

seems to have made the best attempt at solving the difficulty of religious instruction in schools by the facilities it gives clergymen and accredited teachers under clause 17 of the Public Instruction Act, and by the excellent general Scriptural instruction contained in the Irish National Scripture-books which are still in daily use. The moral and civic side of the school instruction in France is strongly emphasized."

62. Then you are aware, I presume, that Mr. Knibbs's recommendation was not adopted by his Department or the Government?—Yes, I understand that is so.

63. And that since his recommendation there has been no alteration made in the system of religious instruction?—No fundamental alteration, so far as I know.

64. In other words, you admit that the Department and the Government of New South Wales adopted Mr. Turner's report?—No, I do not admit that; but they did not follow out Mr. Knibbs's report.

65. You quote the New South Wales books a great deal?—Yes.

66. Do you understand and does your League understand that the League I represent is not asking for the New South Wales books?—I suppose if the Education Department accepted the New South Wales books you would accept them.

67. But I am not answering questions?—I understand that you are leaving it to the Education Department of New Zealand to draw up the book.

68. Yes?—And they might draw up the New South Wales book.

69. Are you aware that we have over and over again explicitly and definitely stated that we do not favour the New South Wales books?—I must say that I did not know that was your view.

70. Would you accept it that it is our view?—The idea I have of your view is that you want the New South Wales system, the whole system, and nothing but the system.

71. I do not attribute bad feeling to you on this point, but you have left out in that comment the most important part of what I said, whoever your authority was, and that is that we are not asking for all the details or any particular detail of the Australian system—we are asking for the principle of the Australian system?—I was not aware how far you went in the details. I understood you were leaving the question of the text-book to the Education Department absolutely.

72. Are you aware that we have stated over and over again our preference for a book such as the Queensland book rather than the New South Wales book?—I do not know. I will accept that from you. I cannot say I knew that was your view.

73. In your statement, under the heading of "The Scripture-lesson Books," you say, "With the exception of Tasmania, where teachers are requested to confine themselves to the narrative as taken from any version of the Bible they may possess ('The Course of Instruction for Primary Schools'), the lessons are given from text-books compiled by States for the purpose." Are you not aware that in Tasmania and Australia there is no text-book?—I believe that is true. I believe that statement is inaccurate. In all places that have adopted text-books, these books were drawn up by the State. That is the intention of the clause.

74. You also quote such things as the texts, and you speak of them as of a highly sectarian nature as some at least will be seen from a few quotations?—Yes.

75. Where is the sectarianism in the sentence "Our Blessed Lord"? "Why cannot a man serve God and Mammon"?—I think the sectarianism comes in if you ask what conception of God you are going to take. You raise the question whether it is the Unitarian or Trinitarian conception of God.

76. That is your interpretation of this as a sectarian question?—Where the sectarianism might arise.

77. Coming back to your statement, you mentioned where the system operated, and you spoke of dates, and you said they were not of importance, and, if I caught you rightly, you said that the system existed in some places before it became law?—No, I do not think so. The point is this: if you take Tasmania, as far as I can find out, the Education Act of 1885 placed religious education on what we may call a legal basis, and there is no reference in that Act to a preceding Act, so I cannot tell exactly when it originated. I accept your statement if you say it originated in 1868.

78. Your figures would be correct if they read—"The system operates since 1866 in New South Wales, 1868 in Tasmania, 1893 in Western Australia, and 1910 in Queensland"?—I quite accept that.

79. You quoted several American authorities as opposed to the question of Bible in schools?—Yes.

80. Are you aware that there is a very strong movement there similar to the League I represent to get the Bible restored to all schools in America?—I should not be surprised.

81. In your pamphlet you quote the regulations in New South Wales?—And Queensland, West Australia, and Tasmania.

82. Are you aware that the Queensland regulations were in existence for thirty years before religious instruction was restored?—All those regulations in Queensland?

83. I do not say all of them, but those regulations referring to what are called teachers' disabilities?—I think you ought to ask me a question about some of those we have quoted.

84. Regulation 85 reads, "Teachers shall not actively take part in public meetings." Are you aware that that regulation, in substance, but with verbal alterations, has been in force in Queensland since the early eighties?—No, I am not aware of that, but I would like to know what you mean by "verbal alterations."

85. That regulation substantially has been in existence for over thirty years?—No, I was not aware of that.

86. Are you aware that a teacher from Queensland visiting New Zealand expressly stated that in public?—No, I was not aware of that.