

and teach the lessons. The question was put over and over again. Would Jewish or other teachers absolutely refusing to teach the Scripture lessons be dismissed, as they surely would be if they absolutely refused to teach arithmetic or geography, and as advocated by Leaguers in Australia and New Zealand? 'I am not Minister of Education,' was the 'reply.' After repeated pressure the lecturer replied that in his opinion the objecting teacher would probably be dismissed. In reply to a further question, the lecturer said it was impossible that six to one of the teachers in New Zealand (the New Plymouth Conference majority) would so refuse. The fact of conscientious objections by New Zealand teachers was questioned or denied. Direct, specific evidence to the contrary was submitted, and the question was put: Who was to judge whether a teacher had or had not a conscientious objection—the teacher or the League? The lecturer, in 'reply,' expressed his inability to understand how any teacher could thus object or take exception to such beautiful lessons as those of Queensland, which could be imparted without any religious significance. Questions were also put by members of the audience. The outstanding 'feature' of the questioning was the manner in which the lecturer evaded the moral and conscientious issues raised, and talked around about and away from the question-subjects. Towards the close of the meeting the Ven. Archdeacon Cowie, a leader of the local League, stated on the platform that on the logical and theoretical side of the matter, Bishop Cleary had 'tangled up' the speaker; that the Bishop's questions ran on one line and the lecturer's replies on another; and that the two lines never met. He (the Archdeacon) thought strong objections might be made in theory, but in practice the New South Wales system had, nevertheless, achieved a measure of success. The Bishop thereupon took occasion to reiterate the entirely practical nature of the difficulties involved.

The utmost courtesy and cordiality prevailed throughout between the Bishop and the lecturer. They several times referred to each other in terms of mutual esteem, and, after the meeting, joined in pleasant conversation.

The Bishop will lecture on Bible-in-Schools, in Hamilton, on next Monday (May 5). The advertisements announcing the lecture contain the following announcement: 'Admission free. No collection. Bible-in-schools clergy and sympathisers especially invited. All relevant questions, on matters within the speaker's knowledge, answered promptly and straightforwardly. No refusals to answer relevant questions. No evading of relevant questions. No introduction of matter beside the question. No need to put any relevant question two, three, or four times. Questions answered promptly in the terms of the questions.'

### BIBLE-IN-SCHOOLS PROSELYTISM

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—In a previous letter I showed (1) that no Catholic took part in actually compiling the Irish Scripture Lessons now in use in New South Wales, and (2) that they were compiled by Rev. Carlile, aided chiefly by Archbishop Whately. These proselytisers' object was proselytism.

Carlile (a Scottish divine) had obliged Catholic pupils to attend his Scripture explanations in his Dublin academy. Thus his evidence before the Commission of 1837. In 1821 he became secretary of the London Hibernian Society, a militant proselytising organisation whose object (as stated by a leader) was to 'make perpetual inroads on the Kingdom of Satan' (that is, 'Popery') in Ireland. During Carlile's secretaryship the society's schools 'had often been employed as instruments of proselytism.' In 1825 he memorialised the Lord Lieutenant on the establishment of a mission to convert Irish Catholics, and for 13 years from 1838 he devoted all his energies to proselytism about Birr. So much we learn from various sources, chiefly from his co-religionist Rev. Dr. Killen, in vol. ii. of his *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland*. The great gifts of his co-worker, Archbishop Whately, were marred by the No-

Popery violence of his *Errors of Romanism*, etc. Till 1838 he and Carlile practically directed the 'national' system.

Queensland compilers mutilated the Virgin Birth of Christ out of the State Scripture lessons, giving the children a Unitarian or Ebionite Christ, not the Christ of the Gospels. So did the Victorian League. So did the New Zealand League in 1904. The Carlile-Whately respect for the Divinity of Christ had not worn so thin; but Carlile otherwise mercilessly mutilated the Bible on sectarian lines. He suppressed practically the whole following body of texts to which Catholics notoriously appeal: those relating to the constitution of the Church, its unity, authority, infallibility, perpetuity; its relations to the written and unwritten word; the Petrine Texts; John vi. and 1 Cor., x. (Eucharistic doctrine); the power of forgiving sins; anointing with oil (James v.); the celibate state (1 Cor., vii.). His manuals were mutilated into a garbled residuum of Protestant Christianity, 'an emasculated caricature' of the Bible, as Bishop Averill (a League vice-president) described the Bible-in-schools lessons of 1904 (*Press*, May 2, 1904).

As paid Resident Commissioner, Carlile was able to pack his relatives into fat Education Board positions. He and other imported Calvinists trained the teachers to 'explain' the mutilated Scripture lessons 'to the children.' A series of sectarian reading books, prepared by Carlile and Whately was forced upon the schools—a hugely profitable Carlile-Whately monopoly. Cunning alterations were made in Stanley's conscience clause to facilitate the work of proselytism, which was carried on in wholesale fashion. Archbishop Whately declared that the 'national' system was the 'only hope of weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery. But I cannot openly profess this opinion. I cannot openly support the board as an instrument of conversion; I have to fight its battles with one hand, and that my best, tied behind my back' (*Life and Correspondence*, one-volume edition, 1868, pp. 274-275). Before the Lords' Committee in 1854 he defended school proselytism, if 'done fairly and openly' (*Mixed Education*, p. 98).

Voluminous statistical and other details of this wholesale proselytism are before me. The system amply justified the declaration of Dean Kennedy (Anglican): 'I think the principles of the National Board are the principles of the Reformation' (*Mixed Religion*, p. 129). Ireland sickened of a system vigorously condemned from 1833 by the great Archbishop McHale (*Life and Times*, p. 105). The sectarian Scripture lessons and reading books were cast out. The system became, and remains, practically denominational. In 1900, out of 8673 national schools, 5585 were exclusively Catholic or exclusively Protestant; 3088 more were practically so. A section of three denominations is now trying to force four of the penal-law features of the discarded Whately-Carlile system upon the consciences and pockets of some 50 denominations in this Dominion.—I am, etc.,

\* HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.,

Bishop of Auckland.

April 26.

### A PROTESTANT LAYMAN'S VIEWS

The following letter appeared in the *Otago Daily Times* of April 30:—

'Sir,—All true Protestants will await the Rev. Mr. Davies's reply to Mr. J. A. Scott's able letter in your to-day's issue. But unless the conspiracy of silence hitherto adopted when unanswerable questions are put be broken, Mr. Scott will get no answer at all. If that be the case, your readers cannot help asking why it is that from first to last of this agitation, and of every other similar agitation, the propagandists have never "faced the music." All they have said regarding the serious Protestant attacks of the Rev. Mr. Ashford is to abuse Mr. Ashford. Mr. Caughley's indictment of the reprehensible use of the State figures of New South Wales remains unanswered. Mr. Braithwaite trots out a new theology—the infallibility of the referendum as a religious authority. But Mr. Braithwaite's logic is more damaging to his own cause than to any other. The older heads know that daylight on

**W. Littlejohn and Son**

By Appointment to his  
Majesty the Governor

Stock the best Goods procurable, and Solicit your enquiries.

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