

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