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My Brethren and Fellow Workers in Christ, I cannot begin my Conference address without saying again how very sincere and great is our pleasure at having with us at this time His Grace the Archbishop of Brisbane, and the added pleasure which has been given to us by the presence of Mrs. Wand. We have already welcomed them, but the course of the last few days has helped us to realise more fully the immense value which their visit is having for us all, and for the Church in Papua. For us, who are members of the staff, and upon whom responsibility in the guiding and building up of the Church in this land depends, it has already been a tremendous stimulus and a very great encouragement. I verily believe that the Archbishop’s contact with the Papuan Christians in the last few days will have brought to them a wider vision of what the Church is, and also a new joy in their religion, and a fuller determination to practise the Christian religion, and to work for God in their own districts. The memory of what they have seen and heard at Dogura will never leave them, and will be passed on to many others round the village fires, and we can be sure it will lose none of its colouring in the process. In that way many who have not been able to be at the Cathedral opening, or to see the Archbishop, will almost feel that they have shared it all with their more fortunate brethren. I think it is no exaggeration to say that, in an incredibly short space of time, both the Archbishop and Mrs. Wand have won the hearts of our Papuan Christians.

We cannot thank the Archbishop too warmly not only for his visit, but also for finding time in his own tremendously busy life for long and arduous preparation for his visitation; particularly that he might be able to speak to the people in their own language. What we have seen here makes us all the more regretful that, on account of the war and the disorganisation of traffic, his visitation to the stations could not take place. (A visit to some of the stations took place after Conference). For myself, I can never feel too grateful for the kindness and affectionate goodwill that the Archbishop and Mrs. Wand have showered upon me ever since my appointment, and even before I had met them face to face. Had it not been for this, I should have viewed the visit of the Metropolitan with a certain amount of nervousness, but the friendliness, and kindness, and understanding, which takes this away, detracts nothing from the loyalty and reverence we all render to him as our Metropolitan.

Visitors and Commissaries.

You would, I am sure, wish me also to say again how very glad we are to have with us Canon Needham and Fr. Maynard.
Canon Needham is paying his second visit, and he has come amongst many old friends. We record with thankfulness the long and valued services he has been able to render to the Church on behalf of the missionary cause, and we may hope in his visit here he may have been gladdened to see something of the fruits of his labours on behalf of New Guinea in the Church in Australia.

Fr. Maynard has been good enough to act as one of my commissaries in Australia, together with Canon Needham and Archdeacon Thomas. His great work for the Church in Australia is well known, and I know that in his present important charge at St. Peter's, Eastern Hill, there is a centre where many prayers ascend upwards for New Guinea, and where there is a great warmth of goodwill for this diocese. I should like him to know how much our clergy value the copies of the "Church Quarterly," of which he is the editor, and which he kindly sends to me for distribution. Those of you who have not read the articles in recent issues on the history of the Reformation, which have made such a valuable contribution to the Rome controversy, may like to get hold of the book, which has now been published under Fr. Maynard's name.

Whilst I am speaking of my commissaries, it may interest you to know that the Rev. Robin Hudson, who was one of my commissaries in England, has resigned on taking up an appointment in West Africa, and I have appointed Dr. Micklem, the Provost of Derby.

Consecration of the Cathedral.

None of us can ever forget the inspiration of the last few days in connection with the Consecration of the Cathedral, and we cannot feel too thankful to Almighty God for bringing the efforts of past years to completion, and allowing us to see this great thing and to share in it, which has been verily a revelation of His Power and His Glory. Our thanks are all the more profound, and for myself, I can say all the more humbling when one thinks with shame of the doubts which have sometimes crossed one's mind in the last two months as to whether it would be possible to carry on with our plans or not. I spoke at length about the Cathedral on Sunday afternoon, and about the work which has been done and the gifts which have been given. I need not repeat what I then said, but I feel I must say again how greatly we admire all that Mr. Jones has done. In fact, that is a cold way of expressing it. Words are difficult to find. The more we examine that stately edifice now consecrated to God's Glory, the more we stand amazed at the greatness of the effort Mr. Jones undertook, the patience and perseverance he has shown week by week, month by month, and year by year as he has given himself up entirely to planning and carrying out this work for God. Mr. Jones will not want thanks or congratulations, for what he has done, we believe, he has done for God's glory; but this much must be said, and it is sufficient for us to know that Mr. Jones must be inwardly at this time a very happy man indeed.

It is a great step forward in the history of the Diocese to have a permanent Cathedral as the centre of our work, and the Mother Church for the whole diocese, and especially to have one which has
been built out of love and devotion to our Lord by the Christians of the diocese, and one which is so inspiring for the Worship of Almighty God.

A Missionary Diocese.

We are a missionary diocese, and it will be a long time before we are as completely organised as dioceses in the Home Church. Our Cathedral stands in a mission station, and is also the parish church, as it were, for a big district controlled from that Mission station. We have not, therefore, a Cathedral Constitution, or a Cathedral Chapter to govern the Cathedral, and we do not at this stage need one. In a missionary diocese the office of dean of the Cathedral is usually inherent in the office of the Bishop of the Diocese, and I feel it should be so in this case. That being so, the Priest in charge of Dogura will, of course, be the Sub-Dean of the Cathedral Church of St. Peter and St. Paul.

I ought to say how much we owe to Father Bodger for all his strenuous efforts on behalf of the Cathedral, and the willing way in which he and his boys, and others connected with him, have undertaken the extra work which has been involved during the time of the building, and not least for the way in which he had thrown himself wholeheartedly and so efficiently into the tremendous task of organising this great gathering at Dogura.

I desire to announce to you that I have decided to appoint as an Examining Chaplain the Rev. A. P. Jennings, Principal of St. Aidan's College. Fr. Jennings has completed 22 years of service as a priest in this diocese, and is the second senior of our white priests in the Mission. We all admire the valuable work he has done in the diocese, and the way in which he has striven against ill health. I am personally grateful for a good deal of help of a diocesan nature he has given me at various times. It is fitting that, as Principal of St. Aidan's College, and as one much concerned with our ordinands and future teachers, he should have this position.

Ordinands.

Let me say in connection with our ordinands how greatly we value the help which Bishop Newton has rendered in preparing and examining candidates for ordination. Through his help we have been able to have candidates for the priesthood and diaconate undergoing preparation at the same time. Long may he be spared to continue this invaluable service for the Papuan Church. Those priests prepared and examined by him cannot fail to bear the marks of that training upon the whole of their future ministry. I also wish to appoint as an Honorary Chaplain the senior of our Papuan priests, the Rev. Peter Rautamara. It is the privilege of those appointed as chaplains to the Bishop to walk behind him in procession if not actually carrying his staff.

Conference.

It is eighteen months ago since we last met in conference. I did think of calling a conference earlier in the year, but for various reasons this course was impracticable. For one reason, we were without a mission boat, and transport would have been awkward and
expensive. Then, also, the gathering of a conference interrupts the work of the stations and districts for periods varying from two to three weeks, according to the distance of each station from Dogura. As there was bound to be such an interruption at the time of the Cathedral Consecration, it seemed wiser to hold our conference at this time. One, and indeed the greatest, advantage of holding our conference now is that we have His Grace the Archbishop with us in our deliberations. Another is that we have in a sense come to the end of a stage and the beginning of another in the history of the diocese, and can both look back and look forward.

A disadvantage is that our time is more limited than would have been the case at a special conference gathering. We shall have fewer sessions, and may therefore be unable to discuss fully all matters that you may wish to bring up. But do not let that deter you in bringing forward any matter affecting our work upon which you feel conference should deliberate, and in which it would be an advantage if we could reach a common mind. As President I shall have to use my discretion as to how many of such matters we can discuss fully at this conference, and how many we must leave over for a future conference. When I arranged to have conference at the time of the Cathedral opening I was expecting to be leaving shortly after for England, and realising that I should be away for almost the whole of 1940 attending the Lambeth Conference and doing other work in England, it seems an additional advantage that we should meet in October rather than earlier, as there would be no conference in 1940. Now that the Lambeth Conference is postponed, I shall be able to call a conference next year, when we can carry on deliberations of any matters into which for lack of time we cannot enter fully now.

It would seem natural that at this conference, having the Archbishop with us, and also the Chairman of the A.B.M., and Fr. Maynard, that we should give preference to matters affecting the Church generally, and more particularly our share in the life of the Church of this Province of Queensland, of which His Grace is our Metropolitan; our privileges and our responsibilities in that life; and also our relationship with the Church in Australia, and in particular with the Australian Board of Missions. I have asked His Grace to address us in the course of our proceedings, and also Canon Needham and Fr. Maynard, and we shall be very glad to hear them and to consider carefully what they bring before us.

Staff Changes.

There are four members of the staff with us to-day who were not with us at the last conference. The Rev. Dennis Taylor and Miss Tomkins were detained at Wanigela last year, and Miss Townson and Miss Willoughby were away in Australia.

We have also to welcome to conference seven new members: Miss Merle Charlton and Miss Emily Clarke joined us last November, Miss Bessie Smith and Mr. John Stanley Duffill in December, Deacon Elwin Keith Clarke came to us from the Newcastle Diocese in March, and Fr. Harold Arthur Douglas Graham, assistant priest at Forbes, in the Diocese of Bathurst, came with the fullest blessing of his
Bishop in June; and now Miss Lesley Irene Wickham and Miss Ena Somerville have just arrived fresh from their training in the Hostel.

There are only four who were with us last year as members of the staff who are not present at this conference. This is rather a different tale to that which I had to tell last year. One of the four is still a member of the staff, but away on furlough. Miss Downing, for private reasons, desired to be with her people at this time. Otherwise furloughs have been so arranged so that all might be present at the Cathedral opening. Of the remaining three, two have resigned and one has passed away.

The Rev. C. Whonsbon-Aston went away in June last year on special sick leave, and on the advice of the doctors resigned at the end of the year. Fr. Aston had been a priest in this Diocese for just over four years, and during the whole of that time he had been in charge of the Mukawa district, and has left a mark there of priestly service as well as of evangelistic zeal. It was unfortunate that after the death of his mother it was never possible for him to have a fellow worker at Mukawa. He carried on bravely single-handed with all the work of the district, but the loss of social companionship must have been great for him, and though not entirely responsible for his breakdown in health, must certainly have been a very large factor. As you will know, he is now Vicar of Levuka, in Fiji, where he served for three years before coming to this diocese, and we trust he may have many blessings in his renewed service in the Diocese of Polynesia.

Mr. Peter Hirst, who was with us only for a few months, and whom I had placed at Isivita with Mr. Holland, left us last August. I had hoped that he might have found his vocation to this work, but he did not do so, and no reproach is attached to his leaving as he was free to do so under the special circumstances under which I took him.

Canon and Mrs. Tomlinson.

Only a few weeks ago there passed from us Mrs. Elizabeth Tomlinson, the oldest member of our staff, and the last of the band of 1891 pioneers. We might have wished that she who had laid the foundation stone of the Cathedral five years ago, had lived, or rather been with us still in the flesh on the day of its consecration. Certainly we should have loved to have had her visible presence still with us at this happy time, but we cannot but feel that it is better as it is, and that she is now more intimately bound up with the Cathedral for all time than could have been possible during her earthly life. St. Paul, in writing to the Philippians, said:—“To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain. But if I live in the flesh this is the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose I wot not. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better.”

Such words seem applicable to Sina in her latter years. St. Paul went on to say that it was needful for those to whom he wrote that he should abide in the flesh. Such was no longer so in Sina’s case. It may be in the lovingkindness of God she has been able to be a fuller partaker with us in the joy and thanksgiving of the Cathedral Consecration united now in Paradise with her beloved husband, than she could have been on earth with the infirmity of
her deafness and the growing limitations of old age. We must feel it to be fitting that, on the day of its consecration, there should be lying at rest in the sanctuary of the Cathedral now for all time sanctified and set apart for God's Glory the mortal remains of the only two of the 1891 pioneers to die in the land they adopted as their own.

My Brethren, it is difficult for those of us who are comparatively newcomers to realise the greatness of the venture upon which Tama and Sina embarked when they offered themselves for this work 48 years ago, and when they landed here three months after Maclaren and King; the greatness of the trials that must so sorely have tested their faith in those early days, when they found themselves and one other, alone, a few weeks later with their leader dead, and the second in command invalided home, and the future all uncertain, with no regular transport or mails, cut off, as it were, almost completely from civilisation.

It was typical of their doggedness of character that they conceived only one thing, that it was their duty to carry on till help and reinforcements came. It is common knowledge that it was Sina who decided, she being the only white woman in the company of three, and indeed in this part of Papua. Those of us who knew and loved her trite sayings can well imagine she would not waste words in doing so, but that her few simple words would settle the matter beyond dispute. It is difficult to say what those weeks of uncertainty must have meant as they dragged themselves into months. For Dogura was not the beautiful and tranquil spot we know it to be today. The surrounding atmosphere was heathen and suspicious, for no Papuan had yet passed through the door of Baptism; there was no priest to minister to them the Sacraments which, with their gifts of strengthening grace, would have helped them so much all through that long period of waiting—and they were forced back upon their own spiritual resources, as they must have been many times also in the future, but never so nakedly as in those early months. What an inspiration this must ever be to those who come from the home countries to work here. Though they must be ready to give up all for Christ, even sometimes the spiritual comforts of religion they have been used to in the past, yet the sacrifices demanded of them can hardly ever be in the future as great as were willingly undertaken by those heroic pioneers.

From the moment of their dedication to the work of Christ in Papua, on St. Lawrence's Day in Melbourne in 1891, Samuel and Elizabeth Tomlinson never turned back, but resolutely steered a straight course of most devoted and loving service for God's children in Papua, until their souls sank at length into the peace and rest within the Everlasting Arms of Eternal Love which in all the changes and chances of this mortal life, by sea and on land, during those 46 and 48 years, had been invisibly beneath them to uphold and direct them.

Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching, verily, our Lord says, I say unto you that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them. And if he shall come in the second
watch, and for Tama it was as it were in the second watch, when in the period of retirement which succeeded the long period of active service, he was called upon again to take up a measure of active priestly service here at Dogura during a time of emergency; or if he shall come in the third watch; and for Sina it was as it were in the third watch, the two years of widowhood that succeeded the time of peaceful retirement together, and shall find them so, blessed are those servants. By their self-offering and by their teaching those two simple devoted and faithful souls sowed the seed of the Everlasting Gospel in the hearts of the people of this land here in Goodenough Bay, in Collingwood Bay, and most of all at Mukawa.

She laid the foundation stone of that great and magnificent building now consecrated as our Cathedral, but together they helped to lay the foundation which is Jesus Christ, of the spiritual building of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, without which the foundation of the building of the other would have been impossible. Let us stand now in silent remembrance, and offer thankfulness to Him who has shown us, through them, how greatly He can use those who whole-heartedly are given to Him, and let us pray that everlasting light and peace may rest upon their souls in Paradise.

A Sad Loss.

We have sustained other losses also, from among those who, for varying reasons, were absent from the last Conference. The saddest of all was the cutting short of the young life of Muriel Elizabeth Reeks, who died in Samarai in June of last year, ten days after she had arrived from England. May God rest her soul in His peace. Those of us who saw her in Samarai during that brief time felt that though the Mission had lost one who would have brought capable gifts and consecrated service to its work, it has gained for that work an ardent intercessor in Paradise. Mr. Taylor has known, I am sure, of the depth of sympathy and affection which has been felt for him in his own great personal loss and disappointment.

The Rev. and Mrs. C. Woodhouse failed to settle here, and though the Archbishop of Brisbane had kindly arranged work for them in his diocese, they returned to England at their expense.

Medical Work.

Dr. and Mrs. MacGranahan, who, at the time of the last Conference, were away on an extended furlough, resigned soon after they reached England, owing to the Doctor’s desire to be with his parents in their old age. Dr. and Mrs. MacGranahan gave four years of conscientious service to the work of this diocese, and we wish them well now in their life in the United Kingdom, where I know they have already taken opportunities of helping to make known to others the story and needs of the Mission. Since their departure in February, 1938, we have had no mission doctor, and this is a serious loss.

Our nurses and others are indeed most capable, and in fact more so than ever, and they seem able to deal with almost everything that arises. Nevertheless, both they and we shall probably all agree that there ought to be a qualified doctor available over an
area so extensive as that from Cape Ducie to Samarai, nearly 400 miles in length, apart from the inland parts. It would seem that the time would really demand a doctor who, though he had his headquarters and hospital work, was able to spend a great deal of his time travelling up and down the coast, and going to inland stations.

Whether the headquarters and hospital should continue to be at Gona is in these days a debatable point, but it is one which could not be settled until we had on our staff again a doctor who had been able himself to survey the situation, and to give us his point of view to help us in coming to a right decision. Meanwhile, of course, the hospital must continue at Gona. Whilst we are without a doctor, the grant which the Government give to the hospital is reduced by £100.

As no offers were forthcoming from doctors in Australia or England for this work, towards the latter end of last year we explored the possibility of offering work to one of the non-Aryan Christian doctors who have come under the racial ban in Germany, and who have either been expelled from their country or forced to give up practising their profession. The plight of the non-Aryan Christians in Germany seemed particularly sad, more so than that of those who were wholly Jewish in race and religion. They were excluded from national charities because they had Jewish blood in them, even though they might be far more German than Jewish; and they would not come within the sphere of the help which Jewish International Charities offer because they are Christians by faith and only partly of Jewish descent.

Obviously it is the duty of the Christian Churches to care for a band of fellow Christians in distress, even as the Jews in other parts of the world are trying to care for their co-religionists driven out from Germany. It seemed, therefore, at the time that in holding out the hand of fellowship to a persecuted brother from Germany and in giving one such who had the necessary qualifications, gifts and dispositions the opportunity to work here as a doctor, we might be not only filling a need here, but also making a small contribution towards solving that problem which must lie heavily on the heart of Christendom.

The Papuan Government were entirely favourable to the idea, and I had a pledge that they would continue to recognise our hospital as being under a doctor. It was, however, necessary, as a safeguard, that we should obtain some assurances from the Commonwealth Government that it would be possible for such a man who, for one reason or another, could not continue in Papua, to be able to enter Australia. This was not forthcoming, because the Commonwealth Government were committed to receive a definite quota per annum of refugees, and were not prepared to go above it. Therefore, anyone we took would have to be already within that quota, for the risk of taking someone who, in the event of failure here, would have no other country that he could go to, would be too great. The Federal Government had already undertaken to find work and settlements for those whom they had agreed to receive within the quota. Therefore to take one such would not be
relieving one who would not otherwise have had a chance. So the proposal fell through.

Jewish Doctor.

Later on we had the opportunity of obtaining the services of a Jewish doctor of Polish nationality, who was most highly recommended. Though he would have been an acquisition as far as medical services are concerned, and admirable also from other points of view, I did not, however, feel it would be right to take on to our staff one who did not accept the Christian faith. It is of course true that some non-Christian doctors may be better doctors than some who are professing Christians, and it might be said that a non-Christian doctor is better than none at all. That I feel might be so in any other sphere but this.

It would, I think, have been a difficult position for our native Christians to understand, and might even have suggested to them that if we took on to our staff a non-Christian for such an important and responsible post as doctor, that after all it was not of such vast importance to accept the Christian faith.

Medical Missionary work has a glorious opportunity of doing what is often not done in the home countries, namely, to link up the ministry of the body with that of the soul, and curing ills both by material and spiritual means. In fact, that is the very essence of its being, and the real ground of its importance. This is of tremendous importance in a country such as this, where the people believe in witchcraft and sorcery. To carry this out properly requires the goodwill, co-operation and belief of the medical man. A non-Christian doctor could only really apply the material side, and possibly also the psychological. The latter without the spiritual in a primitive community such as this might even be dangerous.

From our point of view, as members of the staff, there would, of course, in either of the two possibilities I have visualised, have been the difficulty of the foreigner with a different outlook and way of looking at things to get over, and that would not be easy in a small community living in close contact, and very dependent on its own members for social contact and converse.

In the cases of which I am speaking, it would obviously be more marked and fundamental. But these difficulties can and should be got over if there is on both sides a fundamental belief and purpose common to both. Such could have been so in the case of those who were working with us believing in Christianity even though their profession of faith might have been of a different brand to our own. But in the case of the non-Christian that common fundamental belief and purpose would be lacking. Perhaps it will not be amiss if I go on from this subject to say that I have come to see more and more that that rather undefinable thing which we often call “atmosphere,” is a very real and important thing in a staff such as ours, and with it goes also the maintenance of the unity of the Spirit. It is, I think, a matter for humble thankfulness to God that He has given us a large measure of that spirit in our work together in this part of His vineyard, and I pray that that spirit may in no way be broken, but may rather increase as time.
goes on, so that we may be led to an ever deeper fellowship with our Lord and with one another, and that this may abound to His glory in the building up of His Church in this land. I myself have seen in the fellowship of the work here how small and petty appear many of those things which mar the unity of our fellow churchmen in the home lands with one another, and spoil, for instance, some of the Church papers, and make them so un-Christian in criticisms of their fellow Christians, and of those who think differently to themselves.

Christ’s Holy Catholic Church in Papua.

It would indeed be a sad thing if we brought to the young and growing branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church in Papua those petty controversies of High, Broad, and Low Church which centre so often around things which are of no real or fundamental importance, but which, alas, in the heat and clash of controversy, become ends in themselves, instead of some of the many diverse means God allows us to follow towards the great end which is Himself and His Eternal Love. In the building up of the Church in this land in the past fifty years, men and women from different schools of thought in the Anglican Church have co-operated together and worked side by side, and they have helped to build up what I believe is a Standard of Churchmanship which is high in its ideals of worship, faith and morals, broad in its love and sympathy, and evangelical in its missionary zeal.

Constitution of the Australian Church.

Having said this, it may seem rather incongruous and unfortunate that I should have now to pass to the highly controversial subject of the Proposed Constitution of the Australian Church. However, we must face facts as they are, and I do not think our doing so is likely to arouse controversy within our own circle, and certainly not of any petty kind.

It had been hoped that this vexed question, which has apparently for so long been a controversial issue, might have reached a happy conclusion at the last General Synod, and that this would have helped the Church in Australia to become more united in its spirit, and so, more effective in its witness, and more efficient in its working. It is now a matter of common knowledge that this hope proved a vain one, and that at the end of General Synod, if anything, unity in this matter seemed further than ever from achievement.

New proposals have now been made, and these have been submitted to each diocese. We shall have to consider them, and come to a decision regarding them. It may perhaps help you in the consideration of these proposals when they are brought before you at a later stage in this conference, if I try to give you a survey of what has gone before, in the various Constitution proposals and deliberations, and more particularly of the attitude adopted by this diocese at the different stages. The older members of the Conference will have had the situation put before them at successive stages by Bishop Newton with a far greater clarity and grasp of
the underlying principles at stake than I, as a newcomer to the Australian Church, can hope to give you, and indeed I owe much in the review I now give you to talks that I have had with him on the subject in the past.

This Diocese was one which was unable to accept the Constitution as originally proposed. The two chief grounds of objection were:—First—that Clause VI., which is one of the fundamentals of the Constitution, binds us down to the acceptance of the 39 Articles as being on the same level of importance as the Creeds and the Scriptures. This position was unsatisfactory to Bishop Newton, who, in the absence of a Synod, represented the point of view of the Diocese. It was unsatisfactory for three reasons:—

Three Reasons.

(a) Because it is un-catholic and false to history, since the 39 articles are a sectional document which can be only rightly interpreted in the light of the 16th and 17th centuries, and in the light of the controversies of those times, which are no longer the controversies of the present time.

(b) Because the binding down of the Australian Church to the 39 articles would put a hindrance in the way of Reunion.

(c) Because it is binding an unfair burden, and a wholly unreasonable one, upon the Papuan Church, and in particular upon the Papuan ordinands. Bishop Newton made at the previous General Synod or Convention, the last at which he was present as Diocesan, an earnest appeal on the latter ground, namely, that the young and growing Church in Papua should not be asked to carry this burden under which we and our fathers have groaned in the past, and which is particularly difficult for our Papuan ordinands to understand. That appeal deeply moved many who heard it, and was referred to by speakers in debate at the last General Synod, and by others to me also in private, but it apparently left the Sydney delegates unmoved.

The second main ground of objection which this Diocese, as represented by Bishop Newton, had to the original proposals, was to the composition and terms of authority to the Appellate Tribunal appointed to hear and try disciplinary cases, some of which might be concerned with matters of faith and doctrine.

The proposed Tribunal was predominantly lay in its composition, and took out of the hands of the Bishops who from the first have been regarded both by virtue of their consecration and authority as the natural guardians and interpreters of the Faith and Doctrine of the Church, the decision as to what is, or is not a true interpretation of the Faith with all its many implications. It handed this over to a tribunal composed predominantly of lawyers from among the laity. This second objection presented an even more deadly peril to the true life of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church in Australia.

These objections to the Constitution as then proposed received unanimous support from this diocesan conference. I find myself in entire agreement with attitude taken then by the Conference.
The next stage in the Constitution development was the appointment of a committee of the Australian Church to consider amendments already suggested in synod or convention, or by individual dioceses, and to submit to the dioceses afresh for their consideration the Constitution thus amended.

The proposed amendments largely did away with the grounds of our second objection—not in a wholly satisfactory manner, but sufficiently so to modify our objection. It provided that, in the event of disagreement between the House of Bishops and the Tribunal in matters brought before the Tribunal affecting Faith and Doctrine, the Tribunal should then be restrained from pronouncing judgment, and the matter be allowed to drop. That at least protected the Church from a decision made by a predominantly lay tribunal which might undermine the true faith.

At the time of my arrival here in January, 1937, the Constitution thus amended was again being presented to each diocese for an unqualified acceptance or rejection before the meeting of General Synod in the following October. I discussed the matter with the Archbishop of Brisbane on my way to Papua, and with Bishop Newton after my arrival.

Too Cumbersome.

Personally, I felt very far from being enamoured by the proposed constitution even as thus amended. It was, in my opinion, far too cumbersome, involved and legalistic. Every effort seemed to have been made to make it as inflexible as possible, so that it would seem that the freedom of the Spirit would be fettered in the ordering of the Church’s life in future years. I should have preferred something much shorter, and more flexible, simply stating the fundamental basis of our unity and fellowship in the Anglican Communion—in our acceptance of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, and our spiritual unity with the Church in England, and setting up General Synod with freedom to work out in legislation as time went on whatever else was necessary for the common life of the Church in Australia.

However, it was apparently the best that could be done under the circumstances, and it seemed possible that the amended Constitution might bring about a measure of unity which had hitherto been lacking. I did not feel that as a newcomer, who had had no part in the sweat and anguish which had conceived this scheme over a number of years, I should like to take the responsibility of rejecting, on behalf of a diocese, all that had been done, and putting a spoke in the wheel of what seemed to promise the achievement of at least a semblance of outward unity in the Australian Church. Accordingly, at an informal meeting of the white members of the staff at the time of my enthronement, I put the situation before you, and explained that, in view of the fact that there is no synod in this diocese, I must speak for the diocese, but I should like, first, to have the minds of the members of the staff before doing so.

Staff Support.

The staff supported me unanimously in the decision that, for the sake of unity, we would, as a Diocese, accept the amended Con-
stitution, but under protest that the 39 articles objection still remained. Eventually, then, I wrote to the Bishop of Wangaratta to this effect—but I found that it was clearly stated that an acceptance under reservations would be counted as a rejection. Therefore I felt it necessary to say that we gave a definite acceptance, though, at the same time, we wished to place on record our view about the 39 articles, and our hope that, ultimately, at least missionary dioceses such as this would be relieved of that burden.

Meanwhile, the position had become considerably more complicated because the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney, which had previously accepted the Constitution, and had consented to the forming of the amending Committee, now withdrew its consent, contending that the committee had gone beyond its terms of reference more particularly in the matter of the appellate tribunal. Accusations and inferences of bad faith were being made on both sides, and altogether the situation was an extremely unhappy and unpromising one.

The attitude of Sydney would have been understandable if it had taken the line that the amendments were unacceptable to her, and that she stood by her former acceptance of the 1932 Constitution—unamended. But what was difficult to understand was that she not only refused the amendments, but retracted her former acceptance of the 1932 Constitution, and said that she would only now accept the Constitution if it was amended in accordance with eight resolutions passed by her diocesan synod.

Those resolutions seemed to go far behind the original proposals, and to go very deep in binding the Church most tightly in Protestant fetters. There is little doubt that everyone of them would be opposed by the great majority of the dioceses of the Australian Church. I do not propose to detail all those eight resolutions. They are in a booklet published by the Sydney Diocese at that time in defence of its position. I would, however, mention that one of them demands that the Declarations upon which the Constitution is to be based, including the 39 Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, as the standard of doctrine and worship, should be made absolutely unalterable.

She made this demand because the Constitution as originally proposed, and to which she had previously given her consent, made it possible for alterations to be made by a canon of General Synod if all the diocesan synods assented thereto. And the Constitution as amended provided that such an alteration could be made if only three-quarters of the dioceses assented to it, providing that the dioceses which are metropolitan sees were included in the number.

The possibility of alterations being effected under either of these provisions would be extremely remote, but Sydney wished to do away with even that possibility, and to make the Constitution absolutely inflexible for all time and under all conditions.

The serious consequences which such inflexibility might have will perhaps be understood if I point out to you that one of the declarations refers to Retention of Communion with the Church in England, and with national, regional and provincial churches maintaining communion with that church so long as communion is con-
sistent with the solemn declaration set forth in this chapter. Now it is conceivable and possible that the Church in England might, through its Convocations of Canterbury and York, at some time do away with the assent at present required to the articles, and might even relegate the articles to limbo. Now as one of the solemn declarations relates in no uncertain terms to the definite acceptance for all time of the Articles, the Church in Australia would then, by the terms of its Constitution, be forced to say that it could no longer remain in communion with the Church in England—and there would be no possibility of redress or alteration.

**Appellate Tribunal.**

Another of the Sydney resolutions seeks to give the Appellate Tribunal, with its predominantly lay membership, all power, and not only to do away with the proposed amendment, which restrained the Tribunal from pronouncing judgment in matters of faith and doctrine, if it was at variance with the House of Bishops, but to do away also with the moderate and unsatisfying provision of the Constitution as originally proposed, which simply required consultation with the House of Bishops, but left the Tribunal free to act even if at variance with the Bishops. A further resolution seeks to make absolutely binding upon the Church in Australia the decisions and judgments, many of them on questions of faith, ritual, ceremonial and discipline, and now discredited as having Ecclesiastical authority, of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

It is surprising that in a country which prides itself on its freedom and independence, such efforts should be made to strip the Church of the country of every vestige of liberty and freedom, and to shackle it more firmly with legal bonds than any church before, except perhaps the old Jewish Church, which said, "We have a law, and by our law He ought to die."

A constitution incorporating these provisions would be absolutely intolerable. It would impose upon the whole church a narrow, prejudiced, and one-sided conception of the Glorious Faith of the Anglican Church; and in seeking to assure that the Church should be bound thereby for all time, it would witness to a lamentable lack of faith in the Providence of God, and in the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Whom our Lord promised would lead His Church into all truth, a promise which history proves has been abundantly and in every age fulfilled.

I come now to speak of the position which confronted General Synod when it met in October, 1937. The terms of the Constitution provided that if eighteen dioceses consented to the Constitution, they could proceed to give effect to it, but the fly in the ointment was that the four metropolitan sees must be included in the eighteen. Apart from this stipulation, and supposing that all the other dioceses in New South Wales were willing to proceed independently of Sydney, they would have very little chance of getting the legislation through the State Parliament if the Sydney Diocese stood outside.

Thus, with the withdrawal of the consent of Sydney, the General Synod was faced with a deadlock out of which there seemed
to be no extricating path. The position was that one diocese, the Metropolitan See Diocese of Sydney, had definitely rejected the amended draft. Five dioceses had not yet given a final answer, namely, Willochra, Goulburn, Riverina, Rockhampton, and North Queensland. The Diocese of Bathurst had not considered the amendments in detail, but had previously stated its willingness to accept any constitution which received the requisite number of assents. The other eighteen dioceses had accepted the amended draft, but of these Ballarat, Bendigo and Tasmania were unwilling to proceed further without the assent of Sydney. An attempt was made during General Synod to reconcile the differences, and to find a way out of the impasse. A special committee was appointed on the first day, and reported on the third day, when a full dress debate took place. The committee had failed to find any immediate reconciliation of the differences. All that they were able to do was to propose that another committee should be appointed to take into consideration the 1932 Draft Constitution, the Amended Draft, the new amendments now proposed by Sydney, and any other amendments which should be made; to try to find a Constitution to which all of the dioceses would agree, to report to the next General Synod, or to recommend the holding of another Convention.

The Church Owes Much to the Bishop of Wangaratta.

The proposal was presented to the Synod by the Bishop of Wangaratta, to whom the Australian Church owes so much for all his patient and able efforts in this matter over a number of years. He made a moving appeal to the Diocese of Sydney, as the Mother Diocese of Australia, for the sake of unity to sink her differences, and even at that eleventh hour to come into line. The Archbishop of Brisbane moved an amendment, that upon 18 dioceses and all the dioceses in any State accepting the draft Constitution, either as adopted in 1932, or as subsequently amended, or with such amendments as had proved acceptable to all of them, such dioceses should take the steps to bring the Constitution into effect in the states in which all the dioceses have so accepted. The Archbishop, in a statesmanlike and powerful speech, used his amendment as a means of showing the ultimate end of the obstructionist policy of Sydney, that it would destroy the ideal of a united Australian Church, and lead to the concentration upon Provinces living and ordering their lives in comparative isolation from one another. He made it clear that he did not want this, as it would tell against an effective witness on the part of the Church in the national life, and would also tend towards one-sided churchmanship in individual provinces, and so make the rift between the different parties in the Church deeper, but it seemed the only alternative, and it was well for Sydney to realise that the rest of the Church might decide to proceed without them, leaving them in isolation.

We were thus helped to look facts in the face. Things which needed to be said had been said, and in that way the true issue had been clarified. I abstained from voting on both propositions because at that time I felt that it would be better to let the matter drop completely for ten or even twenty years, and meanwhile to continue
as we are. Ten or twenty years is a long time in secular matters, but a short time in church affairs. By that time, many of the present issues, if seen at all, would be seen in a new perspective, and perhaps not have anything like the importance for some minds that they have to-day. There would be largely new personnel, a new outlook, and the matter could start de novo without the cumbersome data which at present clogs the steps of constitution makers.

However, the prevailing opinion was that one more effort should be made to reach an agreement, and so the Committee to search the way to this was duly appointed. Now we have news that, in spite of what seemed almost insuperable obstacles, the Committee has agreed upon new proposals to submit to the Dioceses.

As the Archbishop of Brisbane has been a member of the Committee, it would seem better that I should ask him to tell us of these new proposals, which we shall in due course have to consider.

I was present, in September of last year, at the Synod of the Province of Queensland, held in Brisbane. The Rev. Robert Leek and the Rev. A. C. Flint acted as our clerical representatives, and Mr. H. Buckland and Captain Pike, of Brisbane, as our lay representatives.

Archbishop of Brisbane.

His Grace the Archbishop in his presidential address emphasised the primary responsibility of the Church in the Province, and of the people of Australia to support missionary work among the aborigines of Australia, and among the natives of New Guinea. We cannot be too grateful to His Grace for speaking as he did, with authority and knowledge of the great and urgent needs of this diocese. His Grace went on to speak on a subject which is not less, but even more important, for it is the source and foundation of the former, namely, the fostering of various vocations to religious work and life.

Religious Vocations.

And here I should like to quote to you a resolution moved by the Bishop of North Queensland, and seconded by Archdeacon Thomas, and carried unanimously:

"That the Revival of the Religious Orders in the Anglican Communion has greatly benefited the life of the Church as a whole, and that the hopes of the Church in Australia depend very largely upon the increase of the Religious Orders for men and women among us here that the work of these Orders should be generously supported by our people, and that every care should be taken to foster the vocation to the Religious Life among the boys and girls of this country."

A similar resolution was moved at a later stage by our own clerical representative, the Rev. Robert Leck, and seconded by Mr. Gordon Gall:

"That recognising the need for an increased supply of men and women consecrated to the service of the Church in the advancement of the Kingdom of God, this Provincial Synod invite every member thereof to pledge himself to foster by every means he may, any
Vocation to such service, particularly vocation to the Religious Life, to Holy Orders, and to work in the Mission Field."

In the debate on the former resolution, I spoke in support of it, drawing attention particularly to what has been done and is being done by the existing religious communities in the Anglican Church in the Mission Field in different parts of the world, and emphasising how a real revival of the Religious Orders in the Church in Australia should ultimately lead to a great strengthening of that Church’s missionary undertakings in heathen lands.

It is a subject, I feel, that should often figure in our prayers, that there may be a real growth in the Religious Life, and for a wise judgment in the development of Religious communities. The Church in Australia has had many setbacks in this connection, which is not unnatural in a young church, and there is always the danger of too much haste in fostering that which must have ever deepening spiritual routes and spontaneous growth, but much good has already been done more particularly by the religious communities for women in Australia, and their work for education and the sick. There are a number of girls from European families in this territory at one or other of the schools in Queensland controlled by the Sisters of the Sacred Advent, and it is good to know that they are receiving their education in such an atmosphere. In connection with this, we may well record our thankfulness to our Heavenly Father for the lives and service on earth of Mother Emma and Sister Faith, of the Community of the Sacred Advent, who have now passed into the nearer presence of our Lord in Paradise.

Religious Houses.

It may be that, in the Providence of God, sometime in the future, the work may be strengthened here by one or other of the existing Religious Communities for men or women being able to establish a branch house in this diocese, and that through such, vocations to the Religious Life may eventually be realised among some of our Papuan Christians. It is matter of regret that the Bishop of Melanesia could not have been with us, for he would have been able to tell us of the growth in that diocese of the native brotherhood.

There is much in our life here, with its demands of simplicity, self-dedication and obedience, which corresponds to the life of those who live in Religious communities, and it is our privilege and responsibility to witness here and now to the ideal of lives consecrated to the service of God and His Church, so that the way may be prepared if in years to come God should will to lead His Church here to new possibilities of service of this kind.

It is my hope that one day one of the sisterhood in Australia may be led to work in New Guinea. It must of necessity be a long time before such a hope could be fulfilled, because their present limited numbers make it difficult for them to carry on the work to which they are already committed.

But it was with this ultimate possibility in view that I chose the site for the new Doubina Home. For it seemed to me that the care of our half-caste children might be the kind of work that could
primarily be undertaken by a religious community, if such was ever able to work here. And the time for the erection of a new and permanent building which we hope will stand for some years to come, was also the time for looking ahead into the possibilities of the future.

Mandated Territory.

The most important matter affecting this Diocese which came up for discussion was the question of the transference of the mainland portion of the Mandated Territory of New Guinea from the Diocese of Melanesia to this Diocese of New Guinea. You will remember that in my last conference address I went fully into the various proposals which had been made for dealing ecclesiastically with the Mandated Territory, and I told you of the conclusions I had come to, and the reasons for those conclusions, and that there was evidence to show that if the suggested solution of the problem was adopted, the Dioceses of New Guinea and of Melanesia would then be embracing areas which it would appear were in the minds of their respective and original founders. The Conference agreed with me that it seemed a fair solution to the problem, and passed a resolution approving of the proposal that the mainland portion of the Mandated Territory should be transferred to this Diocese, and the island portions remain in the Diocese of Melanesia.

The proposed alteration on the side of Melanesia had already received the approval of the Synod of the Church of New Zealand, and I was advised that on our side it remained for the Provincial Synod to give its approval, and then the transference would be effective. Accordingly, I moved for this approval at Provincial Synod, and Mr. Leck seconded. Provincial Synod was willing to approve and confirm the transfer, and felt it ought to come about, but in the course of the discussion a legal opinion was expressed, and finally prevailed that it would be necessary also for the proposed transference to go before General Synod, since it involved not only an extension of the territorial limits of the Province of Queensland, but also of the General Synod of the Australian Church. There would be added to the Australian Church territory, which until then had come under the jurisdiction of the Synod of the New Zealand Church.

Accordingly my motion was finally passed in the following terms:—"That this Provincial Synod approves the transfer of the mainland portion of the Mandated Territory of New Guinea from the Diocese of Melanesia to the Diocese of New Guinea; and its incorporation as part of the Diocese of New Guinea within the Province of Queensland; and accordingly desires:—

(1) That the territorial limits of General Synod and of the Province of Queensland be extended.

(2) That the boundaries of the Diocese of New Guinea be extended, and

(3) That all things necessary be done to accomplish the desired purpose, and
(4) That the President, the Bishop of New Guinea, and the Provincial Registrar be appointed a Committee of this Synod to procure the carrying into effect of the desires of this Synod.

(5) That approval is given to a working arrangement being made between the Dioceses concerned until constitutional effect can be given to the foregoing requests."

It would seem, therefore, that a Determination of General Synod is necessary before the transference can be said to be final and legal. As this involves an addition to the Constitution of General Synod, wherein the territorial limits of the Australian Church represented by General Synod are defined, it is likely to be a lengthy business, and some considerable time before the position can become fully constitutional. General Synod is not due to meet again till 1942, when a Determination will be introduced to give effect to the resolution of the Provincial Synod; but if it is passed, and there is no reason to assume it would not be, by the terms of the Constitution itself it would seem that it must then go for approval to the various Diocesan Synods, and can only have final ratification at the next meeting of General Synod five years later, that is to say, in 1947.

However, as you will have seen from the terms of the Resolution passed by the Provincial Synod, this does not prevent a working arrangement, and that working arrangement has already been entered into between the Bishop of Melanesia and myself, with the approval of our Provincial Synods. So that, in effect, the transference has, to all practical purposes, already taken place. In other words, by agreement the mainland portion of the Mandated Territory is now under my jurisdiction and oversight.

Chaplaincy to the Goldfields.

As I told you last year, there is at present only one piece of work for which the Anglican Church is responsible at present in that territory, and that is the Chaplaincy to the gold fields, having its centre at Wau.

I had hoped that I should have been able to have made my first episcopal visitation to Wau before this conference, and to have been able to have told you about it. I originally planned to go in February, but a hitch arose regarding the financial arrangements in connection with the transference. This was satisfactorily settled, and I took over responsibility from the Bishop of Melanesia as from June 30th of this year. I again planned to make my visitation at the beginning of September, but was prevented from going by the outbreak of war and other reasons, which made it necessary for me to remain in Samarai at that time. I shall take the first suitable opportunity in the future of doing so, as it is a considerable time since Wau had any episcopal visit.

The cost of the chaplaincy is £350 per annum, a really rather inadequate amount when one considers the very high cost of living in that centre. For that amount we are now responsible, and I am glad to say that A.B.M. has made an additional grant towards it of £250, and we can reasonably hope that the remaining £100 may be raised locally. The chaplain is, as you know, the Rev. Vernon
H. G. Sherwin, and he is now a priest of this diocese. I am very sorry that he could not be with us on this occasion. The work at Wau, as at most European settlements of its kind, is, from the spiritual point of view, often discouraging, and probably always difficult; and we shall from now onwards add to our Diocesan intercessions, St. Augustine’s, Wau, and its priest, Vernon Sherwin.

Amalgamation of Territories.

I am very glad that the Commission appointed by the Federal Government to go into the question of the amalgamation of the territories of Papua and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea has now reported against any kind of amalgamation.

As you probably know, this was rather a burning question during the first six months of this year. The idea seems to have originated from Canberra rather than from within the territories itself, though there was supposed to be a good deal of opinion in favour of it in the other territory, which, if it was so, must have largely evaporated by the time the Commission was in action, from all accounts.

Certainly to an outside or superficial observer, and to one without any close inside knowledge of the working of the territories, it might well appear to be an anomaly to have two neighbouring Australian territories such as Papua and New Guinea, separated and governed by different administrations, and that the more sensible and commonsense thing would be to break down the barriers and possible inconveniences, and to combine the two, even though the position is not dissimilar to that of the separate State Administrations in Australia. I verily thought so myself on first coming to the Territory, but, after a closer and more intimate association with this Territory, and more particularly with the life and problems of its native people, and after a closer study of the question, changed my mind.

At one time it looked as if the territories might be amalgamated without any reference to the opinions of the peoples concerned. In common with others, I viewed the possibility of this coming about with some anxiety and concern, because I feared it might involve some departure from the principles laid down at the time of the Annexation, upon which the Government policy regarding Native Administration has been built up; or that it might at least lead to an alteration in its complexion, for I can conceive that it would be possible to give a lip service adherence to the principles without any longer strictly applying them. At the time of the Annexation of Papua, a solemn pledge in the name of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, involving her honour and that of the Sovereigns succeeding her, was given to the native people of Papua that they would be protected, not only in their persons, but also from unjust exploitation on the part of the white man or men of other races; that they would not be carried away from their homes; that their lands would not be seized, but that, in the words of Commodore James E. Erskine, of H.M.S. “Nelson,” who read the Proclamation in the name of the Queen and explained it:—“Your lands will be secured to you. The officers of the Crown will be ever ready to hear the complaints of the people and to do justice. The Crown will not permit white persons who would do them injury to reside in the Territory, but
only those who would be their friends as well as Her Majesty's subjects; that disputes would be settled by the officers of the Crown without bloodshed."

That pledge, I think we shall agree, has been carried out in the letter and in the spirit, and the principles adhered to by successive Administrations. And though there may be particular aspects or actions which from time to time we do not like or think to be altogether good, and though there may be interpretations or misinterpretations, applications or misapplications of law from time to time which we may feel give rise to grievance or ground for complaint, I think we shall all agree that in its main features the native administration of Papua is sound and good, and has a distinctive character of its own, worth preserving in its special individuality both in the interests of the Empire as well as of Papua itself.

I felt, therefore, that any change, even if only of emphasis, would be a grievous and retrograde step. Fears that such would be the case did not seem to be groundless, for I do not see how such change could have been avoided if amalgamation had come about. We know that the Mandated Territory has had a different beginning and a different background, and naturally there are bound to be differences of emphasis and atmosphere in Government and native relationships, even if the policy is not dissimilar. Moreover, the business interests are stronger in the Mandated Territory, and if the two territories were amalgamated the policy would become uniform for both and probably follow on the lines prevailing in the Mandated Territory. This would be the more likely because, under the terms of the Mandate, the other territory has to conform its native administration to the lines laid down by the Mandates Commission at Geneva, to which it must report, and could not deviate from these lines. There would, therefore, have been every likelihood, to my mind, that the distinctive character of the policy in Papua would have been lost or submerged.

It was for this reason that I wrote to the late Mr. Lyons, the then Prime Minister of Australia, last February, urging that though, on grounds of economy and logic, there might be much to be said for amalgamation, these are outweighed by higher considerations, the chief of which is the interests of the native races, of which the Empire and particularly in these parts the Commonwealth of Australia is the guardian; and suggesting to him that these interests would be best served, and Papua and New Guinea both ultimately make a better contribution to the life of the Commonwealth and the Empire by continuing under separate administrations than they could if amalgamated.

Support of other Denominations.

About the same time also, we sent to the Prime Minister, from a meeting of the Combined Missions Committee, at which the L.M.S., the Methodist, Kwato and Anglican Missions were represented, a radio resolution to the same effect. Mr. Lyons sent assurances that no action would be taken which would be detrimental to the best interests of the residents whether European or native, or to the progress of the Territory, and telling us that, in order that all aspects...
of the question might be investigated before a decision should be taken, the Commonwealth Government had appointed a Committee to make enquiries and take evidence within the two territories.

When the Committee visited Samarai, I gave evidence before it. Bishop Newton, the Archdeacon of Samarai, and representatives of the other missions, did likewise, and we were all definitely opposed to the proposals. Differences between the nature and the objectives of a Mandated Territory and one which is held absolutely, and complications political and international and financial arising out of the Mandate itself, really made real union or amalgamation impossible, unless one or two things had happened, either that the Mandate had been renounced, which would have been dishonourable, or that Papua herself had accepted the conditions laid on the other territory by the Mandate. So it is not surprising that in the end the Committee turned the proposal down, and I understand that the Commonwealth Government has accepted their view. Whether the question would be reopened if time brings about a release from the Mandate, and Australia takes absolute control over the other territory, cannot be known.

It may seem inconsistent to consent to an ecclesiastical joining of part of the Mandated Territory with this Diocese, and yet to oppose an amalgamation of governments, but the two things are not parallel, for no alteration in the principle or complexion of the life of the Church in this diocese is involved by the joining of the mainland portion of the Mandated Territory, and no loss of efficiency in the Church life of New Guinea, for it has never been an independent unit of ecclesiastical influence. Actually, of course, it would be in many ways more convenient from the point of view of ecclesiastical administration if both territories were under one secular government, but it is better to suffer the inconvenience involved than to weaken the opportunities of serving the best interests of the native peoples of Papua.

Papuan Administration.

I suppose two of the chief planks, as it were, of the Government's Native Administration in this country are its Labour Policy and its Land Policy.

The Labour Policy and regulations of the Papuan Administration, whilst being by no means perfect, have met the demand and need of the white man for labour for the legitimate development of the country, whilst also protecting the rights of the Papuans. The basis of that policy has been in the solemn nature of an honourable agreement or contract with its mutual obligations and privileges. This has, I believe, been healthy for the white man and for the Papuan. For it has kept before the white man the need for humane treatment of the native labourer as a fellow human-being, and the realisation also that his own interests are best served by such treatment. It has helped towards the building up of character and stability in the Papuans, and has strengthened their moral fibre by the realisation that a contract is a binding thing, and involves responsibilities as well as privileges, and that whilst the Government will punish them for breach of contract, it will also
guarantee their term of service and secure them justice. Alas, we
know only too well that the demands of modern civilisation for la-
bour as it seeks to develop the country does tend in certain ways
to the detriment of native welfare and village life, but the demand
is inevitable, and we cannot stem it. That being so, I think we can
feel thankful for a policy which, in its main lines, seems to be
humane and just, and to give securities which are not to be had
everywhere. If amalgamation had come about it would almost cer-
tainly have involved large scale recruitment of Papuan labour for
New Guinea gold fields and plantations. We should all have felt
that to be disastrous, for it would have increased the demand for
Papuan native labourers, and would have taken them further away
from their homes, and would thus have increased the break up of
ingage and family life, and might ultimately have led to the dying
out of the native races.

Amalgamation would probably have also meant that the native
policy in Papua would have had to be brought into tune with that
demanded by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations
within Mandated Territories. One such effect of this might have
been the abolishment of penal sanctions. The international Labour
Conference at Geneva had been pressing that penal sanctions
should be excluded from contracts of service in this country. To-
wards the end of last year, before we had heard any suggestion of
amalgamation, I was asked to give the Government an opinion on
behalf of the Anglican Mission. As I was in Australia at the time,
it was not possible to get the opinions as I would have wished to
have done, of some amongst you who have had longest experience
of mission work in Papua. I wrote my opinion decidedly against
the abolition of penal sanctions, which I consider would not be in
the best interests of the country, particularly of the Papuans them-
selves, and would be detrimental to the relationship between em-
ployers and employees.

It is possible that the suggestion of the International Labour
Conference springs from the psychological background engendered
by industrial labour conditions in other countries, where a strong
measure of compulsion has existed to enforce native labour, and
where the labourer has not been adequately protected from exploi-
tation by his employer, and has had no real or equal remedy against
such exploitation or misuse, conditions not far removed from sla-

Native Service.

The position in Papua seemed to me to be different entirely.
The Papuan native is not compelled to enter into a contract of
service. He can offer his services as a free labourer or under con-
tract of service, or he can refuse to serve at all and remain in his
village—though a certain economic compulsion may compel those
from some districts to offer their services in order to earn their tax
money. I think it is probably true that the majority of Papuans
would prefer a contract of service to free labour because they feel
that they have a square deal and a sense of security with the govern-
ment in the background to appeal to in case of any injustice on the
part of the employer. If penal sanctions were abolished, it would lead to the breaking up of the mutual contract system between employer and employee, under Government guarantee, and Papuans would be left to strike their own bargains with employers without the Government as mediator to guarantee their wages, and conditions of labour and their rights. It is true they could no longer be punished for breach of contract, and would be free to leave when they wished, but I think they would not come off so well as they do under the present system, and be liable to be exploited.

The Land Policy of the Government has maintained the rights of the Papuans to their own country. Whilst maintaining the principle of the native ownership of the lands, it has not frustrated the white man's endeavours to develop the country, but has enabled land to be transferred to him without leaving behind any bitterness or sense of unfairness in the minds of its Papuan owners. Any other course would be going back on the pledge given by the Crown regarding the securing to the Papuans of the ownership of their lands. Whether amalgamation would have involved eventually an alteration in application of this policy, one cannot of course say. There is the fear that business interests would eventually have brought about some alteration.

Ownership of Lands.

Last year I went into the question of the ownership of lands and property used by the Mission, and now I must tell you of an important change which I have made in regard to this, after consulting the Archdeacons, our legal adviser in Port Moresby, and the Archbishop of Brisbane. On July 27th of last year an ordinance was passed, through the Legislative Council of this territory, to provide for the vesting of the property of the Diocese of New Guinea. The Ordinance is called "The Diocese of New Guinea Property Ordinance, 1938." Copies are in the library, and there you can see the full text of the measure. Briefly, the Ordinance constituted the Bishop of New Guinea and his successors as a Body Corporate for the holding of lands of any tenure in this territory. All the property belonging to the Mission in this territory is now vested in the Corporation by law established. The Corporation holds the Mission property upon trust for Church of England purposes only in the Diocese. The Act gives power to purchase property or take on lease, or acquire by other lawful means, as also to sell, exchange or lease mission property. The Act also provides power for the appointment of an attorney to act on behalf of the Corporation during any period, and that during a vacancy in the See the administrator for the time being shall be deemed to be the Corporation. The Seal of the Corporation is the Episcopal Seal of the Bishop.

Let me now explain the need for this Ordinance and its purpose and working. The Mission lands consist of Freeholds, Crown Grants and Leaseholds. Our Freeholds are limited in number. They were obtained when the Colonial Office in London administered this territory. Since the Commonwealth took over the administration of Papua, no more freeholds have been granted. We hold some freehold property in Port Moresby, the land upon which the Rectory
stands, and a block of land just outside the township, and we have some freeholds on this north-east coast.

Our other properties in Port Moresby, and all our properties in Samarai are leasehold. The rest of our property consists either of Crown Grants, lands granted to us by the Crown for Mission purposes, or leaseholds. I have obtained from the Lands Office a complete list of Mission property, and hope to enter it up in the Diocesan Registry, so that we shall have a proper terrier of Mission lands for permanent record and future reference which can be added to as new lands are acquired.

Until the passing of this ordinance, the Mission or Diocese as such had no right to hold property on its own, and all our properties were held by, and the deeds made out to, the Corporation of the Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane in trust for the Diocese of New Guinea. Such an arrangement had been necessary hitherto. At the beginning of things Bishop Stone-Wigg had, I believe, wished to be made a Corporation Sole for the holding of lands, but at that time the Court of Papua was not prepared to grant this. We should be grateful to the Diocese of Brisbane for having so acted for us. It was obviously only intended to be a temporary arrangement until such time as there could be a Body Corporate within the territory itself, legally constituted to hold lands. Though no serious difficulty had arisen from the arrangement which had continued for some years such might arise any time, and the position was naturally not altogether satisfactory, and could not continue indefinitely. For one thing, it meant that we had no legal standing in the territory. We could not, for example, ourselves seek any redress in a Papuan Court of Law if our property was wrongly appropriated by somebody else. We could only do so through the Diocese of Brisbane, and that obviously would present difficulties in a case that concerned the law in this territory, and would be heard within its bounds.

In addition to this, the arrangement involved a certain amount of inconvenience and cumbersome procedure both for ourselves and for the Government Lands authority. The Government had accepted the position, though they were naturally not enthusiastic about it, preferring that lands should be held by a body within the territory. It is even possible that if it had come to a nice point of law, it might have been questioned on either one side or the other.

Corporation Sole.

The only alternative to this system under present circumstances, is for the Bishop of New Guinea to be made a Corporation Sole for the holding of lands in Papua. In the dioceses in Australia property is invested in the Synod of the Diocese, but it will be a long time before a Synod on the lines of the Australian Synods can be formed in this diocese because of the difficulty of European and Papuan lay representation. The Sacred Synod of the Bishop and his clergy of the kind I outlined in my last Conference address has, of course, no legal status for the holding of property,
and would not be able to obtain such even if it was thought desirable. The same applies also to our Staff Conference.

The one objection I felt to a Corporation Sole was that it might seem to impose too much power in the hands of the Bishop. Because of this, I suggested, first, that it should consist of the Bishop and the Archdeacons, or of the Bishop and the Secretary of the Anglican Mission, or some other person, but I was advised that the soundest course legally would be for the Bishop to be a Corporation Sole, as he is the only official having perpetual succession. I was also advised that the appointment of additional trustees complicates matters, and was in other cases a failure. There is also precedence for the course adopted. This method has been adopted in regard to the property of the Roman Catholic Mission in this territory, and the ordinance drawn up by Mr. Bertie is similar to one he drew up for that mission.

In the early days also of the Anglican Church in Australia, an attempt was made at first to have a body of trustees of Church property, but this apparently did not work too well, and in 1838 it was decided to have the Bishop of Australia as sole trustee. Later on, after different dioceses had been formed, enabling acts were passed dealing with trust property, and it became vested in a corporate body such as a Diocesan Synod, which is controlled by the governing body of the Church. In a Diocese such as this, the Bishop is the only governing body, and if there is therefore to be a Diocesan Corporation, it must be a Corporation Sole. That does not prevent the Corporation Sole accepting self limitation in the exercise of his powers under the act by the making of internal arrangements for church management by committees or the like, by which the Corporation Sole consents to act, if thought fit, with their advice and consent. I should be willing to draw up regulations of that kind, under which alone I should act if it was at any time thought desirable, and meanwhile I shall act in regard to the powers given by the Ordinance with the knowledge and consent of one or both of the Archdeacons.

Before the Ordinance was presented to the Legislative Council of Papua, it was, of course, submitted in draft form to the Archbishop of Brisbane, and was approved by him and by his Chancellor and Registrar, and certain suggestions made by them were incorporated in the final draft of the measure.

The passing of the Ordinance has involved the revoking of the Trust as provided under the deed under which the Corporation of the Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane has hitherto held the lands; and the Corporation Sole as the new Trustee holds the property upon and subject to all the original trusts, if any.

It is my intention that the powers of the Ordinance shall only be used in relation to the holding of lands and property within the territory; and the Corporation of the Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane will continue to hold in trust for us the monies hitherto held by them.

It only remains for me to say on this subject that lands which are to be used for white missionary stations, or which are otherwise to become permanently mission property, can now only be obtained
from the Government through and in the name of the Corporation. Some of our out-stations have been established and carried on for some years without any application being made to the Government for a site. The Papuans have put up the necessary buildings. It would not be possible to do this if a white missionary were living on such a station. Where no intention exists of establishing a white missionary on the station, it does not seem there can be serious objection to this course—though if it came to a dispute, it is doubtful if such arrangements with the local Papuans would be recognised by the Government, as we have no title or legal right to the site.

In such cases we have acted on the principle that Papuans can put up what buildings they like in their own villages, and that there is no law to prevent a Papuan living in a village not his own.

Sometimes, where work is being opened out experimentally, and where any suggestion of permanency is not for a time desirable, temporary measures of this kind may be a convenience; and there is the added convenience that we are not bound to keep up buildings on a site granted by the local Papuans, as we are on a Government site. We could, of course, at any time be expelled by the Papuans, to whom the land belongs, as we are only there by their goodwill, but then we should not want to stay if they did not want us.

**Shortage of Papuan Teachers.**

We have been experiencing lately a rather acute shortage of Papuan teachers. This is partly due to the fact that we have lost some of our licensed teachers for varying reasons. In a few cases teachers have left their work and either gone back to the village or signed on to local plantations. The plantations are naturally glad to get educated boys as boss boys, and the consideration we might have expected on the part of European employers is not always given when it clashes with their own interests. There is also the temptation to a teacher who may be temporarily discouraged or disgruntled about his work or life in the mission station to go and seek employment at a neighbouring plantation, where it may be he will receive higher wages.

I have asked the Lieutenant-Governor if he could make a ruling that no magistrate should sign on a boy who is known to have been employed as teacher at a mission station without finding out first from the head of the mission if his services have been dispensed with.

There have also been a few cases where teachers have had to be dismissed for misconduct, or have had their licenses suspended for a time. Such cases are very sad when they occur, but in view of all the circumstances, I do not think the number during the last three years has been above the average, or a matter to cause us undue anxiety. The majority of our teachers are steadfast both in their lives and in their work, and there is, on the whole, a high standard and tone among them. The losses we have sustained, however, have hit us badly at this present time owing to the fact that the supply of new teachers from the college in the last year
or two has been small on account of some failures and disappointments among the students. And this year there will be no students coming out of the college on account of the fire three years ago, when it was impossible to take the usual batch of new students for training. We shall therefore continue to be badly hit in this direction, and at a time when constant requests are being made to me for extra teachers.

Evangelists and Local Workers.

It will be necessary for a fuller use to be made of pupil teachers, evangelists, and local helpers. This is being done in most districts, and much of the advanced work recorded in the annual report has been possible only on account of the offers within the districts of whole time mission workers. This is, of course, tremendously encouraging, and makes up a little for the disappointment we have felt at the apparent lack of vocations for training and testing in the college.

I feel, however, that it will be advisable for me to regularise the licenses of the various Papuan mission workers, and I have done so during the recent gathering of Papuan delegates at Dogura for the Cathedral opening.

Up to the present, there have been two kinds of licences for lay Papuan workers—the Taunola or teachers’ licenses, and the Tauevanelia, or evangelists’ licenses. The former has been for full-time and paid mission teachers living on the station in the place where they have been sent by the Bishop. The latter for voluntary workers living in their own villages.

Under the existing state of affairs, I have found that a certain number of those with evangelists’ licenses have been doing whole time work as teachers or evangelists on a mission station, and receiving some remuneration, as they were living out of their villages.

It appears that we now have, by a process of evolution, four grades of workers, instead of two. I have, therefore, whilst keeping the two kinds of licenses used in the past, classified those who hold licenses as teachers into two grades, and those who hold licenses as evangelists into two grades, and endorsed the licenses accordingly. The position then now is as follows:

Grade 1 teachers are those who have been trained at St. Aidan’s College, or under a white teacher, or who have some proficiency in education for teaching work. They will be diocesan teachers receiving the diocesan rates of pay, and being contributors to the Papuan Pension Fund. As diocesan teachers they are under the control of the Bishop, and must be ready to go wherever he sends them in the diocese, and to devote their lives to their work.

Grade 2 teachers are those who may or may not have had special training, but who have some proficiency for teaching work, who perhaps have been pupil teachers. They are district teachers, having volunteered for work in their own district, and having been recommended for licenses by the missionary in charge. They live on the Mission station, and receive pay as arranged by the missionary in charge. They may or may not be contributors to the Papuan Pension Fund.
All teachers are also evangelists, and authorised by their licenses to take services and classes of instruction:

Grade 1 evangelists are those who have had no training as teachers, but who have volunteered for help in their own district, and who are living out of their own villages either as helpers at the head stations, or as evangelists in charge of some out-stations. They may, in addition to taking services and classes of hearers and catechumens, have elementary schools. They receive a small wage, as arranged by the head missionary. Usually it is arranged that it is only a very small monetary wage, and the rest is made up in food by the people of the villages they are serving. In that way we have been able to meet some of the demands which have been made for teachers on an out-station in heathen districts, and it is wholesome for the people if they want a licensed teacher or evangelist to live amongst them to have to do a large part towards his support. They do not come under the pension scheme. They should have had some intensive preparation or training of a spiritual nature for their work before they go forth to it. This has, I know, been given on some stations by the missionary in charge. They are district evangelists. Grade 2 evangelists are village evangelists, living in their own villages, receiving no pay from the Mission, but licensed to go out on Sundays to conduct services in surrounding villages.

Licenses in the latter two cases are given on the recommendation of the priest in charge.

It is possible, of course, for a Grade 2 evangelist to become Grade 1, for a Grade 1 evangelist to become a Grade 2 teacher, and for a Grade 2 teacher to become a Grade 1. Licenses are being endorsed under these grades, though it is a little difficult at first to classify some whom I do not know personally, and I have not yet had time to consult all the priests in charge.

The growth of the principle of self support in the Papuan Church is a cause for very great thankfulness. It was the main subject of the 1937 anniversary address, and it occupied a large part of our deliberations yesterday. There is much I would like to say about it, but I must not do so now. It is a matter we might usefully discuss in conference.

In Conclusion.

I must now draw to a close an already far too long address. My brethren, those of you who have read the annual report must have been amazed, as I was when I came to write it, at the amount of progress which has been made in the last year, and in recent years, in spite of all our difficulties through shortage of staff and lack of finance. Surely he would be blind who could not see in it all the hand of God guiding and blessing His own work in this land. It is to me all the more amazing when one sees side by side with it all my own, and may I say for you all, our own human weakness, and many failings, and yet it is not amazing, for His Strength is made perfect in weakness.

My Brethren, let us dedicate ourselves anew to Him and to the work to which He has called us. Let us see to it that our own
ideals in our personal life and conduct alone and with others are always the highest, that we are really ourselves striving to grow in holiness by striving after an ever closer contact with our dear Lord, and that we maintain amongst ourselves as a staff, as a body, as a fellowship, as a family, a high tone; that we depreciate and turn away from anything which is going to lower our standard individually or collectively.

There is no doubt that we shall have a hard time in the immediate future. The soaring prices which have already begun, mean great economies and drastic retrenchment will probably be necessary from now on. But we shall not shrink from the sacrifices or shirk them. There have been few times when the mission has not had to face great difficulties, but through the grace of our Lord, it has triumphed over them, and the victories won have redounded all the more to God's glory because they have been won over mountains of difficulty. As it has been in the past, may it be also in the future, and even more so, and may God help us and strengthen us, that we may walk with Him in our daily life and work.