed to Carlile, that the Scripture extracts were prepared 'at the express wish' of the aged Catholic Archbishop. Dr. Murray's 'express wish' for the New Testament was refused. He agreed to the Scripture extracts afterwards only on three specific conditions, according to Carlile (*Mixed Education*, Dublin, 1865, p. 24). The Commissioners all saw the proofs; but even Carlile never suggested that the Catholic Archbishop had any part in the compilation. 'Neither Catholic nor Irishman,' says the contemporary Head Inspector Kavanagh, 'ever composed one sentence or modified one line of these religious works' (*Mixed Education*, p. 33). Archbishop Murray occupied, in regard to them, no representative capacity. The Catholic Bishops were not consulted in regard to them. Indeed, these extracts were opposed to their unanimous resolutions of January 26, 1826, and February 14, 1840. These required (among other things) that all books intended for the religious instruction of Catholic children should be 'composed,' 'selected,' or 'approved' by the Bishops—not by Protestant Commissioners. In these resolutions Archbishop Murray concurred. So did he in the more emphatic decrees, in point, of the Thurles Synod of 1850, and in the Bishops' thanks for the Papal Rescript condemning the Protestant 'common' Christianity forced upon the Irish schools.

As priest, Bishop, and Archbishop, Dr. Murray had, in 1831, lived through the penal days, witnessed the ascendancy party's six years' reign of terror, its long-drawn, lately ended, anti-Emancipation fury. With many other prelates, he looked not for full educational justice, but merely for removal of the more galling grievances; and he was willing to sacrifice much for a system free from 'even the suspicion of proselytism.' In his simplicity, he trusted even the arch-proselytisers, Drs. Whately and Carlile. Another letter



By Appointment to His
Excellency the Governor

W. Littlejohn and Son

Stock the best Goods procurable, and Solicit your enquiries.

WATCHMAKERS, JEWELLERS, SILVERSMITHS, OPTICIANS,
222-4 LAMBTON QUAY, WELLINGTON.