

AUSTRALIAN CHURCH SCHOOLS AND STATE AID

by **H. W. Baker**

Introduction

Church schools are not English "Public Schools" but Church agencies. The spiritually compelling reason for Church schools.

I

Australian Mixed Systems—Pluralist Democracy.
Examples of Mixed Systems: Mixed Systems in education.
Government and Municipal services to Churches and their schools as a return for valued services to the community.
National Income and education.
Present proposal—the State needs more help and will help pay for it.

II

Are Church Schools Socially Divisive?
The society is divided into many units — pluralism — and likes it that way.
Would having only one system of schools produce complete unity?
Could even Hitler's methods achieve it?
Church schools do not cater only for the well-to-do.
Church schools can produce unity because they can assert God is above social divisions.

III

Three Bogeys

Fragmentation—Government Control—Unconstitutional?

IV

The morally compelling reason for Church schools.
Protection of Free Discussion.
Neutrality is always opposition.
Indoctrination (a) in our thinking
(b) in our living together.
Tolerance does not mean tolerating the intolerant.

V

Sum up.

Sir Frederick Schonell—Professor A. K. Thomson.

Copies available from **H. W. Baker, 14 Albert Street, North Parramatta.**

© 1964 H. W. Baker

MOORE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE LIBRARY



3 2042 10099009 6

AUSTRALIAN CHURCH SCHOOLS AND STATE AID

Introduction

This is written at the suggestion of clerical friends and financed by them and others.

The writer is aware that many people may, because he has spent the greater part of his life working in Anglican Church schools, assume that he is merely defending his own game.

This might well be the truth. But it is a fact that I had my own doubts about the right of Church schools to exist, until, about 1950, I took a higher degree in education. Included in this was a special study of religious education in a rapidly changing society, and in the course of this work I found my ideas were changing as I furthered my research. Since then, I have been, by intellectual conviction, a firm advocate of a strong religious element in education generally, and of Church schools in particular, and therefore of "State Aid" for them.

If the reader will continue thoughtfully, I will try to set out some of the factors that have made up my mind for me.

Nobody can support State Aid unless he first believes in having Church schools.

Church Schools Are?

A CHURCH school is not just a school conducted in association with a Church. Visibly, a Church school is a part of a Church, that, like homes or hospitals, has a special function — that of Godly study. Essentially, the Church is present in it as completely as elsewhere.

At present, confusion about Church schools exists not only among those who have never had anything to do with them, but also, most unfortunately, among Church people, even those directly concerned with the schools. This arises from a fundamental confusion of aims and traditions, both local and overseas.

The Australian Church school and the English "Public School" are not really similar, despite innumerable assumptions that they are, and attempts to make them so. The oldest Australian Church schools, such as that survivor, The King's School at Parramatta, were in fact founded before the "Public School" existed in England. The Public School was something new, in the 1840s, created either by adapting schools that existed already, perhaps centuries old, or by founding new schools as the concept spread.

These facts are not widely known in Australia, and ignorance makes it easy to assume that the English and Australian schools are closely comparable, but the aim of the Church founders in setting up the schools in Australia was different. They never intended that the schools should become the schools of a social class of colonial administrators, as had happened in England, and hold the gate to public office and social promotion. And they have not done so. They have continued as Church agencies, and that is a sufficient justification for their existence, to the Christian mind. Without taking up more space, this is a spiritually

compelling reason for Church schools, that they witness daily to the whole Christian truth in the annual round of worship—seeking "by the same Spirit to have a right judgment in all things"—and maintain daily common prayer and worship, and unite this to illuminate secular studies with Godly purpose. (Refer to the final paragraph of this pamphlet.)

It must be said, too, that while I shall be describing advantages of Church schools, it must not be assumed that I wish to detract from the immense achievement of the State's schools. I have many friends in the Department of Education of N.S.W. and I desire that nothing I say should upset any of them. I very much doubt whether a better general system of education can be found anywhere in the world, although, of course, as in the Church schools, individual schools will vary from time to time.

I wish here to draw attention to one fundamental error that bedevils the whole discussion—the idea that Church and State activities in education are mutually exclusive. This is absolutely false. The State's schools, especially secondary schools, owe a debt to the Church schools which pioneered the way well into the twentieth century, and they could never hope to accommodate all the children now attending schools. On the other hand, the Church schools rely on the State's system for numerous background services. *Each group owes much to the other. The idea that they are exclusive is rubbish.*

In the midst of so much confusion a statement like this must be written to meet the questions of a variety of people. Church people who believe in Church schools, and those who don't; those who think there should be religious instruction in State schools by both clergy and teachers, or by one or the other, or by neither: others outside the Churches who share some of these views, as well as the atheists and "humanists", who hope to reduce religious observances and allegiances of all kinds. So please be tolerant, if parts of the pamphlet seem to be too obvious, or not to apply to you at all—they may be important for other people.

I

A PLURALISTIC DEMOCRACY

WHATEVER does that mean? It's quite simple. It means that you do not have just ONE agency—the State—at work in social fields, but may have more than one—a PLURAL number—sharing expense, activity, responsibility. Anybody—you yourself—is free to get together a working group to meet any social need at all, either working by itself, or working with and alongside some government department. If you had only the one organisation, in some circumstances it might be hard to avoid totalitarianism. With our pluralist system—or sometimes happy lack of system—you can't get totalitarianism. So that wasn't very hard to explain after all. It was just what you knew already. It recognises that there are likely to be at any time different aims in the one or similar fields, and that these varying aims can, in our society, find expression by admitted right, because we enjoy freedom. *In freedom, you get such mixed or pluralist systems.*

Examples of Mixed Systems

WE already have a number of pretty big examples of this mixture of State and voluntary action. Hospitals have, in addition to government sup-

port, fund-raising auxiliaries. At Parramatta Psychiatric Centre there is a very interesting development—the government is erecting buildings to be run by Churches, for patients in the rehabilitation stage. Homes for the aged are normally run by Churches, with large government subsidies to help them. In the field of child welfare, more homeless children are under Church care than State. Auxiliary action helps the Art Gallery, and the voluntary rangers to protect and preserve native plants and animals are pretty well known. In the Federal sphere, the Immigration Department brings people into the country, and then the voluntary Good Neighbour Council helps settle them in.

The Mixed System in Education

IN education we have the same sort of thing. Primary schools and High schools are helped by their Parents' and Citizens' Associations, and there is no limit to the voluntary self-taxing these associations may undertake for their local schools. It is the policy of the Department of Education to encourage such local interest. Through the Department, the State provides so much as it feels it can, and it hopes that from that point the local pride and enthusiasm of the community will take over, and put further really large sums into the schools. It seems that few realise how far this can go.

Then, beside the Department's schools, there are the Church and other schools, where parents voluntarily tax themselves to pay fees to such an extent that much more is put into each child's education. This voluntary taxing corresponds to the work of P. & C. Associations. Behind that, there is once more the government element, and it is interesting to see the numerous State and municipal services shared by these schools and their people.

STATE AND MUNICIPAL SERVICES TO CHURCH SCHOOLS

- The advice and research of the Department of Education.
- Educational and Vocational guidance of the Department's clinics and the Department of Labour and Industry.
- Free milk in Primary schools.
- Free radio and TV licences.
- Access to Government Stores and contractors.
- Access to visual aids and film libraries.
- Education Gazette* and other official publications.
- Courses of study—otherwise no mean task to build up.
- Tax rebates for donors to registered funds.
- Exemption from Payroll Tax.
- Exemption from Sales Tax.
- Exemption from Rates.
- Commonwealth Scholarships, Fifth and Sixth Year Scholarships.
- Bursaries.
- Travel Concessions.
- Income Tax deductions for school expenses.

People who argue that there should be no State Aid for such schools at all, must advocate removing these services from the schools, because in one form or another they are all public aid.

Many of these Church schools are *boarding schools*. State systems do not run boarding schools, but boarding schools are a necessity in a country

like Australia, with its great areas and long distances. This again is something critics too easily forget. Running a boarding school is a complex and very specialised art by itself.

The close texture of the mixed system in education, in an over-all view, is well illustrated by the fact that many pupils of Church secondary schools have had State primary schooling, while others from Church primary schools go on to State secondary schools.

The demand for Church secondary schooling in particular, is rapidly increasing, exceeding the population growth-rate, or the proportionate increase in the High schools, and beyond doubt the reason for this is a desire for an educational provision that must cost more.

National Income and Education

OFFICIALLY, Australia spends only 2.2 per cent of national income on education, so that although we come third in order of income per head, we come 17th in order of expenditure on education. Somehow or other much more must be spent in providing education up to the country's needs. *It seems that about three times as much should be spent. The pioneers in increasing education expenditure are the P. & C. Associations and the parents who pay fees for their children's schooling.* The examples of the Granville Technical High School P. & C. Association, which has recently installed the first school closed-circuit TV, and the industrial interests of Newcastle, who put in the costly plant of the Newcastle Technical College, are outstanding.

Certainly the example of the Church schools should stimulate pressure on governments to spend much more on the State schools. It goes even further, because of the large provision for scholarships and financial assistance in these schools. This is traditional from the days when, up to 40 years ago, Church schools were the main way of opportunity, but of course it is also due to the fact that no school can afford to let brains pass its doors.

If people are choosing more and more to pay fees, the reason must be that the effects of limited government expenditure are felt. If government expenditure is limited, then why do public authorities provide all those free services?

The answer is perfectly obvious. *The society recognises the value to it of the Churches and their work, including the schools.*

Let it be stressed again, that Church secondary schools dominated the field till some time between 1912 and 1920 in N.S.W., and much the same in other States. Among the great debts of the State to the Churches is the very model of Australian secondary schooling itself.

The Present Proposal for State Aid

IT is not proposed to take up space here with the intricate details of the present scheme of State Aid. Those complications are due directly to the effort to avoid what are called below The Three Bogeys, Fragmentation, Excessive Control, and Unconstitutionality.

The aim is to get more and better scientific teaching, for the good of the country.

The method is, to help pay for the augmented scientific teaching where schools need better facilities to provide it than they now have.

There is absolutely nothing in this to encourage any Church to set up more schools, or to give the government more control.

It is just as simple as that.

II

ARE CHURCH SCHOOLS SOCIALLY DIVISIVE?

IT is constantly charged against the Church schools that they are socially divisive, and that they split the society into separated groups. At first sight this appears to be an obvious truth. But first sight can be wrong. We must look at the facts of our society. Does it show any strong trends towards single unity? Do we wish it to? Is it not, as the last chapter showed us, a pluralistic society with all the advantages and variegated enrichment of its freedom? *It is quite contradictory to set up the advantages of pluralism, and then complain that there isn't a tight consistent unity throughout.*

Society Consists of Many Units

OUR pluralism extends further than the sorts of organisations we have talked about. Each family belongs to its own social groups, with their varied interests in work and leisure—in effect, their own special ways of life. We can call them “sub-groups”, and their ways of life “sub-cultures”.

If you think about your own family and the groups it enters into, and then of all the others there must be, you get a very complex picture of our whole society, and you see clearly that there are many, many sub-groups with varying interests and ways of life. They tend to fence in their own cherished ways, too, and are slow to let their children accept the ways of other sub-groups.

So, Australian society, like all large societies, is not a monolithic unity at all, but a collection of units. Do we wish it to be a monolithic unity, with everybody thinking and acting much alike? Don't we treasure our freedom to develop our own sub-groups and their ways of living?

Can Schooling Produce Social Unity?

BUT supposing you did wish to have what we have called a “monolithic unity”? Have you any proved reasons for feeling certain that putting every child into the one sort of schooling would achieve that?

You may have some knowledge of history, especially perhaps of Hitler's Germany, in which case you know that he, like every other dictator in history, tried to use the schools to make everybody think the one desired way. He didn't just abolish truth from textbooks and forge every story: he had children spying on their teachers and on each other, as well as on their own and each other's parents—and the price was concentration camp or death; even beyond that, he had the children in youth organisations to take them as far as possible from the leading of their homes.

With all that, there were still dissenters. You can't imagine our Australian schools ever going one-tenth so far. *It is in fact only an assumption, unproved, that if everybody attended the same schools you would necessarily get a great, or a highly desirable social unity. You can find that assumption in books and all round you, but it's unproved.*

It is said that having two general kinds of schools separates people

later on, but is there in fact social unity within each of the supposed two separate groups? Well, of course, there isn't. It is an old and still common fallacy that the adult world can shovel off its responsibilities on to the schools, but it can't. Strict social unity would have to come from the adult world, but the adult world thinks the present pluralist system of many differently-thinking groups is more fun. Just try to imagine the work your school would have had, to make you and all the boys and girls you knew, think alike, for the rest of your lives!

Here we must mention for the first time “indoctrination”, of which we shall have more to say below. People who complain that the two systems of schools cause disunity, are demanding not only a single system, but also a high degree of social indoctrination. Strangely, however, they are usually the same people who object to indoctrination of any kind. Let us leave indoctrination to chapter IV.

It is worth remarking that if we did away with Church schools, and had only the one system, the effect would be to *reduce* the total amount spent on education in Australia, whereas it ought to be increased three times.

However, this charge, that Church schools are divisive, is unreasonable and unjust in itself.

Church Schools Aren't Only For The Well-to-do

WHAT organisations are there that do cover the whole range of our social sub-groups? Can you think of any? Does the R.S.S. & A.I.L.A.? Do the Churches? You say—they do, pretty well. But they find it difficult to be completely comprehensive, don't they? You cannot think of any organisation that is, as a fact. In most organisations, some sub-groups make more use of the facilities than others, while they ask people from outer groups to help run the organisation—people who don't attend so frequently. Haven't you heard people complain of that? Such are the actual social facts. You do not find any voluntary organisations that cover all the sub-groups, and in practice it is unreasonable to ask any to do so.

The Church schools, even those that have to charge heavy fees, do cover more than half the social sub-groups. This is quite a remarkable fact. Sons and daughters of wage-earners are to be found in them. They are by no means the exclusive preserve of the rich, at all. Far from being exclusive and divisive, they are unifying factors. The demand that they should be still more widely inclusive is sympathetically echoed within the schools, but to insist on it would be unreasonable, as being excessively difficult in face of social facts of such things.

It is also the case that none of them are “omnibus” schools, containing every type of course in the one school, and so they are, usually, academic secondary schools (too seldom they may be technical schools) and they are not suited to develop and cater for every type of ability that children have.

Church Schools Increase Unity

SURELY, in a free pluralist society, with a strong Christian tradition, Church schools are just what you would expect? The Christian tradition itself tends to give a bond of unity with its gift of freedom. The effect of having such schools, is, if we allow it, not to divide, but to perpetuate a unifying influence, with diversity of expression. The descriptive word is not

“divisive”, but “DIVERSIFYING”, for they add variety to the educational apparatus of the society.

The bond of unity works by lessening the force of the sub-groups, and asserting their subservience to the Kingdom of God.

Is the visible authority of the State the highest authority we know? Or the often invisible authority of our sub-groups over us? Do we not judge them by an even higher authority? By what higher authority do we at times judge that the State or some social group is acting, or might act, wrongly? It may be more difficult to deal with social sub-groups, but we have political means to execute judgment on the State. When the State appears to be right, it gets extra agreement and power from that judgment, but we must beware always of allowing the State to appear to be the top authority over all. Except rarely, when legislation gives power over sub-groups, there is nothing but religion to modify *their* attitudes.

This will become a very important point below, when we consider the special functions of the Church school.

Mention might be made here of staffing. Teaching staff do exchange to a minor extent between State and Church schools, and their salaries and qualifications are much the same, varying somewhat from State to State and school to school. The number of “trained” teachers in the Church schools has increased, and there is a strong general interest in educational developments, while there is a trend to have rather more high academic qualifications in Church schools: there are few in Church secondary schools without degrees.

The Church school has one of its greatest advantages in that members of staff usually stay in the one school for a good many years, and in many cases for their whole teaching careers, building up a detailed knowledge of the school and its people and problems, and remaining in personal contact, guided by a strong sense of vocation, with their pupils’ whole secondary school lives. Recently, too, there has been increasing exchange of staff or visitors with America as well as the United Kingdom.

These staffs are vigorously independent in mind, value a responsible academic freedom, and accept social nonsense from nobody. As to that, the Australian parent in every sub-group demands social realism for his children, and detests every sort of social nonsense. The life that lies beyond the school is too real to be fooling the children about it.

So, we conclude, *there are the strongest sociological reasons why the Australian Church school is not in effect divisive or exclusive, but, on the other hand, diversifying.*

III

THREE BOGEYS

The Fragmentation of Education by State Aid

IN the past, government financing of Church schools has caused too many schools to be built. This happened in N.S.W. where at one period the Penrith-Windsor district included about a dozen schools averaging one teacher and 40 pupils. It happened in Victoria, where Gregory remarks on five or six schools, averaging about 100 pupils, in small country towns—see the reference in *Current Affairs Bulletin*, July 30, 1962, which otherwise seems so out of date in the present stage of this discussion. Those schools were of course inefficient and uneconomical.

But this does not necessarily happen. In England today there is a vast system of direct State Aid, including finance for the buildings of schools. They have had some troubles, but nowadays seem able to run this system without causing any “fragmentation” of education at all.

The present Federal government offer of finance for science teaching facilities could never have any such effect.

It is unthinkable that any government, in view of past experience, would ever again allow its money to be used to produce uneconomic and inefficient schools: it simply wouldn't dare incur all the trouble that would result.

In spite of the loudly-voiced fears of “fragmentation”, it is nothing more than a bogey to frighten the ill-informed.

Excessive Government Control with State Aid

THIS is just another bogey to stampede voters. There is quite a bit of government supervision now, which is aimed at guaranteeing a reasonable level of efficiency, and therefore beneficial and often valuable. Schools are free to ask advice from Departmental sources, and often do so. Only government agencies can have the resources to know everything worth while that is going on all over the world.

Beyond question the government is entitled to know that its money is being spent wisely. In the present proposal there is a committee, headed by the former Head of a Church school, to see that science laboratories are made efficient but not luxurious.

The present manner of Aid is not capable of leading to increased control, and even the English method somehow does not. On the contrary, decentralisation is the general policy today, now that professional standards are so much higher. In 1880 Parkes’s main concern was to get centralisation to maintain standards—not, as is so often wrongly stated, to overcome denominational squabbles—but that is hardly a problem now.

No government would ever set out to control more than was necessary for curricular efficiency.

Is State Aid Constitutional?

BASING their views on the American Constitution and legal decisions, some argue that State Aid as now proposed is unconstitutional. A glance at the two Constitutions will show that their wordings are very different, at the start, and that a similarity of outcome cannot be counted on. The writer is no lawyer, but it seems also that nobody can appear unless he can prove a substantial material interest in the case. The only people who could prove that are those who gain by State Aid, and they certainly will not appear against it. It seems unlikely that this form of State Aid is unconstitutional, or will be questioned in the Courts.

IV

A MORALLY COMPELLING REASON FOR HAVING CHURCH SCHOOLS

Protection of Free Discussion

SOME people will be surprised to read that discussion is more free in Church schools than in the State’s schools, because one of the most serious

objections constantly urged against Church schools is that they cannot tolerate free discussion. However, it is the truth that they are its most natural home.

In secondary education there must be discussion of controversial matters. Often they are the best things on which to cut one's intellectual teeth—the ancient Greeks had an excellent system of education, and they based it on current controversy. Adolescents must talk their way round and through the questions that come under public discussion, because the answers they find then guide them in their generation of adult control when it comes. If we adults do not give them opportunity for these discussions, in which they can refer to us if they wish, they will still have them without us. Nothing could be worse than to prohibit this discussion on the ground that they are too young for it, because it is while they are too young that, either in rebellion against, or in friendly talk with, their elders, they settle their futures.

Such discussions will be in the fields of social problems and justice, morality generally, sex and marriage, religion and life. *Now, what discussions about such matters can you have in a government system of schooling?* Whatever the talkers arrive at, or whatever the teacher says, there will be somebody who can object, and sooner or later some parent will make an official report. Let us hope the teacher will eventually be exonerated by the authorities, but he is almost certain to be tactfully advised to be more tactful, and he will have gone through quite an ordeal. The natural outcome is that *he decides to be neutral in the future*, and not be caught that way again. So his days as an instigator or referee of healthy controversy in his school are over. It is not suggested here that government departments of education do not know the value of such controversies, but simply that it is a very difficult problem for them to accommodate it.

(See Brubacher: Eds. 1939-'50-'62, chap. X.)

Neutrality is Always Opposition

IT is an accepted educational principle that *neutrality is always opposition*. (The best statement of it the writer knows is in Brubacher: *Modern Philosophies of Education*, 1939 ed.; 229.) Think it over. In answer to most questions a teacher is quite definite. But then he is asked a question to which he feels he must take a neutral position, and that is tantamount to telling the class that the question is less important than those that have had definite answers, and can be neglected by them. When you think of it, it's obvious.

In a Church school a teacher doesn't have to do that. He can start or enter into controversial debates. A parent who objects is faced with a different kind of authority. Truth now is not politically limited. It is not man's, to be taken up and put down at will, but God's, to which all are subservient. The writer has known of various cases in which parents have had to learn that, and it is essential that the Church school should always preserve this freedom of discussion within the full breadth of the Christian horizons. *Controversial discussion goes on in Church schools every day*. Nothing is more educative. "The truth will set you free" (John 8:32) to see God's truth permeating all topics.

Indoctrination

HOWEVER, this is still only a partial answer to those who object to what they call "indoctrination", or "dogmatic instruction", by which they mean a "laying-down-the-law" kind of teaching, which, they think, occurs in Church schools and not in others.

(a) IN OUR THINKING

An answer to them must have two parts. In the first place, *there is no knowledge without its dogmas, or indoctrinations*. The scientist has his dogma, among others, "I believe the universe can be understood by me": that is a true dogma, because there is no foundation for it, and it is merely a declaration of faith. Logically, it stands on the same ground as "I believe in God". Some critics argue further that the scientist's dogma has practical consequences, and so demonstrates itself, whereas the religious dogma has no consequences *they can see*. The last three words are what count—the eye of faith does see the consequences, and there are notable scientists and philosophers who have it. There has been a good deal of this sort of criticism in Australia lately, and it is difficult to see that trained minds are honest in putting only the one-sided view before the less-instructed public.

(b) IN LIVING TOGETHER—TOLERANCE

In the second place, *there can be no society without indoctrination*. Children must learn to accept the basic assumptions of their society, progressively sorting out the contradictions that may exist. This sorting has to start with guidance of family authority, or we should all start insane. It can make little progress before the secondary school. As every trained thinker knows, you must work from some definite point of view, so that at the worst there can be definite corrections. To talk of training a child always to say "I don't know" until he is capable of proving everything he is willing to assume is rubbish, yet we hear a lot of it—as from the parent who says his child should have no religious guidance (or Confirmation) till he can think it all out for himself. One basic assumption Australian children accept is that every family should have its own roof. It isn't all-important, but it would be hard to prove. More important, they accept the assumption that a pluralist society is better, and let us hope they will demonstrate it by their use of its advantages. They learn toleration too, though its limitation is often not understood—Mannheim, the great sociologist, wrote (*Man and Society*: 1942, 353):

"Democracy ought to instruct its citizens in its own values instead of feebly waiting until its system is wrecked by private armies from within. Tolerance does not mean tolerating the intolerant."

Those who complain that Church schools indoctrinate, usually mean that they teach the existence of God, and that certain forms of behaviour are right and others are wrong: and that this is done on the basis of authority. Probably they would be surprised if they could see how it actually is done.

The argument of this pamphlet is that of course Church schools seek to indoctrinate: everybody does, especially those who complain of it. Why do they complain? Because they want empty minds to fill with their own doctrines. That is the reason why the Secular Education Society, the humanists and the atheists, worked together to change the syllabus of general religious instruction.

To counterbalance that, Church people who criticise their schools do so on the ground that the indoctrination is inefficient.

The social indoctrination of the Church school is indoctrination into responsible freedom. That happens to be the heart and soul of democracy. *A democracy needs people who know that some things are more important than others, and can judge that scale of importance, and their democracy, by an even higher standard. No school is so well placed to train such people as a Church school, the most natural home of free discussion. That is the morally compelling reason for having Church schools.*

V

TO SUM UP

QUOTING conveniently from the speech of The Hon. J. D. Killen in the House of Representatives, May 19, 1964, we find these weighty opinions. Sir Frederick Schonell, a famous educational expert of the University of Queensland, has written:

“Two recent developments in English secondary education that have given the plan of *secondary education for all* a better chance of success are: (a) the raising of the school leaving age and (b) *the increased financial assistance to voluntary or non-State schools.*”

Professor A. K. Thomson, of the same University—and the son of a coalminer—has said:

- “1. The raising of the school leaving age has placed the independent schools in a difficult position.
2. It is not logical to neglect in any way the Church or independent schools and help Church colleges in a university.
3. *It is a good thing that there should be different kinds of schools in the State.*
4. In a State like Queensland *there must be boarding schools.*
5. Where there is a scarcity of teachers, and a special shortage of teachers with a sense of vocation, we should neglect no source of supply.
6. The State will be short of schools and teachers for a long time to come: it is only a fiction that at present the State can teach all who desire secondary education.
7. *Through the effluxion of time, the independent schools have gained the right to survive: they have earned their place in the community, and the community, by its support, has shown that it wants these schools.*”

What applies in England, or in Queensland, in this respect, applies also to Australia throughout in a varying but still very significant degree. When will our total educational effort be commensurate with the wealth and needs of our society?

No school is ever good enough, but it is sound to believe that there should be Church schools, and try to make them good enough. For the perfection that will always be lacking, the sincere efforts of all concerned could be an acceptable substitute.