

that "the alternative" for Catholic teachers in the Australian Bible-in-schools States is "that they are hypocrites, and sell their souls for bread and butter." This is a vastly different statement from that made by me, and the various alternatives clearly set forth by me. The same remark applies to the similar statement made by the Rev. Mr. Cook. The reader is referred to my actual words of the 24th July and the 4th August.

Pages 160 and following: My quotations were taken direct, and with their proper context, from the official copies of the Sydney Anglican synods, and from the reports, therein contained, of (among other things) the Church of England Committee on Religious Instruction. They are open at any time to inspection by the Committee or Canon Garland. The testimony of Rev. G. A. Chambers, M.A., Warden of Trinity College Grammar School, Sydney, were attributed to the *Catholic Press*. They were in reality (as quoted) taken direct from the *Sydney Daily Telegraph* of the 20th July, 1914. The sort of effort to discount this evidence is clearly indicated in these words of the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney in reply to the Canon's unquoted letter: "I am not surprised that the Roman Catholic Bishop whose evidence you quote to me has endeavoured to prejudice the parliamentary Committee against the New South Wales system of religious instruction in public schools." The Rev. Mr. Chambers's reply to Canon Garland's letter contains an equally significant remark. He writes that his sermon "preached by me in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on the 19th July last is being used to favour the exclusion of the Bible from State schools." As regards Archdeacon Irvine (p. 170 of Canon Garland's evidence), I correctly quoted his specific declaration as to the "materialistic" tendency in the public schools of New South Wales, and I expressly quoted it in refutation of the League's story as to the "success" of the New South Wales system. The accuracy of the quotation is not questioned. The secretary of the Archdeacon's committee, who followed, spoke strongly to the Minister of Education regarding the clergy's neglect of their opportunities for religious instruction in the public schools, and of the manner in which, "for eighteen years, the provisions of the Act had not been carried out in public schools, as was intended" (*Sydney Morning Herald*, 6th May, 1913). These series of evidences of the partial failure of the legalized "general" and "special" religious instruction in the New South Wales public schools were rendered all the more telling by the following facts: (1) They were given by prominent Church people, lay and clerical; (2) they were laid before the Minister of Education with all the deliberation becoming a formal deputation; and (3) they were advanced as arguments to sustain a demand for further opportunities for denominational religious instruction in the State high schools. All this has been before the Committee. It has been before the League for the past sixteen months or more.

Catholic children attending State biblical lessons: In his statements before the Committee Canon Garland has all along assumed that, where parents fail to send written notifications to withdraw their children from such biblical lessons, such children, as a matter of fact, actually do attend them; and according to the law they would be required to attend. Canon Garland quotes Mr. Board, then Under-Secretary of Education, New South Wales, to this effect: that "such notifications are so few that, for statistical purposes, they may be said not to exist." We may be prepared to accept Mr. Board's testimony on this matter, even though the very same letter in which this statement occurs has been shown to the Committee, by the plan of parallel columns, to be chiefly made up of a public document mutilated and garbled in nine separate places, each such mutilation and garbling being, without exception, to the benefit of the League's contentions. But the general neglect of such written notifications by parents—even if admitted—would by itself by no means justify Mr. Board's sweeping statement that "the general outcome of the instruction is that all pupils receive a substantial knowledge of Scripture history," &c. Nor would such neglect of notifications (even if admitted) by itself justify Canon Garland in his positive and repeated assertion that practically all the Catholic children in the State schools of New South Wales (nearly 32,000) actually and in point of fact do attend the teachers' biblical and "general religious lessons." That Protestant children may generally—or almost universally—attend the "general religious instruction" by the teachers (where the teachers give it) may or may not be true. But even the League's own literature and evidence, as laid before this Committee, contains statements to the effect that there is, on the part of Catholic children, a general abstention from those Government "general religious" lessons. See, for instance, the 24th, 87th, and 96th letters of the League publication, "Opinions of Educational Experts." See also page 6 of the evidence of the Rev. G. Cook before this Committee, and page 13 of his exhibit, entitled "Methodist Church of Australia and Bible in State Schools." Canon Garland (page 109) quotes Mr. R. H. Roe, "Inspector-General of Schools and Chief Professional Adviser, Queensland," as saying that the Roman Catholics "denounce the whole system. Their children are withdrawn during the Bible lessons," and so on. And the president of the Catholic Federation of New South Wales wrote in the *Catholic Press* (Sydney) of the 10th September, 1914, "It is a rule in all public schools that the Catholic children are not detained for Scripture lessons. The Act provides that the children may be kept, unless the parents object 'in writing.' The good sense of the teachers, however, neutralizes this very objectionable clause." The negative conscience clause, devised by Irish proselytizers for proselytizing purposes (as shown in my principal evidence), has, according to evidence quoted, proved largely unworkable, so far as Catholic children are concerned, in New South Wales. See also the evidence from various sources to the effect that the Irish Scripture lessons, imposed by law upon the public schools of New South Wales, are frequently not used there; that the legal provisions in regard to "general religious instruction" by teachers are widely neglected; that lessons on "civics," &c., are often substituted for the Scripture lessons, and so on.

On pages 26-27 of his evidence Canon Garland prints a grave and unwarranted reflection on my personal honour in connection with the amazing statement of a former Director of Education in Tasmania (Mr. Neale) that "the system existing in Tasmania is accepted by all denominations as a happy solution of the religious difficulty." The following vital facts, omitted by