

**THE HISTORY**  
**OF**  
**THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND**  
**IN QUEENSLAND**

**A Thesis Submitted to**  
**The University of Queensland**  
**For the Degree of**  
**Doctor of Philosophy**  
**By**  
**KEITH RAYNER**

**December, 1962.**

## PREFACE

This study is a history of the Church of England within the state, not the ecclesiastical province of Queensland. The ecclesiastical province includes two major territories outside the state boundaries – The Northern Territory and New Guinea. Both are important, and the latter in particular, as a great and vigorous missionary diocese of the Australian church, has a rich and heroic history. The problems and achievements of the church in New Guinea form, however, so distinctive a story, that they are much better treated as a separate study. Consequently New Guinea has only been discussed in this history insofar as it has been related to the life and work of the church on the mainland of the state.

The history of the church in Queensland would be grossly distorted if it were to be considered in isolation. The growth of the church was part of the developing life of the state, and cannot be divorced from political, social and economic factors in Queensland history. But more than this, the Church of England in Queensland was part of the whole Australian church, itself a part of the world-wide Anglican Communion. Ecclesiastical developments in Queensland were rarely unrelated to events and trends in the church in other parts of Australia and in England.

An attempt has been made throughout to set local developments against their wider background. To this end a brief introductory section has been designed to indicate some of the most pertinent elements in the English and Australian background of the church in Queensland, and constant reference has been made throughout the work to the broader scene. The opportunity for study of the English church in the nineteenth century, and of comparative intellectual and religious developments in the United States, which was provided by a year's post-graduate study at Harvard University was of great value in this regard. It might be pointed out that no attempt has been made in the bibliography to list all the books related to this wider setting: only those of major significance, and those specifically referred to in the text, have been included.

The best method of organising my material exercised my mind considerably in the early stages of writing this history. Four dioceses were directly concerned, and in the early period particularly, there was little unity of development of these dioceses. This was particularly connected with the fact that whereas the church in southern Queensland radiated outwards from Brisbane, the Diocese of North Queensland commenced its career as an outpost of the diocese of Sydney. I was anxious to avoid a series of parallel diocesan histories, yet an attempt to suggest a unified development in the early stages would have been to impose an artificial unity. However, the very pattern of events appeared to suggest a natural structure for the material, as there was a noticeable growing together of the dioceses from about the turn of the century, a development that was symbolised by the formation of the Province of Queensland in 1905. Before this period, the treatment of dioceses separately appeared desirable; but from that time it became quite natural to take a broader view, and to discuss the development of church life on the state-wide level.

Four broad periods have for convenience been distinguished in the history of Anglicanism in Queensland. While rough dates have been allocated to these periods, it is hardly necessary to emphasise that no attempt is made to think of them in terms of watertight compartments, and particularly the period from 1890 to 1920 – which appears to me to be the crucial generation in the history of the church in Queensland – is not strictly bound to these dates. As in so many aspects of Australian life, these years formed a particularly creative period for the church, and for that reason considerable space has been devoted to this generation. It was the time when the trends of the pioneering period came to maturity, and when the basic pattern of church life as it exists to this day was stabilised.

Biographical treatment of individual leaders of the church has played a bigger part in the completed work than I initially expected. This reflects two circumstances: first, in the developing life of any institution, strong personalities have freer scope to exercise influence than when long traditions are firmly established, and developments within the institution cannot be understood without the study of the individual personalities; secondly, in an Episcopal church, the peculiar moral authority attaching to the office of bishop places him in a position to be more influential than his political counterpart in secular history. Nevertheless, I have sought to avoid building the whole study around individual episcopates – as many Australian church histories have done – as this seems to lay excessive emphasis upon the individual contribution as against the general continuity of historical development.

The serious study of church history has been much neglected in Australia until quite recently, and the secondary sources relevant to the history of the church in Queensland are both extraordinarily scanty and of questionable accuracy of detail and soundness of judgment. For this reason almost the whole work has had to be based essentially on primary sources. Fortunately the official records of the church in the form of Synod Proceedings, Year Books and official church papers, have been fairly well preserved, though they are widely scattered, as they exist for the most part only in the various diocesan registries. Parish records have been kept with less uniform thoroughness, and in some cases, hardly kept at all. A certain number of private diaries and letters of individual churchmen have been preserved in Queensland, but quite the most useful materials of this kind were those found in the archives of Lambeth Palace and S.P.G. House, London. These materials, many of which have never been used in historical research previously, filled in many gaps and elucidated many questions

left unanswered by official records. By the completion of my research it appeared that the sources available gave a much more complete picture of the history of the Church of England in Queensland than at first seemed likely.

Finally it should be said that I write as a priest in the Anglican Church, and that I cannot – any more than any other historian – claim to write without bias. I write as one who believes in the vocation of the Anglican Communion as an integral, yet distinctive, part of a divine society, the Holy Catholic Church. Yet I trust that this does not predispose me to undue prejudice: for it is an important element in the tradition of Anglican scholarship that there need be no disparity between Christian faith and an honest quest for truth, and that there is no need to defend the divine nature of the church by denying the human frailties of its members.

K.R.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**

It would have been quite impossible to write this history without the co-operation of a large number of people, both in Australia and overseas. I am deeply appreciative of the assistance which they have given.

The Archbishop of Brisbane and the Bishops of the Dioceses of North Queensland, Rockhampton and Carpentaria, and the diocesan secretaries and office staffs of the various diocesan registries have been most helpful, even though my researches not infrequently interrupted their normal work.

The use of the many parish records listed in the bibliography was made possible though the ready co-operation of the respective parish priests.

I am specially indebted to the librarians of the Oxley Memorial Library, the Mitchell Library and the Queensland Parliamentary Library, and to the archivists at S.P.G. House, London, and Lambeth Palace. They were not only courteous and attentive, but frequently helpful with suggestions.

There were several other people who were of great assistance in making available the results of their own historical research and collections. Especially I am grateful to Professor A.P. Elkin, whose monumental work on the Diocese of Newcastle solved many of my problems for the early period; the late Archdeacon W.P. Glover, who over many years had gathered a great deal of information on Darling Downs church history; Brother Robin Warsop, B.S.B., who had made a study of the history of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas; the late Mr. A.E. Illidge of Milton; Mr. Arthur Hale of Redcliffe (the son of Bishop Mathew Hale); and Mr. Allan A. Morrison, of the University of Queensland.

Interviews with a number of people personally connected with the history of the church also provided valuable elucidation on certain points. Specially helpful in this regard were the Rt. Rev. and Rt. Hon. J.W.C. Wand (formerly Archbishop of Brisbane); the Rt. Rev. H.H. Dixon (formerly Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane); the late Archdeacon W.P. Glover; the late Rev. B.P. Walker; and the late Mrs. C.M. Bancroft (daughter of Canon Thomas Jones).

To my former colleagues of the Brotherhood of St. John, Dalby, I am grateful for having on two occasions willingly added my duties to their own, so as to enable me to carry out research in other parts of the state. The English and American research was made possible through the award of a Rotary Foundation Fellowship and a Fulbright Travel Grant.

The registrar of the Diocese of Brisbane, Mr. R.T. St. John, has been particularly helpful, in making material available, in making valuable comments on the last few chapters and in arranging for the typing of the manuscript. Mrs. N.H. Bishop has typed the thesis with great efficiency and patience, and Miss A.E. Fletcher has kindly handled the typing arrangements.

Finally, I was at all times greatly helped and encouraged by the interest of the late Archbishop of Brisbane, the Most Reverend R.C. Halse, who for the past half century was not only a keen observer of our history, but a creative participant in it.

For all of this generous assistance I am sincerely grateful.

K.R.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	i
Acknowledgements.	iii
<b>PART I: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Chapter 1: The English Roots.	2
Chapter 2: The Church Transplanted	9
<b>PART II: MORETON BAY BEFORE 1859.....</b>	<b>13</b>
Chapter 3: Religion in a Penal Station.	14
Chapter 4: The Mission 'Beyond the Boundaries'	19
Chapter 5: Preparations for Self-Government	24
i.    The Leadership of Bishop Tyrrell.	24
ii.   Benjamin Glennie : Apostle of Queensland.	25
iii.  The Growth of the Parishes	27
iv.   The Beginnings of Self-Support.	31
v.    Education.	33
vi.   The Church in the Community.	35
vii.  Separation and a New Diocese.	39
<b>PART III: BEGINNINGS OF THE DIOCESES .....</b>	<b>42</b>
Chapter 6: A New Colony and a New Diocese	43
i.    The First Bishop: Edward Wyndham Tufnell	43
ii.   Laying the Foundations.	45
iii.  Men and Money	48
iv.   The Education Controversy.	51
v.    Constitutional Church Government	54
vi.   Church and People	61
Chapter 7: The Drift to Congregationalism.	69
i.    Mathew Blagden Hale : Second Bishop of Brisbane	69
ii.   The Losing Battle	71
iii.  The Spiritual Condition of the Diocese.	78
Chapter 8: The Booming North.	82
i.    The Earliest Phase.	82
ii.   Creating a Bishopric.	84
iii.  George Henry Stanton: First Bishop of North Queensland	86
iv.   Australia's First Tropical Diocese.	87
<b>PART IV: THE CHURCH COMES OF AGE. ....</b>	<b>93</b>
Chapter 9: Strength Through Unity.	94
i.    William Thomas Thornhill Webber: Third Bishop of Brisbane	94
ii.   Unity in Diocesan Finance	97
iii.  A United and Vigorous Clergy	100

iv.	The Cathedral as the Symbol of Unity.	104
v.	Unity in Administration.	107
vi.	Unity Extended	112
Chapter 10:	Division and Wider Unity.	116
i.	The Diocese of Rockhampton	116
ii.	The Diocese of North Queensland.	121
iii.	The Diocese of Carpentaria.	124
iv.	The Province of Queensland	128
Chapter 11:	The New Leadership.	131
i.	G. H. Frodsham and the End of the Organisational Phase.	131
ii.	St. Clair Donaldson and Ecclesiastical Statesmanship	136
iii.	G.D. Halford and Anglican Self-Criticism.	140
iv.	John Oliver Feetham and the Catholic Faith	145
Chapter 12:	The Weapons of the Church Militant.	151
i.	An Indigenous Ministry	151
ii.	Christian Education	154
iii.	The Religious Life	161
iv.	Evangelism in the Cities	163
v.	Evangelism in the Bush: the Bush Brotherhoods.	164
vi.	The Church Societies.	171
Chapter 13:	Looking Outwards.	174
i.	The Province and the National Church.	174
ii.	The Missions of the Church	177
iii.	Relations with other Christian Communions	184
Chapter 14:	Society in Transition.	187
i.	The Intellectual Challenge.	187
ii.	Capital and Labour	189
iii.	The Moral Order	193
iv.	Christian Patriotism: The Church in War.	198
<b>PART V: AN UNSETTLED WORLD.....</b>	<b>203</b>	
Chapter 15:	New Hopes and Old Doubts.	204
i.	The Post-War Environment and the Church's Leaders.	204
ii.	Years of Expansion	207
iii.	Teaching the Faith	212
iv.	The Legal Nexus	217
v.	Christian Unity.	219
vi.	The Aboriginal Missions	221
Chapter 16:	The Years of Crisis	224
i.	Depression and its Consequences.	224

ii.	The Renewal of Self-Confidence: the Brisbane Episcopate of John William Charles Wand.	231
iii.	Total War.	243
Chapter 17:	A World of Change.	248
i.	The post-War Scene	248
ii.	Christianity and Colour	254
iii.	Financial Revolution and Its Consequences.	259
iv.	Evangelism in City and Country.	264
v.	Queensland and the Wider Church	272
<b>PART VI:</b>	<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>276</b>
Chapter 18:	The Church in the Sixties.	277
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>286</b>	
APPENDIX I:	THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION OF THE DIOCESE OF BRISBANE – 1868.	287
APPENDIX II:	BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE BISHOPS OF QUEENSLAND.	292
APPENDIX III		303
i.	The Archdeacons of the Dioceses of Queensland.	303
ii.	The Deans of the Cathedrals of Queensland.	306
APPENDIX IV:	Table of Population, Anglican Population, Number of Clergy and Number of Anglicans per clergyman at various periods	307
BIBLIOGRAPHY		308

**PART I: INTRODUCTION**



## CHAPTER 1: THE ENGLISH ROOTS.

“Too enthusiastically English”: so the Diocese of Brisbane was described by some critics at the very end of the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> Whether the judgment was a fair one will become more apparent later; but it does serve to remind us that the Church of England in Queensland cannot be understood without reference to its English origins. The unashamed object of the early settlers and their clergy was to transplant the old English church into their new country. This was to be no new church: not even the externals of the Church of England were to be altered more than was absolutely necessary. In time, it is true, the ideal altered, and an Australian flavour began to manifest itself; but this was a slow and subtle process.

It was not surprising that the Anglican Church in Queensland should maintain identity with the mother church. Its membership, both lay and clerical, was constantly being reinforced from the home country, and for long after the majority of its clergy were native born, many of its leaders were still English. The fact was that the closeness of the ecclesiastical affiliation with England reflected the political connection of the colony with the homeland. In many respects, at least until the twentieth century, the church in Queensland had closer links with England than with the southern colonies of Australia. The trends in English church life – whether in theology or social thought, in liturgy or architecture – sooner or later were reflected in Queensland. Sometimes English trends made an impact almost immediately, sometimes only after a long delay. Mostly there was a process of adaptation to the new environment, either slight or radical; and the result was a church unmistakably Anglican, yet subtly different from the English prototype, and increasingly manifesting its own distinctive character.

To understand the Anglican Church in Queensland, we must look at the English roots from which it sprang.

The nineteenth century was a time of radical transformation of English religious life. In 1800 the Church of England presented a depressing picture. It is true that, as recent studies have emphasised,<sup>2</sup> the eighteenth century church had not been as uniformly barren as historians of earlier generations were apt to picture it. There were many faithful clergy who ministered to their flocks in the best tradition of the church; there were parishes in which real spiritual life had been preserved through the religious apathy of the eighteenth century; and some at least of the bishops devoted attention to their pastoral labours. Faith and devotion, though often apparently submerged in the rationalistic spirit of the age, were still to be found in the church.

Yet it remains true that by and large religious life was at a low ebb. Church buildings were bare and colourless, and not infrequently in a state of miserable disrepair. There were great inequalities of income between the favoured clergy, who held rich livings in plurality, and the poverty-stricken curates who could barely feed and clothe their families. According to Halevy the incumbents were non-resident in more than half the livings of England<sup>3</sup>; while in the new towns of the industrial revolution great masses of people saw neither church nor parson in their midst. As late as 1832, Thomas Arnold could yet pass his gloomy judgment that “the Church as it now stands, no human power can save”.<sup>4</sup> It is one of the basic elements of Australian church history that the Church of England began its Australian career at the time when it was in its weakest condition.

There were, however, signs of hope. Already by 1800 the first of those movements of renewal that were to revive the English church was beginning to make itself felt. It was significant that the last-minute decision to send a chaplain with the first fleet to Botany Bay was at the instigation of a small group of influential evangelicals, the forerunners of that “Clapham Sect” which was to become so influential in English religion and politics by the early nineteenth century.

Stemming initially from the zeal of John Wesley and his friends, the evangelical revival was the first of the movements that were to breathe new life into the spiritless rationalism of eighteenth century English religion. Evangelicalism found its most natural home, it is true, in the less formal religion of the dissenters and the new sect of Methodists; but by the beginning of the nineteenth century an evangelical wing was already providing the most positive religious force within the established church.

Suspect for their “enthusiasm” by the majority of churchmen, the evangelicals did not have one of their party on the Episcopal bench until Henry Ryder’s consecration in 1815. Yet, though strict evangelicals always remained a small minority within the church, their views, diffused and scaled down, became a prevailing motif not only of religion, but

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Bishop W.T.T. Webber in his synod charge, Brisbane Year Book, 1900, p.35

<sup>2</sup> e.g. Carpenter, S.C., Eighteenth Century Church and People

<sup>3</sup> Halevy, E., England in 1815, p. 398

<sup>4</sup> Quoted in Moorman, J.R.H., A History of the Church of England, p.329

of much social custom, in Victorian England. Strict evangelicalism, with its individualism, introspection and puritanical outlook, never appealed to the majority. Among the rising industrial and commercial middle classes its ethics struck a responsive chord; but it had little success with the new urban proletariat, and its theology provided insufficient basis for the corporate revival of the church. Only in a modified version could it spread; and as G.M. Young points out, "by the beginning of the Victorian age the faith was already hardening into a code".<sup>5</sup> Yet the religious achievement of the evangelical revival was immense: it restored in the Church of England a deep concern for things of the spirit and personal religion, a zeal for the salvation of men, and a sense of the need for moral integrity.

The mainspring of the second kind of movement for church reform came, incongruously enough, from outside the church, and in some cases from men who were opposed to all that the Church of England stood for. This was connected with that increasingly influential strain of thought embraced under the name of liberalism. In England liberalism never had those anti-clerical overtones which generally accompanied it on the continent, though Jeremy Bentham, whose utilitarian doctrines so largely shaped English liberal thought, was himself an unbeliever.

Bentham advocated the rationalisation of law and society, the abolition of privileges that were based only on tradition, and freedom for individuals to order their lives without unnecessary hindrances in law. The application of these doctrines vitally affected the church, because the Church of England with its pluralism, non-residence of clergy and inequalities of clerical incomes was a glaring example of irrationality, and the privileges accorded to an established church were abhorrent to liberal principles.

Throughout the century the liberals were active in church reform. Already in the 1820's the repeal of disabilities against Non-conformists and Roman Catholics pointed the way, and in the 1830's church reform in England and Ireland proceeded apace. By 1840 the most glaring of the inequalities bequeathed from the eighteenth century had been rectified; but throughout the century, under liberal influence, many of the surviving privileges of the Church of England were swept away. If to some churchmen this appeared as an attack on religion itself, to others it was a liberating force which allowed the church to be itself. For it meant not only the reform of those internal abuses in organisation which handicapped the spiritual work of the church, but by removing the support of external stays of privilege, it forced the church to look to its own inherent spiritual character for the source of its authority. So the perceptive Bishop of London, C.J. Blomfield, could welcome reform in the thirties and forties; and later in the century it was that devout Anglican, W.E Gladstone, who took the initiative in stripping the church of some of its traditional privileges.

Strangely enough, the third of the forces of renewal in the nineteenth century originated as a reaction to the very liberalism whose influence we have just examined. It was in protest against the plan to rationalise the Irish bishoprics that John Keble preached in 1833 his famous sermon on National Apostasy which sparked off the Oxford movement. The catholic revival which thus began lacked initially the general social implications of the evangelical and liberal movements, but from the point of view of the church as a body corporate it was to be the most important

of the reform movements. The evangelical revival had restored a sense of individual spirituality among church members: the Oxford movement aimed at restoring a corporate spirituality. The Catholic Church – not the individual Christian – came to occupy the centre of the stage; and a renewed vision was caught of the Church of England as an integral part of the one Catholic Church whose history extended unbroken through the whole Christian era.

The Oxford reformers in their Tracts for the Times proclaimed Catholic doctrines which for years past had been virtually forgotten in the Anglican Church. The secession to Rome in 1845 of John Henry Newman, leader of the so-called Tractarians, weakened the struggling and unstable movement; but the majority, with E.B. Pusey as their most prominent figure, remained in the Church of England and gradually saw their doctrines permeating the church. At first the "Puseyites" concentrated on matters of theology, and made little outward alteration in the conduct of public worship; by the middle of the century, however, traditional Catholic forms of ceremonial were being introduced to accord with their doctrines. So controversies over 'ritualism' became one of the reoccurring features of church life for the rest of the century.

As with the evangelicals, the strict Anglo-Catholics remained a minority; but their ideas also became diffused, so that the doctrine and worship of the Church of England as a whole were gradually transformed. To say, as one recent writer has done, that "the Anglo-Catholics had won, and in 1899 it was evident that they had won", is perhaps an

---

<sup>5</sup> Young, G.M., Victorian England, p.4.

exaggeration<sup>6</sup>. But certainly, many of their ideas, once bitterly opposed, had been recognised as acceptable in the Church of England.

The last element of revival which we shall discuss was of a different character. This was the response of a group within the church to the new kinds of intellectual and social problems presented by the nineteenth century. Studies in the realms of geology, biology and biblical criticism had created intellectual difficulties, while the emergence of the new urban society that resulted from the industrial revolution raised new social questions for the church. Old methods of stating Christian doctrine were found to be inadequate for the new intellectual atmosphere, while the social attitude which the church had inherited from a stable society consisting mainly of landed aristocracy, yeomen and peasantry was no longer appropriate to the changing social structure of the new age.

It was this situation that aroused the distinctive approach of the "broad churchmen". In 1860 seven of them combined to publish Essays and Reviews in which they seriously attempted to grapple with the intellectual problems raised by scientific and biblical study. The book received a hostile reception, and indeed at times some of the broad churchmen appeared more broad than churchmen! Yet in their aim of relating religious thought to the whole of human knowledge they were pioneers of a revitalisation of theology in the Church of England that was to have far-reaching effects. The social side of the movement was faced by men like F.D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley, whose Christian Socialist doctrines were as unwelcome to the majority of churchmen as were the liberal ideas in theology. Nevertheless they performed a valuable service in seeking to bridge the gulf between the church and the great mass of the working population of England. By the end of the nineteenth century both the intellectual and social aspects of the broad church movement had achieved increasing acceptance, and it is significant that under the leadership of men like Charles Gore and Henry Scott Holland many of their ideas were later incorporated into Anglo-Catholic thought.

The effect of these varied forces of revival was to transfigure the appearance of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. How did this effect the Anglican Church in Queensland?

It meant that in Queensland two processes were taking place simultaneously. On the one hand the church was undergoing natural growth as Queensland passed through its various stages – penal outpost, frontier community of free settlers, self-governing colony, and finally, a state of an autonomous country in the Commonwealth of Nations. As the life of the community became more settled, so naturally did the life of the church. Opportunities for public worship and other church activities became more regular, numbers of communicants increased, and income became more stable. But this natural growth resulting from the maturing of the community was only one aspect of the development of the church. At the same time the Anglican Church was being affected by the changes in church life that were taking place in England. The early spiritual and material weakness of the Church of England in Moreton Bay reflected not only the primitive conditions of the new settlement but also the torpor of English church life. Likewise, the spiritual quickening of the mid-century resulted not only from the growth of the settlement, but also reflected the influence of the catholic revival in the Church of England.

In the same way, we shall see that the Australian counterpart of English liberalism was active in Queensland in whittling down the privileged status of the Church of England. First government grants to the church were abolished; then there followed the bitter controversy over the question of state aid to church schools in the early years of self-government, with its culmination in the complete secularisation of education in the Act of 1875.

In this way, as the century progressed, the natural development of the church was modified by the latest developments in English thought as successive waves of clergy and laity migrated from England. Sometimes there was a time-lag; sometimes there were almost immediate repercussions from English trends. Usually the clergy were quicker to adopt new religious ideas than the laity, with the result that a gap frequently appeared between the clerical and the lay points of view.

Of the movements of English church revival it was the broad church influence that had least immediate impact on Australia. The reasons were clear. The problems raised by science and biblical criticism had little relevance in the atmosphere of pioneering life. Broad churchmen were not themselves the type to emigrate: their natural setting was the cloistered world of the university or the leisured existence of cathedral canonries, not the rough-and-tumble of missionary endeavour. It was not until the twentieth century that the issues they raised aroused much interest among Queensland churchmen. Nor was the Christian Socialist movement very relevant to the predominantly rural character of Australian life in the mid-century: and by the time that questions of capital and labour came to the fore in the late eighties and nineties, Christian Socialism had lost much of its initial drive.

---

<sup>6</sup> Lloyd, Roger, The Church of England in the Twentieth Century, I, p.122

The evangelical revival had more influence on Queensland, though in its strict form evangelicalism was never a dominant force in Queensland church life. This was partly the result of the disposition of English missionary enterprise and partly the result of historical chance. The evangelical Church Missionary Society concentrated its efforts on the non-British heathen, because the older Society for the Propagation of the Gospel bore the responsibility for work in the colonies. This society was traditionally high church, and was influenced in the nineteenth century by the Oxford movement, though it never became the tool of any one party. The result of this arrangement, however, was that the main missionary zeal of evangelicalism was directed not towards British colonists but to the heathen, and the extension in the colonies of evangelical influence largely depended on the chance of the appointment of evangelically minded bishops who would bring men of like mind to their dioceses. In this way the Diocese of Sydney was set in an evangelical direction by its vigorous and devoted second bishop, Frederic Barker (1854-1882), while the long episcopate of Melbourne's first bishop, Charles Perry (1847-1876), originally settled that diocese on predominantly evangelical lines. There were times when it seemed that the same might happen in Queensland. The pioneer Bishop of North Queensland, G.H. Stanton, and the second Bishop of Brisbane, Mathew Hale, were both evangelicals by inclination. But they were in the nature of exceptions, and for reasons which will be discussed later, neither left a permanent mark on the churchmanship of his diocese.

It would be a mistake to assume that all sections of the country were equally affected by the revival of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. Among the landed aristocracy and country gentry the hold of traditional religion was undoubtedly fairly strong. The Church of England was part and parcel of the traditional order of things, and the description of the church as 'the Tory Party at prayer' had at least enough bite to make it a worthwhile gibe. Among the middle classes, too, religious practice was strongly evident; it was among them as we have said that evangelicalism made its surest headway, either in its Anglican or its Non-conformist embodiment.

There was, however, the other side of the religious scene, which was recognised by the perceptive Vicar of Leeds, Dr. W.F. Hook. In 1843 he wrote:

The people in agricultural districts are generally indifferent about the Church, - lukewarmness is their sin; the upper and middle classes uphold her; - but in the manufacturing districts she is the object of detestation to the working classes.<sup>7</sup>

The meagre statistics that are available confirm Hook's view that the church had all but lost contact with the labouring classes. In the country it was bad enough: but in the great industrial areas, especially in the north, the church entirely failed in the first half of the nineteenth century to keep pace with the growth of the densely-populated factory towns. An observer in Sheffield in 1843 estimated that not one family in twenty attended either church or chapel<sup>8</sup>, and the religious census conducted by Horace Mann in 1851 presented a similar picture. In London and the more settled districts of the south the situation was rather better, but in general it was true that the poorer people were estranged from the church; and although later in the century the Anglo-Catholics did notable work in slum areas, the survey of Charles Booth at the end of the century showed that most working men still attended no place of worship, and the majority of those who did went to Non-conformist missions.<sup>9</sup>

The fact was that the involvement of the established church in the old order of society that was passing away made it the object of dislike to the urban workers. They were conscious of class distinctions in the Church of England, distinctions which in the rural setting had been accepted as part of the natural order, but which cut against the grain of the proletarian class consciousness which was becoming increasingly evident. "One chief cause of the dislike which the labouring population entertain for religious services," commented Horace Mann in 1851, "is thought to be the maintenance of those distinctions by which they are separated as a class from the class above them".<sup>10</sup>

This class structure of the church in England was of crucial significance for the history of the Anglican Church in Queensland. No detailed study has so far been made of the back-ground of English immigrants to Queensland in the nineteenth century, but there can be little doubt that the majority of them came from the poorer classes. They were people for whom the threat of depression, unemployment and the monotony of industrial life made migration an attractive enterprise. The upper classes were hardly represented among the immigrants; there were some of the middle classes, often younger sons who hoped to make their fortune; but the great number of immigrants were from

---

<sup>7</sup> Letter to Archdeacon Samuel Wilberforce, 5th July, 1843; quoted in Ashwell, A.R., Life of Bishop Wilberforce, I, p.226

<sup>8</sup> G. Calvert Holland's "Vital Statistics of Sheffield", 1843; quoted in Wickham, E.R., Church and People in an Industrial City, p.92

<sup>9</sup> Ensor, R.C.K., England 1870-1914, p. 308

<sup>10</sup> Quoted in Hammond J.L. and Barbara, The Bleak Age, p.58

the rural or industrial poor. In short, a very large proportion of the Anglican immigrants to Queensland came from just those classes with whom the church in England had least contact. This gave early Australian religious life a very different character from that of the American colonies in their early years. For many of the American settlers their church had been the very centre of their life; for most of the early Australian colonists, with the exception of the Irish, the church was an object of indifference or worse.

In this English social background we find the clue to some of the early difficulties of the church in Queensland. Successive waves of clergy came out from England, conscious of the forces of renewal that were operating in English church life. They were keen to apply new ideas in Queensland. All too often, however, they ran into difficulty: the "respectable" and wealthier members of society, who were often the leading churchmen, had in all probability come out from England some years earlier, and wanted the church in the colony to be as they had known it at home; and enjoying their position as a kind of petty aristocracy in the colony, they were only too happy to lord it over the young clergy as they remembered the gentry had done with the village curates in England. On the other hand, the unchurched poor, who might have benefitted most from the new forces at work in church life, had brought with them an indifference to the clergy, or sometimes a positive resentment against them, and were prepared to give them no support. The church as they remembered it meant privilege and class consciousness, and these memories remained with them long after they settled in their new home. Nor were the clergy themselves free from blame in this delicate situation of readjustment: all too often they failed to recognise the difference between the new colonial society and that which they had known in England, and could not adapt themselves to the requirements of the new situation. In various forms, we shall observe these tensions inherited from England being worked out in early Queensland church history.

One aspect of the nineteenth century church revival to which ecclesiastical historians have paid insufficient attention was the remarkable increase of Anglican missionary interest and activity. It was a missionary era unsurpassed since the age of St. Francis Xavier, and the repercussions for Anglicanism were immense. The nineteenth century saw the transformation of the national Church of England into a world-wide communion of closely related, but autonomous, Anglican churches.

Before 1800 Anglican missionary enterprise had been half-hearted. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (S.P.G.) and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) had done useful work in America and India, but by 1800 they were half moribund. As in other aspects of church life, it was the influence of evangelicalism that sparked off renewed missionary zeal. The thought of the millions of heathen who were perishing in ignorance weighed heavily on the evangelical conscience, and so the evangelicals in 1799 founded the Church Missionary Society (C.M.S.). Evangelical missionary enterprise had little direct effect on Queensland: one short-lived mission among the aborigines was its sole result.

Indirectly, however, its impetus was powerful, because the missionary zeal which had originated with the little group of evangelical enthusiasts grew until it became a notable mark of church life as a whole; indeed the philanthropic missionary motive eventually became an important component of the British variety of imperialism.

From about 1820 the evangelical example began to breathe new life into the S.P.G., which was the official missionary society of the Church of England. Then, in the 1820's and 1830's, several factors combined to stimulate the already growing interest in missions. The well-organised anti-slavery agitation of those years had important missionary implications; publicity about the spiritual plight of the growing stream of British migrants to the colonies aroused public concern; and the withdrawal in the thirties of large government subsidies for S.P.G. work in Canada stirred that society to the urgency of the need to achieve self-support.

In fact, it was government support, with its corollary of government control, that had been one of the great hindrances to Anglican missionary expansion. Not until after the American Revolution did the British government agree to the consecration of bishops for the colonies, and until 1814 there were still only two colonial bishops, both of them in Canada. The appointment of the first Bishop of Calcutta in 1814 filled a gap: but the oversight of a diocese that ranged from the Cape of Good Hope to Cape Horn was not exactly practicable!<sup>10A</sup> As missionary work grew and the British colonies became more populous, leading churchmen in England realised the need for more overseas bishops; but the church had no funds to endow them, and the government, in an age when liberal tendencies were reducing the privileges of the church at home, was unwilling to commit itself to large expenditures for the formation of new colonial dioceses.

In this situation the missionary societies resolved to build up their own funds to finance overseas expansion. Colonial clergymen made out a strong case for more assistance. One of the most vociferous was W.G. Broughton, who first as Archdeacon and then as first Bishop of Australia, bluntly put the issue. "The question, in truth, which the

people of this nation have to consider”, he wrote, “is, whether they are prepared to lay the foundation of a vast community of infidels”.<sup>11</sup> Such pleas brought a growing sense of urgency in England, and in 1838 a great public meeting in London expressed the conviction that “a crisis has occurred in the religious affairs of the British Colonies”.<sup>12</sup> The importance now accorded to the matter is indicated by the fact that this meeting was attended by three archbishops, twelve bishops, eight prominent peers, three judges and a number of leading members of parliament. It was a fact of great importance for the history of the Anglican Church in Queensland that the beginnings of free settlement coincided with the resurgence of missionary enthusiasm in the church.<sup>13</sup>

One particular event in the new English missionary age had special relevance for Queensland. This was the establishment in 1841 of the Fund for the Endowment of Additional Bishoprics in the Colonies, an event which inaugurated what one contemporary enthusiast described as “the most important chapter in Modern Church History”.<sup>14</sup> Charles James Blomfield, Bishop of London, was the architect of the new strategy that lay behind the fund. Recognising that the state could no longer be expected to finance the work of the church overseas, Blomfield saw that the church must provide its own means of systematic expansion. In a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury he criticised the old policy of sending individual missionaries to the colonies, and providing a bishop only when the work was well established. Such a plan, Blomfield argued, was inefficient in practice and inconsistent in theory with the doctrine of an Episcopal church:

If we desire the good to be complete, permanent, and growing with the Church’s growth, we must plant the Church amongst them in all its integrity. Each colony must have, not only its parochial, or district pastors, but its chief pastor, to watch over, and guide, and direct the whole. An Episcopal Church without a bishop is a contradiction in terms.<sup>15</sup>

Blomfield’s view won acceptance, and the Colonial Bishoprics Fund was launched at a great public meeting in London in 1841 with the support of every school of thought within the church. The results were immediate: by 1849 £133,000 had been subscribed to the fund, and fourteen new colonial dioceses were added to the ten that existed before the inauguration of the fund. By the end of the nineteenth century the fund had been instrumental in the foundation of some sixty-seven new bishoprics. This striking growth of the colonial episcopate resulted not merely from the finances made available through the fund, but from the entire new strategy that was represented by the plan. Under the old strategy not one of the Queensland dioceses could have been formed when it was. None of them at its foundation had more than a handful of scattered clergy and a few struggling parishes: but in every case the appointment of a bishop, with the assistance of the Colonial Bishoprics Fund, stimulated growth and led to the development of a relatively vigorous and healthy church life.

When the Colonial Bishoprics Fund had been founded, the chief agent of its successful operation was Canon Ernest Hawkins, who as secretary both of this fund and of the S.P.C. became a sort of general strategist of the overseas expansion of the Church of England. A skilful organiser of missionary committees in England, a wise adviser on the appointment of the right men to colonial bishoprics, and an untiring propagandist, Hawkins was largely instrumental in the planning of the thirty-nine colonial dioceses that were formed between 1841 and his retirement in 1864. The fact that in 1867 there were 144 Anglican bishops in every part of the world eligible to receive invitations to the first Lambeth Conference shows how far the transformation of the national Church of England into the Anglican Communion in its modern sense had already proceeded. The growth of the church in Queensland was part of this wider process.

This rapid ecclesiastical expansion was accompanied by the same kind of constitutional problems that attended the political expansion of the British Empire. Naturally enough, the colonial churches were regarded at first neither as

---

<sup>10A</sup> Actually it was not until the appointment of the second Bishop of Calcutta in 1823 that the limits of the diocese were extended beyond India itself. See Giles R.A., The Constitutional History of the Australian Church, pp.57-59.

<sup>11</sup> Letter from Archdeacon W.G. Broughton to S.P.G., 9 December 1834; printed in S.P.G. Annual Report, 1834-5, p. 195

<sup>12</sup> Proceedings at a Public Meeting of the Members and Friends of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 22 June, 1838, p.3.

<sup>13</sup> Some statistics indicate the extent of this resurgence. The annual income of the S.P.G. rose from about £8000 in 1800 to just on £90,000 in 1850; the C.M.S. had no income in 1800 and over £100,000 in 1850. The immediate effect of the 1838 appeal is illustrated by the fact that the number of missionary clergy supported by the S.P.G. rose from 177 in 1837 to 327 in 1843. These figures are taken from S.P.G. Annual Reports.

<sup>14</sup> Colonial Church Chronicle, 1847, Vol.I. p.11

<sup>15</sup> Bishop C.J. Blomfield to Archbishop Wm. Howley, 24 April, 1840; quoted in full in S.P.G. Annual Report, 1839-40, p.cxiii

autonomous in government nor equal in status to the home church. Colonial bishops and clergymen were considered as being of inferior quality to their English counterparts, and as late as 1874 the Colonial Clergy Act was passed to restrict the exercise of ministerial functions by colonial clergymen who removed to England.<sup>16</sup> In part this discrimination reflected the inferior training which colonially ordained clergy often received; but in part also it illustrated the problematical nature of the question of the constitutional status of the colonial churches.

In England the formal relationship between the established church and the state was axiomatic. In the colonies, the influence of liberals, combined with that of Roman Catholics and Protestants, early ensured that the Church of England would not be an established church there. What, then, was the relation of the colonial Church of England to the home government? The question was greatly complicated by the granting of self-government to the colonies, and by slow degrees an entirely new status had to be formulated for the colonial churches. It was a painful and complex process, closely parallel to the related question of the nature of the political ties between mother country and colonies. An important part of our story must concern this gradual elucidation of a new kind of relationship, both with the government and with the home church: once more, we find that the English origins of the Church of England in Queensland sets the background for our history.

Much more might be said about the English roots of Queensland church history. Enough has been said, however, to emphasise that what happened in Queensland cannot be understood out of the context of the great changes that were at the same time transforming the English church and the whole Anglican Communion. In the nineteenth century external influences came to the Australian church almost entirely from the British Isles. To these influences were added in the twentieth century others from other parts of the now more cohesive Anglican Communion. It is true that during this time the growth of maturity led to increasing self-sufficiency in the Australian church. Yet this has itself been part of a wider pattern of the life of the Anglican Communion: it is only with this pattern in mind that we shall be able to understand the history of the Church of England in Queensland.

---

<sup>16</sup> Lowther-Clarke, H., Constitutional Church Government. P.72

## CHAPTER 2: THE CHURCH TRANSPLANTED

The church began its Australian life as nothing more than an outpost of the established church of England. That it was established in New South Wales as at home was taken for granted, and everyone assumed that it was the responsibility of the government to see that provision was made for the ministrations of the established church. The early clergy, as chaplains of the penal settlement, were civil as well as ecclesiastical officers: they were appointed by the government and paid out of revenue, and were under the close surveillance of the colonial authorities.

As population grew, and the proportion of free settlers and freed convicts increased,<sup>17</sup> it was obvious that the old type of chaplaincy establishment was no longer sufficient for the needs of the colony, and in 1824 – almost coinciding with the foundation of the Moreton Bay penal station – an Archdeaconry of New South Wales was formally constituted with Thomas Hobbes Scott as archdeacon. Scott, a one-time wine merchant turned priest, was a capable organiser, but was hardly noted for spirituality. Nominally subject to the Bishop of Calcutta (who at this time was the well-known hymn writer Reginald Heber), Scott was of necessity practically autonomous in the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and played a significant part in the life of New South Wales in the 1820's.<sup>18</sup>

Although the presence of so large a proportion of Irish and Scotch people among the early inhabitants caused the authorities to permit the ministrations of Roman Catholic and Presbyterian clergy in the twenties, the Church of England continued to occupy an unquestioned status of privilege. The position accorded to the archdeacon clearly reflects the special status of the Anglican Church in the colony. Not only was Archdeacon Scott the chief ecclesiastical officer. He ranked in precedence in the colony next after the governor and lieutenant-governor; he was ex officio a member of the Executive Council, and also sat on the Legislative Council; as "Visitor of all Schools maintained throughout the Colony by His Majesty's Revenue"<sup>19</sup> he was virtually the director of the education system of New South Wales; and socially, his salary of £2000 a year raised him to the highest level of colonial society.

The privileged status of the Church of England appeared to be rendered permanent by the creation by letters patent in 1826 of the Church and Schools Corporation. To this body was committed the administration of the religious and educational establishment of the colony. It was to provide finance for the erection of churches, schools and parsonages and for the payment of the salaries of the clergy and teachers. To supply an endowment for this work the charter of the corporation provided that one seventh of the land in each county was to be allocated to the corporation. In short, the Church of England was to be not only established, but also richly endowed, and to have a virtual monopoly over education. The governor was nominally president of the corporation, but the archdeacon in fact presided over its meetings and was its chief executive officer. He had the right to appoint and remove all schoolmasters, and the parochial schools were under the direction of the clergyman of the parish in which they were situated. This was the situation about the time the church began its work at Moreton Bay.<sup>20</sup>

Actually, however, the land provisions of the corporation's charter were never carried out. Owing to surveying and other delays no land grants were made to the corporation until 1829, and already by that time the home government had decided on a change of policy. This was the time when Catholic emancipation and the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in England indicated a diminution of the religious monopoly of the Church of England at home, and these changes were naturally reflected in colonial policy when the Whig government came into power. By 1829 the Tory government had already decided on the eventual abolition of the Church and Schools Corporation<sup>21</sup> and in 1833 it was formally dissolved, and control of its property vested in the colonial government.

This did not mean an immediate cessation of government support for the Church, but already by 1833 important changes in the relationship between church and state in Australia were being suggested by the governor of New South Wales, Sir Richard Bourke.<sup>22</sup> In view of the religious composition of the community changes were inevitable, because there was widespread discontent that the Church of England in 1833 received £11,542 from colonial revenue, while the Roman Catholic Church received only £1500 and the Presbyterian £600, amounts which were quite disproportionate to the relative

---

<sup>17</sup> 1. According to figures quoted in Greenwood, G., (Ed.) Australia, A Social and Political History, p.13, the proportion of the population of New South Wales still under sentence as convicts had declined to 41% by 1821.

<sup>18</sup> For details of the early arrangements for Episcopal jurisdiction over Australia, see Giles, R.A., The Constitutional History of the Australian Church pp 57-61 and pp 195-200. Also Border, R., Church and State in Australia pp 1-10

<sup>19</sup> H.R.A. (Series 1), XI, p.419

<sup>20</sup> For the draft charter of the Church and Schools Corporation, which was later put into effect with minor verbal alterations, see H.R.A. (Series 1), XI, pp 444-454.

<sup>21</sup> Sir G. Murray to Gov. Darling, 25 May 1829, in ibid. XIV, p. 789

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., XVIII, pp. 224-233.



size of the three groups. The Presbyterians in particular, embracing as they did a considerable number of the more influential free settlers, were indignant at this arrangement.

Governor Bourke therefore proposed a quite different system of religious subsidies, which was put into operation by an act of 1836.<sup>23</sup> This act provided for assistance to congregations in proportion to the number of members of the church and the extent of their own contributions. When, for example, churches were being constructed, and at least £300 was collected locally, the act authorised government subsidies equal to the amount raised by subscription, up to a maximum of £1000. The stipends of the clergy were to be assisted to the extent of £100 if the congregation numbered 100; £150 for a congregation of 200; and up to a maximum of £200 where the congregation exceeded 500. In the outlying districts “beyond the boundaries”, where there was no church or chapel, subsidies of up to £100 were available for clergymen’s stipends on a pound-for-pound basis, provided a minimum of £50 was subscribed by the congregation.

This act was in force when free settlement began at Moreton Bay. For the Church of England it meant a very real initial setback, because it meant that no longer would its clergy be entirely supported from colonial revenue nor its churches built at public expense, and Anglicans had had little training in the voluntary support of the church. Yet there was potentially a great advantage in the change, because so far the number of chaplains had been strictly limited by the amount of colonial funds allocated to their support, and the number could not be increased above what the government would allow. Now the onus was placed upon the church

to provide the means for the desperately needed increase in the number of clergy. The local response in church offerings was frequently disappointing in the early years: but it was this situation that led Bishop Broughton to make that urgent appeal for the increased support of the English missionary societies which was to change the outlook for the Australian church.

These changed financial arrangements did not necessarily mean that the Church of England was disestablished in New South Wales.<sup>7A</sup> Though no longer possessing financial privileges to the same extent as earlier, it was still officially regarded as the established church, and its organisation was still to be ordered by parliamentary enactment as in the mother country. In 1837, for example, an “Act to Regulate the temporal affairs of churches and chapels of the United Church of England and Ireland in New South Wales”, commonly known as the Church Act, was passed by the colonial legislature. It provided for from three to five trustees for every church who were to be elected by contributors to the building funds of the church; it ordered churchwardens to be appointed by the trustees, the pewholders, and the clergyman respectively; voters at church meetings were to be the paying pewholders, with as many votes as they held sittings up to a maximum of six; and at least one-sixth of the sittings in the church were to be free.<sup>24</sup> This act, though long out of date in some of its provisions, was to provide the legal basis for parish organisation until almost the end of the nineteenth century in Queensland.

Another proposal made by Governor Bourke in his despatch of 1833 that was to have profound significance was that the Archdeaconry of New South Wales should be detached from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Calcutta, who was in no position to exercise effectual oversight. This was the germ of a series of enquiries which led to the creation of the new Diocese of Australia, for which William Grant Broughton, who had succeeded Scott as archdeacon in 1829, was consecrated first bishop in 1836.<sup>25</sup>

It was a happy choice. Broughton was experienced in Australian conditions, and he had shown undoubted organising ability, devoted pastoral zeal and a definite churchmanship. The Moreton Bay district continued within his diocese until the erection of the see of Newcastle in 1847.

Broughton’s immediate contribution to the life of the church at Moreton Bay was limited, and he was never able to visit the outlying settlement. Yet indirectly he was of real significance for the history of the church in Queensland. It was he who sent the Reverend John Gregor to the new free settlement at Brisbane in 1843, and so commenced the henceforth uninterrupted ministry of the church there. But further than that, he was the chief early architect of the Church of England in Australia and to his energy, organising ability and strong catholic faith the whole Australian church owes much. Strongly opposed to what he regarded as the errors of both Roman Catholicism and Dissent, he stood firmly in the Catholic tradition of the English church.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> N.S.W. Government Gazette, 1836, p. 609, commonly known as the Bourke Act.

<sup>7A</sup> For a full discussion on the nature of the establishment of the Church of England in New South Wales, see Border, R. Church and State in Australia, 1788-1872, Chap.4..

<sup>24</sup> For the full text of the Act, see Pring R., Statutes in Force in the Colony of Queensland, I, p. 133ff.

<sup>25</sup> For details of various proposals, see Giles, R.A. op.cit., p. 204.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Broughton’s comments on J.H. Newman: “...if I might make my choice of my fellow-labourers, they should be from his school. They take, I think, the most just and comprehensive view of the true Constitution of our Church, and of its actual duties in the present state of the world...” Quoted in Whittington, F. T., William Grant Broughton, p. 187.

In Sydney itself the evangelicalism of Broughton's successor, Frederic Barker, left a more permanent mark, but in the northern parts of the original Diocese of Australia the new diocese of Newcastle, and then of Brisbane, followed along the lines that Broughton had established.

One of Broughton's most significant achievements, to which reference has already been made, was the cementing of contacts with the English missionary societies, especially the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K.. During his long sojourn in England prior to his consecration he forcefully pleaded the needs of the church in New South Wales. He made his voice heard to good effect, and returned to his new diocese with some £4,000 from the societies, together with several thousands that had been privately collected; and there was the promise of more.<sup>27</sup> So was forged a link that was to be vital throughout the history of the Australian church, and not least for the part of it in Queensland. Without the later grants of these societies, many of the early dioceses could not, humanly speaking, have survived in their early years.<sup>28</sup>

It was largely through Bishop Broughton's representations to the English missionary societies, and through them to the home government and the Colonial Bishops Council, that the striking expansion of the episcopate in Australasia occurred in the 1840's. Broughton constantly urged the division of his huge see, and the voluntary sacrifice of half of his episcopal salary of £2000 played no small part in the endowment of the new dioceses in 1847. Already before this date, however, New Zealand had been erected into a diocese in 1841 and Tasmania in 1842. Then the Diocese of Australia, which embraced the whole mainland of the continent, was divided in 1847 by the creation of the new dioceses of Melbourne, Adelaide and Newcastle, and the change in title of Broughton's remnant from Australia to Sydney. More than that, there was a new spirit abroad in England. This was typified by the fact that whereas Broughton himself had been consecrated bishop privately in the Lambeth Palace Chapel, the first Bishop of Tasmania was consecrated in Westminster Abbey with a small congregation present, and the three Australian bishops of 1847 together with the first Bishop of Capetown were consecrated at a service attended by a crowded congregation.

For the church in what would later be called Queensland, this sub-division of the original Diocese of Australia was a significant development. The new Diocese of Newcastle took in the whole eastern part of the continent from a point south of Newcastle to the 21<sup>st</sup> parallel. Its western boundary was the 141<sup>st</sup> meridian.<sup>29</sup> The new diocese consequently included all of what would become Queensland except for a narrow western strip, and for the part to the north of a line just beyond Mackay. Why the 21<sup>st</sup> parallel was chosen as the boundary is not clear, except that such a boundary embraced all of the settled districts – including the proposed settlement at Port Curtis – and sufficient land beyond to include prospective settled areas for years to come. This boundary was to become significant within twenty years, when the north was beginning to be populated by Europeans, because it meant that North Queensland did not come within the boundaries of any existing diocese.

Despite his hard work and intense zeal, Bishop Broughton had never been able to visit the Moreton Bay district, and as long as his diocese embraced the whole continent, it was unlikely that he would be able to do so. This meant that episcopal supervision was somewhat remote in the early years. The creation of the new bishopric brought a great change. The new bishop, William Tyrrell, still had his headquarters hundreds of miles from Brisbane, but with his smaller area he was able to visit even the northern parts of his diocese regularly every second year. The effects of this closer episcopal supervision will become apparent when we examine the growth of church life at Moreton Bay under Tyrrell's guidance.<sup>30</sup>

Enough has perhaps been said of the transplanting of the English church to New South Wales to indicate the background against which the church in Queensland grew up.<sup>31</sup> In general terms, the nature of the difficulties to be overcome and questions to be faced are already evident. The need of sufficient clergy of the right kind, the provision of a source of income to replace maintenance by the state, the tackling of religious apathy and ignorance of a great number of the inhabitants: these were the common problems to be faced throughout Australia, and we shall see them arising in particular forms in Queensland. Closely related to them was the ticklish question of whether the Church of England was to be an established church; and when that was decided in the negative, there was the question of the relationship of the

<sup>27</sup> Elkin, A.P., The Diocese of Newcastle, pp.85-6.

<sup>28</sup> Pascoe, C.F., Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G., p. 467, estimates that up to 1900 the S.P.G. alone had spent £2500,000 in the growth of the Australian church. In the same period the S.P.C.K. contributed £15,864 to the four mainland dioceses in Queensland. See Allen W.O.B., and McClure, Edmund, Two Hundred Years – The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge 1698-1898.

<sup>29</sup> For the letters patent by which the Diocese of Newcastle was created and in which details of boundaries are set out, see Elkin, A.P., op.cit., pp.130-1. In the same work a detailed account of the creation of the diocese is given on pp.125-145.

<sup>30</sup> See below, chap.5.

<sup>31</sup> For much fuller treatment of the early history of the church in New South Wales, see Rowland, E.C., op.cit., chaps. 1-5 and 9, and Elkin, A.P., op.cit., pp. 77-86. Elkin also makes a detailed study of the social and moral background of the colony, pp. 47-77.

disestablished church in Australia to the established church in England and to the civil authorities both at home and in the colonies.

It was in part to discuss such common problems that the six Australian bishops met in Sydney in 1850 under the chairmanship of the venerable Bishop Broughton. Such a meeting was in itself significant, for the convening of such a gathering implicitly challenged the commonly held erastian doctrine that ecclesiastical authority derived from the state, and should only act with the permission of the civil power. It demonstrated that the church in Australia was beginning to face the realities of its situation.

**PART II: MORETON BAY BEFORE 1859.**

### **CHAPTER 3: RELIGION IN A PENAL STATION.**

The beginnings of the Moreton Bay settlement in 1824 were scarcely promising. Throughout the twenties and thirties Brisbane Town never became more than a crude and straggling little convict village. Slowly the population grew from the 45 who were recorded in the 1825 census; by 1828 there were 378 inhabitants, a figure that had already doubled by the following year. At its peak at the beginning of the thirties the station numbered over a thousand – convicts, officers and soldiers a few government officials, and some wives and children.<sup>32</sup>

Spiritually the prospects of the settlement did not look hopeful. Professional soldiers were hardly the most religious men, and early nineteenth century clergy found it hard to think of convicts as potential pillars of the church. This was particularly true of Moreton Bay convicts, who mostly consisted of those who had committed a further offence since arriving in New South Wales and consequently included some of the more hardened prisoners. One Moreton Bay chaplain pointed out to the missionary society which supported him that “they are, on that account, as may be supposed, the worst characters”.<sup>33</sup> It is true that here was real scope for a zealous chaplain who might be anxious to help individuals to repentance and reform by personal ministry to them; but most of the colonial chaplains had little taste for this type of work, nor indeed real appreciation of the need for it. The work of the church as they saw it was to provide public worship, supervise education, and perform the occasional offices of baptizing, marrying and burying. That was sufficient!

It is not surprising that no chaplain accompanied the first party to Moreton Bay in 1824. The number of clergy in New South Wales was quite inadequate, even for the more settled regions, and the small population of the new settlement did not warrant the removal of one of the ten chaplains in the colony from his post.

Yet the spiritual and educational needs of the new settlement were not entirely neglected. In 1827 a supply of Bibles and tracts was despatched for the prisoners’ edification, and following representations from Archdeacon T.H. Scott the colonial secretary of New South Wales sent instructions to the commandant at Moreton Bay about spiritual matters:

You will cause a Bark Shed or some other temporary Building to be immediately performed {sic} as a place of public Worship so that the Prisoners may be protected from the very intense Rays of the Sun. It is considered here that Mr. Henry Cowper occasionally reads the Church Service and I am directed to recommend to you to request of him to read the Funeral Service whenever any Interment takes place, it being advisable that the Service should be performed by one person until a Chaplain can be sent to the settlement.<sup>34</sup>

The bark shed was not built,<sup>35</sup> but Henry Cowper, who was assistant surgeon of the colony, seems to have carried out his duties as a kind of lay reader.

In his capacity of director of education in the colony Archdeacon Scott also wanted to provide a school, but the usual difficulties of staff and accommodation faced him. The number of children was small, so that a full-time teacher was not warranted. Scott met the difficulty in 1826 by appointing Mrs. Esther Roberts as teacher, on the magnificent salary of £20 per year. She was a young woman already present in the settlement, where her husband was on the staff. The education provided was very elementary, and at first there were only sixteen children, though by 1829 the number had grown to thirty-three. So it was under the auspices of the church that rudimentary education commenced in the settlement.<sup>36</sup>

By 1827 the increase in the number of convicts at Moreton Bay made the provision of a chaplain more urgent, and Archdeacon Scott’s request for the building of a parsonage at a cost of £500, and of a school house for £100 shows that matter was on his mind. As it happened, lack of government funds prevented the governor acceding to the request.<sup>37</sup>

It seems likely that the Archdeacon himself visited Moreton Bay in June 1827; if so, he was the first priest of the church to officiate there.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>32</sup> For census figures, see H.R.A. (Series 1) XII, p. 318; XIV, p. 72; and XV, p.306.

<sup>33</sup> Rev. J.C.S. Handt, quoted in Church Missionary Record, 1838, p.210.

<sup>34</sup> Col. Sec, to Commandant 17 January 1827, in N.S.W. Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>35</sup> Adn. Scott to Gov. Darling, 16 September, 1828 in Scott Correspondence.

<sup>36</sup> In 1827 John Neill, a soldier, took charge of the boys, leaving Mrs. Roberts with the girls. In 1828 another soldier, Robert Maginnes took charge; in 1831 Edward Blount took over the school with the assistance of his wife. For full details, see Wyeth, E.R., Education in Queensland, chap.5.

<sup>37</sup> Adn. Scott to Gov. Darling, 29 May 1827, in H.R.A. (Series 1) XIV, p. 51.

<sup>38</sup> This inference is based on the record of the baptism of four Moreton Bay infants on 19 June 1827 in the baptismal register of St.Philip’s Church Sydney. A note in the register explains that the baptisms are recorded by direction of Archdeacon Scott. The burial register of the same church records sixteen burials at Moreton Bay, which had taken place since the establishment of the station, but which were inserted in the register of 7 July 1827. This suggests that Scott may have returned from Brisbane Town, where he had performed the baptisms, and brought back the list of burials. There is an earlier entry of three baptisms of Moreton Bay children dated 22<sup>nd</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 1825, but there is no mention of the

Despite these signs of interest, the lack of chaplains in New South Wales still prevented the appointment of a clergyman to Moreton Bay. Governor Darling, while recognizing the need for more clergy, protested that the revenues of the colony could not stand the expense,<sup>39</sup> and suggested the appointment of lay catechists instead. Indeed, Darling argued that such catechists would prove 'more useful' than ordained clergy on the penal stations – presumably because they could be paid a lower stipend.<sup>40</sup> In any case, Scott arranged in 1828 for a catechist named Layton to proceed to Moreton Bay, and the commandant was instructed to "cause a residence for that gentleman to be prepared with all convenient despatch".<sup>41</sup> The house was prepared, but there is no evidence that Layton actually reached his destination.

By 1828 the appointment of a chaplain could no longer be delayed, and as a last resort the archdeacon decided to send as chaplain the Reverend John Vincent. This was something of an act of desperation, because since his arrival from England earlier in the year, Vincent's health had been so poor that "even assisting the Senior Chaplain at Parramatta he found himself exhausted by performing three Services on one Sunday, one of them being about a mile distant."<sup>42</sup> Indeed, the governor even doubted whether Vincent could be expected to survive at all.<sup>43</sup> Yet the archdeacon was determined to send him. Theoretically he gave Vincent a choice between Moreton Bay and another post, but when Vincent protested against being stationed at Moreton Bay on grounds of health and family circumstances,<sup>44</sup> Scott replied that if he did not make up his mind he would simply notify the government of his appointment. Scott favoured Moreton Bay, because there was a house available and there would be no need of extensive travelling. Vincent, however, still showed no enthusiasm, so the archdeacon carried out his threat and informed Vincent that "I have this day notified to the Governor your appointment as chaplain at Moreton Bay."<sup>45</sup>

It was an unfortunate appointment. Though Vincent's health improved – indeed, he lived for many years – he went to Moreton Bay with great unwillingness, and he demonstrated little of the zeal needed for such difficult work or of the patient temperament required for the peculiar circumstances of a chaplaincy under conditions of martial law. At all events Vincent duly arrived in Brisbane Town on the Isabella on 27 March 1829, accompanied by his wife, four daughters, one son and three convict servants; and so the first regular ministry of the church in what would be come Queensland had its rather unromantic beginning.<sup>46</sup>

If Vincent's own temperament did not augur well for his success, the character of the commandant of the settlement, Captain Patrick Logan, made it certain that trouble would arise. Logan was known as a severe administrator who would brook no disagreement with his rule, and Archdeacon Scott's comforting assurance to Vincent that "the Commandant and his wife and sister are very amiable persons",<sup>47</sup> if true in another environment, was not a very accurate picture of Logan as commandant. Logan made it clear that he expected the chaplain to come under his authority in matters of administration; Vincent was just as adamant that in view of his spiritual functions a chaplain might act independently. It was the old struggle between church and state, taking shape in the unusual conditions of a penal settlement, and magnified by the personalities of the particular representatives of the church and state who were involved.

It was not long before tension arose between commandant and chaplain, and correspondence flowed in a steady stream to their respective superiors in Sydney. From Vincent came a string of complaints. His house remained uncompleted because Logan had withdrawn the convict labour from it; he wanted convicts to be given to him to fill the offices of clerk, sexton and bell-ringer; he needed an advance of stipend to maintain his family; the accommodation for public worship was insufficient; he had suffered "damage and ill-usage" on board a convict ship.<sup>48</sup>

For his part Commandant Logan reacted to the chaplain's complaints with counter-charges, and finally by direct action. He denied Vincent's claims that facilities were being refused and when Vincent began to write direct to Sydney instead of directing his despatches through the commandant as regulations required, Logan protested that "the Reverend Mr. Vincent

place or minister of these baptisms, and it seems likely that these were children of Moreton Bay parents who had returned to Sydney, and that the baptisms took place in St. Philip's itself.

<sup>39</sup> Gov. Darling to Sir George Murray, 18 October 1829 in H.R.A. (Series 1) XV, p.212.

<sup>40</sup> Gov. Darling to W. Huskinson, 10 April 1828 in H.R.A. (Series 1) XIV, p. 128

<sup>41</sup> Col. Sec. to M.B. Commandant, 11 February 1828, in Col. Sec. Corr.

<sup>42</sup> Adn. Scott to Gov. Darling, 16 September 1828, in Scott Correspondence.

<sup>43</sup> Gov. Darling to Sec. of State for Colonies, 30 December, 1828 in H.R.A. (Series 1) XIV, p.561.

<sup>44</sup> Rev. J. Vincent to Adn. Scott, 6 August 1828 in S.P.G. 'C' Mss., Box 10

<sup>45</sup> Adn. Scott to Rev. J. Vincent, 16 September 1828, in Scott Correspondence.

<sup>46</sup> It should be pointed out that some early historians of the Anglican Church in Queensland had no knowledge of the Rev. John Vincent, and mistakenly supposed that the Rev. John Gregor was the first clergyman at Moreton Bay.

<sup>47</sup> Adn. Scott to Rev. J. Vincent, 29 July 1829 in Scott Correspondence.

<sup>48</sup> These complaints are mentioned in the following letters in the Col. Sec. Correspondence: Rev. J. Vincent to Col. Sec., 19 June 1829; Capt. Logan to Col. Sec., 5 May 1829; Rev. W. Cowper to Col. Sec., 13 July 1829; Capt Logan to Col. Sec., 22 June 1829; and Adn. Broughton to Col. Sec., 27 November 1829.

appears to consider himself entirely independent of my authority and persists in making reports without supplying me with copies."<sup>49</sup>

Two issues brought the matter to a head. Vincent's refusal to give Christian burial to a prisoner who had died caused bitter disagreement. This was capped when the chaplain published in church without the commandant's consent (as regulations required) the bans of marriage between two convicts. Logan, who was present, stalked out of the service in fury, and when the service concluded, the commandant had a public order read out in the church room in the presence of the soldiers and convicts:

The Revd. Mr. Vincent will immediately send to the commandant his reasons in writing for disobeying the official orders he received from Lieutenant Bainbrigg during the absence of Captain Logan that the same may be forwarded to His Excellency the Governor.<sup>50</sup>

This deliberate public humiliation of the chaplain removed any further possibility of Vincent's continuing in his post. Angri-ly he sent his resignation to Archdeacon Broughton, who had now replaced Scott, and Broughton accepted the resignation with a stern rebuke to Vincent for his part in the quarrel, and ordered him to leave the settlement on the first ship.<sup>51</sup> Logan too was rebuked by the government for his part in the episode.

In this way the work of the first resident clergyman in Brisbane came to an unhappy end after only eight months. There cannot be said to be any permanent result in Queensland from Vincent's work. He was not personally an impressive character, "not likely", as Archdeacon Broughton wrote, "to command attention or to conciliate general esteem".<sup>52</sup> The most that can be said is that during his chaplaincy services were held regularly twice a Sunday, arrangements for divine worship were improved (though no proper church was yet available), and the school was active with thirty-three children on the roll at its peak.

John Vincent in many ways typifies the less attractive side of the Church of England before the reforms of the nineteenth century. His ministry appeared to be marked by neither zeal nor humility, nor by an understanding of the peculiar circumstances of a penal station. Striving with his three servants to maintain that air of respectability considered fitting for an English clergyman, he could not help complaining that his stipend of £250 was insufficient. His very failure in itself suggested that there was need of a different outlook if the Church of England were to be a force in the life of the new community.

When Vincent left Moreton Bay the population of the penal station was approaching its peak, but Archdeacon Broughton could spare no one else for the chaplaincy.<sup>53</sup> Hopes in 1832 of being able to spare a clergyman from Sydney failed to eventuate, and as the population of the settlement began to decline the matter seemed less urgent. Doubts as to the future of Moreton Bay as a penal station confused the issue;<sup>54</sup> indeed by 1835 the Secretary of State for the Colonies in the English government was not even certain whether the station was still functioning.<sup>55</sup>

This meant that the convicts at Brisbane Town were receiving in the early 1830's only the barest of religious ministrations. In 1836, for example, two officers named Spicer and Owen held divine service twice every Sunday, once after muster, and again in the early afternoon.<sup>56</sup>

An eyewitness account by two visiting Quakers about this time pictures such a service:

1<sup>st</sup> April. Being the day called 'Good Friday', no work was exacted from the prisoners; but they, with the military and civil officers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, assembled as on First-days, in the chapel; where the prayers and lessons of the Episcopal Church, with a few omissions, in deference to the Roman Catholics, were read in a becoming manner, by the Superintendent of the Convicts.<sup>57</sup>

This attempt to maintain a regular religious life reflects credit on the authorities, but under the circumstances its effect for good must have been extremely limited. The comments of the two Quakers on religion in the penal stations in general apply to Moreton Bay as to the others:

<sup>49</sup> Capt. Logan to Col. Sec., 22 June 1829 in Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>50</sup> Adn. Broughton to Col. Sec., 27 November, 1829 in Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> Adn. Broughton to Gov. Darling, 13 November 1830, in H.R.A. (Series 1), XVI, p.30

<sup>53</sup> In 1833 there were still only fifteen Anglican clergymen in New South Wales besides the archdeacon.

<sup>54</sup> See, for example, Viscount Goderich to Gov. Bourke, 25 December 1832, in H.R.A. (Series 1) XVI, p. 831; and Lord Glenelg to Gov. Bourke, 30 November 1835, in ibid., XVIII, p. 204

<sup>55</sup> Lord Glenelg to Gov. Bourke, 26 December 1835, in ibid., XVIII, p.243.

<sup>56</sup> Col. Sec. to M.B. Commandant, 31 December 1836, in Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>57</sup> Backhouse, J., A Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies, p.361. The commandant had been instructed that Roman Catholics were not to be compelled to attend.

In visiting the various Penal Establishments of the Colony, and observing the limited means made use of for moral and religious instruction, we must conclude, that restraint, rather than reformation, has been the object of the British Government... There is no religious instructor, at the Penal Settlement, at Moreton Bay... Few of the ironed-gangs have any other semblance of religious instruction, than the reading of 'the prayers' of the Episcopal Church by the military officers in charge. Though this means is deplorably inefficient, yet, being, in the estimation of the officers, the best at their command, it is persevered in, in a manner that is creditable to them.<sup>58</sup>

It was a fair criticism. Religion was seen by the civil authorities, and by most of the clergy too, as fostering restraint and good order.

In England the evangelicals were beginning to see that the church must concern itself with the spiritually and materially destitute, but this concern was as yet barely perceptible amongst the clergy in Australia.

The closing years of the penal settlement in the late thirties witnessed the provision of another convict chaplain at Moreton Bay, but under a curious arrangement which again reflects Anglican apathy. This was the appointment of a Lutheran minister, the Reverend John Christian Simon Handt, to act as a quasi-Anglican chaplain.

Because of the sparsity of Anglican clergy offering for missionary service the evangelical Church Missionary Society had followed the example set in the eighteenth century by the S.P.C.K., of employing German ministers as missionaries of the society.<sup>59</sup> Handt was one of these, and had come to New South Wales under C.M.S. auspices in 1831 to found with an English missionary an aboriginal mission at Wellington Valley.<sup>60</sup> On the arrival of another German missionary to relieve him, Handt was transferred by the C.M.S. committee in Sydney to Moreton Bay, where he landed in May 1837.

Although Handt was a Lutheran, his position as the agent of an Anglican society entitles him to a place in the history of the Church of England in Queensland. He does not seem to have received a formal license from Bishop Broughton, but as there was no chaplain of the Church of England at the penal station at Moreton bay, Handt was recognised by the government as a part-time chaplain to the station, though his main work was with the aborigines.<sup>61</sup> His C.M.S. salary was supplemented by a government stipend of £100 for his chaplaincy work, but he was classed in the civil list under the category of "missionary" rather than "clergyman".<sup>62</sup> At all events his appointment reflects the inability of the Church of England to provide one of its own clergy for the ministry to the convicts at Moreton Bay.

For his work among the prisoners, Handt used the services of the English Prayer Book, and he felt that his efforts were not altogether unsuccessful. His optimism was reflected in a letter to the C.M.S.:

I certainly met with more success among the prisoners; they listen with profound attention, both Protestants and Roman Catholics; although the latter are not compelled to attend. Besides my services on the Lord's Day, I meet the prisoners every Wednesday from eleven till twelve o'clock; and the more I become acquainted with them the more I perceive a relish and desire for heavenly things. I also Superintend the Soldiers' Children's School in Brisbane Town, and the School for Convicts' Children at Eagle Farm.<sup>63</sup>

If Handt felt that he could see some results from his work with the convicts, the same could not be said for his aboriginal missionary work. Yet his project was significant, because it was the first attempt to Christianise the aborigines in northern Australia. There had actually been a proposal ten years earlier for a mission to the aborigines at Moreton Bay. In March 1827 the Rev. Richard Hill, of St. James', Sydney, had written to the colonial secretary of New South Wales asking for permission for the Australasian Auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society to commence a mission station at Moreton Bay. Hill requested a grant of ten thousand acres close enough to the penal station to receive provisions, yet distant enough to

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., Appendix p. cxxviii f.

<sup>59</sup> Stock, Eugene, History of the Church Missionary Society, Vol. 1, p. 82ff. Statistics in Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society, 1829-30, p. xi, show that at that time the C.M.S. were employing on their missions 37 English and 16 Lutheran clergy.

<sup>60</sup> Proceedings of the C.M.S., 1830-1.

<sup>61</sup> The question of Handt's status has been complicated by Gov. Gipps' statement in a letter to Lord Stanley in 1842 that Handt "has for some time past officiated as a Minister of the Church of England at Moreton Bay, under a License from the Bishop of Australia (H.R.A. (Series 1) XXII, p.330). This was directly contradicted in another letter from Gipps in 1843 when he wrote: "Mr. Handt is a Lutheran, as well as a Foreigner, and consequently is not recognised by the Bishop of Australia (Ibid., XXIII, p.10). The Sydney Diocesan Registry has no record of Handt's having been formally licensed by Bishop Broughton, and it seems that Gipps was speaking loosely in his first despatch of a general recognition of Handt by the bishop, in the absence of any Anglican chaplain at Moreton Bay. See correspondence between F.W.S. Cumbrae-Stewart and Sydney Diocesan Registrar, September and October 1918, in Church of England Papers, Oxley Library.

<sup>62</sup> Rowland, E.C. a Century of the English Church in N.S.W., P. 119.

<sup>63</sup> Church Missionary Record, 1838, p. 210



prevent contact between the aborigines and the convicts. The memorandum scribbled on the back of Hill's letter, "Cannot be allowed to go to a penal settlement", shows the burden of the government's reply.<sup>64</sup>

In 1837, with the convict settlement constantly diminishing in size, and with the prospect of its eventual extinction, the government was prepared to allow the missionary experiment.

Handt laboured with great industry among the two or three hundred aborigines who roved within the vicinity of the settlement, but from the start he was faced with those difficulties of language and aboriginal temperament that later missionaries were to encounter over and over again. At first he was optimistic of speedy progress, but time and again he found the members of his instruction classes vanished after he had given them food and clothing. His own account of the methods he employed illustrates some of the mistakes made by the early missionaries:

They have a knowledge of the solemnity of the Lord's Day; that they must not cut wood etc; but go to Church and be quiet. But I would by no means intimate that they do go to Church; for we have only succeeded three times in getting them washed and dressed, and in making them go...They have been taught, likewise, that it is a sin to curse and to swear, or to say other bad words. With regard to their civilization, some have worked with me in the garden for three hours; but this was the longest time I recollect. They will, in general, not wear any clothes: when they receive any such article, they sometimes sell it in the Settlement for a piece of bread. But they chiefly take it to the bush; where it is torn to pieces, and the pieces used for head-bands by the whole tribe.<sup>65</sup>

The attempt to conform the natives to European customs was bound to fail. Yet it would be unfair to criticize Handt: he could only employ the knowledge of his day, and some like him had to experiment in order that better methods might be learned by experience. It is to his credit, and to that of the missionary society which sponsored him, that such an early attempt was made to do a work which was not be effectively taken up in Queensland for another half century. There was a real concern in the church from the beginning for the conversion and material improvement of the aborigines; but it was to be a long time before manpower and resources were sufficient to accomplish anything successfully.

The obvious failure of the Moreton Bay mission led the C.M.S. to recall Handt to Wellington Valley, and financial support was withdrawn from the Moreton Bay mission.<sup>66</sup> For some reason, however, Handt determined to stay. The closing of the convict settlement in 1839 meant the end of the chaplaincy work, so Handt joined forces with the German missionaries who had established themselves at Zion Hill, Nundah. Here, too, success was limited, and Handt found himself in a gradually worsening financial position, and was finally relieved only by a government gratuity of £100 which enabled him to go to Sydney and build up a small congregation there. So concluded his temporary connection with the Church of England.<sup>67</sup>

The closing of the penal station marks the end of the first phase of the history of the church, as of the settlement itself. It was scarcely a glorious beginning. For only eight months of the life of the station was an Anglican priest in residence, and then with unhappy consequences. For the last two years of the station, a Lutheran minister was employed to do the work of the Church of England. Yet it would be unfair to blame the colonial church entirely. The country was vast, clergy few, finance inadequate. Here already were apparent the three great difficulties that were to beset the church in the coming century. They were difficulties relatively unknown in England, with its compact parishes, numerous clergy and rich ecclesiastical endowments, and they represented a new and strange challenge as the church sought to make itself part of the life of the new country. These are themes that will recur throughout our history.

---

<sup>64</sup> Rev. R. Hill to Col.Sec., 16 March 1827 in Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>65</sup> Church Missionary Record, 1839, p. 161.

<sup>66</sup> Proceedings of C.M.S., 1839-40, P.84. The Proceedings of the following year indicate that the C.M.S. in England thought that Handt had actually returned to Wellington Valley.

<sup>67</sup> Gov. Gipps to Lord Stanley, 8 July 1843, in H.R.A. (Series 1), XXIII, p.10.

#### **CHAPTER 4: THE MISSION 'BEYOND THE BOUNDARIES'**

In 1842 the district around Brisbane was thrown open to free settlement, and the first sales of land took place. Already before this squatters had begun to move into what is now southern Queensland, but by law free settlement had been forbidden within fifty miles of Brisbane. With the arrival on 17 January 1843 of Captain J.C. Wickham as first police magistrate organised civil life began. On the same ship came the Reverend John Gregor, M.A., to be the first resident priest of the free settlement.

Moreton Bay in the forties was very much a frontier outpost, frequently referred to in the official correspondence as the territory "beyond the boundaries". Gregor found that the district for which he was responsible ran 120 miles from north to south and 200 miles from east to west.<sup>68</sup> In the first decade the population remained small, but it was steadily increasing. In 1843, the year of Gregor's arrival, there were estimated to be 217 people in the county of Moreton, and 335 on the Darling Downs; of these 71 were still under bond. By 1846 the total population had risen to 2525, of whom about half classified themselves as belonging to the Church of England. Brisbane itself constantly grew in size, but Ipswich too, with a population of some three hundred by 1847, was a flourishing little township. These numbers were not in themselves excessive for one priest, but the scattered nature of the population created immense difficulties: it is estimated that by the end of the forties there were some sixty runs on the Darling Downs and another thirty-nine in Moreton.<sup>69</sup>

Nor did the conditions of life in the rough pioneering settlement present an easy environment for even the most energetic and devoted missionary. Moreton Bay had all the unsettled characteristics of a frontier outpost, and the population contained more than its share of adventurers and drifters. In 1845 there were only half-a-dozen professional men – attorneys and surgeons – and most of the townspeople made their living as tradesmen, innkeepers, artisans or domestic servants. There was a great disparity in the number of sexes – the men were in a majority of three to one – and little of the stabilising influence of regular family life. The large proportion of ex-convicts pointed in the same direction, and it is hardly surprising that drunkenness and immorality were much in evidence and that there was little spiritual or cultural atmosphere. It was perhaps natural that Gregor should feel that 'such a population presents to the eye of the minister of Christ a field of forbidding character.'<sup>70</sup>

When John Gregor came into this environment he was only new in the priesthood of the Church of England, though of mature years. He had come to New South Wales in 1837 as a minister of the Church of Scotland<sup>71</sup>, but he had been caught up in the animosities that were current in the Presbyterian Church at the time, and had fallen foul of Dr. John Dunmore Lang and other influential Presbyterians. As a result of these personal difficulties Gregor had grown to be dissatisfied with Presbyterian order and in 1842 had offered himself to Bishop Broughton as a candidate for holy orders within the Church of England. In the circumstances Broughton was naturally wary as to the motives of his candidate, especially as some Presbyterians had accused Gregor of seeking a post of greater profit.<sup>72</sup> It was only after he had assured himself that Gregor was sincere, and would not stand to gain financially by his changed allegiance, that Broughton agreed to ordain him. Indeed, Broughton found, on enquiry, that Gregor had formerly been regarded as "one of the best qualified among the Scots ministers, in literary and scientific attainments: his character indeed stood high and irreproachable in every respect."<sup>73</sup>

Yet while he may be exonerated from the accusation of avarice which his enemies levelled at him, Gregor seems to have lacked the qualities of leadership and determination so necessary for a missionary in such discouraging circumstances as Moreton Bay provided. With the exception of J. C. Wickham, the police magistrate, who supported him faithfully, and whose wife taught at the Sunday school in Brisbane, Gregor had little success in winning the loyalty of the leading men of the settlement; nor did he appear to have more success with the less prominent citizens. He came to feel that all Brisbane was against him. His action in moving out of Brisbane to live with the German missionaries at Nundah when the lease expired on the government house which he had rented was a virtual admission of defeat and signified the end of his prospects of exercising real influence over the townspeople. Henceforth he travelled in for Sunday services, but for most of the week he was cut off from the daily life of his parishioners. This sense of defeat was already evident in his report to the

<sup>68</sup> Missionary Return of Rev. John Gregor, 1845, in S.P.G. "E" Mss., Box B. This is a valuable and detailed report of the life of the church and community at Moreton Bay, and is the source of much of the material used in this chapter, except where other specific references are given.

<sup>69</sup> These figures are based on statistics given in: Gregor J., Journal of Missionary Tours, p.46; M.B. Courier, 4<sup>th</sup> July 1846, 25 July 1846 and 24 July 1847; and Elkin, A.P., The Diocese of Newcastle, p.45.

<sup>70</sup> Gregor's Missionary Return, 1845

<sup>71</sup> H.R.A. (Series 1) XVIII, p. 801

<sup>72</sup> Cf. the later comment of Dr. Lang in Cooksland, p. 475 "Mr. Gregor is, without exception, the most worldly-minded person I have ever known in a clerical habit".

<sup>73</sup> Bishop Broughton to S.P.G., quoted in S.P.G. Annual Report, 1843, p. 58.

S.P.G. in 1845, when he bitterly complained that the labouring population were ‘abandoned characters whose reformation in religion & morals is almost hopeless.’<sup>74</sup>

The fact was that there was none of that mutual confidence that should mark a healthy relationship between priest and people. A great number of his parishioners neither understood nor desired to understand the nature of Gregor’s work as a mission priest largely dependent on their support. On one occasion when he asked the people to contribute towards his support, a number of them announced that they would withdraw from the church if he persisted in such a request. On the other hand, he had no confidence in them. Rather than have churchwardens he resolved to do their work himself, and he confided to the S.P.G. that he had kept secret from his people the fact that he was being partly supported by that society, for fear that they would make it an excuse to hold back their own meagre contributions. Perhaps part of the trouble was his Scotch and Presbyterian background. There was always something of the minister of the Kirk in his appearance and manner<sup>75</sup>, and this did not endear him to the Anglicans, while the memory of his defection from their ranks did not make the Presbyterians well disposed towards him. In his report of 1845 Gregor made repeated references to the opposition of ‘puritanical radicals, infidels and drunkards’ – a strange combination of enemies, among whom the ‘puritan’ element was doubtless largely supplied by Presbyterians who occupied some of the most prominent positions in the settlement.

It would be wrong, however, to give the impression that Gregor accomplished nothing. He did, in fact, a great deal of faithful and devoted work for the church, especially in the early years of his five year ministry at Moreton Bay. His first task on arrival was to establish a place of worship in Brisbane itself. Pending the provision of a church he first used the old convict barracks which were now serving as a courthouse, but it was not long before application was made to the government through Bishop Broughton for the use of “a ruinous building, attached to the lumber yard at Brisbane Town in order that the same may be converted into a place of public worship for members of the church of England”.<sup>76</sup> The application was approved, and the building was leased to the church at a nominal rental of one shilling per annum.<sup>77</sup> So after alterations to the value of £100 this humble and rather unattractive brick building, situated on what is now the corner of Queen Street and North Quay, was dedicated as the first St. John’s Church, Brisbane.<sup>78</sup>

The services in this little church in Gregor’s time were of the very simple and austere kind typical of the early nineteenth century. The chief service was Morning Prayer at eleven o’clock on Sunday morning, to which a celebration of the Holy Communion was added no more frequently than once a month. Customarily there was an afternoon service in St. John’s, but in 1847 this service was advertised to take place at a private house at Kangaroo Point, and Gregor’s successor found that there had been no evening service at St. John’s for some time.<sup>79</sup> There was little singing, and though Gregor’s own prayer book had the words of four hymns inserted in the back, the staple musical diet consisted of the old metrical version of the psalms by Tate and Brady.

Despite the growing population, church life in Brisbane was at a low ebb. In 1845 Gregor estimated his average congregation as one hundred, and he reported that he had never had more than eight communicants on the one occasion. Sometimes the attendances were far worse, and one correspondent to the Courier recalled an occasion when his own family were the only people in church.<sup>80</sup> On the business side of church life lack of interest was just as deadly. In 1845 a laymen’s committee was organised at St. John’s, but very quickly disintegrated. The following year a meeting gathered under the chairmanship of Richard James, and appointed leading citizens of the district including prominent squatters like Patrick Leslie, R. Gore and A. Hodgson to collect funds, but the result was negligible. Just before Gregor’s death a public meeting called to discuss the building of a new church was attended by only a dozen people, though among those present were such prominent citizens as Captain Wickham and Dr. Ballow.<sup>81</sup> There was clearly a great lack of cohesion in the life of the church.

<sup>74</sup> Gregor’s Missionary return, 1845.

<sup>75</sup> According to the reminiscence of an eye-witness, quoted in Batty, F. de Witt, The Diocese of Brisbane, p.6.

<sup>76</sup> Quoted in letter from Col. Sec. to Capt. Wickham, 2 February 1843, in Col. Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>77</sup> Col. Sec. to Capt. Wickham, 7 April 1843, in ibid.

<sup>78</sup> A description of the church as he found it when he reached Brisbane in 1848 was given by Archdeacon B. Glennie in St. John’s Parish Chronicle, January 1889: “Forty years ago, the little brick building which was honoured with the title of St. John’s Church, stood in a small plot of ground enclosed by a low brick wall; the entrance being in Queen Street. The door was in the middle of the east wall. The altar was at the N.E. end, enclosed by a simple rail. The corner towards Queen Street was curtained off, to serve as a vestry; in the other corner stood a prayer desk and pulpit, sent from Sydney by Bishop Broughton. Seats facing the altar were placed on both sides of the Church, a passage being between them”.

The building was capable of seating 150 on open benches

<sup>79</sup> M.B. Courier, 27 February 1847, and an article by Archdeacon Glennie in St. John’s Parish Chronicle, February 1889.

<sup>80</sup> M.B. Courier, 6 May 1848.

<sup>81</sup> Gregor’s Missionary Return, 1845; and M.B. Courier, 15 January 1848

Education was another part of Gregor's responsibility, but again the results were relatively meagre. There was a Sunday School which met before the morning service on Sundays, but the average attendance was not more than fifteen. The day schools under the clergyman's superintendence numbered three – two in Brisbane and one at Ipswich. They were, however, as Gregor himself reported, 'of a very humble character'<sup>82</sup>, meeting in private houses and with an attendance in no case of more than sixteen. The schoolmasters, who had to depend entirely on fees paid by the parents, received only a miserable pittance. The fact was that most of the parents were little concerned whether their children were educated or not. Yet if these schools under the auspices of the church seem poor, it must be remembered that they provided the only education available at Moreton Bay, and the government was doing nothing at all in this field.

This work in Brisbane represented, however, only one side of Gregor's task, and perhaps it was in his country tours that the best side of the man revealed itself. It was not that he had more immediate success in the country: but he did show here a degree of self-denying effort that demonstrated his underlying earnestness of purpose. Already by 1843 it was clear that Ipswich would grow into an important centre. Gregor noted in his Journal that year:

It is of course very plain that Ipswich, now not only fixed upon by Government, but also surveyed and laid out as a township, is a place where a church of the living God is required...<sup>83</sup>

The best he was able to do, however, was to give Ipswich one Sunday a month, while Wickham or some other layman was left to read the service in St. John's. Before long there were complaints from Ipswich that monthly visits were not enough, and that Ipswich was important enough to have its own resident clergyman:<sup>84</sup> but the suggestion that money might be raised to support such a priest fell as usual on deaf ears.<sup>85</sup> Complaints were much more readily forthcoming than subscriptions!

At longer intervals Gregor also travelled father afield, and the published account of his travels in 1843 gives a valuable picture of his work in the country districts. Several times a year he made trips through the Brisbane, Albert and Logan valleys; and each year he spent a period of several weeks on the Darling Downs. In 1845 Gregor reported that 'there is hardly a shepherd's hut even in this wide extend of country which I do not visit every year, & in which I do not perform divine service as a priest of the Church of England'<sup>86</sup>. On one occasion, in 1846, he even undertook a pastoral tour through New England, as far south as Tenterfield, which in view of the state of the bush tracks and the possible dangers from aborigines, was no mean feat.<sup>87</sup> It was these long tours that led Bishop Broughton to commend the "laborious zeal" which Gregor had displayed in spreading the Gospel.<sup>88</sup>

Though Gregor was often cordially received on these bush tours, the reception given to his ministrations was by no means uniformly encouraging. Many of the working people who had had no contact with the church for years showed little interest, and indeed the impression left by Gregor's Journal is that there were very few among the bush people who were willing to be roused to a concern about spiritual things. There is one pathetic picture of his preaching to one man at Archer's station, some sixty miles from Brisbane:

At this station there was only one Protestant; and as the Romanists did not appear to desire, but rather to decline, my services as a clergyman, I addressed my observations to the Irish Protestant.<sup>89</sup>

Whether Dr. Lang's biting comment that the Protestants on the stations made themselves out to be Roman Catholics when Gregor arrived was true in this case, we cannot know! The squatters, too, were often critical of Gregor, and complained – with dubious justice in view of the vastness of his territory – that he did not visit them regularly enough. One squatter protested that he had not been visited for three years, and objected because Gregor would not ride fifty miles for a baptism.<sup>90</sup>

If they served no other purpose, these charges provided a convenient excuse for refusal to contribute to church funds.

<sup>82</sup> Gregor's Missionary Return, 1845.

<sup>83</sup> Gregor, J., Journal of Missionary Tours, p.42

<sup>84</sup> M.B. Courier, 8 August, 1846

<sup>85</sup> Ibid., 1 August, 1846.

<sup>86</sup> Gregor's Missionary Return, 1845.

<sup>87</sup> The route taken on this tour may be gleaned from the dates and places of baptisms recorded in St. John's Baptismal Register.

<sup>88</sup> Quoted in appendix to Gregor, J., Journal of Missionary Tours, p.45. It is interesting to note that the registers of St. John's church show – as pointed out by Cumbræ-Stewart, F.W.S., in an article in the Church of England Papers, Oxley Library, - that there were in Gregor's time 206 Baptisms, 37 Burials and 42 Marriages. Some of the burials were taken by laymen in Gregor's absence.

<sup>89</sup> Gregor, J. Journal of Missionary Tours, p.17.

<sup>90</sup> Hodgson, C.T., Reminiscences of Australia, pp. 197-8.

Although in such circumstances Gregor's services at any one bush centre had to be infrequent, there were at least a few places where worship was not entirely disregarded. It was the custom on some of the runs for the master of the house to gather together his family and employees on Sunday mornings for the reading of prayers and sometimes of a short sermon. It was little enough, but it did help to keep the spirit of religion alive in circumstances where it might entirely have died out.<sup>91</sup>

Financially the state of the church at Moreton Bay in the forties was quite desperate. For the first two or three years about £100 a year seems to have been collected locally towards Gregor's stipend, but after that local contributions almost entirely dried up. It was only the £200 which Gregor received annually from the S.P.G. that enabled the missionary and his servant to eke out a bare existence in a community where prices were much higher than in the south. Whether Gregor ever received government aid towards his salary under the provisions of the New South Wales Act of 1836 is doubtful: if so, it could only have been for a year or two in the middle of his ministry at Brisbane.<sup>92</sup> One thing, at all events, is clear: the members of the Church of England had quite failed to appreciate the demands which an unendowed church must make upon them. Generosity to their church was not one of the virtues of Moreton Bay Anglicans in the 1840's. Only one incident shows that the wells of generosity had not entirely dried up: a collection on Easter Day in 1847 in St. John's for the relief of persons who had suffered through the loss of the steamer Sovereign yielded the surprisingly large sum of £314.<sup>93</sup>

Another issue besides the purely financial one was involved in the need to change over from an endowed to a voluntary system of support for the church. Some of the laymen felt that as their contributions were supporting their minister, he could be regarded as a sort of employee of theirs, who ought to fall in with their wishes. Gregor on one occasion complained that some of his parishioners "expect, not that the Gospel shall be preached & the sacraments administered with fidelity, but that the clergyman preaching according to their taste, shall be their tool in all political questions touching their temporal interests, & their slave in everything."<sup>94</sup>

There was, as Bishop Broughton agreed in a marginal comment which he inserted into Gregor's report, much truth in this. Some of the more aggressive laymen were only too ready to use their contributions as a lever to force their will on their clergyman, and Gregor was not alone among the English clergy who came to Australia in the nineteenth century and saw in the voluntary system a threat to the fulfilment of the prophetic function of the church without fear or favour. Yet in most cases their anxiety was exaggerated, for as Broughton commented, those clergymen who exhibited "judgment, force of character, activity in his calling, and an irreproachable life", could overcome this danger.<sup>95</sup>

These elements all militated against the exercise of a powerful influence by Gregor in the life of the small community. One other factor inherent in the nature of the pioneering situation rendered Gregor's lasting effectiveness more difficult. Settlement in the forties was still very much in a state of flux. That Brisbane and Ipswich would grow into important centres was clear; but it was not so clear which of the other small settlements might become permanent towns. It was useless, then, to try to build churches:

It will be apparent, that among a population at once thin and widely scattered, the erection of churches at present would be an almost totally useless work, inasmuch as no considerable number of people could assemble in them for prayers, and the hearing of the word of God; and there being little prospect of an increase of population, as well as great uncertainty respecting the place in which population, when it does increase, may concentrate, it is difficult to divine where, in future times, temples of God may arise, with their spires pointing to heaven.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., pp. 200-201.

<sup>92</sup> The evidence on whether Gregor received help from government funds is highly confusing. A return of government expenditure for clergy and churches at Moreton Bay in "Papers Relating to the Separation of the Moreton Bay District from New South Wales", In British Parliamentary Papers, 1857-8, Vol. XLI, p. 47, shows expenditure as follows:

1843	£100
1844	£100
1845	£336
1846	£235
1847	£374

Yet Bishop Broughton wrote to the S.P.G. ON 22 June 1844 ( in S.P.G."C" Mss.) that the government had paid Gregor nothing; and again on 13 November 1847 that Gregor had received nothing from the government either in 1846 or 1847. This is confirmed by the fact that a meeting of parishioners of St. John's in 1846 wanted to raise sufficient income for Gregor to be eligible to receive government aid under the provision of the act of 1836. (see M.B. Courier, 1 October 1846).

<sup>93</sup> M.B. Courier, 12 June 1847.

<sup>94</sup> Gregor's Missionary Return, 1845.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid.

<sup>96</sup> Gregor, J., Journal of Missionary Tours, p.41

This meant that Gregor could have little of that personal satisfaction of founding centres of church life which, however weak they might be for the present, would be certain to become strongholds of faith in the future. For the most part, he had none of the consolation of seeing concrete results from his work.

There was a note of pathos about the pioneering ministry of John Gregor at Moreton Bay. His was a lonely task, and in no instance was his isolation more pathetically demonstrated than in the end of his life. On 22 January 1848 Gregor's death came suddenly and unexpectedly by drowning, as he sought refuge from the midsummer heat in a waterhole at Nundah. The funeral arrangements were crude: there was no professional undertaker, and the hearse that carried his body to St. John's Church an old vegetable cart; nor was there a fellow priest to read the burial office in the church. So without a service in the little building that Gregor himself had prepared and dedicated as a church, the body was taken in disorderly procession to the cemetery where a military officer committed the body to the grave.<sup>97</sup>

Settled in the regular routine of an established parish John Gregor might well have carried on a faithful, if unspectacular, ministry. The tragedy was that he was a second-rate man placed in a position where only a first-rate man could have succeeded. Working without the fellowship of another priest with whom he might have shared the spiritual and physical burden, and without the support and guidance of his bishop – for Broughton was never able to visit Moreton Bay – this man, new in the ministry of the Church of England, was given a colossal task. It is scarcely surprising that his achievements were limited, and that the church failed to penetrate in depth the life of an unspiritual community. Yet it was to his credit that for five years he held on; and already a few days before his death the first bishop of the new Diocese of Newcastle had landed in Australia. With him came the promise of better things for the church at Moreton Bay.

---

<sup>97</sup> M.B. Courier, 29 January and 5 February 1848.

## CHAPTER 5: PREPARATIONS FOR SELF-GOVERNMENT

### i. The Leadership of Bishop Tyrrell.

In January 1848 the Right Reverend William Tyrrell commenced work in the new Diocese of Newcastle, which embraced Moreton Bay as its northern outpost. The choice of Tyrrell as first bishop was a happy one. While he was not a spectacular personality, he was vigorous, far-sighted, systematic in his personal life and diocesan affairs, a fair scholar, a sound statesman, and above all a real pastor – in fact, just the type needed for a new Australian diocese. Indeed, the Australian church has cause to be thankful for all three men consecrated for the new dioceses in 1847. William Tyrrell, Charles Perry and Augustus Short, though differing in many respects in character and outlook, were all first-rate pioneering bishops who devoted years of their lives to the work of building up the church in Australia. Tyrrell's episcopate was so significant for the church at Moreton Bay that we must look briefly at the man himself.<sup>98</sup>

The key to Tyrrell's long and highly effective episcopate was his deep and disciplined spiritual life.<sup>99</sup> Even in the midst of anxious business or wearying travel his life never lost that order and regularity that marked everything he did. Each day when he was at home he gave two hours to devotions and four hours to the study of divinity, as well as the hours he spent on administrative and pastoral work. Everything he did was committed to the guidance of God, as illustrated from a passage in his diary:

Many serious thoughts about my Diocese, and how it can be ordered for the best. The difficulties very great, and make me very anxious. May I be enabled by the most careful employment of my time to fit myself for the discharge of all my difficult duties, as Overseer of this Diocese...Let there be also much serious careful meditation....Friday in each week to be kept as a day of seclusion and fasting, and devoted to preparation for the Sunday...O Lord, give me wisdom to go in and out before thy people, and to train up an earnest and efficient Clergy. Grant this in the Name and for the sake of Jesus Christ.<sup>100</sup>

This example of order and self-discipline could not help making its mark on the clergy and people of his diocese, and these were qualities that were sorely needed in the undisciplined turbulence of an expanding colony. It is true that at Moreton Bay the clergy and people were distant from the daily oversight of their bishop; but his earnestness of purpose and ordered life were amply demonstrated in his faithful pastoral visits to the northern extremity of his diocese. Every second year he came, no matter what the difficulties. The trip involved a long hard ride on horseback on 1100 to 1500 miles according to the route taken, though sometimes he made the return journey by sea. Sometimes weather conditions were dreadful, sometimes his own health made riding almost unbearable. But still he came, and the account in his diary of his northern tour of 1856 reveals the courage of the man:

When I reached Darling Downs, the parsonage of the Rev. B. Glennie at Drayton, tho' it was only ten in the morning, I was obliged at once to go to bed over-wearied and full of pain. During Tuesday, the day of my arrival, and Wednesday and Thursday, I had appointed to remain at Drayton, to settle many matters connected with the Church in that district. For these three days I did not leave my bed, except to hold a Confirmation which I would not allow to be put off. I was in violent incessant pain from over-exertion; got no sleep by day or night: could take no food: and the most violent medicines which the doctor could give me produced no effect. On the third day he expressed his opinion of the danger if his medicine did not very soon act; and I shall not forget the expression of his countenance, when I told him that I could remain under his care only that one night more, as at dawn the next morning I must leave Drayton on horseback, for my next station 52 miles off, where I had appointed to hold a service in the evening. No change for the better took place: and on Friday morning, just at sunrise, with much difficulty from my great weakness and pain, I mounted my horse, and some time after the sun was set, reached Franklin Vale, my appointed resting place for the night. It was a day to be remembered – the heat was overpowering, the roads scarcely passable, and the suffering from pain, weakness and fatigue very great. The doctor still declares that I ought to have died that day, but in truth the intense exertion did for me what medicine could not do, and though very weak for some days, I gradually recovered.<sup>101</sup>

Here is the clue to one of Tyrrell's greatest qualities as a leader: he was willing to do himself all that he asked of his subordinates.

<sup>98</sup> A much more detailed study of the character and work of Bishop Tyrrell than is possible here may be found in Elkin, A.P., The Diocese of Newcastle, especially in chaps. 23 and 24. The much older work of Boodle, R.G., The Life and Labours of William Tyrrell, D.D., is also valuable in giving the picture from the viewpoint of one of the bishop's chaplains. In this chapter I am much indebted to Dr. Elkin's detailed and careful study of Tyrrell and his part in the growth of the church at Moreton Bay.

<sup>99</sup> Elkin, A.P., op.cit., p.450

<sup>100</sup> Boodle, R.G., op.cit., pp.63-4

<sup>101</sup> Quoted from Bishop Tyrrell's diary in Elkin, A.P., op.cit., pp.419-420.

Under this leadership the church at Moreton Bay at last began to make distinct headway. Not only did the bishop have courage, self-discipline and ability. He also had a firm belief in the mission of the Church of England, and in the authority which he as a bishop of the church must exercise. In no sense a ritualist, he had nevertheless been deeply influenced by the basic doctrines of the catholic revival in the Church of England, and was prepared to stand firm on these principles. He exercised his episcopal authority courteously, but firmly, and such authority was just what was needed to deal with the centrifugal tendencies of church life at Moreton Bay. It was not long before members of the church in the north were well aware that they had a new bishop!

## ii. Benjamin Glennie : Apostle of Queensland.

No matter how able the bishop, much must depend on the clergy in the parishes. One of Tyrrell's first problems on taking over the diocese was to fill the vacancy left by the death of John Gregor at Moreton Bay. No one, however, could immediately be spared, and for two months the church in Brisbane lacked a pastor.<sup>102</sup> On 25 March 1848, however there arrived in Brisbane from Newcastle the Reverend Benjamin Glennie, B.A., whose pioneer work was to give him a unique place in the history of the church in Queensland for the half-century until his death at the age of 88 in 1900.

It was a great task that faced Glennie on his arrival in Brisbane. He was not yet even in priest's orders, having been made a deacon by Bishop Tyrrell only two days before he embarked for Brisbane.<sup>103</sup> At his ordination, however, he was already of mature years, being 35 years of age. Glennie, who had come out with Tyrrell as an ordination candidate, was a graduate of Christ's College, Cambridge, where he had been in residence from 1843-1847. Previous to that he had lived in London, where he had been brought into contact with the beginnings of the Tractarian movement, through his regular attendance at King's College Chapel, London, which the Times had described (with some exaggeration) as a 'hotbed of Tractarianism'. This, however, was Tractarianism in its early form, and in externals there was little difference from other churches; the vesture of the clergy, for example, still consisted only of surplice and hood, the stole was never worn, and the old type of black preaching gown was still in use.<sup>104</sup> Meanwhile Glennie's college chapel at Cambridge remained untouched by the catholic revival. The result was that when Glennie first came to Brisbane he belonged to the more 'advanced' school of his day; but later in his life he came to be regarded by his younger colleagues as something of a low churchman.

These were the days before theological colleges had become a part of the typical Anglican scene, and Glennie's preparation for the ministry consisted of directed reading under the guidance of Bishop Tyrrell and his examining chaplains. The whole journey from England was taken up with a planned course of study for Glennie and the other six ordination candidates who accompanied the bishop, and the ordination took place a short time after arrival. It was little enough preparation for a man who for a time was to be quite alone in his vast cure, and who would throughout his long life occupy an important place in the life of the church in the new colony. Yet so thorough was the training given by Bishop Tyrrell, and so strong the example of his own disciplined life, that habits of prayer, study and perseverance were formed in Glennie that remained with him throughout his life.<sup>105</sup>

In appearance Glennie was not an impressive figure. Small and spare of stature, he had an impediment in his speech which reflected a natural nervousness of temperament and which hindered him from being a great preacher. But he was simple and direct, in manner and in speech, and this appealed to bush people more than pretentious eloquence.<sup>106</sup> Although he lived to a ripe age his health was never robust, and there are indications in his diary of repeated physical and nervous ailments in his early years at Moreton Bay. In his second year there he had to be ordered a month's rest by his doctor, and there is a terse note in his diary about that time, "Hysterics at Kangaroo Point", a reference apparently to himself.<sup>107</sup> The following year, after a strenuous ride of almost five hundred miles with his indefatigable bishop, he wrote, "...not very beneficial to my nerves. For many weeks afterwards I was in a nervous irritable state."<sup>108</sup> For a man of his temperament and devotion to his mission, it was above all the thought of the scope of the work to be done, and the amount that he must leave undone, that weighed him down.<sup>109</sup> Several times in the early years it seemed that he would have to

<sup>102</sup> The statement in Boodle, R.G., *op.cit.*, p.43, that the Rev. P. Beamish of Singleton was sent temporarily to Moreton Bay, which is repeated in Elkin, A.P., *op.cit.* P. 155, is not supported by any evidence, and is directly contradicted by Benjamin Glennie's reminiscences in St.John's Parish Chronicle, February, 1889.

<sup>103</sup> Glennie was made a deacon on 19 March 1848, and ordained priest on Trinity Sunday 1849.

<sup>104</sup> Glennie's reminiscences, St.John's Parish Chronicle, December, 1888.

<sup>105</sup> One curious example of the habit of study which Glennie had acquired is mentioned by E.C. Osborn in a memoir in the Church of England Papers, Oxley Library. Every Monday morning Glennie devoted to the study of Shakespeare, a remarkable discipline in view of his itinerant life

<sup>106</sup> The correspondent of the M.B. Courier, 22 April 1848, praised Glennie's first sermon at Ipswich as being 'simple in the extreme and admirably adapted to his hearers, being purely scriptural.'

<sup>107</sup> Glennie Diary, 7 October 1849.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., July 1850.

<sup>109</sup> Colonial Church Chronicle, Vol.III (1849-50), p.120



retire from the strenuous pioneering work at Moreton Bay; but such was the courage and perseverance of the man that he not only remained, but lived to see the seeds which he had planted bearing rich fruit.

While Glennie was ministering alone in Brisbane in 1848 and 1849, he could do no more than follow Gregor's example of visiting Ipswich once a month, making occasional trips through the Brisbane and Logan valleys, and spending a month of the year on the Darling Downs. Even on his first journey from Brisbane in 1848 he ranged as far as St. Ruth (near Dalby), Cecil Plains, Jondaryan, Yandilla and Canning Downs (near Warwick).<sup>110</sup> At this time there was till no settlement between Ipswich and Drayton, with the exception of four houses. In the fifties, when Drayton became his headquarters, Glennie averaged, on horse and foot, about three thousand miles a year. It was only when he became Rector of Warwick in 1860 that he was provided with a gig to make travelling easier; in any case, it would have been of little use in the earlier years, as tracks were often unmade, and particularly in wet seasons it would have been impracticable for crossing the flooded creek-beds.

As well as the physical hardships and perils of travel through the lonely country, difficulties of lesser kinds stood frequently in Glennie's way. There could be for him none of the satisfaction of ministering to large congregations, with the beauty and dignity of worship in fine churches. Services took place wherever a congregation could be conveniently assembled. The first place for service on the Downs in Glennie's time was Horton's Bull's Head Inn at Drayton<sup>111</sup>; later, before the church was built, he used part of the Drayton parsonage for services; at Warwick the court-house was used; in the bush, congregations gathered at the station homesteads. These places presented their own peculiar problems. Once at Leyburn in 1853 Glennie noted, "Kirby's Public House in too drunken a state to hold a service. Adjourned to Young's."<sup>112</sup> On another occasion his troubles were of a different kind, but his diary records that they were triumphantly overcome by degrees:

May 10, 1855. "in dressing killed 25 fleas..."

May 11, 1855. "Killed 19 fleas in flannel waistcoat..."

May 12, 1855. "Killed only two fleas while dressing..."

More important, however, was the lack of response that was so often shown by the people to whom he had gone to such pains to minister. Attendances at church were sometimes fairly good, but there were many irregular churchgoers. It was a gloomy comment on Christmas Day 1854: "Most melancholy Xmas Day. Four women at Holy Communion while there was great feasting in all directions."<sup>113</sup> But perhaps worst of all his trials was that spiritual loneliness which he had as the sole priest in an environment that was wrapped up in material concerns. The lack of the possibility of companionship with other likeminded men weighed down many of the early clergy in Australia.<sup>114</sup>

The meagre response that was indicated by poor church attendances was also apparent in the financial difficulties that Glennie had to face. He was himself a generous man. When, in 1854, he received a legacy of £450, Glennie gave half of it to the funds of the Newcastle Church Society.<sup>115</sup>

The following year he gave another £75. Yet not infrequently the payment of his own stipend – or at least that part of it that came from the subscriptions of his people – was lagging. Even when members of the church began to learn to contribute to the church they were apt to be narrow in their spirit of generosity. They expected immediate and visible returns from their payments, in the shape of more frequent services at their own small centre and more regular visits from the clergyman. There was little sympathetic understanding of the great scope of Glennie's labours: in the 1851 drought, for example, while Glennie was having trouble even buying feed for his horse, the Warwick people withheld their contributions to the stipend fund. When support was asked for more remote fields of church work, as in Bishop Tyrrell's appeal for overseas missions, the Canning Downs Folk, except the servants, gave a blank refusal.<sup>116</sup> Indeed, it was all too often the wealthier people who were less ready to give.

On occasions when his stipend lagged, Glennie took a firm stand that it be paid. It was not only that he needed the money to live: more important was the fact that he believed it to be morally wrong that his people should fail to fulfil their

<sup>110</sup> Warwick at this time had just been proclaimed a township, but only consisted of two or three humpies.

<sup>111</sup> It is not, however, correct to say that these were the first services on the Darling Downs, as has often been said in the past. As we have seen, Gregor conducted services on the Downs from 1843 onwards.

<sup>112</sup> Glennie Diary, 6 November 1853.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid., 25 December 1854.

<sup>114</sup> In speaking of Glennie's loneliness, it might be mentioned that he did not marry until the age of 56, when he was Rector of Warwick.

<sup>115</sup> Newcastle Church Society Report, 1854.

<sup>116</sup> Glennie Diary, 30 March 1851.

obligations. Sometimes he took strong measures to remind people of this duty, but he did it in such a way that it was never a cause of resentment except for a small minority of malcontents.<sup>117</sup>

Even while faced with such difficulties of stirring up a concern with spiritual things and keeping his head above water financially, Benjamin Glennie never lost a vision of the future. He set about a programme of buying land in the various centres which he expected to become important in the future, especially on the Darling Downs, where most of his work was accomplished. At Drayton, the Swamp (Toowoomba), Warwick, Dalby, and at other places as well in later years, he chose land to be obtained either by government grant or by purchase. He had a vision of four churches to be named after the four evangelists – Matthew, Mark, Luke and John – and he lived to see those buildings arise at Drayton, Warwick, Toowoomba and Dalby respectively. He also raised large sums of money to build and endow church schools,<sup>118</sup> partly by his own efforts at growing and selling vegetables for the fund. So, step by step, with little to encourage him, he played a great part in laying the foundations of the Church of England in southern Queensland.

With all this, the thing that was most remembered about Glennie was his tenderness and pastoral zeal, his care for each one of his scattered flock. A memoir, probably written by W.H. Groom, sums up the impression left upon those who knew him:

He was the living personification of what a good clergyman should be. He was one of the kindest and gentlest of men, one to whom anger was foreign, and his calm, placid, sweet temperament made him beloved by old and young alike. When he visited the stations, the little children ran to meet and welcome him with outstretched hands, and eager joy in their faces, for to them he was truly the 'Gentle Shepherd'.<sup>119</sup>

It was in this role that Benjamin Glennie really left his mark. This man who came to Moreton Bay as a lone, inexperienced deacon was in 1863 to be appointed first Archdeacon of Brisbane, and was frequently called upon to administer the Diocese of Brisbane in the absence or indisposition of the bishop. It was a well-deserved honour when, towards the close of his active ministry, Bishop Webber appointed him the first Honorary Canon of St. John's Pro-cathedral. Yet it was not for these honours that he achieved eminence, but rather in those dedicated pioneering labours that render appropriate the title sometimes accorded to Glennie: the Apostle of Queensland.

### **iii. The Growth of the Parishes**

From the time of the arrival of Benjamin Glennie in 1848, the population of that part of New South Wales that would eventually form the colony of Queensland was steadily rising. The growth of population is demonstrated in the five-yearly census figures:

Year	Population
1846	2,525
1851	8,575
1856	17,082
1861	30,059

Thus, in fifteen years, the population multiplied almost twelve times. This growth represented a challenge to the church to keep its ministrations up to the rate of growing population, and it was a problem that very much exercised the mind of Bishop Tyrrell. The problem was magnified by the ever-widening geographical extent of settlement. While Brisbane and Ipswich were growing to be sizeable towns, the population of the Darling Downs was becoming quite large, and the 1856 census showed a population of 3977 already on the Downs. Settlement was also widespread in the Burnett Valley and Wide Bay, which in 1856 showed populations of 1,309 and 669 respectively, while Maryborough was becoming a township

---

<sup>117</sup> Canon James Matthews, who began his ministry as Glennie's curate at Warwick, recalled one of Glennie's methods of reminding his people that they had fallen down on their duty of providing his stipend: "There were times when our dear old friend was peculiar, verging almost on the eccentric, e.g. he had an extraordinary suit of clothes, consisting of a blue frock coat, with a high collar, and very tight sleeves, considerably rubbed at the elbows, a pair of rather short grey trousers, which displayed a good deal of white sock. An old cabbage-tree hat completed the costume. Whenever his stipend was in arrear, he donned this suit, and continued to wear it in the parish until the reason for his doing so no longer existed."

(Quoted in the Church of England Papers, Oxley Library.)

Even while Glennie was Rector of Warwick, 1860-1872, his stipend fell into arrears, and he left the parish with some £80 owing to him. On his insistence, however, it was paid after he left. (Warwick Vestry Minute Book, 13 January 1870 and 4 December 1871.)

<sup>118</sup> Glennie Diary December, 1855.

<sup>119</sup> Church of England Papers, Oxley Library.

of some note. From 1853, settlement had been springing up around Port Curtis and a population of 615 was shown in Port Curtis and Leichardt by 1856.<sup>120</sup>

Bishop Tyrrell was aware from his regular visits to Moreton Bay of the needs of this part of his diocese, but he was hampered by the perennial difficulties of manpower and finance. So Glennie, while still in deacon's orders, had to be left on his own in this great part of the diocese.

Glennie quickly set about putting church life in Brisbane on a firmer basis. Within a fortnight of his arrival he re-commenced the Sunday School, which had fallen into decay. He began preparing candidates for Confirmation, and was ready to present the first eight candidates to the bishop on his visit in June 1848. Free passages were arranged on the ferries from Kangaroo Point and South Brisbane for the benefit of Sunday churchgoers. The service of Evening Prayer was restored at St. John's after having been discontinued in the later part of Gregor's incumbency.<sup>121</sup>

The visit of Bishop Tyrrell in June gave an immediate impetus to the awakening of church life. Tyrrell quickly set about making plans for the future. He gathered together the most prominent members of the church in Brisbane to discuss plans for building a new church, school and parsonage. It was obvious that the old church could no longer suffice. It was, as the Courier put it, in a 'dilapidated and ruinous condition'<sup>122</sup>, and already before Gregor's death some money had been collected for its replacement by a worthier structure. Tyrrell planned for a church to seat 250 people, to be designed by the eminent Parramatta architect, E.T. Blacket,<sup>123</sup> of which the nave should be built first, the chancel and tower later. Actually the tower was never built, partly because of the expense of building such a pseudo-Gothic stone church in inflationary years; expense also caused a limitation of size, which resulted in the fact that it was never big enough from the time it was consecrated.<sup>124</sup> Having gained the support of the Brisbane church people, Tyrrell applied for a grant of land from the government, and was given a site of two acres for a church, school and parsonage.<sup>125</sup> The foundation stone of St. John's was laid by the bishop on his second visit to Brisbane on 6 July 1850, and the building that was to be the mother church of Queensland for half a century was consecrated on 29 October 1854.<sup>126</sup>

Bishop Tyrrell's deliberate financial policy gave a considerable impetus to building schemes in the Moreton Bay district. On his visit in 1850 the bishop saw the need of a parsonage, but he recognised that the burden of building a new church made it difficult for the local people to raise enough money quickly for the purpose of a parsonage as well. So Tyrrell made a loan of £200 at a rate of five percent which, added to money received from other sources, made possible a £300 government subsidy under the provisions of Bourke's Act.<sup>127</sup> He actually broke the letter of the regulations of the S.P.G. in using their funds for this type of scheme, and also pursued the adventurous, but risky, policy of lending a large portion of the diocesan endowment for parochial building purposes.<sup>128</sup> The result could have been disastrous if one of the recurrent economic crises of the nineteenth century had made it impossible for parishes to repay their loans. Actually, however, the policy proved to be highly successful: church building schemes were greatly stimulated, and in the case of the loan for the Brisbane parsonage it was paid back within five years.

Not only in Brisbane itself did building occupy a good deal of the bishop's attention on his biennial visits. On his first visit to Ipswich in 1848 Tyrrell personally solicited for funds for a church, but the response of £120 was only sufficient for a school to be projected instead. There was, however, a contention between the bishop and the local committee over the site, and a schoolmaster arrived to find no building erected, and he had to be withdrawn to Brisbane. Tyrrell was not, however, easily diverted from a fixed intention; and his 1850 visit did result in the building of both a school-church and a parsonage.<sup>129</sup> At Drayton, too, arrangements were made in 1850 for a parsonage-church to be built as the centre of the new projected

<sup>120</sup> Census figures quoted from Elkin, A.P., op.cit., p. 238

<sup>121</sup> Glennie's reminiscences in St. John's Parish Chronicle, February 1889.

<sup>122</sup> M.B. Courier, 22 April 1848.

<sup>123</sup> Among Blacket's buildings were the main building of the University of Sydney, St. Andrew's Cathedral (only part of which was his) and other well-known Sydney churches.

<sup>124</sup> Selwyn Letters p. 66. For other details on the building of St. John's see M.B. Courier 24 June 1848, and 13 January 1855. The church when completed actually cost over £1500, of which a little more than £700 was provided out of a government subsidy, and the remainder locally subscribed.

<sup>125</sup> Col. Secretary to Capt. Wickham, 10 July 1848, in Col. Sec. Correspondence. The grant included the site on which St. John's was built in George St., where Queen's Park and the Executive Building now stand, as well as the site of the original church on the corner of Queen St. and North Quay.

<sup>126</sup> M.B. Courier, 28 June 1850, 31 August 1850 and 4 November 1854. John Petrie was the builder of the church.

<sup>127</sup> Newcastle Church Society Report, 1851.

<sup>128</sup> Ibid., 1855, shows that £8000 of the total diocesan endowment of £14,000 was available for building loans to parishes in that year.

<sup>129</sup> For the controversy over the Ipswich buildings, see M.B. Courier, 24 June 1848, 14 October 1848 30 December 1848, 11 August 1849, and 28 June 1850.

parochial district on the Darling Downs.<sup>130</sup> It is noticeable that though Glennie and the other clergy were constantly pushing ahead with raising money for buildings, it was during the bishop's visits that definite forward steps were taken. By virtue of his episcopal office Tyrrell commanded that measure of authority and respect which enabled him to overrule local dissensions to a great extent, and he had the personal initiative to enable him to use this advantage to the full.<sup>131</sup>

So the foundations were laid by Bishop Tyrrell and by Benjamin Glennie under his bishop's direction, for the first division of the vast area of southern Queensland into smaller parishes. At first, as we have seen, Glennie had to concentrate most of his efforts around Brisbane; but the need for resident clergymen at Ipswich and the Darling Downs had long been apparent. When Glennie was away in the country, Captain Wickham continued to act as lay reader at St. John's, and from October 1848 there was some slight relief afforded by the arrival of the Reverend T.W. Bodenham from Sydney. Bodenham had come to Moreton Bay for health reasons, and so precarious was his health that the bishop had not formally licensed him to work at Brisbane. His arrival did mean, however, that there could be occasional celebrations of Holy Communion, which had so far been impossible because Glennie was still in deacon's orders. Bodenham lived at Kangaroo Point, a growing centre of population, and early in 1849 made his house available for regular Sunday afternoon services, at which the congregation quickly increased to fifty.<sup>132</sup> Later that year a small wooden church was built at Kangaroo Point, which served as a church until the stone St. Mary's was built in 1873.<sup>133</sup> The arrival of the Reverend Robert Creyke later in 1849 afforded added relief, but he, too, was in such a poor state of health that he could offer only occasional assistance.<sup>134</sup>

Despite his great field of pastoral work, Glennie pioneered other activities outside his normal parish round in Brisbane. He was, for example, appointed chaplain to the Brisbane gaol:<sup>135</sup> and he took an interest in the establishment of a public hospital in Brisbane.<sup>136</sup> This was a significant contrast to his predecessor, who avoided all part in public life, and it marked the beginning of a new phase in the life of the church inasmuch as it implied the acceptance of the church's role in civic affairs which were not religious in the narrow sense.<sup>137</sup>

At the same time as Benjamin Glennie was raised to the priesthood in 1849 at Morpeth, John Wallace was made a deacon. Wallace, a graduate of Durham, had come to New South Wales as an ordination candidate, and had been reading for holy orders under the direction of the Reverend H.O. Irwin at Singleton. With the increase of his clerical staff, Bishop Tyrrell proposed to send Wallace to Moreton Bay, with the intention of stationing him at Ipswich. He did in fact spend a short time there in 1849, but soon had to be withdrawn to Brisbane to relieve the ailing Glennie, who was allocated light duties on the Darling Downs. The arrival of the Reverend H.O. Irwin about October 1850 enabled the final division which the bishop contemplated for the time being. He took charge of Brisbane, while Wallace returned to Ipswich and Glennie remained on the Darling Downs. Glennie's time was to be equally divided between Drayton and Warwick, but his headquarters were at Drayton, which seemed likely to be much more important than Toowoomba, "the Swamp", as it was still known. Eventually these three parishes of Brisbane, Ipswich and the Darling Downs were intended to form the nucleus of a northern archdeaconry of the Diocese of Newcastle; but the new Diocese of Brisbane had been formed before this proposal could be effected.<sup>138</sup>

This division into three parochial districts naturally meant a more effective ministry of the church at Moreton Bay. Yet already the expansion of settlement was creating a need for further parochial divisions. To the north the township of Maryborough was too distant to be served by the priest at Brisbane. By 1851 there were three hundred people in the town

<sup>130</sup> M.B. Courier, 22 June 1850.

<sup>131</sup> The dependence on the bishop is well illustrated from a comment of A.E. Selwyn, when H.C. Irwin was incumbent of St. John's in 1851: "He is very anxious for the Bishop's arrival also, as he says everything is going wrong. He cannot get any money etc., and the church has come to a standstill. I think there is some truth in what he says, that the Bishop, taking so direct a part in all proceedings as he does, can less easily be spared than if he were a less active person." (Selwyn Letters, p.87).

<sup>132</sup> Glennie's reminiscences in St. John's Parish Chronicle, March 1889.

<sup>133</sup> This church was very small, only 50 feet by 20, with an aisle so narrow that only one person could walk down it. The land in John St., on which it was situated, was given by Captain Wickham. The Rev. T.W. Bodenham returned to Sydney in May 1850 where he died soon afterwards. For further details of early church life at Kangaroo Point, see St. John's Parish Chronicle, March 1889 and the small pamphlet, Centenary of the Parish of St. Mary the Virgin, Kangaroo Point.

<sup>134</sup> Selwyn Letters, p.15 Creyke's health gradually improved, and after some years as District Registrar at Moreton Bay, and Deputy-Registrar of the new colony of Queensland, Creyke later undertook full-time parish duties again after some twenty years.

<sup>135</sup> Col.Sec. to Capt. Wickham, 18 February 1850, Col.Sec. Correspondence.

<sup>136</sup> M.B. Courier, 20 May 1848.

<sup>137</sup> There were several interesting examples of civic duties taken up by early clergymen. Creyke's work as Registrar has already been mentioned; the Rev. J.R. Moffatt became first Parliamentary Librarian in the new colony; and the Rev. John Bliss was appointed official meteorological observer in 1866, while carrying on his parish duties.

<sup>138</sup> M.B. Courier, 22 June 1850.

of Maryborough<sup>139</sup>, and many more in the districts of Wide Bay and the Burnett Valley. Tyrrell realised the need, but there was no priest to send.<sup>140</sup>

Such was the urgency of the request from the settlers, however, that Tyrrell resolved to send one of his ordination candidates, G. Hungerford, to act as catechist.<sup>141</sup> Regular services were carried on by laymen at Maryborough until the Reverend Edward Tanner arrived from Melbourne in 1853, and the voluntary labour that made possible the building of a wooden slab school-church that year for only £30 demonstrated the keenness of some of the members of the church.<sup>142</sup> Unfortunately, however, Maryborough had a succession of three incumbents in the fifties, so that there was little continuity of work, and from 1859 to 1861 the parish was vacant. This fact, combined with the great area of the district, meant that the country districts were not very adequately cared for. From Gayndah, in particular, came complaints. One correspondent castigated Bishop Tyrrell on behalf of this “shamefully neglected flock”<sup>143</sup>, and indeed, the fact that divine service was held there only five times from 1857 to 1859 gives some justification to these complaints. At one time some of the Anglicans at Gayndah even threatened to secure a minister from another denomination.<sup>144</sup> The growing town of Gladstone, which numbered two hundred people by 1856,<sup>145</sup> received even less attention, and apart from a visit from the Rev. T.L. Dodd of Maryborough in 1856, seems to have received no ministrations of the church.

It was, of course, very easy to criticise this apparent lack of care for the scattered members of the church; but it has to be remembered that the scattering of small communities over large areas of the continent was placing an impossible strain upon the very limited resources of the church in Australia at this time.<sup>146</sup>

There was one further parochial division before the formation of the Diocese of Brisbane. Brisbane itself was growing rapidly; by 1856 its population was 4395 and St. John’s Church was proving inadequate. When the Reverend E. K. Yeatman succeeded Irwin in 1855, he found St. John’s was already overcrowded on Sundays, and there was need of extra accommodation. He therefore arranged for the Reverend James Carter, who was conducting a private school in Brisbane, to take services every alternate Sunday in the North Brisbane schoolroom.<sup>147</sup> During the same year a school was being built in South Brisbane, and presumably, in accordance with the usual custom, was also used for Sunday services. The other area where population was growing was Fortitude Valley, and in 1856 Yeatman rented a house where school, as well as Sunday services, could be held. This increase of church centres in Brisbane was, however, becoming too much for one man, so a church meeting agreed that another clergyman should be sought. In 1857 the Reverend Bowyer E. Shaw arrived to assist Yeatman, and soon took charge of the Fortitude Valley district, which became a separate parochial district which included New Farm, Bowen Hills, Enoggera and Sandgate.<sup>148</sup> Shaw remained only two years in Brisbane, and the parish of Fortitude Valley, like Maryborough was vacant when the first Bishop of Brisbane arrived.<sup>149</sup>

So it was that under the guidance of Bishop Tyrrell the nucleus of a parochial system was established in the fifties. There were five parishes – North Brisbane, Fortitude Valley, Ipswich, Darling Downs and Maryborough, of which the last two in particular covered great areas of country. It was as yet a small nucleus, and the church was scarcely keeping pace in its parochial organisation with the growing needs of the community; but a foundation had been laid on which the first Bishop of Brisbane could build.<sup>150</sup>

<sup>139</sup> Pugh’s Almanac, 1860, p.89

<sup>140</sup> Newcastle Church Society Report, 1852, p.56.

<sup>141</sup> Bishop Tyrrell to Rev. E. Hawkins, (S.P.G.), 15 January 1853, S.P.G. “D” Mss. Newcastle Letters.

<sup>142</sup> Perry, Hope, St.Paul’s Maryborough Centenary.

<sup>143</sup> M.B. Courier, 28 July 1858.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 1 December 1858, 30 March 1859.

<sup>145</sup> Pugh’s almanac, 1856, p.89

<sup>146</sup> For further details of the early history of the church at Maryborough, see Elkin, A.P., op.cit., pp. 186 and 743f.

<sup>147</sup> M.B.Courier, 6 September, 1856.

<sup>148</sup> For the early history of the church at Fortitude Valley, see also typescript at Church House, Brisbane, Trinity Church – 1856 to 1918 – Fortitude Valley.

<sup>149</sup> Shaw returned to Brisbane in 1862, and for a while conducted a collegiate school, as well as having charge of the church at South Brisbane.

<sup>150</sup> A complete list of the parishes, with those who ministered in them up to 1859, may be of interest:-

Brisbane.

Rev. John Gregor, M.A.	1843-48
Rev. Benjamin Glennie, B.A.	1848-50
Rev. John Wallace, B.A.	1850 (Acting)
Rev. H. O. Irwin, M.A.	1850-55
Rev. Edward Kelson Yeatman, M.A.	1855-58
Rev. John Mosley	1858-60

Ipswich

Rev. John Wallace, B.A.	1849 (briefly and 1850-55)
-------------------------	----------------------------

This development of a parochial system was accompanied by a steady construction of churches, schoolhouses, parsonages and teachers' residences. Some of the initial building projects have already been mentioned. The usual pattern was that the first building to be erected was a school, which could also be used for church services, and then a parsonage for the clergymen. A building that served only as a church was something of a luxury at the very beginning, and indeed Brisbane was the only centre to start with a consecrated church which did not also serve as a school. Bishop Tyrrell's visit in 1850 resulted, as we have seen, in a wave of building. Parsonages were built at Brisbane, Ipswich and Drayton and a school-church at Ipswich, while the foundation stone of St. John's was laid in Brisbane. After this, however, there was a period of stagnation, partly because of the high building prices of these years, and it is notable that it took four years to build St. John's. By 1856, however, funds had been accumulated, and another series of building projects took place. By 1857 school-churches and master's dwellings had been erected at South Brisbane and Fortitude Valley; a new school-church and a parsonage were built at Maryborough; Gayndah had a parsonage;<sup>151</sup> and at Toowoomba and Warwick slab churches were built – the original St. Luke's and St. Mark's.<sup>152</sup>

Drayton and Jondaryan followed with slab churches in 1858 and 1859 respectively, the latter of which still stands, on a different site, as the oldest wooden church in the Diocese of Brisbane. Meanwhile the most ambitious project of all was being undertaken at Ipswich, where the large brick church to accommodate more than four hundred people was commenced in 1855. Built at a cost of £4000 with the aid of loans from Bishop Tyrrell's endowments, it was a great enterprise for this early stage of development. It was the first indication that the church was beginning to look ahead beyond the temporary pioneering needs.<sup>153</sup>

#### iv. The Beginnings of Self-Support.

Lack of finance was always a limiting factor in the expansion of the church. In the 1850's there were three sources from which money came into the coffers of the church at Moreton Bay – government subsidies, the contributions of the English missionary societies, and local subscriptions. From this income came the stipends of the clergy and the funds for new buildings.

Bishop Tyrrell insisted that the stipends of the clergy should be adequate, and in a pastoral letter in 1854 he set out a proposed 'basic wage' for the clergy of the diocese. In normal times, deacons were to receive £150 a year, priests £200, and after twenty years' service £300, besides the Easter offering of the people. Tyrrell pointed out, however, that times were not normal. The gold discoveries had resulted in inflation and government salaries had been increased by 75%, so he proposed as the basic scale £200, £300, and £400 respectively.<sup>154</sup> As high prices continued the bishop called for the continuance of the high salary rates for the clergy in another letter three years later.<sup>155</sup> In view of the inflated prices, however, even these higher salaries were felt by the clergy themselves to be hopelessly inadequate.<sup>156</sup>

---

Rev. John Mosely	1855-58
Rev. Lacy Henry Rumsey, M.A.	1858-64
<u>Darling Downs</u>	
Rev. Benjamin Glennie, B.A.	1850-60
Rev. William E. Dove	1855-59 (assistant to Glennie)
<u>Maryborough</u>	
Mr. G. Hungerford	1852-53 (catechist)
Rev. Edward Tanner	1853-54
Rev. T,L, Dodd	1854-57
Rev. R. Postlethwaite, B.A.	1857-59
<u>Fortitude Valley</u>	
Rev. Bowyer E. Shaw, B.A.	1857-59
<u>Unattached clergy during this period were:-</u>	
Rev. Thomas Wall Bodenham	1848-50
Rev. Robert Creyke, B.A.	From 1849
Rev. James Carter	1856-57
Rev. J.R. Moffatt, B.A.	Probably from 1858

<sup>151</sup> A temporary church was also planned for Gayndah, but does not appear to have been built.

<sup>152</sup> The cheapness of land is indicated by the fact that Glennie had bought the two acre site for St. Luke's in 1854 for £8.4.0.

<sup>153</sup> Details of building progress may be found in Newcastle Church Society Reports, 1851-59; the Glennie Diary; and M.B. Courier, passim.

<sup>154</sup> Printed Pastoral Letter, 1854.

<sup>155</sup> Letter printed in Newcastle Church Society Report, 1857.

<sup>156</sup> See evidence of clergy before Select Committee of N.S.W. Legislature in 1854, in N.S.W. Votes & Proceedings, 1854, I, pp. 800ff.

As we have seen, the stipends of the clergy in New South Wales had originally been paid entirely out of colonial revenue, but since the act of 1836 government aid was given to the clergy only in proportion to the size of their congregations. There was, besides, a limiting factor in the government grant: the total sum made available for the purpose was restricted to £30,000, which was provided from the funds of the colony but administered by the imperial authorities. With the separation of Victoria in 1851 the amount for New South Wales was reduced to £28,000, to be divided among the Anglican, Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and Wesleyan churches, so that the share of the Diocese of Newcastle was only £3,700. This amount was quite insufficient to provide adequate salaries for all the clergy in the diocese,<sup>157</sup> so that while the clergy in most of the old-established districts received the maximum government grant of £200 and others received £150 or £100 there was nothing left for the clergy in the less wealthy new districts. This must have been what Bishop Tyrrell had in mind when he stated at a meeting in Brisbane in 1848 that Benjamin Glennie was unlikely to receive a government grant because the local act was inconsistent with the imperial regulations.<sup>158</sup>

The result was that comparatively little government money came to the Church of England at Moreton Bay.<sup>159</sup> The stipends of some of the clergy were subsidised by the government and a total of £1000 was given from colonial revenue towards the building of the church and parsonage in Brisbane, but there seems to have been no other government grant for building purposes as the limited money available from revenue was needed for stipends.<sup>160</sup> There were grants of land by the government in various towns for church purposes, as well as assistance for the educational work of the church. This, however, amounted to only a small proportion of the financial needs of the Church of England at Moreton Bay.

By the middle of the nineteenth century it was apparent that the Church of England in Australia could not expect to be permanently endowed by the state. This prospect was received by the clergy with deep regret and considerable opposition. It was with some nostalgia for English conditions that Bishop Tyrrell in a letter to Brisbane referred to the church as 'a widowed Mother, deprived of the support and maintenance which she has enjoyed for centuries in our Fatherland.'<sup>161</sup>In the following year E.K. Yeatman chose an occasion just before the colonial election to preach a sermon denouncing the voluntary principle in religion, and at a public meeting not long afterwards he argued for an established church and for the exclusion of the Roman Catholic Church from state aid.<sup>162</sup> In these views the young Yeatman represented an extreme point of view, but his viewpoint typifies the fears felt by some Anglicans that the withdrawal of state support might prove a mortal blow to the church. Tyrrell's view was more balanced: he realised that it could only be a matter of time before the church would have to stand on its own feet, and he made plans accordingly.

In view of the inadequacy and threatened impermanence of government grants, the assistance of the S.P.G. – and to a lesser extent the S.P.C.K. - was invaluable.. The S.P.G. made an annual grant to Newcastle for work beyond the boundaries, and this alone made possible the pioneering work on the frontiers of settlement. Glennie received £200 from this fund in his first year at Moreton Bay, and as the church pushed outwards, this sum was used for the Darling Downs and Wide Bay.<sup>163</sup> We have noted already the use which Tyrrell made of these S.P.G. funds to stimulate building projects. Relatively small though they were, these funds enabled the bishop to have a flexible approach in the opening up of new spheres of work.

Nevertheless Bishop Tyrrell realised that self-support in finance must be the goal. It was not so easy to persuade the laity of this, as Gregor's failure to raise local contributions in Moreton Bay well indicates. The renting of pews was one expedient universally adopted - and not only in the Church of England – to obtain funds, but this method had certain undesirable features, as we shall have cause to see.

The chief source of local income, however, was from subscriptions to stipend or building funds, and in practice the work of collecting these subscriptions often devolved upon the clergyman. It was obviously an invidious situation for the priest to have to collect his own stipend, and it put him in a difficult position, but there was frequently no alternative as the committees of laymen that were appointed to do this work were apt to show little enthusiasm. A large part of the bishop's own time had to be devoted to this same matter, and Tyrrell made the practice of personally extracting promises from

<sup>157</sup> Elkin, A.P., *op.cit.*, p.211; and Newcastle Church Society Report, 1857.

<sup>158</sup> M.B.Courier, 24 June 1848.

<sup>159</sup> Expenditure for church purposes at Moreton Bay in 1850 and 1851 were £241 and £599 respectively, but only part of these amounts went to the Church of England (N.S.W. Votes & Proceedings, 1850, II, p.235; and 1851, II). In 1854 both H.O. Irwin and B. Glennie were receiving grants, and shared in the extra allocations made because of inflationary conditions (N.S.W. Votes & Proceedings, 1855,I). but in 1859 the only one of the Moreton Bay clergy receiving a government grant appears to have been John Mosely who received £133.6.8 (Newcastle Church Society Report, 1859)

<sup>160</sup> Glennie Diary, 8 June 1853

<sup>161</sup> Quoted in M.B.Courier, 4 August, 1855.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid., 12 April, 1856 and 20 September 1856.

<sup>163</sup> Bishop Tyrrell to S.P.G., 28 May 1851, in S.P.G. "G" Mss. See also Elkin, A.P., *op.cit.*, p. 210.

several prominent churchmen that they would guarantee £100 towards the stipend of any clergyman who might be sent to their district.<sup>164</sup>

Bishop Tyrrell soon realised that the financial question must be approached from a diocesan, rather than a parochial, point of view. He aimed to have a centralised financial system for the whole diocese, which would have several advantages. It would help develop a spirit of unity in the diocese which would demonstrate more clearly the unity of the Body of Christ;<sup>165</sup> it would mean that the old-established parishes whose clergy were almost entirely supported by government grants, could contribute towards the support of the clergy in the outlying districts; and it would minimise the dependence of the clergy on their own congregations for support.

With this in mind Tyrrell established in 1851 the Newcastle Church Society, which was to play a major part in unifying the diocese and putting its finances on a sound footing. The society was composed of all those who contributed ten shillings annually to its funds; and these funds were to be used to support the clergy, erect buildings, maintain church schools, supply Christian literature and extend missionary work among the aborigines and Pacific Islanders. There was to be a branch in each district, with the local clergyman as secretary, and each district was to be represented on the diocesan committee.<sup>166</sup> Not all of the bishop's hopes were realised, but on the whole the result was a resounding success.

It was not until Tyrrell's visit to Brisbane in 1854 that a branch of the society was founded there.<sup>167</sup> By 1856 the diocesan committee of the society included the names of Captain J.C. Wickham, of Brisbane and Colonel M.C. O'Connell of Port Curtis, who was later to become first president of the Legislative Council of Queensland.

The significance of the Newcastle Church Society for the growth of the church in what would soon be Queensland was twofold. On the one hand it did lead to a marked improvement in the regular contributions of members of the church in the north, because contributions from the northern parishes rose from £364 in 1853 to \$1511 in 1858, an increase not wholly to be accounted for by the rise in prices and the growing population. It was a significant beginning on the hard road to financial self-sufficiency, and regular habits of giving were fostered among church people from which better things could develop.<sup>168</sup> On the other hand the society was important as a model to be copied when the new Diocese of Brisbane was formed. Plans for a Brisbane Church Society were later to be copied from the Newcastle pattern, and though later copies were not so successful as the prototype, they did gain from its example.

#### v. Education.

In the mother country education was by long tradition an integral part of the church's work. As we have seen, the beginnings of education in Australia, too, were under the aegis of the church, and the first schools at Moreton Bay were under ecclesiastical supervision. That there was a desperate need for schools needs little demonstration: the fact that at least one of the parties in more than half the weddings solemnised by John Gregor was unable to sign the certificate speaks for itself.<sup>169</sup>

By the 1840's the Church of England no longer had the monopoly of education in New South Wales that had characterised the earlier history of the colony, and Roman Catholic and National schools were entering the field. Governor Bourke had wanted to introduce the Irish National system of education in the thirties. This would have created a uniform system of national schools, in which non-sectarian Bible teaching would be given by teachers, and ministers of religion be permitted to teach their own children one day a week. Non-conformists and secularists joined in supporting this scheme, as it would have the effect of destroying the Anglican monopoly of education. However, the opposition of the Anglicans, together with that of the Roman Catholics after their initial period of supporting the plan, caused the defeat of Bourke's proposal. The result was that in the 1840's there were two parallel types of schools – national and denominational – under the control of separate boards and both receiving government assistance.<sup>170</sup>

<sup>164</sup> Bishop Tyrrell to Rev. E. Hawkins, 15 January 1853, in S.P.G. "D" Mss., Newcastle Letters.

<sup>165</sup> See especially Bishop Tyrrell's sermon at the conference at which the Newcastle Society was formed, printed in Newcastle Church Society Report, 1851.

<sup>166</sup> For further details of the purposes, procedures and achievements of the society, see Elkin, A.P. op.cit., p.219ff.

<sup>167</sup> M.B. Courier, 11 November 1854.

<sup>168</sup> The Church Society income from the parishes that would later be incorporated into the Diocese of Brisbane was as follows:- 1853, £364; 1854, £526; 1855, £749; 1856, £1248; 1857, £1415; 1858, £1511; 1859, £1091. The decline in 1859 was probably due to the unsettled situation in view of the impending creation of the new diocese, and the fact that two parishes were without clergymen. It is noticeable that parochial contributions varied according to the personalities of individual priests. Thus, Darling Downs always contributed well because of Glennie's influence, whereas Brisbane under Irwin did badly, because he was unpopular, and did not in any case approve of the scheme. (See Selwyn Letters, p. 70)

<sup>169</sup> St. John's Register of Marriages, 1843-48.

<sup>170</sup> For full details of the development of this system, see Wyeth, E.R., op.cit., chap. 4.



By the time of Gregor's death the three rudimentary schools under his supervision appear to have died a natural death, but the appointment of Benjamin Glennie, supported by Bishop Tyrrell, resulted in a renewed concern with education at Moreton Bay. Before the end of 1848 a church day school was re-established at Brisbane, with Christopher Meyers as teacher. Meyers, however, was not a success, and was soon replaced by Robert Stace, a recent immigrant whom Glennie had baptized since his arrival in the colony.<sup>171</sup>

In 1849 a Church of England school was commenced at Ipswich, and another one at Kangaroo Point, though this latter was not immediately recognised as an official denominational school for the purpose of government assistance, and when recognised, it only remained so for one year. In addition to the recognised denominational schools there were other unassisted private schools which gave Anglican teaching. Besides the one at Kangaroo Point, there was one at South Brisbane privately controlled in this fashion.<sup>172</sup>

Even judged by the educational standards of the time, these schools were not very efficient. Much depended upon the individual priest, who virtually had the responsibility for appointing or dismissing the teacher in his parish, and if necessary, of filling the gap himself if no teacher was available. This was a constant worry in the fifties, because the Australian gold discoveries of 1851 resulted in a period of fluctuating employment, and in two years the Brisbane school had eight teachers.<sup>173</sup> These usually had very little training, and indeed the poor rate of salary was quite insufficient to attract competent teachers. Meyers in 1848 received a salary of only £40 a year, supplemented by the fees paid by the children, which ranged from a penny to a shilling a week according to circumstances.<sup>174</sup> In all, the teacher's salary was little more than £100 a year. In the mid-fifties salaries improved, and in Brisbane the teacher received £127, and in Ipswich £145; but in view of the high prices then ruling it is doubtful if this represented a real improvement. The difficulty in obtaining teachers meant that it was practically impossible to dismiss even the most inefficient schoolmasters,<sup>175</sup> so there was little chance of improving teaching standards.

The facilities and equipment of the schools also left much to be desired. In Brisbane the original St. John's Church was converted to school purposes after the new building had been opened; but it made a poor schoolroom, and inspectors in 1853 reported that this school 'is in bad repair, the furniture is insufficient, but there is a fair supply of apparatus and books'.<sup>176</sup> The Ipswich school was described as "suitable but encumbered with church furniture". In these poor conditions great numbers of children had in some cases to be dealt with by one teacher. In Ipswich in 1855, for example the one teacher taught all 131 children, and even with the use of the older children as monitors, the education given must have been inadequate. It should be remembered, however, that similar criticisms could be made of most schools at this period, and the fact was that no one else was ready to give even the meagre degree of education provided under the auspices of the church.

The opening of schools at Fortitude Valley, Toowoomba, Maryborough and South Brisbane made the Church of England school system the most widespread in the colony by the time of separation. There were six officially recognised Anglican Schools, with a total of 387 children on the roll.<sup>177</sup> For this educational work a government grant of £385 was paid to the church in 1859.

Among the private schools in Brisbane in the fifties were two founded by unattached Anglican clergy. In 1856 the Reverend James Carter, formerly of Sydney, began a "classical and commercial school" in Brisbane, taking day scholars and a few boarders,<sup>178</sup> but it does not appear to have lasted long. In 1859 the Reverend J.R. Moffatt was conducting a "Collegiate Institute" in George Street. This also accommodated some boarders, and was intended for older boys.<sup>179</sup> In themselves these institutions were not important: but they are interesting as the first examples of secondary and boarding schools.

<sup>171</sup> Glennie's reminiscences in St. John's Parish Chronicle December 1889 and Glennie Diary, 22 February 1849.

<sup>172</sup> Advertisement in M.B. Courier, 11 November 1848.

<sup>173</sup> Wyeth, E.R., op.cit., p.52.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., pp 50 and 52

<sup>175</sup> Cf. the comment of A.E. Selwyn on the teacher at Brisbane in 1851: "a rather intractable master whom Mr. I. {Irwin} finds difficult to manage, but is afraid to dismiss for fear of not being able to get another". (Selwyn Letters, p.19)

<sup>176</sup> Report quoted in Wyeth, E.R., op.cit., p.53

<sup>177</sup> Queensland Votes & Proceedings, 1860. Actually the four Roman Catholic schools had more children on the roll.

There was at this time only one National School in operation, at Drayton, and the rest of the children who went to school at all attended one of the 32 small private schools.

<sup>178</sup> M.B. Courier 26 January 1856.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 19 January 1859. This school is briefly mentioned in the reminiscences of one of the original pupils in an article in the Brisbane Daily Mail, 12 January 1927.

Bishop Tyrrell's own project of an official Church of England Grammar School in Brisbane was premature, and nothing came of it. Indeed it was another half century before this hope was to be fulfilled.<sup>180</sup>

At the same time as the church was venturing into the educational field at Moreton Bay with her own schools, the clergy took a leading part in vigorous opposition to the introduction of the National System, which would threaten the existence of the denominational schools. So began a struggle which was to reach its height during the episcopate of the first Bishop of Brisbane. Bishop Tyrrell had himself frequently expressed himself strongly against the principles on which the National schools were conducted, and in Brisbane his opposition to them was reflected particularly by the Reverend E.K. Yeatman.

<sup>181</sup>

Even with those educational efforts it was obvious that only a small proportion of the Anglican children were in the church day schools. For this reason Bishop Tyrrell constantly urged upon his clergy the importance of Sunday schools for religious education, and the beginnings of what was to become a network of Sunday schools in every parish in Queensland had already been made by the time of separation. The bishop on his 1856 tour remarked that he was much cheered by the gathering of the children of the primary and Sunday schools in Brisbane.<sup>182</sup> No doubt teaching methods were very elementary, being largely based on the learning of the catechism by rote; but it was the beginning of what was to become the major field of instruction of the younger members of the church right down to the present day.

#### vi. The Church in the Community.

This survey of the Church of England before Separation would be incomplete without some attempt to estimate the degree of real influence of the church in the life of the community. This is no easy task, because external manifestations alone cannot tell the whole story. Figures of church attendance, the extent of building programmes, the pressures brought to bear on political questions, the amount of people's contributions to the church – all of these can be measured, and can form a rough guide. Yet in dealing with spiritual categories statistical judgements have only a limited value, particularly in dealing with the Church of England, whose outlook has traditionally been less cut-and-dried- than that of many other religious bodies. The real influence of the church was not necessarily in direct proportion to figures of church attendance nor the annual income of the church.

It is clear that with the growth of the parochial system in the fifties and the development of better facilities for worship and teaching, the ministrations of the church were being more widely spread than in the previous decade. More people over a greater area had the opportunity to hear the Word proclaimed and the Sacraments administered. What was their response?

In the towns church attendance was undoubtedly increasing. The new St. John's in Brisbane was overcrowded from the date of its opening, and a gallery had very soon to be added; the building of so big a church in Ipswich, whose total population in 1856 was only 2500 people of all denominations, suggests the expectation of large congregations; and the gathering of new congregations in town and country centres was encouraging. Despite these encouraging signs, however, there is evidence that only a small proportion of the Anglican population could be found at church on the average Sunday. St. John's indeed was crowded, but then it could seat only two hundred of Brisbane two thousand Anglicans.<sup>183</sup> The official ecclesiastical returns for 1859 showed that the average attendance at Anglican churches in the Moreton Bay district was only 640, out of the ten thousand or more who claimed to belong to the Church of England.<sup>184</sup>

Several considerations must be born in mind in estimating the significance of these figures. There were thousands who were out of reach of regular Sunday services, and who had to be satisfied with occasional churchgoing: others were discouraged from going to church by the fact that so few free settings were available; and in any case complete figures were not sent from the two parishes which were vacant in 1859. There were, of course, also many who considered themselves good churchmen though they did not go to church every Sunday.

In the country districts church attendance varies greatly according to the district, the seasonal occupation of the inhabitants and weather conditions. Benjamin Glennie's congregations on the Darling Downs ranged from handfuls of six or seven people on station homesteads to sixty or seventy in the larger centres of Toowoomba and Warwick. In the bush the very infrequency of the services in many places encouraged people to come who would not think of being regular church goers,

<sup>180</sup> Project mentioned by Bishop Tyrrell, *M.B. Courier*, 28 August 1852, and in *Newcastle Church Society Report*, 1852, p.52

<sup>181</sup> *M.B.Courier* editorial, 21 August 1858.

<sup>182</sup> *Newcastle Church Society Report*, 1856.

<sup>183</sup> *M.B.Courier*, 12 January 1856.

<sup>184</sup> *Queensland Votes & Proceedings*, 1860. These ecclesiastical returns contain much valuable information regarding the three clergy in the area at the time and their parishes, including their stipends, housing arrangements, particulars about churches and congregations, glebes etc.

and the congregations frequently included people of various denominations. At Glennie's first service in Dalby, for example, the majority of his small congregations were Presbyterians<sup>185</sup> In one sense this was good, but it was indicative of a general weakening of denominational loyalties in the bush, which eventually tended to lead to indifference to religion as a whole.

The irregularity of bush services had the same effect. As early as 1857 Benjamin Glennie could discern the results of many years devoid of religious services:

The Swamp is very unsatisfactory place at present. I can count 50 families belonging to the Church, while an ordinary congregation numbers 20 to 30 individuals. I can account for this sad truth partially by the fact that the place is inhabited by persons who have lived so many years in the bush, that they have quite lost the habit of going to Church, and partially also by the fact there is no leading person to set them an example.<sup>186</sup>

This enforced habit of infrequent church attendance in the bush was to have marked consequences for the Australian church for a long time, especially in the less closely settled areas.

Within church life there is evidence of a degree of class consciousness and of a relationship between church attendance and "respectability". Opposition to this spirit came from some of the young clergy in the fifties, and once incumbent of St. John's, the Reverend E.K. Yeatman, went so far as to write an open letter on the subject in the press.

He wrote:

Our communion has, I fear, hitherto failed to act together as heartily and unanimously as we have a right to expect from Christian brethren...We have incurred the charge, I fear deservedly, of being too exclusively the church of the rich.<sup>187</sup>

About the same time there were indications in Ipswich of similar class consciousness. Some of the wealthier parishioners made a move to have the Reverend John Mosely removed from the parish, his offence being, according to the anti-squatter Courier, that

He has crossed the boundary fence that separates the 'pure merino' from the coarser breeds; and dared to look upon the whole of his congregation as if they were on the same level of humanity.<sup>188</sup>

The Courier's opinions on ecclesiastical matters were far from impartial: but in this case the evidence of the counter-petition of 150 parishioners seems to confirm the newspaper's view of the situation. In any case, the bishop ruled that Mosely was to stay.

This class consciousness was undoubtedly fostered by the pew letting system. By the Act of 1837, those who had subscribed five pounds or more to the building of a church had the first choice of sittings, so the best pews customarily went to the wealthiest parishioners. In the election of the pewholders' churchwarden, voting was restricted to those paying £1 per annum in pew rents, and a pewholder might have up to six votes according to the number of sittings he held. This meant that the real voting power was in the hands of a comparatively small number of men, as was well illustrated at a bitter Easter meeting in Brisbane in 1855 when a churchwarden was elected mainly on the votes of two or three men.<sup>189</sup>

Naturally, only the well-to-do could be elected to office, and as most church meetings were held at 12 noon, only the self-employed could attend. It was therefore something of a radical innovation when in 1856 Yeatman called a meeting of parishioners for 6.30pm. in order to form a committee of "all classes and both sexes", the men to consult for the welfare of the church, and the ladies to undertake collecting -- a division of labour that has persisted in the Australian church until very recent times!

The class consciousness apparent in the church in the nineteenth century is particularly striking from the standpoint of a century later. It must be remembered, however, that at this time it merely reflected the structure of society: in politics there was no thought as yet of universal male suffrage, to say nothing of the suffrage for both sexes, and the principle that voting power should be in the hands of those who contributed to the finances of the church was in accord with the political theory of the age. It did, however, imply a strange criterion for membership in the Body of Christ, and was clearly related to that alienation of working people from the church which was all too typical of the Anglican Church in Australia as in England.

Class distinctions fostered the spirit of divisiveness that characterised the church in this period, but there were two other factors tending to the same result: one was the absence of sufficiently strong leadership by the clergy, and the other was the beginning of cleavage on matters of doctrine resulting from the diffusion of the principles of the Oxford movement.

---

<sup>185</sup> Glennie Diary, 25 May 1851.

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., December, 1857.

<sup>187</sup> M.B.Courier, 5 January 1856.

<sup>188</sup> Ibid., 15 November 1856

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., 14 April 1855.

The inadequacy of clerical leadership in the northern part of the Diocese of Newcastle was in no sense due to weakness on the part of the bishop. Tyrrell was a strong and decisive leader; but he was too far away to exercise a direct day-by-day leadership, and his biennial visits, while of inestimable value, were too occasional to provide adequate episcopal supervision. Nor were the clergy who served in the Moreton Bay area lacking in personal qualities. Of the twelve clergymen who served north of the later border before Separation (excluding those who were unattached) eight were graduates of British universities and a number of them exercised long and fruitful ministries in Australia. The fact was, however, that with one exception they came to Moreton Bay with little experience of pastoral work or parochial administration. Five of them were still deacon's orders when they arrived, and the others had been in priest's orders only a short time before their arrival.<sup>190</sup> This had the advantage that they were in the vigour of youth, but they lacked the wisdom and experience that alone could have made their leadership fully acceptable to their people.

The emergence of cleavage along lines of doctrine was most apparent in the Brisbane ministry of the Reverend H.O. Irwin, the one priest who had a measure of seniority. Irwin was no extremist, but like his bishop he was anxious to restore a degree of discipline in church membership and of conformity to the rules of the church as set out in the Prayer Book. In Australia, as in England, the Church of England had inherited from the eighteenth century a diluted doctrine and a slipshod mode of worship. Changes were essential, and even Benjamin Glennie, moderate churchman that he was, could look back at the end of his life and recognise that conflict had been inevitable:

And troubles were unavoidable, in the great work of restoring all the Church Services to their proper time and place; and conducting them in the manner prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, where the minister is directed in the rubrics how to proceed in the several services. Instead, however, of attending to these directions, a very general habit prevailed, of neglecting, or acting quite in contradiction to them while those who endeavoured to conform to the rubric were usually styled 'Puseyites'.<sup>191</sup>

Glennie himself did not entirely escape party labels. One of his parishioners "asked me if I was a clergyman of the Church of England. Somebody told her I was not, but I was a Puseyite."<sup>192</sup> Another of his prominent parishioners took him to task at the time of the notorious Gorham Judgment in England, because he believed in the catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration.<sup>193</sup> He was, however, so moderate in his views and so respected for his pastoral zeal that he never became involved in serious disputes.

With Irwin, however, it was different. By training an intellectual and by temperament a rigorist, he was the kind of priest who aimed at the perfection of the few rather than the general improvement of the many,<sup>194</sup> the sort of man who could not allow principle to be tempered with expediency. The issues which aroused controversy were small: but behind them lay basic questions of theology, worship and discipline.

The first issue concerned the funeral of a girl whose family had withdrawn themselves from the Church of England for two years, and had apparently attended another church. Irwin refused to conduct the burial service, on the ground that the family had chosen to withdraw itself from the communion of the Church of England. The father of the girl angrily petitioned the governor of New South Wales, who sent on the protest to Bishop Tyrrell. The bishop, however, entirely supported his subordinate, and wrote in reply:

One of the great and fatal errors among professing Christians in these days, and especially in newly-formed colonies, is to think far too lightly of disunion, and schism, and separation; and to suppose that anyone may, without sin, change his religious communion, as whim or self-will may incline him.<sup>195</sup>

It was an unpopular, and easily criticised, judgment. But behind it lay the deliberate conviction that the Church of England must tighten its internal discipline, if it were to overcome its great weakness. In the colonies it lacked the external props which the establishment provided in England: it must then develop an internal discipline and cohesion, a sense of obligation and loyalty among its members, such as characterised other churches. Such was the view of Tyrrell and Irwin: but the attempt to enforce rules where anarchy has reigned always proves difficult, and it was to prove a ready source of conflict whenever it was attempted in Australia.

---

<sup>190</sup> B. Glennie, J. Wallace, E.K. Yeatman, W.W. Dove and T.L. Dodd were all deacons when they arrived in Moreton Bay. Yeatman, Mosely and Shaw, and perhaps others, were only in their twenties. An interesting sidelight revealed by the St. John's Register of Marriages is that the deacons were apparently authorised to solemnize marriages. Glennie, Wallace and Yeatman all did so while in deacon's orders, even at times when there was a priest in the district.

<sup>191</sup> Glennie's reminiscences in St. John's Parish Chronicle, October 1889. Coote, W., History of the Colony of Queensland, p.246, seems to confirm this view.

<sup>192</sup> Glennie Diary, 12 April 1849.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., 18 May 1851

<sup>194</sup> Selwyn Letters, p.35

<sup>195</sup> M.B.Courier, 20 December 1851.

The other issue was so trivial as to appear positively amusing from the viewpoint of a century later. It concerned the question of taking up a collection during the Sunday morning service.

Bishop Tyrrell had issued instructions that an 'offertory' was to be received during the service, as provided by the rubrics of the Prayer Book. The practice had long fallen into disuse in England, but its restoration in Australia was an intensely practical matter in view of the financial needs of the church. After the consecration of St. John's in 1854 Irwin therefore resolved to carry out the bishop's instructions.

The result was explosive! A section of the congregation immediately called a meeting to protest against the innovation, and in the absence of Irwin, who refused to attend on the ground that the meeting was not lawfully constituted, sent a remarkable letter to the bishop:

The pure faith of our Fathers long since consigned this ritual to oblivion, as inimical to religious feeling, and an unseemly interruption of the Worship of God...What is its use? To play upon the weaker passions of poor human nature: to extort money from those who would otherwise withhold it,-- to shame the sordid into liberality, and to profit by the vanity of those who love to exhibit their gifts before men. The Churchwardens, plate in hand, pass slowly from seat to seat, fulfilling a distasteful office; the Clergyman's voice is heard at intervals through the sound of small coins dropping;<sup>196</sup> many are the temptations to irreverence, -- it is no longer order, but disorder.<sup>197</sup>

It would be hard now to take such a letter seriously, but the complainants were in deadly earnest, and so too were Tyrrell and Irwin. For them it was a matter of principle, and the bishop replied courteously, but firmly, refusing to alter the instructions which Irwin was carrying out.

This reply was the signal for further rumblings from St. John's. Another meeting of parishioners was called, which passed a series of resolutions. One of these attacked the offertory on the ground that

it is in effect to promote discontent and disunion, to uphold the doctrine of priestly supremacy, and to deny the right of private judgment to the laity.<sup>198</sup>

Another called for active opposition to its introduction because it was the work of those

who looked upon the Reformation as a curse, and who, unless they were vigorously opposed, might next introduce large candles on the communion table, and then go on to auricular confession.

The malcontents further resolved to leave the church after the sermon, in order to be absent from "the celebration of the Offertory"; and they decided to form a "Church of England Association" to defend the status quo. One of those present declared that "a congregation formed a church, and had power to decide upon subjects like these." The following Sunday about two-thirds of the congregation of 120 walked out of St. John's before the offertory.<sup>199</sup>

Bishop Tyrrell refused to be moved by these actions. He replied in a very deliberate strain, referring to the disturbance of divine worship by those who walked out of church as a sin, and obliquely hinted at the possibility of excommunication.<sup>200</sup>

In the usual fashion of such incidents the matter quietly subsided after this: the malcontents agreed to stay in church, but not to contribute, and in the course of time the offertory came to be regarded as perfectly normal.

This incident had significance far beyond the immediate point under dispute. The objections of opponents of the offertory contained a number of different elements. The very fact that it was an innovation made it objectionable, because in religion more than anything else people are apt to be conservative. What made it much worse in this case was that it was innovation that implied a concrete obligation in church membership: the setting of the offertory in an act of worship implied that it was in the nature of a duty towards God, whereas local churchmen preferred to think of their support for the church as a voluntary payment for services rendered – whether the service was the use of a pew or a visit by the clergyman.<sup>201</sup> Further, the innovation was feared, as we have seen, as the thin edge of a Romanist wedge, in the sense that the blessing of the gifts by the priest implied for him a special sacerdotal status; while the whole notion of the change being made on the authority of the bishop ran counter to those unconsciously held congregational theories of church polity which we have noted.

---

<sup>196</sup> It was the custom for the minister to read aloud all the offertory sentences in the Prayer Book while the collection was being taken.

<sup>197</sup> M.B.Courier, 10 March 1855.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid. The following quotations are also from the same source.

<sup>199</sup> M.B.Courier, 17 March 1855.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 4 August 1855.

<sup>201</sup> In this connection, it is significant that some of the leading men in the anti-offertory party were prominent in a public meeting to protest against the other possible source of support for the church, viz. state aid. See M.B.Courier, 11 August 1855.

What in fact happened in this trivial dispute was that both sides glimpsed, albeit dimly, the struggle between conflicting viewpoints that was beginning under the surface of Anglican life as a result of the Oxford movement. The Brisbane laymen stood for the continuance of the old easy ways in the church; Bishop Tyrrell and Irwin stood for a new vision of authority, discipline, Prayer Book order and a definite sense of obligation in church membership. It was a conflict that was to appear in many different guises in the century that followed.

It must not, however, be imagined that the Oxford movement was yet making a marked impact on the church at Moreton Bay. So far as church services were concerned, they were little different in form or ceremonial from the earlier part of the nineteenth century. The chief prominence was still given to Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Holy Communion was not celebrated more frequently than once a month in the main centres, and less frequently in outlying districts. In Brisbane, the first Sunday of the month was "Sacrament Sunday". The usual Sunday morning service was a long one, consisting of Morning Prayer, Litany, Ante-Communion and Sermon, with the Communion itself added once a month. Even when there was a celebration of Holy Communion, the number of communicants was small, and Benjamin Glennie's diary shows that there was never more than a handful of communicants on the Darling Downs in the early years, even on days like Christmas and Easter, and the small number of confirmation candidates points to the fact that the sacraments occupied a very small place in the spiritual life of most church people.<sup>202</sup> The services were still conducted with very little ceremonial, though the better buildings in the bigger centres and the more settled nature of life in the towns led to a gradual increase of better ordering of the services. More singing of psalms and canticles, and of a few hymns, was introduced, though much depended on the musical abilities of individual clergymen. Under the Reverend John Mosely, for example, there was a noticeable improvement of the choirs first at Ipswich, then at Brisbane. Even in the country the services were brightened by more singing, as Glennie was noting in his diary by the end of 1859.

On political questions churchmen at Moreton Bay appeared to exercise little specific influence in the fifties. The clergy were too busily engaged in laying the foundations of parochial life to find much time to spend on political issues, and in any case they were too far distant from Sydney to make their voices heard on matters in which the church had need to be concerned. Among Moreton Bay residents prominent in public affairs were a number of Anglican laymen – men such as J.C. Wickham and M.C. O'Connell – but on the burning question of the decade, separation, it was not church allegiance that caused men to take one side or the other. It was not until the foundation of the new colony, and the emergence of Brisbane as a political centre in its own right, that political questions become immediately relevant to the church in the north.

The picture, then, that emerges in the 1850's is of a church whose organised life was gradually becoming more regular and effective. There was still a long way to go. Parochial organisation was still rudimentary; church attendance was mediocre; there were tensions and conflicts within the church; and the church was only touching the fringe of public life. Yet compared with the previous decade even these moderate achievements represented a considerable advance, and suggested the possibilities of a deeper spiritual and moral influence in the future.

### vii. Separation and a New Diocese.

Separation was a live issue at Moreton Bay throughout the fifties, but long before it appeared a practical possibility ecclesiastical eyes were watching the implications of separation for the church. As early as 1851 Bishop Broughton, who was always suspicious of Roman Catholic activities, sent a warning to the S.P.G. that he had heard that the Roman Catholic Church was planning a new diocese at Moreton Bay. "If any addition be thought of to our own episcopate", write the ageing Metropolitan, "pray remember the Capital of the district is the town of Brisbane: and ought to be the title of the See".<sup>203</sup>

Broughton's warning was few years premature, but by 1856 it was clear that the British government had accepted the principle of a new colony for north-eastern Australia. By this time the Bishop of Newcastle was very conscious of his own inability to give proper oversight to the outlying districts of his increasingly populous diocese:

The efficient oversight of a Diocese extending according to my letters patent, from North to South from the 21<sup>st</sup> parallel of latitude to the Hawkesbury and Colo Rivers – and from East to West, from the Eastern coast to the 141<sup>st</sup> degree of East longitude, comprising an area about four times the size of Great Britain and Ireland, is a physical impossibility. My visitation jurnies, though 1,500 and 1,600 miles in length, have not extended to the north, beyond the district of Moreton Bay, leaving Wide Bay and the Burnett district, and Port Curtis, unvisited, though not uncared for, by me. It has been my anxious desire to supply the spiritual wants of these vast districts; but it has been a task of no ordinary difficulty, and for the sake of the members of our Church resident in them as well as for my own sake, I shall sincerely rejoice when they are formed into a new See, under the oversight of a resident Bishop.<sup>204</sup>

<sup>202</sup> At the biennial Confirmation in Brisbane in 1856 there were only 18 candidates. M.B.Courier, 8 November 1856.

<sup>203</sup> Bishop Broughton to Rev. E. Hawkins, 14 March 1851, S.P.G. 'F' Mss., Vol III.

<sup>204</sup> Newcastle Church Society Report, 1856.

Naturally enough, then, Tyrrell received the news of the proposed new colony with delight, and wasted no time in writing to England to urge that a diocese should be created co-terminous with the colony.<sup>205</sup>

The creation of a new diocese was not a matter in which the church could act independently of the state. The colonial church was still regarded as an overseas extension of the established church in England. It was therefore the prerogative of the Crown to erect new dioceses, and this was effected by the issue of letters patent which defined the boundaries of the see and the extent of the bishop's jurisdiction. One condition that was wisely imposed as a prerequisite of a new diocese was that it be provided with a sufficient endowment at least to maintain its bishop. When Bishop Broughton had been appointed first Bishop of Australia the government had itself provided the endowment from colonial revenue. That policy had now long since ceased, and by the forties the church had to provide its own endowment funds. When the requisite money was available, a bishop was nominated by the Crown on the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was customarily advised by such men as Ernest Hawkins in his joint capacity as secretary of the S.P.G. and of the Colonial Bishops Council. When the bishop-elect had been so nominated the letters patent were issued by the Crown, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was given a mandate to consecrate the new bishop.

In short, the erection of a new colonial diocese involved four distinct steps at this time, in which church and state were linked. First, a sufficient endowment had to be raised by the church; secondly, the bishop-elect was nominated by the Crown on the advice of the appropriate ecclesiastical authorities; thirdly, the diocese was created by letters patent of the Crown; and finally, the new bishop was consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Very shortly the changed relationship between Britain and the colonies implicit in the grant of responsible government was to cause the breakdown of this pattern, but it was not until the sixties that this question came to a head. The result was that Brisbane was the only diocese of the later Province of Queensland to be created in this fashion, and its first bishop Dr. Tufnell, was the only Queensland bishop to be appointed by the Crown.

The first step in the formation of a diocese for the proposed colony was therefore the raising of sufficient money for a permanent endowment; and with his customary initiative Bishop Tyrrell made himself responsible for this task. He anticipated that £8,000 to £10,000 would be the minimum required by the English authorities, and that this might take four or five years to collect. He received, however, a welcome surprise, when he was informed by the S.P.G. that £5,000 had been considered an adequate initial endowment for the new Diocese of Perth, and that the same sum should suffice for the proposed new diocese. Invested at interest rates of 10% this would yield £500 a year, and a bishop, when appointed, would soon be able to increase the endowment by his personal exertions.<sup>206</sup>

The raising of the £5,000 was achieved remarkably quickly, mainly through the generosity of the English societies. The S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. each gave £1,000, and to make up the rest Tyrrell was prepared to use part of the assets of the Diocese of Newcastle to help its offspring. In this transaction the financial shrewdness which we have already noticed in Bishop Tyrrell, was amply demonstrated, for the plan was carried through without any loss of income to Newcastle, but eventually with an actual gain.

Tyrrell's scheme was simple, but ingenious. The Colonial Bishops Council provided £333 per annum towards the Bishop of Newcastle's stipend, being the interest on a sum of about £8,300 invested at 4%.

Tyrrell proposed that this capital be brought to Australia where he could invest it at 6%. On this rate of interest £6,000 capital would be sufficient to provide the old income and the surplus of £2,300 capital could be credited to the endowment of the "Moreton Bay Bishopric."<sup>207</sup>

The Colonial Bishops Council agreed, and with the addition of £700 from English supporters of the Diocese of Newcastle, Tyrrell had the requisite £5,000 by 1858, without one penny having come from Australian sources. Tyrrell would not, however, let the matter rest here. He insisted that the £2,300 taken from Newcastle funds should be repaid from Australian contributions, so he issued an appeal for funds in a circular letter.<sup>208</sup> The response was only moderate – a total of £977 by 1859 – and from the Moreton Bay District itself the result was poor with the exception of the Darling Downs;<sup>209</sup> but it must be remembered that there were only four clergymen to urge the appeal in the north and it was not very effectively put forward.

<sup>205</sup> Bishop Tyrrell to S.P.G., 17 October 1856, in *S.P.G. 'G' Mss.*, quoted in Elkin, A.P. *op.cit.*, p.244

<sup>206</sup> S.P.G. to Bishop Tyrrell, 30 March 1857, in *S.P.G. 'F' Mss*

<sup>207</sup> For some further details, see Elkin, A.P. *op.cit.*, pp. 245 & 753

<sup>208</sup> Tyrrell, Rt.Rev. W., *Appeal to the Members of the Church of England for Contributions towards the Endowment of a Bishopric at Moreton Bay*, dated 21 September 1858.

<sup>209</sup> *Newcastle Church Society Report*, 1859, shows that Tyrrell himself gave £100. Three contributors from Sydney gave £220. The Moreton Bay parishes gave as follows:- Brisbane £69; Fortitude Valley, with Burnett £100; Ipswich £50; Darling Downs £221. According to Dr. Elkin (p.753) Tyrrell did eventually succeed in raising the whole £2300 to replace the amount given from the Newcastle Diocesan Endowment.

At Moreton Bay the news of the new bishopric was not received with universal rejoicing. The Courier, a strong advocate for the Non-conformist viewpoint, attempted to stir up opposition to the proposal;

We do not know that there was any necessity for such an appointment. What there is at present to be Bishop of we do not know. In England the Bishops live on the fat of the land, dwell in palaces replete with earthly splendour, and endeavour in the House of Peers, to constitute a spiritual tyranny against which the millions rebel...Surely England might leave her children, settled so far away, to do as they please...The appointment of the new Bishop gives another pensioner on the general fund, which the voluntaryists have to help to raise, as well as to support their own sects.<sup>210</sup>

Whether the last sentence represented ignorance or wilful deception is not clear; but such views had the effect of creating a preconceived image of the first Bishop of Brisbane which proved hard to eradicate. Even many of the lay members of the Church of England were lukewarm. For those who held such 'congregational' views of church polity as we have seen expressed, a bishop close at hand represented a threat to the desired ecclesiastical democracy (or oligarchy!); while many others, having had no experience of the advantages of episcopal leadership on the spot, saw no positive value in the new arrangement.<sup>211</sup> On the other hand, there were those among the clergy and laity who, understanding the proper order of the Church of England, keenly welcomed the news.

With the necessary endowment collected, the remaining steps for the creation of the new diocese were speedily carried out. The Reverend Edward Wyndham Tufnell was nominated as first Bishop of Brisbane, and on 6 June 1859 letters patent were issued creating the new see and appointing Dr. Tufnell to be its first bishop. Eight days later, on 14 June, he was consecrated bishop in Westminster Abbey by John Bird Sumner, Archbishop of Canterbury. The Church of England in the new colony had begun its life as an independent diocese.

---

<sup>210</sup> M.B.Courier, 13 October 1858

<sup>211</sup> The comment of the Gayndah correspondent of the Courier, who had been complaining about the lack of ministrations by the Church of England in his town, was simple but expressive; "bah"! ( M.B.Courier, 30 March 1859).



**PART III: BEGINNINGS OF THE DIOCESES**

## CHAPTER 6: A NEW COLONY AND A NEW DIOCESE

### i. The First Bishop: Edward Wyndham Tufnell

In the formative period of Queensland's history it was inevitable that much should depend upon the ability and character of her leaders; and this was as true of the church as of the state. There was, despite the primitiveness of colonial life, already a consciousness of the immense potentialities of Queensland, and of the historic character of the pioneering work. The Secretary of State for the Colonies had written to Governor Bowen on the subject:

It is indeed a grand thing to be the founder of the social state of so mighty a segment of the globe as Queensland, and is, perhaps, more sure of fame, 1000 years hence, than anything we can do in the old world. It is carving your name on the rind of a young tree, to be formed with enlarged letters as the trunk expands.<sup>212</sup>

What were the qualifications of the first Bishop of Brisbane for such a historic role?

The career of Edward Wyndham Tufnell had been able but not specially distinguished. He was a man of middle years – being just 45 years old at his consecration – an important consideration for the bishop of a diocese requiring constant and exhausting travel. Yet somehow Tufnell did not give the impression of being a man in the prime of life. From his arrival he seems to have been regarded as an elderly man, and his serious illness in the 1860's had the further effect of ageing him prematurely.<sup>213</sup> He never mastered the art of horsemanship, and consequently his pastoral journeys by rail, coach and buggy, lacked the romantic quality of the epic rides of Bishop Tyrrell.

In England Tufnell had lived the life of a country vicar, and though his appointment to a Salisbury prebend showed that his ability was recognised, it must be admitted that his experience and training in England had scarcely been a kind to equip him for the special circumstances of leadership in a remote and somewhat unstable colony. His chief qualification for selection to a missionary bishopric seems to have been his energetic and efficient work for a number of years as an honorary organising secretary for the S.P.G.<sup>214</sup> Yet he was essentially a fine example of the cultured English clergyman – dignified, courteous, and devoted to his work – steeped in the traditions of Oxford, where he had been for some years a Fellow of Wadham College. He was, in short, as an acquaintance wrote of him after his death, “a centre of light and learning, of culture, honour and piety”.<sup>215</sup>

These were excellent qualities: yet it is doubtful if they were the characteristics most required in the pioneering bishop of a colony such as Queensland in the 1860's. The bishop and his diocese were far apart; and the fact was that the diocese never appreciated its bishop, and the bishop never completely understood his diocese. In the settled routine of an English country parish he had not gained experience either in the handling of numbers of clergy or laity or in the complexities of ecclesiastical administration and organisation. These were abilities sorely needed in the first Bishop of Brisbane; and in these respects there was discernable a certain deficiency in his leadership. Bishop Tufnell had some fine personal qualities, he had some sound plans for the future, and he possessed a certain stubborn determination in carrying out his plans against bitter opposition. Yet his leadership lacked inspiring qualities, and there was some want of sureness of touch both in the implementation of policies and his handling of men.

Bishop Tufnell was often accused by his opponents of being an autocrat. It was an unfair accusation. It is true that he had a strong sense of the authority inherent in his episcopal office, and he clearly grasped the fact – as many of his laymen did not – that in the pioneering phase of the diocese, supreme power must reside in the bishop's own hand. He believed that until the polity of the church was firmly settled along traditional lines, it would be a mistake to lay down his personal control; and he recognised that he alone was in a position to persuade clergy to come out from England, and that to do this he must be able to guarantee them a suitable parish and a sufficient stipend. This rendered it necessary in the early years for control over appointments and finances to remain in the bishop's hands. In any case, there was no diocesan machinery to which these responsibilities could be delegated, even had he desired to relinquish personal control. Yet the exercise of authority never came naturally to Tufnell, and he looked forward to the time when synodical government might be established, so that he might share with the clergy and laity the responsibility of administering the diocese. Until the time was ripe for such constitutional machinery to be established, however, he believed it to be his duty to hold all the reins of diocesan government firmly in his own hands.

<sup>212</sup> Sir E.B. Lytton to Sir G. Bowen, quoted in Bowen to Rev. E. Hawkins, 18 December 1861, S.P.G. “D” Mss.

<sup>213</sup> As early as 3 November 1860 the Moreton Bay Courier described Tufnell sarcastically as ‘a well-educated elderly gentleman with an imposing title’.

<sup>214</sup> S.P.G. Annual Report, 1859, p.127

<sup>215</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1897.

This attitude was never appreciated by some of the more influential laymen in the diocese, and from the beginning of his episcopate Tufnell was subject to constant criticism on this score. Behind this spirit of opposition to the bishop's personal leadership there were several important elements.

First, Bishop Tufnell inherited the situation, which we have already noted, of gross laxity in the church in matters both of doctrine and discipline. Bishop Tyrrell had striven – against strong lay opposition – for stricter standards of churchmanship, upon the basis of the exercise of definite episcopal authority. There was, however, a strongly erastian element in the outlook of many of the politically conscious laity, who regarded any claims to spiritual authority by the bishops as a mark of 'popery'. It was an attitude typified by a series of anonymous letters in the press during Tufnell's episcopate:

I certainly do not admit that the supreme authority in the Church in this colony is vested in the Bishop....nor do I admit that episcopal authority is of Divine institution.

The same correspondent went on:

The Bishop's authority here depends entirely on his letters patent, however much or little they may be worth.<sup>216</sup>

As we shall see, it soon became evident that the letters patent were worth very little, and the bishops were thrown back upon the spiritual authority inherent in their episcopal office. In this situation, Bishop Tufnell, a strong high churchman, naturally found himself at loggerheads with the advocates of erastianism, who for their part received strong and vociferous support from the Non-conformist press of the colony.

Early colonial psychology was another factor in lay opposition to a strong episcopal authority. The granting of self-government to the colony was followed by an adolescent sense of triumph at the independence from external control. Men of small stature suddenly found themselves in positions of authority in controlling the destinies of the new colony, and not a few men of this kind were elected to the newly established parliament. The bitterness of debate in parliament and the clash of personalities reflected the ambitious rivalries of small-minded men grasping for power. The claims of the bishop to exercise authority in the church represented a threat to the desire of such men to control the affairs of the colony, of the church as well as the state. Thus it was that the Anglican majority in parliament was frequently – and sometimes bitterly – opposed to Tufnell's policy. A section of them argued that all would be well with the church if only the laity had the right to select their own parish clergy, and if only they had the financial administration of the church in their hands. People would then subscribe liberally, and there would be no need to worry about state aid for religion. The test of these claims was to come, with disastrous results, in the later years of Bishop Tufnell and his successor.

Yet while the deficient churchmanship of some of the leading laymen was largely responsible for opposition to the bishop's policies, some blame must attach to the bishop himself. He was perfectly justified in upholding the traditional spiritual prerogatives of the bishop and in insisting that for the early years control even of the temporalities of the church must rest in his own hands. If he had himself been a first-rate leader, the wisdom of these claims would probably have soon become apparent. The trouble was, however, that his powers of leadership were not equal to the task. He lacked the ability to take men into his confidence. His clergy were all junior men, with the exception of Archdeacon Glennie who spent most of his time at Warwick and was not readily accessible; and few of the laymen in the young colony sufficiently understood the nature of the church for the bishop to have confidence in their advice. The result was that he tended to keep his own counsel, and to give the impression of secretiveness in his planning of policy or expenditure of money. Suspicions and questionings were easily aroused, and there were sometimes slanderous innuendoes as to how the resources of the diocese were being employed. So the laymen of the diocese were often suspicious and disloyal, and the clergy, while generally loyal to their bishop, scarcely seemed to regard him with that deep affection that might be expected between a bishop and his clergy in a small diocese.

Bishop Tufnell was aware of this cleavage in the diocese, yet seemed powerless to correct it. His failure to establish a proper rapport with his people was demonstrated by the unnecessary antagonisms aroused by his long absence in England from 1865 to 1867. His return to Brisbane was delayed by recurrent critical illnesses, for which he was in no sense to blame;<sup>217</sup> but he seems to have made little serious effort to keep his diocese informed as to the reason for his prolonged absence. In Brisbane it was widely interpreted as representing a lack of interest in his diocese, and even the Governor

<sup>216</sup> Brisbane Courier, 20 August 1867.

<sup>217</sup> Evidence for this illness is given in Rev. I.C. Tufnell (brother of the bishop) to Rev. W.T. Bullock, 18 October 1865, S.P.G. 'D' Mss. Tufnell's desire to return to Brisbane is shown in his apology to Archbishop C.T. Longley for being unable to stay in England for the first Lambeth Conference: "My succession of illnesses has so long postponed my return to my Diocese, that I think your Grace will agree with me that I ought not to defer my purpose of leaving England by this mail". Tufnell to Archbishop of Canterbury, 19 March 1867. Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

sarcastically wrote that “I wish poor Colonial Governors had such liberty as Colonial Bishops enjoy”.<sup>218</sup> There was, in short, a lack of sympathetic understanding between the bishop and his people.

The fact was that Bishop Tufnell was never quite sure of himself in the strange environment of early Queensland. Despite his well-made initial plans, he was constantly of the defensive. The result was that at first he gave the impression of keeping too much authority to himself; and then recognising his error he went to the other extreme by tending to relinquish too much of his responsibility. It is not surprising, in these circumstances, that not all his hopes were realised. Yet despite his failures, his policies were basically sound – much more so, indeed, that most of his contemporaries would have admitted – and Bishop Tufnell carved a significant mark on the young Queensland tree.

## ii. Laying the Foundations.

Fifteen months separated the consecration of Bishop Tufnell in Westminster Abbey and his enthronement in St. John’s Church, Brisbane. In part the delay was the result of a shipwreck of the vessel in which the bishop’s party were to have travelled, but Tufnell deliberately planned a long preliminary period in England to assemble his resources.

Tufnell was under no illusions as to the magnitude of his task. “I believe,” he wrote to Ernest Hawkins, “that I shall find the Church in the new Diocese in an exceedingly languid state”,<sup>219</sup> and he recognised that clergy and finance would be his great needs. He therefore utilised the time before sailing to launch a double-barrelled campaign. By personal contact and public announcement, he appealed for ‘earnest and judicious Clergymen or candidates for holy orders – men with a sound mind in a sound body, of a gentle, loving spirit’.<sup>220</sup> His invitation received some response, and by the time the party sailed in the *Vimera* on 5 May 1860 the bishop’s party included seven clergymen and four laymen, a welcome addition to the quite inadequate resources of manpower already serving the church in the colony. One of the clergymen died on the journey from epilepsy, and the remainder was of a youthful party, four of them being aged from 23 to 26 years, and two being still in deacon’s orders. Among the latter was Thomas Jones, who was destined to remain in the Diocese of Brisbane until his death in 1918, having become one of the best known and loved priests of the diocese.<sup>221</sup>

The other side of Tufnell’s campaign was concerned with finance, and in this respect too the bishop achieved notable success. He belonged himself to a family with banking interests, and he had both private means of his own and connections with others who were able to give him liberal financial support. This was a great help: indeed, it was almost a necessity for colonial bishops at this time to have private resources at their command to supplement the meagre diocesan endowments. So successful was Tufnell’s money-raising, that quite apart from the money given by the Colonial Bishops Council for the endowment of the see, Tufnell was able to take more than £7000 with him for his diocese, as well as promises of annual subscriptions from a large number of people for a period of five years.<sup>222</sup> The S.P.G. also provided assistance to the extent of £70 for the passage money of each of the clergymen in the party.<sup>223</sup> Only this vigorous fund-raising campaign enabled the new diocese to be put on its feet: the original endowment of £5000 by itself would have been hopelessly inadequate.

After a voyage lasting almost four months Bishop Tufnell’s party sailed up the Brisbane River on 2 September 1860, to the accompaniment of the bells of St. John’s Church, calling the faithful to their Sunday worship. The journey had been long and tiring, but the time had been turned to good account with daily morning and evening services, a monthly Communion,

<sup>218</sup> Bowen to Bullock, 11 April 1866, S.P.G. ‘D’ MSS. The attitude in the diocese to Bishop Tufnell’s long absence is further revealed by a correspondent in Brisbane Courier, 14 May 1867, who suggested that the address of welcome to the bishop should be entitled, “To the Right Rev. Edward Wyncham Tufnell, Bishop, commonly but erroneously styled, ‘Bishop of Brisbane’”.

<sup>219</sup> Tufnell to Hawkins, 8 February S.P.G. ‘D’ MSS.

<sup>220</sup> Colonial Church Chronicle, February 1860 p.65

<sup>221</sup> Details of the clergy accompanying Bishop Tufnell, as set out in Bp.Tufnell’s Clergy Records, a MS in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane, are as follows:-

John Sutton, B.A. (Oxford), Aged 41

Duncan Campbell Mackenzie (King’s Coll., London and Chichester Theo.Coll.), Aged 36

Vincent Frederick Ransome (Magdalene Coll., Oxford, and St. Augustine’s Coll., Canterbury), Aged 25.

Edmund George Moberley, Aged 26

Thomas Jones, Aged 24

John Tomlinson, B.A. (Wadham Coll., Oxford, and Wells Theo. Coll.), Aged 23

According to Colonial Church Chronicle, November 1860, p. 426 the Rev. Frederic Gee died on the voyage. According to ibid., June 1860, p.237, the names of the laymen in the party were:- W. Barker; - Fewings; H. Ransome; and – Kirby.

<sup>222</sup> For details of funds brought by Bp.Tufnell from England, see report of Select Committee of Synod, 1869-70, Synod Proceedings, pp.43-45. With regard to the annual subscriptions, Tufnell wrote to the subscribers at the end of the first five-year period, asking them to renew their subscriptions. See Queensland Daily Guardian, 28 June 1864.

<sup>223</sup> S.P.G. Annual Report, 1860, p.168

and classes for the boys and apprentices on board.<sup>224</sup> Two days after their arrival, on 4 September, Dr. Tufnell was enthroned as first Bishop of Brisbane by the incumbent of St. John's, the Reverend John Mosely, in the presence of an overcrowded congregation which included most of the leading citizens of Brisbane.<sup>225</sup> In his sermon Bishop Tufnell outlined what he regarded as the two chief objects before him – the establishment of the doctrines and precepts of the English Church in the hearts of the people, and the conversion of the aborigines. Later in the day an address of welcome was presented to the bishop by the President of the Legislative Council, Captain M.C. O'Connell, in the presence of the Governor. There was a feeling that a new era was beginning for the church in Queensland.

The bishop and his party arrived not a bit too soon, because it was obvious that the Anglican Church was lagging badly in its task of supplying the spiritual needs of the colony. Three Anglican clergymen for a scattered population of more than 25,000 had been quite inadequate, and if anything the year's interregnum pending the arrival of the new bishop had seen a definite recession in church life.

In one respect in particular the church had lost ground seriously in the first months of the independent colony. This was in the abolition of state aid to religion. Even before separation this had been a thorny issue, and Bishop Tyrrell had long recognised that government grants of money to the church must eventually cease, in face of rising liberal and secularist pressures; but he had hoped that state aid might continue at least during the formative period of Queensland. For the Church of England the continuance of state support appeared to be vital, because by tradition it was far less geared than any other religious body to the voluntary principle.

Non-conformist and secularist forces, however, strongly urged the abolition of state aid, with the vociferous support of the press, and moves were quickly made towards this end. The first defeat for the supporters of state aid to religion took place in June 1860, when a motion by John Watts, M.L.A. for Drayton, Toowoomba and the Western Downs, for the grant of £5000 for the support of religion in the colony, was defeated in parliament without debate by 14 votes to 10.<sup>226</sup> The following month a bill for the abolition of state aid to religion was passed; exception was made in the case of those clergymen who were already receiving government grants at the time of separation, but no new clergymen were to receive assistance.<sup>227</sup> The absence of any official Anglican leader in Queensland pending the arrival of Bishop Tufnell prevented any organised opposition to this important measure. The Reverend Robert Creyke, an unattached priest who was acting as Registrar-General of the colony took up the cudgels in favour of continuing state aid, but he could exert little influence.<sup>228</sup> Indeed, one reason for the speedy passing of the measure appears to have been the desire to have the bill passed before Bishop Tufnell could arrive to organise opposition.<sup>229</sup>

The government originally proposed that while financial grants should be discontinued, grants of land might still be made to religious bodies for churches and parsonages. Even this measure of assistance was deleted from the Unoccupied Crown Lands Bill by the parliamentary majority opposed to state aid,<sup>230</sup> though the government still had the right to make grants of land in areas that were already settled. Such grants continued to be made for a few years, but they, too, soon died out, the last land grant being given in 1863.<sup>231</sup>

A significant feature of these parliamentary decisions was that although Non-conformist churchmen were among the leaders of the move to abolish government support to religion, it was through Anglican members that the measure was carried through parliament. Of the fourteen who voted in favour of abolition in the Legislative Assembly, ten were members

<sup>224</sup> Tufnell to Hawkins, 7 August, 1860, S.P.G. 'D' Mss.

<sup>225</sup> The Rev. L.H. Rumsey, of Ipswich, was also present, but the Rev. B. Glennie was not. The story that Glennie walked from, Warwick to Brisbane to enthrone the bishop, which is given in Canon T. Jones' reminiscences in Church Chronicle, January, 1908, and repeated in Elkin, A.P., The Diocese of Newcastle, p.248, is romantic, but untrue. Jones' article was written 47 years after the event, and contains a number of inaccuracies of detail. Both the Moreton Bay Courier, 6 September, 1860, and Guardian, 8 September 1860, agree that it was Mosely who installed the bishop, and Glennie's Diary indicates that Glennie remained on the Darling Downs at this time to await instructions. The text of Bishop Tufnell's enthronement sermon was Psalm 107 vv.30-31.

<sup>226</sup> Guardian 30 June, 1860.

<sup>227</sup> Votes & Proceedings, Q'ld. Parl., 1860, p. 840. The Revs. J. Mosely, L.H. Rumsey and B. Glennie were each entitled to £100 a year as in the past.

<sup>228</sup> M.B. Courier, May 1860, passim.

<sup>229</sup> This was later stated in parliament by James Taylor, M.L.A. Brisbane Courier, 17 May 1865.

<sup>230</sup> Guardian, 28 July 1860.

<sup>231</sup> A table of church properties, appended to Synod Proceedings, Brisbane, 1869-70, shows that of 37 portions of land in the possession of the church, 16 were government grants, 7 by private donations, and the rest purchased. The biggest was 279 acres at Wolston (near Darra on the Ipswich line), given by Thomas Mort to provide a basis for a general endowment of the diocese. Some of the government land grants became very valuable in later years, eg the site on which St. John's Church was built was sold in 1899 for £30,000 (Brisbane Courier, 24 August 1899).

of the Church of England.<sup>232</sup> These figures clearly indicate the division of opinion that existed between the clergy and a section of the laity on the one hand and the rest of the laity on the other. It was a division that was to continue throughout Bishop Tufnell's episcopate. Whether the bishop would have been able to change the mind of a sufficient proportion of the Anglican parliamentarians to reverse the vote if he had already arrived in the colony, we cannot know. The fact is that he had not arrived, and when he did land, he was faced with a fait accompli. Worse, there was the further threat of the discontinuance of state aid to church schools; and on that issue the bishop girded himself for a struggle that was to occupy much of his episcopate.

Tufnell saw that his first task was the filling of vacant parishes, and the creation of new parochial districts to meet the needs of the expanding population. It will be recalled that on his arrival there were five parishes – North Brisbane, Ipswich, Darling Downs, Fortitude Valley and Maryborough – of which the last two were vacant. Within a few months the vacancies were filled and a number of new parishes created. Pending the provision of an episcopal residence the bishop himself moved into St. John's parsonage, as a convenient centre for directing operations. With him at St. John's he kept the most junior of the new clergy, John Tomlinson and Thomas Jones; he sent Mosely to Fortitude Valley, and by 1861 established new parishes at Kangaroo Point and south Brisbane. On the Darling Downs,

Benjamin Glennie's vast area was divided, and while Glennie was centred on Warwick Edmund Moberley and Vincent Ransome were sent to Dalby and Toowoomba respectively; and by 1861 a new priest, Richard Thackeray, was at work on the Downs around Leyburn and Cambooya. Duncan Mackenzie was posted to the Wide Bay and Burnett area, with headquarters first at Gayndah, and then at Maryborough. The appointment of John Sutton to Port Curtis filled the long-standing gap there, and later in 1861 Rockhampton was supplied by the transfer of Thomas Jones.

There was a double-barrelled policy behind these appointments. On the one hand Tufnell was anxious to develop Brisbane as a strong centre for the diocese, as indicated by its division into four parishes. At the same time there was the concomitant policy of keeping pace with the spread of population in the growing country townships. There was an interesting – and wise – reversal of Bishop Tyrrell's policy in regard to country appointments. Whereas Tyrrell had sent the more junior clergy to the country outposts, it is noticeable that the three senior priests in the new diocese were all placed in outlying districts – Glennie at Warwick, Sutton at Gladstone and Mackenzie in the Burnett. Tufnell hoped that he would be able to send the clergy in pairs to the country areas, so that they might alternate between town and country work, and be spared continual loneliness. There was a glimpse of this plan in operation in sending of a new young arrival, James Matthews, to be Glennie's curate in Warwick in 1861; but there were neither sufficient clergy nor sufficient money to permit this becoming a regular policy.<sup>233</sup>

By the end of 1861 there were twelve parochial districts in existence, and this number slowly but steadily grew throughout the 1860's. By 1862 the growth of population in Brisbane around the old windmill and the Spring Hill area necessitated a new temporary church on Wickham Terrace; by 1864 Drayton-Toowoomba was divided into separate parishes, and another priest was stationed in the Upper Dawson Valley; in 1865 the Bowen area, strictly speaking outside the Brisbane diocesan boundary, was receiving the ministrations of an itinerant priest; by 1871 further divisions on the Darling Downs resulted in the formation of additional parishes at Goondiwindi and Allora, while Gympie was formed into a separate parish in the north. Gympie was an example of the problem presented to the bishop by mushrooming towns. Following the gold discoveries, six or eight thousand people had flocked to the town, and already by 1868 the local newspaper was voicing complaints about the church's failure to provide ministrations there. Bishop Tufnell was accused of "treating these famishing souls with so much contumely and indifference", and he was severely criticised for building his own residence in Brisbane while his flock at Gympie went untended.<sup>234</sup> Bishop Tufnell finally arranged for a priest to be sent there;<sup>235</sup> he was quite aware of the needs, but he was also only too aware of his own inadequate resources of manpower with which to meet them.

Not all of these newly formed parishes had an unbroken life once they were formed. Particularly in the outlying districts, where the clergy tended not to stay long, there were sometimes long gaps between the departure of one priest and the arrival of another. Roma, for example, after having a resident priest for a brief period in 1868, was then vacant for almost six years. Goondiwindi after a short time with its own clergyman waited sixteen years for its next incumbent.<sup>236</sup> One difficulty was that many of the townships were quite unstable in population, and proved after a time to be unable to support their own clergyman. In the more scattered areas Bishop Tufnell sought to solve this problem by appointing itinerating

<sup>232</sup> M.B.Courier, 11 August 1860.

<sup>233</sup> For full details of ecclesiastical appointments and arrangements in the diocese, see V. & P., Q'ld Parl., 1863, p. 306.

<sup>234</sup> Nashville Times, 20 May 1868. Similar letters appeared 11 April and 2 May 1868. Newspaper cuttings in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid., 16 September 1868.

<sup>236</sup> Information gleaned from parish records by Archdeacon W.P. Glover.

clergymen, such as the Reverend W.H. Dunning who covered a great area of some ten thousand square miles in the Dawson Valley in the mid-sixties. Gradually, however, as the districts became more settled and the population more numerous, so the work of the church became more continuous amongst them.<sup>237</sup>

For the clergy, especially in the country districts, life was by no means easy or attractive. When the diocese was formed there were only two permanent churches, St. John's in Brisbane, and St. Paul's in Ipswich. Elsewhere slab huts, school buildings, or public buildings like courthouses served as places of worship. In 1861 only four of the parishes had their own parsonages, and home comforts for the clergy were strictly limited. For some of them, travel was hard and constant. W.H. Dunning reported in 1865 that he held services at 24 centres,<sup>238</sup> while in 1861 Edmund Moberley of Dalby had reported a pastoral tour of more than 1400 miles over a period of four months in which he held 45 services and baptized 70 children.<sup>239</sup> These records are particularly impressive when it is remembered that most of these men had come to Queensland from a very different kind of environment, and with very little parochial experience behind them.

As parishes were established building projects were undertaken, according to the initiative of the local clergyman. Progress was steady rather than spectacular, and financial difficulties often caused delays and resulted in the expedient of cheap and unattractive buildings being erected. Nevertheless by the time of the first diocesan synod in 1868 Bishop Tufnell was able to enumerate an impressive list of constructions. In the metropolitan area new congregations had been formed and churches built at Wickham Terrace, Lutwyche, and Toowong; the old buildings at Fortitude Valley, South Brisbane and Kangaroo Point had all been enlarged; St. John's Church was in the process of being doubled in size by the addition of its second wing; and small churches were under construction at Groveley and Doughboy Creek. At Ipswich the church debt had been reduced by £1000 and the parsonage completely renovated. New churches had been built at Dalby, Allora, Maryborough, Rockhampton, Bowen, Yandilla and Goomburra (the last two by the owners of stations), while at Warwick the fine stone church of St. Mark was under construction. The churches at Toowoomba and Drayton had been enlarged, and parsonages were complete at Taroom, Warwick, Dalby and Bowen.<sup>240</sup>

From all this it is clear that the Church of England had developed very rapidly since the formation of the diocese. Yet in view of the fact that the Anglican population of Queensland increased more than threefold between 1861 and 1871<sup>241</sup>, the rate of parochial extension and the construction of buildings were barely sufficient to keep pace with the general growth of the colony. Bishop Tufnell could rightly express some satisfaction at the growth of the diocese as he looked back over his first ten years in 1870; yet as the synod reminded him in a motion passed after his address, the rate of progress was still not satisfactory.<sup>242</sup> The church could by no means yet afford to rest on its laurels.

### iii. Men and Money

It was soon evident that the twin shortages of manpower and finance were preventing the more rapid growth of the church. No amount of good intentions could transcend the limitations imposed by the inadequate number of clergy. The initial party of six clergymen who accompanied the bishop from England formed a good nucleus, and several more priests followed within a year or two. Yet the supply of clergy remained a constant anxiety, particularly as those who had come out with Tufnell began to leave again. By 1868 only two of the original six were still at work in Brisbane, another being inactive through ill health, and the other three having left the diocese. This was typical of the constant fluctuations in the clerical personnel of the diocese, and a constant recruitment of men in England was necessary if numbers were to be maintained at even the barest minimum level.

To Bishop Tufnell this was always a vexing problem. He had, indeed, moderate success in building up the number of clergy in the early years of his episcopate, but he would willingly have divested himself of this particular responsibility. Securing a supply of clergy, he declared to his first synod, should be regarded as one of synod's immediate problems,<sup>243</sup> and again in 1869, in reporting that he had taken no action apart from telling the S.P.G. and the warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, of the need of his diocese for manpower, he expressed his willingness for synod to assume responsibility in the matter.<sup>244</sup> This passing of the buck was a thoroughly negative attitude: the only possible way of securing staff for a colonial diocese was by constant and energetic action by the bishop himself, and nowhere were

<sup>237</sup> Details of the growth of parishes and the appointment of clergy may be found in the Ecclesiastical Returns in the Statistical Register, V. & P., Q'ld Parl., 1863, 1864 and 1865. Pugh's Almanac printed a list of ministers of religion each year. From 1868 material may be obtained from Brisbane Synod Proceedings.

<sup>238</sup> W.H. Dunning, Missionary Report for 1865, S.P.G. 'E' Mss.

<sup>239</sup> Tufnell to Hawkins, 14 November 1861, S.P.G. 'D' Mss.

<sup>240</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1869, p.24

<sup>241</sup> Cf. census figures, Appendix 4.

<sup>242</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1870, p.14

<sup>243</sup> Ibid., 1868, p.23

<sup>244</sup> Ibid., 1869, Bishop's Address, p.3.

Tufnell's deficiencies of leadership more apparent than in this attempt to evade a responsibility which must in the nature of things be his own. Once synod was established he was all too ready, probably in reaction to earlier complaints about episcopal autocracy, to place the responsibility for initiative on synod. However much such a policy might have been practicable once church life became stabilised, it certainly was not wise in this pioneering phase.

The diocesan council, however, eventually took the matter in hand to the extent of urging the bishop to make more contacts in England. In 1870 the council resolved that the bishop should ask the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, and the warden of St. Augustine's College, to recommend suitable clergy for the colony.<sup>245</sup> Later, a different and more personal approach was tried, when the Reverend John Tomlinson, one of Tufnell's original party who had returned to England, was requested to seek out young unmarried clergymen to serve for three years in the diocese.<sup>246</sup>

This method of having young English priests coming out for a short term helped relieve immediate difficulties, but it had the effect of creating a continuous instability of clerical staff, and the introduction of a fairly high proportion of unsuitable men led to a considerable wastage. In 1872, for example, Bishop Tufnell reported to synod that there were in the diocese five clergymen who had once held his license, but were no longer exercising their ministry – a particularly large number in view of the small number of clergy in the colony. "How difficult it is," commented the bishop, "to select for the ministry of the Church in an extensive but sparsely populated diocese those who are really adapted for its requirements."<sup>247</sup>

It was in the face of these difficulties that a sub-committee of the synod of 1873 recommended that the colonial church must begin to look to the young men of the colony itself as a source of ordination candidates. It must still be a long time before there could be any thought of self-sufficiency in clergy, or even before a local theological college could be established, but this report is significant as representing the beginning of the realisation that an indigenous ministry must eventually be built up. The sub-committee recommended that Queensland youths should be

induced to enter the ranks of diaconate, with the understanding that they would be called upon to work and study under the direction of experienced priests for not less than three years prior to their own admission to the priesthood.<sup>248</sup>

Bishop Tufnell did not remain to preside over another synod, so it was left to his successor to implement the policy of admitting local candidates to holy orders.

Finance was closely linked to manpower: one of the greatest difficulties in increasing the supply of clergy was providing adequate stipends for them, and men could not be expected to undertake the long journey from England unless they were guaranteed economic security on arrival. Where was the requisite finance to be found?

Before separation, there were three sources of income available to the church – government grants, gifts from England, and local contributions. In the relative importance of these sources there had been a gradual, but quite perceptible, alteration. The government grants, which at the beginning of the church's life in New South Wales, had provided almost all the revenue of the church, were relatively small by 1859, and in the new colony of Queensland they had comparatively little significance. The abolition of state aid to religion, as one of the first legislative acts of the Queensland parliament, virtually put an end to this source of revenue, and assistance to the pre-separation clergy and grants of land for church purposes were all that remained, and as we have seen, even this small assistance soon vanished.

The loss of state aid meant that heavy reliance must be placed upon gifts from England, of which the grants of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel were the most reliable source of aid. Without this assistance it is not too much to say that the church in Queensland could barely have begun to make progress, because Brisbane was still essentially a missionary diocese, quite unable to support itself. We have already noted the initial assistance received by Bishop Tufnell from the Colonial Bishops Fund, the S.P.G. and his own personal friends. By the mid-sixties, however, the need for further ecclesiastical expansion to keep pace with the growth of the colony rendered increased English support imperative, particularly in view of the worsening depression in the economy of Queensland. In the course of his lengthy visit to England at this time, Tufnell succeeded in persuading the S.P.G. to raise its annual grant from £200 to £700 for a period of three years. The money was to be used to provide passage money for new clergy, and to support priests who were sent to the sparsely settled portions of the bush. The value of this increased S.P.G. grant is indicated by the fact that by 1867 eleven of the clergy of the diocese were being assisted from this fund.<sup>249</sup> After the three-year period the S.P.G. grant was diminished by degrees, to £500 in 1869, £350 in 1870, and £300 from 1872 until its eventual abolition in 1881. This was in accordance with the society's policy of progressive diminution of grants as an incentive to local self-support.

<sup>245</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 20 April 1870.

<sup>246</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1873, p.27

<sup>247</sup> Ibid., 1872, p.5.

<sup>248</sup> Ibid., 1873, p.28.

<sup>249</sup> S.P.G. Annual Report, 1867, p.137



With the abolition of state aid and the prospect of diminishing grants from English sources, Tufnell recognised that the financial stability of the diocese must depend upon the degree to which Anglicans in Queensland could be brought to admit their financial obligations to the church. He hoped to establish a Church Society on the pattern of Bishop Tyrrell's eminently successful Newcastle Church Society, and within a fortnight of his arrival in Brisbane he alluded to this prospect at a public meeting.<sup>250</sup> Such a society was in fact established, but it never attained the vigour of its Newcastle prototype, and by 1864 its treasurer had to admit that it had virtually become a dead letter.<sup>251</sup>

Nevertheless the bishop speedily set about a programme of seeking subscriptions for the work of the church within the various parishes. In the first three months of his episcopate he toured the chief centres of population to visit his flock and discuss the financial arrangements necessary for parochial organisation.<sup>252</sup> His objective was identical with Bishop Tyrrell's, namely that a minimum stipend of £300 should be provided for every priest.<sup>253</sup> This ideal was not in practice achieved: in many cases £250 came to be regarded as a sufficient minimum, and frequently even this amount was not forthcoming.

On this initial visitation Tufnell achieved a gratifying measure of success. At a meeting in Warwick £400 was promised; at Dalby £300 was subscribed; and similar results elsewhere provided distinct encouragement.<sup>254</sup> It was with some satisfaction that the bishop was able to report that local contributions to the church increased from £575 in 1860 to £2900 in 1861.<sup>255</sup>

Unfortunately, however, promises were not always fulfilled, and particularly in bad seasons some of the clergy found themselves in difficult financial circumstances. By 1868 the salary of the Rector of Dalby was £200 in arrears;<sup>256</sup> in 1870 the parish of Warwick owed Archdeacon Glennie £115;<sup>257</sup> and at this time seven out of fifteen parishes in the diocese were lagging in their payment of stipends. It was this inability to guarantee regular stipends that caused some parishes to go for long periods without a clergyman, and often the incumbent was placed in the ignominious position of having to try to collect his own stipend. An indication of the kind of situation that had arisen is given by a resolution of the Warwick Vestry:

That it is desirable the Committee should relieve the Archdeacon from the unpleasant necessity of soliciting contributions for the Stipend Fund as it is calculated to hinder him the discharge of his more important duties, and that they hold themselves responsible for the due and regular payment of the clergyman's stipend.<sup>258</sup>

The necessity for passing such a motion is eloquent testimony to the predicament in which many of the clergy were placed.

Bishop Tufnell was well aware of this situation, and envisaged some form of diocesan financial arrangement to relieve hard-pressed clergy.

Despite the failure of his projected Church Society, he continued to urge some kind of diocesan fund from which at least part of the stipend of the clergy might be paid, supplemented by the offerings of the local congregation. He gave his reasons to the synod in 1868:

To be entirely supported by voluntary contributions, in my judgment, places the Clergy in a position of unhealthy dependence upon the will of the congregation; whilst on the other hand, it appears to me that the system of entire endowment is exposed to the danger of rendering the Clergy too independent of the affectionate respect and good will of those who are committed to their pastoral supervision.<sup>259</sup>

The idea was sound enough in principle, but as usual it was not followed up, and the bishop waited for the synod to act instead of giving a quite definite lead himself. Finally, however, in 1870 a canon was half-heartedly passed for the establishment of a Diocesan Fund. It lacked the precise organisation and social character of the Newcastle Church Society, and was entirely a financial scheme. Its object was to provide a central fund to pay for the passages of new clergy, to help with the stipends of priests in poorer districts, to assist with the erection of churches, parsonages and schools, and to promote education. The income was to come from rents and interests, annual subscriptions, special collections and grants from the English societies.<sup>260</sup>

<sup>250</sup> M.B. Courier, 13 September 1860.

<sup>251</sup> Brisbane Courier, 23 July 1864.

<sup>252</sup> Tufnell to Rev. E. Hawkins, 18 December 1860 S.P.G. 'D' MSS. His first tour lasted seven weeks and included services at 27 centres.

<sup>253</sup> M.B. Courier, 4 October, 1860

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 6 November 1860, 17 November 1860.

<sup>255</sup> S.P.G. Annual Report, 1862, p.181

<sup>256</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1868, Statistical Returns.

<sup>257</sup> Minutes, Warwick Vestry, 13 January 1870.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 1 April 1865.

<sup>259</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1868. p.23

<sup>260</sup> Ibid., 1871 (Special Session), p.45.

Despite the bishop's pleas, the idea never really aroused enthusiasm. Members of the diocesan Council and synod were asked to set the pace with their own contributions, but they mustered only £110 between them. In 1872 it was reported that only three new subscriptions had been received in the past year<sup>261</sup> and the collapse of the scheme was revealed in a rather pathetic minute of the Diocesan Council in 1872.

... since no person of sufficient influence and social standing can be induced to undertake the collection of money to form a central fund which is absolutely necessary for carrying on the work of the Diocese, the Bishop be requested to undertake the duty of canvassing the settled districts and discharging pastoral duties.<sup>262</sup>

Tufnell justifiably refused to accept this motion, and while he agreed to urge the claims of the central fund upon the people in the course of his ordinary pastoral visits, he declined to make it his primary work. It was an indication of the disturbing tendency to regard the bishop in the Diocese, like the priest in the parish, as a convenient person on whom to place the burden of raising money.

By the end of Tufnell's episcopate the diocese had taken the first steps towards an adequacy of clergy and financial self-sufficiency. But they were only the first steps. If continuous assistance from England were to be cut off, the diocese would still find itself in a disastrous condition. It was clear that serious problems still lay ahead.

#### iv. The Education Controversy.<sup>263</sup>

If questions of parochial organisation, recruitment of clergy and finance were necessarily among the first matters to occupy Dr. Tufnell's attention, it was perhaps the education question that was his dearest concern and that involved him in the most controversial aspect of his episcopate.

The school, my brethren, has been regarded as the handmaid of the Church: and in a well-ordered parish, next in importance to the ministrations of the ordained pastor, we may regard the efficiency of the teachers of the day and Sunday Schools.<sup>264</sup>

Such was his attitude to church schools. He came from an environment where most educational work was directly or indirectly linked with the church, from primary school to university. It was in the parish schools that most English children received their education, and Bishop Tufnell could conceive of no satisfactory education that was not grounded on the Christian religion.

Tufnell's great ambition, therefore, was to build up a comprehensive and efficient system of church schools, but he recognised that without government grants this would be impossible. He argued that as the conscience of many people demanded that their children be educated in church schools, it was only fair that the money which they contributed in taxes should be drawn upon to support these schools as well as the national schools.

The bishop summed up his viewpoint in a letter to the press:

Believing, as we do, religion to be a most important element in the education of the young, we cannot conscientiously avail ourselves of a system from which it is practically excluded, and as we contribute our quota to the revenue of the colony, if a system of general education is to be maintained at the public expense, we ask (I think not unreasonably) that it may be a system in the benefits of which all can participate.<sup>265</sup>

Within a month of his arrival in Queensland Bishop Tufnell announced his complete opposition to the attempt which was clearly pending to abolish state aid to the denominational schools<sup>266</sup>. At this time the church schools comprised a significant portion of the educational system of the colony. At the time of separation, there were six Anglican schools - three in Brisbane, and others at Ipswich, Toowoomba and Maryborough - at which a total of 387 children were enrolled. This represented about a quarter of the school children of the colony, and these six schools had received government aid during 1859 to the extent of £384.<sup>267</sup>

<sup>261</sup> Ibid., 1872, p.26

<sup>262</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 7 February 1872.

<sup>263</sup> For a fuller account of the education controversy, see Wyeth, E.R., Education in Queensland, Part II; the subject has also been more fully dealt with than in this thesis in Rayner, K., The Attitude and Influence of the Churches in Queensland on Matters of Social and Political Importance (unpublished thesis), Chap 2. My own interpretation differs in some respects from Dr. Wyeth's, who, it seems to me, has been unduly influenced by the attitude of the two Brisbane newspapers of the time, both of which were strongly opposed to Bishop Tufnell's policy.

<sup>264</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1868, p.24.

<sup>265</sup> Queensland Daily Guardian, 28 April 1863.

<sup>266</sup> M.B. Courier, 4 October 1860.

<sup>267</sup> There was only one national school at this time, at Drayton, and the rest of the children were in the 4 Roman Catholic schools and 30 smaller private schools. V. & P., Q'ld Parl., 1860, p.938.

Before Bishop Tufnell arrived, the Primary Education Act had been passed by parliament.<sup>268</sup> It provided for two types of schools under the supervision of a Board of General Education – “Vested” schools (i.e. vested in the board), and “Non-vested” schools (i.e. those vested in a religious denomination). The latter were to be assisted by the government through payment of teachers’ salaries and through the supply of books. It was provided, reasonably enough, that the Non-vested schools should be subject to inspection in order to ensure the maintenance of a sufficient standard. The measure seemed quite uncontroversial, and was passed with little opposition, and the fact that it was introduced and strongly supported by M.C. O’Connell, later one of Bishop Tufnell’s staunchest supporters in his claims for state aid for church schools, indicates that the possible deleterious effects of the bill on church schools were not foreseen. There might have been more concern if bishop Tufnell, and his Roman Catholic counterpart, Bishop Quinn, had arrived but they were still a safe distance away. At all events, the bill appeared acceptable to all parties; the supporters of church schools were satisfied that provision was made for financial assistance to their schools, while the advocates of national schools recognised that it would take some time for sufficient national schools to be built to cope with all the children of the colony, and that in the meantime it was reasonable for the existing church schools to be maintained with government assistance.

There was, however, the seed of future discord within the act, because its intentions were liable to opposing interpretations. The opponents of state aid to denominational schools interpreted the act to mean that state aid should continue only so long as there were insufficient national schools. On the other hand Bishop Tufnell and those who were like-minded understood the act to provide for state aid to church schools on a permanent basis. The act itself was non-committal: and it contained no detailed regulations for the Non-vested schools, and it was left to the Board of General Education to draw up regulations. Everything depended on how successive Boards of General Education interpreted the act.

It was not long before the conflict came into the open. The first Board of General Education under the act was predominantly Non-conformist in composition and distinctly favoured an entirely national system. The result was that two regulations were soon promulgated which were clearly aimed at the church schools. The first ordered that school buildings were not to be used for public worship outside school hours, a provision without parallel in the New South Wales regulations on which those of Queensland were in other respects modelled. In Queensland, as we have seen, most of the school buildings were used on Sundays for worship pending the erection of permanent churches, and the observance of this regulation would have paralysed parish life. Tufnell immediately reacted by calling a meeting of protest, and as a result the government agreed to restrain the board from exercising any control over the use of school buildings outside school hours.<sup>269</sup>

The second controversial regulation of the board prohibited the use of regular school hours for giving denominational religious instruction in the Non-vested schools. Ostensibly the purpose was to ensure that sufficient time was devoted to the secular subjects; but it meant that if special religious instruction were to be given, it must be done by extending the hours which the children must spend in school, an expedient hardly calculated to make the study of religion attractive to the average child. It is scarcely surprising that this regulation was only very grudgingly accepted by the church.

The bishop now made a renewed application to the board for aid for his church schools, but the claim was rejected in the case of two schools on a new ground, namely that they would be competing with Vested schools in their vicinity. This implied an interpretation of the act which was quite unacceptable to those who believed in church schools on principle, and Tufnell saw it as a throwing down of the gauntlet. Already the schools were forming a strain on his meagre finances. Fees were not sufficient to meet expenses,<sup>270</sup> and only one small church school, at Kangaroo Point, was receiving government aid.<sup>271</sup> To tide the schools over, the bishop was employing the interest on a sum of £3000 which he had collected in England for various purposes;<sup>272</sup> but this could be only a temporary expedient, and in any case, this small sum could do no more than keep the existing schools open, leaving no possibility of expansion.

A long and bitter campaign now began in earnest. A petition was organised, to which seven hundred signatures were attached;<sup>273</sup> the bishop spoke publicly on the subject on every possible occasion; and finally a parliamentary select committee was set up to enquire into the question. The report of this committee proved favourable to Bishop Tufnell’s claims, but it was rejected by the Legislative Assembly. Education became the great issue of the day. The two Brisbane newspapers, under Non-conformist control, led the attack on Bishop Tufnell. His policy was to ‘grope about after filthy lucre’, declared the Courier<sup>274</sup>, while the Guardian deliberately announced its policy:

<sup>268</sup> Pring, R., Statutes in Force in the Colony of Queensland, pp. 521-523.

<sup>269</sup> Queensland Guardian, 10 January 1861 and 7 February 1861.

<sup>270</sup> Fees were a shilling a week for the first child, and three pence a week for younger children.

<sup>60</sup> V. & P. Q’ld Parl., 1863 Statistical Returns for 1861.

<sup>61</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1868, p.25.

<sup>62</sup> V. & P. Q’ld Parl., 1861.

<sup>63</sup> 3 November 1860.

For ourselves we promise this agitation, most infelicitously called the Bishop's agitation, a most uncompromising opposition in every stage of its progress.<sup>275</sup>

The heat of controversy rose and fell. Finally in 1862 the whole Board of General Education was dismissed by the government for exceeding their prerogatives by a sharp criticism of Dr. Tufnell in their annual report.<sup>276</sup> The controversy was stirred up again early in 1863 when a new board was appointed, including two prominent Anglican laymen, M.C. O'Connell and John Douglas, as well as the secretary of the Roman Catholic bishop. From the Non-conformists and liberals came cries of bishops' plots! That year, the number of Anglican schools receiving subsidies rose to three, but the refusal of the board to grant assistance to the others led to the resignation of O'Connell and Douglas from the board. Feeling was now running high, and both Bishop Tufnell and Bishop Quinn organised protest meetings, and they took the unprecedented step of making a joint tour of some of the chief centres of the colony to win support for their case. Meetings were held in Dalby, Toowoomba, Ipswich and Brisbane: charges and counter-charges were hurled by both sides; and the whole colony was sharply divided on the issue.

Within the Church of England itself there was great division of opinion on the matter. Many Anglicans were strongly prejudiced against the Roman Catholic Church, and the alliance of Bishop Tufnell with Dr. Quinn was regarded with some uneasiness. The newspapers played upon these doubts, and pictured the Anglican bishop as the gullible dupe of the shrewd Roman Catholic prelate.<sup>277</sup> These suspicions were genuinely held by many people, and even the governor made a similar inference in a despatch to England at the time. Having described Dr. Quinn's efforts to have precedence accorded to the senior bishop in the colony, whether he be Anglican or Roman Catholic, Sir George Bowen went on:

It would almost appear that Bishop Quinn soon became convinced that, instead of carrying on a barren struggle for precedence, it would be more useful to put forward the amiable and excellent Anglican Bishop as the prominent exponent of their common hostility to the system of Education established by law.<sup>278</sup>

That Tufnell was put forward on tactical grounds as the chief spokesman for the joint case was certainly true: his voice would be more likely to influence the non-Roman majority of colonists than would Quinn's. There is, however, no reason to suppose that Bishop Tufnell was not fully conscious of what he was doing, or that he was unwittingly being used for the purposes of others. He was simply carrying out by every possible means the same policy as he had consistently advocated from his first days in the colony.

Tufnell was much hindered by the disunity within the Church of England on the education issue. In Ipswich, which had always been noted for strong sectarian feeling and where there was considerable hostility between Roman Catholics and members of other churches, a large meeting of Anglicans almost unanimously declared its opposition to Bishop Tufnell's policy.<sup>279</sup> Another meeting in Brisbane, smaller but very influential as it included many of the leading men of the colony, only narrowly supported the bishop.<sup>280</sup> But the weakness of his position was particularly evidenced by the fact that the parliament which was carrying through the educational programme which Tufnell opposed, contained a majority of Anglicans (at least nominally) in both houses. Tufnell's campaign was further weakened by favourable comments on the Irish National System of Education (on which the national system in Queensland was based) by Bishop Frederic Barker, Bishop of Sydney, during his metropolitanical visit to Brisbane in 1864. Barker obviously approved of the national system, on the understanding that it would embrace special religious instruction in school hours, and even his mild approval helped bolster the case of Tufnell's opponents.<sup>281</sup>

The bishops' joint campaign had little obvious immediate effect, except for some relaxation of the regulations, which had the effect of permitting schools established since separation to become eligible for assistance as Non-vested schools.<sup>282</sup> The long absence of Bishop Tufnell in England in the mid-sixties brought a temporary truce, but for Tufnell, the struggle was far from complete, and his return was marked by the continuance of a persistent correspondence from the bishop to the board seeking additional aid. His persistence was rewarded, and by 1871 Tufnell was able to report to synod that the salaries of all teachers in the Anglican schools were now being paid by the government.<sup>283</sup>

---

<sup>275</sup> 10 January 1861.

<sup>276</sup> R.G.W. Herbert, the Colonial Secretary, who opposed Tufnell on the schools issue, was nevertheless an Anglican and an old school-fellow of the bishop. No doubt he felt that a personal attack on the bishop by an official board was going too far.

<sup>277</sup> E.g. *Queensland Daily Guardian*, 11 October 1864.

<sup>278</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 1864 No 71.

<sup>279</sup> *Queensland Daily Guardian*, 21 October 1864

<sup>280</sup> *Ibid.*, 9 November 1864.

<sup>281</sup> *Brisbane Courier*, 23 July 1864. Also Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 1864, No 71.

<sup>282</sup> *Queensland Government Gazette*, 1864, p.71

<sup>283</sup> *Brisbane Synod Proceedings*, 1872, Bishop's address, p.8.

Yet the victory was not nearly so complete as it appeared: it had been bought at too costly a price. While the ten-year controversy had been proceeding the Anglican schools had gradually been slipping in relation to the total education system of the colony. In view of the uncertainty about future aid, no new schools had been constructed, and the existing ones had not improved in standard, while in the same period a system of national schools had been built up, with the resources of the colony behind them. In 1873 there were still only seven Church of England schools, and though the biggest had seven hundred children, some were quite small, and these schools now embraced only a relatively small proportion of the school children of the colony.<sup>284</sup> Perhaps the most disastrous result of the long controversy, however, was the growth of determination aroused in the secularists to bring about an entirely secular system of education in which religious instruction would be entirely excluded during school hours.

By the time Bishop Tufnell retired from Brisbane, the process of secularising Queensland's education system was already gathering pace. A new regulation in 1873 forbade teachers who were paid by the government to give special religious instruction during school hours in the Non-vested schools, a regulation which crippled religious instruction in the Anglican schools.<sup>285</sup> This was quickly followed by the appointment of a Royal Commission on Education, whose very composition made its findings a foregone conclusion. The Education Act of 1875 was the result: within five years all aid to church schools was to cease, and religious instruction was to be excluded from the state schools during school hours. By 1880 not one of the Anglican schools remained open: finances were too low to permit of the expenditure of church funds upon them, and with Tufnell's departure there was no leader sufficiently determined to carry on the struggle to keep the schools alive. Later the church would make further contributions to education in Queensland, but these were to be in other fields than that of primary education. For the present the collapse of Bishop Tufnell's education aspirations was complete.

One consequence of this breakdown of the church's day school system was a recognition of the need to concentrate on building up a system of Sunday schools. By this time Sunday schools were an established feature of church life in England, but they had even more significance in a colony where the children received an entirely secular education in their day schools. Sunday schools were the only alternative if the children were to receive some kind of definite religious instruction. For this reason the Non-conformist churches, opposed as they were to the principle of church day schools, had concentrated on developing an effective Sunday school system.

As the parochial system developed in Queensland the Sunday school became a normal part of Anglican parish life. Already by 1861 there were three Sunday schools in Brisbane and five in country centres, with a total attendance of more than five hundred children.<sup>286</sup> Numbers grew as time went on, and though good teachers were hard to find and teaching methods lacked polish, these Sunday schools did provide a place where the children could be grounded in the elements of the faith.

#### **v. Constitutional Church Government**

Of all Bishop Tufnell's achievements perhaps the most significant in the end was his work in placing the new diocese on a sound organisational and constitutional foundation. As we have seen, he regarded it as essential that initially he should personally act as the fount of all authority – for the practical reason that in its embryonic state the diocese must have one leader, and for the legal reason that he was the only person entitled to exercise authority, by virtue both of the spiritual authority of his episcopal office and of the jurisdiction conferred by his letters patent. He had, therefore, all the property of the diocese vested in his own name<sup>287</sup>; he kept personal control over the money which he had brought from England and that which was collected for diocesan purposes locally; and he appointed and removed clergy by his own decision. It was not that he was unwilling to share the responsibility; but he believed that must wait until suitable constitutional machinery had been devised and a synod legally established.

As the first requirement of diocesan organisation Tufnell was anxious to ensure that the office of the bishop was itself placed on a secure economic foundation, so that there would be no danger of future bishops being left without adequate means of support. His endeavour to build up the See Endowment Fund for this purpose aroused criticism from time to time; but there could be no accusation of personal selfishness, for Tufnell himself never seems to have received a stipend of more than £400 a year from the fund.<sup>288</sup> By means of an extra contribution from the Colonial Bishops Council, subscriptions from English friends, and £2200 raised locally, the see endowment was raised to more than £9000.<sup>289</sup> Owing

<sup>284</sup> V. & P. Q'ld Parliament, 1873, p. 927

<sup>285</sup> Queensland Government Gazette, 1873, p.1230.

<sup>286</sup> V. & P., Q'ld Parl., 1863; Statistical Returns for 1861.

<sup>287</sup> Actually the See Endowment Fund was vested in three trustees – the Bishop, M.C. O'Connell and Robert Little (Crown Solicitor). See Tufnell to Rev. E. Hawkins, 16 May 1863, S.P.G. 'D' Mss.

<sup>288</sup> Week, 27 October 1877, an article probably by William Coote; on his first arrival in the colony, the bishop was receiving only £200 a year. Brisbane Courier, 23 July 1864.

<sup>289</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1869, pp.43-45: Select Committee Report.

to the somewhat unsatisfactory nature of the investment of this money, however, the income from the fund was not as high as might have been anticipated.<sup>290</sup>

As a further means of stabilizing the bishop's position Tufnell also wanted to provide a suitable episcopal residence, where the bishop could live with that dignity appropriate to his position. He had been given money for this purpose by friends in England, which was fortunate, because the expenditure of £4400 on land and building of Bishopsbourne was not a project calculated to win widespread approval at a time when the diocese and its parishes were languishing from want of funds. In 1868, however, the fine stone building was complete, and the bishop took up residence there, moving from St. John's parsonage which had so far served as a very meagre episcopal palace. From an immediate point of view, the construction of such an expensive house had little in its favour: but Tufnell in all his planning was thinking of the future, and the wisdom of his action was to be vindicated by the value of Bishopsbourne over the years.

Tufnell's policy of maintaining personal control until stable constitutional machinery could be provided was demonstrated in his handling of the temporary church built on Wickham Terrace in 1862. He followed his usual custom of appointing a curate rather than a rector,<sup>291</sup> but what made the parishioners more irate was his refusal to licence the building as a parish church. The bishop's logic was clear: he intended the site to be used for the future cathedral, and he was determined to ensure that no parochial rights and traditions should be established which might prejudice some future bishop's rights in his cathedral.<sup>292</sup> In Sydney and some other Australian dioceses bishops had found themselves in difficulties in their own cathedrals for this reason. In the end Tufnell gave way: but not before he had decided that the site would be unsuitable for a cathedral in any case.<sup>293</sup>

By 1864 the bishop's policy of personal control was arousing considerable discontent, especially insofar as it related to the administration of finance and the appointment of clergy. There was considerable misapprehension in the community as to how much money the bishop had at his disposal, and this was made a convenient excuse by people who did not want to contribute to church funds. Under considerable pressure from public opinion, and realising that it would help clarify the position, Tufnell took the opportunity of the visit of the Bishop of Sydney in July 1864 to publish an exact account of the financial condition of the diocese.<sup>294</sup> He still had no intention of relinquishing personal control over diocesan funds, but his action did help to allay for a time the doubts that had genuinely arisen and that had been assiduously fostered by the bishop's opponents. Bishop Barker supported Tufnell and agreed with him that it was desirable for colonial bishops to retain personal control over the funds which they had raised.

Less than a month afterwards, another attempt was made to limit the bishop's authority. On this occasion the issue was the disposal of property which the church held by virtue of government grant. The government introduced into the Legislative Assembly a Trustees of Public Lands Bill, which was designed to permit the sale of land granted by the government, provided the government approved. An exception was made in the case of church lands, however, which would have had the effect of requiring the bishop's consent before church land could be so alienated. Tufnell had consistently refused to allow church land to be sold or mortgaged, whereas some of the laymen had wanted to adopt the shortsighted policy of selling land as a painless way of raising funds for building projects. The bishop was undoubtedly right: if some of the parochial trustees had had their way, much precious church land that would grow increasingly valuable as years passed, would have been disposed of to make quick money. The trustees of St. John's had wanted, for example, to sell part of their land, and only the bishop's refusal had prevented this action.

While the bill was before parliament some of the bishop's opponents called a meeting of members of the Church of England to protest against the clause requiring the bishop's consent. The meeting was small but influential,<sup>295</sup> and by petitioning the government they succeeded in having the controversial clause removed from the bill. The actual consequences were insignificant: but the controversy was yet another indication of the underlying conflict that was proceeding as to the rightful seat of authority within the church.

---

<sup>290</sup> Governor Bowen estimated that the episcopal income was £900, but this was based on an inadequate knowledge of the nature of the investments. Bowen to Sec. of State for the Colonies, 1866, Despatch no 70.

<sup>291</sup> A curate could be removed at the bishop's will, whereas a rector had a security of tenure.

<sup>292</sup> Tufnell had brought with him a grandiose design for a cathedral by the eminent English architect, William Burges. The plans were never used, which was probably a blessing for Brisbane. One feature was to be a pulpit standing on dogs, because the dog, who keeps us awake by barking, was supposed to symbolise the Christian preacher! Clarke, B.F.L. *Anglican Cathedrals Outside the British Isles*, p. 103.

<sup>293</sup> *Brisbane Courier*, 30 January 1864 and 20 February 1864.

<sup>294</sup> *Ibid.*, 23 July 1864

<sup>295</sup> Among those present were R.R. Mackenzie and C.W. Blakeney, M.M.L.A., who consistently opposed the bishop's authority, and some other parliamentarians. *Brisbane Courier*, 20 August 1864.

It was not long afterwards that the most important attack was made on the bishop's personal authority. This time the issue was the right of patronage, or appointment to ecclesiastical benefices, and it was significant because it brought to light remarkable anomalies in the constitutional position of the bishop.

There had been considerable dissatisfaction in various parishes with some of the clergy whom Tufnell had appointed, particularly on the ground of churchmanship. Many of the men he introduced were regarded, by the standards of the day, as high churchmen. In 1864 when the parish of Ipswich fell vacant, the congregation refused to concede the bishop's right to appoint the next incumbent, and asked the governor to intervene, as the representative of the Crown, so that the nominee of the congregation might be appointed. Bowen was unwilling to act, but on referring the matter to the attorney-general for legal advice, he found that a remarkable situation existed. No legal power of appointment to spiritual cures had been vested in the bishop by his letters patent, nor did the congregation possess any legal right of appointment. The legal opinion went on:

If such a legal power exists anywhere it is to be found in the Governor, acting provisionally on behalf of the Crown, under that part of the 22<sup>nd</sup> clause of the Royal Instructions which runs as follows:- 'It is our pleasure that you do appoint provisionally and until our pleasure be known, to such spiritual cures as may from time to time become vacant'.<sup>296</sup>

This instruction was a throwback to the time when the colonial church was established, and had been simply copied from earlier lists of instructions to colonial governors. It was obviously anachronistic in a colony where church and state were separated. Yet legally the position was that the bishop had no right of nomination to cures, and that all Tufnell's appointments so far were *ultra vires*. Sir George Bowen recognised, however, that it would be unjust and impolitic for the governor to exercise his legal power of appointment, and he refused to intervene officially in the Ipswich case, though he did unofficially act as a mediator between the bishop and the congregation.

For Dr. Tufnell this ruling was a severe blow, though not entirely unexpected, as the anomalous legal position of colonial bishops was becoming increasingly apparent to legal authorities. It meant, however, that his claim to exercise authority in the diocese by virtue of his letters patent was seriously undermined. In practice it mattered little, because it was at this time that he left the diocese for a period of two and a half years, and the whole position was to be clarified soon after his return. It does, however, point to the truth of Governor Bowen's comments that 'it is admitted in all quarters that the position of the Colonial Episcopate is surrounded with difficulties and anomalies'.<sup>297</sup>

Conscious of the undesirability of maintaining autocratic rule indefinitely, Tufnell had already in 1864 raised the question of the wisdom of creating a diocesan synod as a basis of constitutional government for the diocese. This expedient had been advocated as early as 1850 by the conference of Australasian bishops, and had been adopted in some of the southern dioceses.<sup>298</sup> It was during the metropolitanical visitation of Bishop Barker that Tufnell took advantage of the presence in Brisbane of the clergy and leading laity to ask their opinion on synodical action. The answer was almost unanimously in the negative. It was universally felt by those concerned that conditions were not yet sufficiently settled, nor ease of assembly sufficiently adequate to make a synod practicable at that time.<sup>299</sup> The unanimity of this opinion at any rate exonerates Bishop Tufnell from the blame that was sometimes ascribed to him for continuing to hold the reins of diocesan administration in his own hands.<sup>300</sup>

Nevertheless by 1865 it was becoming clear that some action was necessary both to clarify the legal powers of the bishop and to enable the sharing of administration, and there was some talk before the bishop left for England of the desirability of a bill's being submitted to the colonial legislature to accomplish this end. The departure of the bishop seemed likely to delay proceedings, but some of the laymen pressed on with a bill, rather rejoicing in the fact that the bishop's absence gave them a free hand.<sup>301</sup> The bill was introduced into parliament by R.R. Mackenzie, a consistent critic of Tufnell's policies, supported by two other of the bishop's opponents, James Taylor and C.W. Blakeney.

<sup>296</sup> Opinion of attorney-general of Queensland, quoted in Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 1865, Despatch no.6.

<sup>297</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>298</sup> Giles, R.A., *The Constitutional History of the Australian Church*, p.237 ff, gives the Minutes of the 1850 Conference.

For the legal standing of diocesan synods at this time see also Clarke, H.L., *Constitutional Church Government*, pp 24-27.

<sup>299</sup> Brisbane *Synod Proceedings*, 1868, p.26

<sup>300</sup> The earlier popular misconception, that proposals to establish synods were a plot to give coercive power to the bishops, was not now held by any responsible people. This view had still been current, however, as late as 1859, when the Sydney correspondent of *M.B. Courier* claimed that proposals for a synod there would confer "more real and uncontrollable power upon Bishop Barker and all other colonial prelates than either the Russian Autocrat or His Holiness the Pope possesses". *Courier*, 5 January 1859.

<sup>301</sup> James Taylor actually stated in parliament that he approved of dealing with the bill while Bishop Tufnell was away, because he was afraid that it would not be passed if they waited for the bishop to return. *Brisbane Courier*, 17 May 1865.

The draft bill was a loosely worded measure, obviously hurriedly prepared, and containing a number of serious loopholes. Indeed, its supporters admitted that it could be improved and urged that a select committee be appointed to examine the matter, and Sir George Bowen wrote to the home government for legal advice on the bill.<sup>302</sup> In certain respects the bill was unobjectionable, but some of its clauses contained a real sting. Bourke's Church Act, under which the affairs of the Church of England were regulated, was to be repealed. Provision was made for the appointment of the bishop by the Queen, unless she should delegate that authority to synod when such a body were established. The bishop was to have power to institute to benefices, grant licenses to officiate, and exercise the power of visitation and spiritual discipline. Each parish was to have from three to five trustees, elected at a meeting of parishioners who had contributed at least one pound to parish funds in the previous year, and there were to be three to five diocesan trustees who would be elected at a meeting of all the parochial trustees. In parishes where the greater part of the stipend was provided locally, the incumbent was to be nominated to the bishop by the parish trustees, and it was provided that,

The Bishop unless he shall know the said person so presented to him to be unfit and improper shall institute the said person so presented to him, and grant him a license to officiate.<sup>303</sup>

It was provided that the bishop was not to refuse to institute a priest on the grounds of insufficiency of stipend provided, nor for any other reason except personal unfitness. After appointment he could not be removed by the bishop.

If this bill had passed, it would have destroyed the whole basis of ecclesiastical organisation and discipline that Bishop Tufnell was endeavouring to build up in Queensland. The qualification for voting was entirely a financial one: there was no requirement for electors of the trustees to be communicants or even attendants at Anglican worship. The bishop was to have no say whatever in the appointment of clergy, having only an indefinite vote on the grounds of "personal unfitness", whatever that might be construed to mean. Consequently there could be no planning in the most strategic placement of the men available, and the way would be opened for clerical sycophants to be appointed to important cures by pandering to public opinion. Then, the bishop was required to license the clergyman so appointed, with no legal power of discretion; and no grounds whatever were provided for the bishop to remove a clergyman, even on grounds of heresy or immorality.

As the debate proceeded, opinion in parliament hardened against the bill. Petitions of protest poured in from almost every parish in the diocese. Non-conformist members suspected the bill as a veiled attempt to establish the Church of England, while the more moderate Anglican members began to recognise that it was in effect an attack on the bishop's personal authority. The debate was fierce, and the supporters of the bill descended into bitter attacks on Tufnell's administration, which in turn only hardened the opposition of good churchmen like John Douglas, who had at first been inclined to support the bill.<sup>304</sup> At a critical stage news arrived of the Privy Council's momentous decision on the Colenso case, which had the effect of destroying the legal value of the letters patent by which colonial bishops were appointed in self-governing colonies.<sup>305</sup> The alteration thus implied in the legal position of the colonial churches made a thorough re-consideration of the whole situation necessary, and provided a convenient excuse for the withdrawal of the bill.<sup>306</sup>

It was unlikely, however, that the bill as it stood could have passed through parliament, and the unexpected strength of the opposition to it may be inferred by R.R. Mackenzie's sarcastic parting shot:

The clergy had shown they could get up petitions. He was glad of it. He hoped they would be able to raise subscriptions as well.<sup>307</sup>

So the attempt of a section of the laity to introduce a Church of England Bill proved abortive: yet even the opponents of the bill recognised that some definite legal action must soon be taken, and the Colenso judgement rendered this quite imperative. Hitherto the Church of England in the colonies had been regarded as simply an extension of the church in the home country, having the same legal standing and the same relationship to the Crown. It was by letters patent of the Crown that new dioceses were created and bishops appointed, and it was from these letters patent that the bishops had derived their powers of administrative jurisdiction (as distinct from the purely spiritual functions of the episcopal order, which were conveyed to them by virtue of their consecration). In crown colonies this arrangement was still valid; but in self-governing colonies like Queensland the situation was quite different. As the judgment stated:

<sup>302</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 1865, Despatch no. 15.

<sup>303</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 May 1865. The bill is quoted in full in this paper.

<sup>304</sup> Ibid., 24 May 1865: report of Second Reading debate is given in detail.

<sup>305</sup> John William Colenso, Bishop of Natal, had been deposed as bishop on the ground of heresy by Bishop Robert Gray, of Capetown, acting as metropolitan of the church in South Africa, on the basis of the authority conferred in his letters patent. On appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council decided that Gray had no authority to depose Colenso, because of the Queen's letters patent conferred no authority in a self-governing colony. This judgement was relevant to bishops in all the self-governing colonies. For further details of the Colenso dispute, see Burnett, B.B., Anglicans in Natal, Chap. 4.

<sup>306</sup> This was the reason advanced by the governor: Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 10 July 1865, Despatch no. 43.

<sup>307</sup> Brisbane Courier, 8 July 1865.



We therefore arrive at the conclusion that although in a Crown Colony, properly so called, or in cases where the letters patent are made in pursuance of an Act of Parliament...a bishopric may be constituted and ecclesiastical jurisdiction conferred by the sole authority of the Crown, yet that the letters patents of the Crown will not have any such effect or operation in a colony or settlement which is possessed of an independent legislature.<sup>308</sup>

The effect of this judgment was revolutionary. It meant that Bishop Tufnell was thrown back entirely on the spiritual powers inherent in his episcopal office, without any legal backing from the civil power. It placed the Church of England in exactly the same status as other Christian communions in the colony,<sup>309</sup> with this exception, that the Anglican Church had evolved no internal constitutional arrangements to take the place of what had hitherto been provided by the external authority of the state. It was now apparent that action must be taken to put the church in Queensland on a sound constitutional basis. So it was that when Bishop Tufnell returned from his long sojourn overseas in the middle of 1867, he found a practical unanimity in the diocese that the time had come to formulate a constitution and establish synodical government.

The bishop arrived back in Brisbane, accompanied by the bride whom he had married in England, to find a reception that was distinctly cool. His clergy were disquieted by his long absence; some resentment had been aroused by reports from England of his pleading for money on the basis of the poverty of the diocese,<sup>310</sup> and there was unrest about the failure of the church to keep pace with expanding settlement in the outlying areas.<sup>311</sup>

Nevertheless a few months after his return from England Tufnell convened a diocesan conference of all the clergy and representative laity to take steps towards the formation of a synod. Even now, there were elements of opposition, this time in connection with the bishop's requirement that lay delegates to the conference should be communicant members of the church, and that only communicants should vote at their election. At Ipswich, for example, a move was made to disregard the bishop's ruling,<sup>312</sup> and the matter was raised again when the conference met. There was still a section of the community, some of them men in prominent public positions, who wanted a large voice in the affairs of the church, even though they were not practising churchmen.

The conference met in September 1867, and once it convened, there was a general spirit of goodwill and unanimity which augured well. All but one of the fifteen clergy of the diocese were present, and twenty-three laymen were on the roll, representing fourteen parishes and two other districts which were not yet full parishes.<sup>313</sup> Among the leading citizens present as lay representatives were the two judges, Chief Justice Cockle and Mr. Justice Lutwyche, Colonel M.C. O'Connell (President of the Legislative Council) and John Douglas and W.H. Groom (Members of the Legislative Assembly).

While favouring the establishment of a synod, the bishop made it clear in his opening address that action was being taken on his initiative, and that there must be no idea that the bishop derived his authority democratically from the synod. This was the theory of synodical government that some of his opponents were anxious to foster. Speaking of the matter, Tufnell declared:

It is as Bishop of this diocese that I call on you, the presbyters and laity, to come forward and concur with me in the great work of administering this diocese, in organizing a system, and giving effect to it when organized. I ask you to uphold my hands in the responsible and arduous task laid on me...In creating a Synod, you, my brethren, are not giving his jurisdiction to the bishop. We do not ask you to create him, but to share with him a power already his.<sup>314</sup>

It did not take the conference long to resolve that a synod should be formed: what was more doubtful was the method which should be adopted to achieve this result. There were two possible methods of procedure, both of which had been used in the southern dioceses. The first way, which had been adopted in Victoria, was to ask the colonial parliament to pass a bill giving synod legal status.<sup>315</sup> The other method was to proceed by consensual compact, whereby without

<sup>308</sup> Ibid., 24 May 1865: Quoted by attorney-general in the Legislative Assembly.

<sup>309</sup> This fact had already been recognised by the Privy Council in an earlier case, *Long v. Bishop of Capetown*, 1863. The judgment in this case stated: "The Church of England, in places where there is no Church established by law, is in the same situation with any other religious body, - in no better, but in no worse position; and the members may adopt, as the members of any other communion may adopt, rules for enforcing discipline within their body which will be binding on those who expressly or by implication have assented to them." Quoted in Phillimore, Sir. W.G.F., The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England (Second Edition), Vol. ii, p. 1783.

<sup>310</sup> Brisbane Courier, 16 February 1867.

<sup>311</sup> Ibid., 16 May 1867.

<sup>312</sup> Ibid., 23 August 1867.

<sup>313</sup> The parishes represented were:- St. John's, Brisbane; Wickham Terrace; Fortitude Valley; South Brisbane; Kangaroo Point; Ipswich; Toowoomba; Drayton; Warwick; Dalby; Maryborough; Gayndah; Darling Downs (Leyburn); Rockhampton. The other districts were Lutwyche and Toowong.

<sup>314</sup> Brisbane Diocesan Conference Proceedings, 1867, Bishop's Address, p.6.

<sup>315</sup> Act of the Colony of Victoria 18 Victoria no 45. Printed in full in Giles, R.A., op.Cit., p. 247 ff.

seeking legislative enactment, the members of the church through their chosen representatives, would agree to accept a particular constitution. This method had been adopted in South Australia and New Zealand.

It was the latter method that was favoured by Tufnell and his advisers, particularly Judge Lutwyche. They took the attitude that the less the church was tied to the state the better, and that even though it might be necessary later to seek an enabling bill to safeguard property rights, it would be better for the church to act independently in the first instance. Lutwyche succinctly summed up his case at the diocesan conference: "What the State can give, the State can take away".<sup>316</sup> Memories of the unfortunate debates in parliament in connection with the 1865 bill, when the church's business was openly discussed and criticised, were probably still in the minds of most members of conference.

It was with general relief that the conference finally agreed to proceed by the method of consensual compact, and appointed a committee to formulate a constitution for the diocese, which might be adopted by the first synod the following year. The two judges, Cockle and Lutwyche, both sat on this committee, and the latter was undoubtedly the guiding hand behind the constitution that was drawn up.<sup>317</sup> The following year the constitution was duly adopted by the new synod, and the constitutional organisation of the diocese was completed two years later, in 1870, when the Corporation of the Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane was constituted under the provisions of the Religious and Charitable Institutions Act of 1861.<sup>318</sup>

The constitution of the diocese was an important document. It provided for the establishment of a synod, to be held annually, and the powers of synod were clearly defined. It could make its own rules as to the qualifications of members and electors; it could determine the mode of the appointment of clergy to parishes; make provision for a judicial tribunal to decide questions of doctrine and discipline; be responsible for the management of church property; appoint a diocesan council to act between sessions of synod; elect, or delegate the responsibility for electing, a bishop when the see fell vacant. Provision was made for the bishop, clergy and other officers of the church to make an act of submission to synod.<sup>319</sup>

Perhaps the most important part of the constitution was the declaration of the doctrinal standards of the church in the Fundamental Provisions of the Constitution.

This Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Brisbane, doth hold and maintain the doctrine and sacraments of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as the said United Church of England and Ireland both receive the same together with the Holy Scriptures and the book known as The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, and also – the articles agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops of both provinces and the whole clergy in the convocation holden at London, in the year one thousand five hundred and sixty-two. And the Synod hereinafter constituted for the government of this branch of the said Church shall also hold and maintain the said doctrine and sacraments of Christ, and all and every of the said Scriptures, books and articles hereinbefore enumerated.

A proviso was added that there was nothing to prevent synod from adopting such alterations to these books and formularies as might be adopted by the church in England.

In this rigid attachment to the Prayer Book of 1662 and the Thirty-nine Articles were the seeds of future tension. It was natural enough that the fathers of the diocese should want to maintain the precise forms of the English church, both for the sake of sentiment, and as a convenient means of ensuring uniformity.<sup>320</sup>

Yet the adherence to the exact letter of the traditional liturgical forms and articles of religion was to prove something of a straight jacket as the church faced changing social, intellectual and liturgical conditions in the century that followed. By its constitution the Diocese of Brisbane was legally bound to follow precisely the static rubrics of the 1662 Prayer Book, or such alterations as might be permitted by an English parliament in which the people of the diocese had no representation. The temptations – and indeed the practical necessity – to depart from the letter of the law grew increasingly intense as the years passed, with consequences that we shall have to trace in the subsequent history of the church.

<sup>316</sup> Brisbane Courier, 4 September 1867.

<sup>317</sup> The committee consisted of: Bishop Tufnell, Archdeacon Glennie, Rev. J. Bliss, Chief Justice Cockle, Mr. Justice Lutwyche, and John Douglas, M.L.A. Brisbane Diocesan Conference Proceedings, 1867, p.12.

<sup>318</sup> The Corporation of Synod was constituted by letters patent, in the persons of the Bishop, Chairman of Committees of Synod and Treasurer of Synod. The document is printed in full in Giles, R.A., op cit., op cit., p.123

<sup>319</sup> The constitution is printed in full in Appendix I. In some details it has been altered since 1868, but its main provisions are still the same.

<sup>320</sup> A contemporary historian saw these rigid provisions as a wise antidote to unnecessary litigation. William Coote, Week, 22 September 1877, wrote: "It is impossible to conceive how much waste of time and how much of dangerous litigation this wise decision has prevented".

At all events a synod was established and the diocese set upon a firm constitutional basis, and that this was accomplished along generally sound lines was one of Bishop Tufnell's enduring achievements.

Tufnell's constitutional interests were not limited to his own diocese. He saw his diocese as part of a wider Australian church, and he returned from his visit to England in 1867 with a clearer understanding of the way the Anglican Communion as a whole was evolving, and of the part the colonial dioceses were to play in it.

The mid-nineteenth century was an era of great expansion for the Church of England. The first Lambeth Conference in 1867 was itself an indication not only of the overseas growth of the church but of the emergence of a new conception of the Anglican Church. Instead of consisting simply of the established Church of England and Ireland with colonial appendages it was becoming a world-wide communion embracing branches in an increasing number of countries. Tufnell looked forward to a future when the dioceses of Australia would be bound together by some sort of common organisation as a united branch of the Anglican Communion.

A start had already been made in the unification of the Australian church. The conference of the six Australasian bishops in 1850, convened by Bishop Broughton, had reached a number of significant agreements on matters of common policy, among which was the decision to establish an Australasian Board of Missions. Bishop Barker in his turn took his metropolitan duties seriously, and, as we have seen, made an official and lengthy visit to the Diocese of Brisbane, and delivered a most impressive vitiating charge in St. John's church.<sup>321</sup> There was, however, still no permanent machinery for the Australian dioceses to speak and act in common, and Bishop Tufnell was one of those to recognise that this deficiency could only be remedied by the establishment of an effective general synod of the Australian church. Speaking to the 1867 conference on hopes of the eventual reunion of Christendom, he declared:

If we cannot arrive at such a consent of Christendom, yet we can hope that the establishment of Diocesan and Provincial Synods in the colonies and dependencies of the British Empire may be steps towards enabling our own widely spreading branch of the pure and reformed Catholic Church of Christ to speak before long with the full voice of her collective body.<sup>322</sup>

Accordingly, when Bishop Barker convened a conference to draw up a constitution for a general synod, Tufnell took a keen interest in the matter. Particularly he took a lead in seeking to give to general synod real and effective powers, and to one clause of the constitution of general synod he was quite opposed:

No Determination of the General Synod shall be binding upon the Church in any Diocese unless and until such Determination shall be accepted by the Church in such Diocese.<sup>323</sup>

Tufnell saw that this provision would cripple general synod, and he proposed an amendment that determinations should take effect unless they were actually repugnant to some existing ordinance of a diocesan synod or act of a legislature. His amendment was defeated, but it is significant as marking the emergence of what became a continuous policy of the Diocese of Brisbane, that really effective power should be given to the central organs of the Australian church. In part this sprang from the high doctrine of the church held by Tufnell and most of his successors; and it was no coincidence that the chief opposition to a powerful general synod came from Bishop Barker and the extremely evangelical Diocese of Sydney.

These constitutional developments are scarcely the most exciting part of church history; yet they are significant because they do symbolise the development that was taking place. A consciousness was growing that the church in Queensland and Australia was no longer simply a missionary outpost of the home church, but a distinctive branch of the Anglican Communion, having its own life and requiring its own forms of organisation.

Whilst I believe that the several Dioceses which, by the good providence of God, have of late years been formed in the province of Australia are an integral part of the Church of England, as to the elements which are essential to the existence of that Church as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ, I cannot regard the Church in the colonies as identical with the Church of England, as to the accident of establishment, which is the result of her connection with the State.<sup>324</sup>

The fact that it was possible for the first Bishop of Brisbane to make such a statement towards the end of his episcopate shows how far the church had already begun to move in the direction of self-government within the fellowship of the Anglican Communion.

Although the formation of the diocesan synod had the effect of relieving Tufnell of a little of the constant barrage of personal criticism that had been directed against him since the early days of his episcopate, there were still occasions of friction between him and his synod and diocesan council. In certain respects, as we have seen, the bishop too readily placed

<sup>321</sup> Brisbane Courier, 19 July 1864.

<sup>322</sup> Brisbane Conference Report, 1867, Bishop's Address, p.6.

<sup>323</sup> Minutes, General Conference, 1872, p.61.

<sup>324</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1873, p.6. : Bishop's address.

responsibility on the shoulders of the corporate body. The matter of the supply of clergy was a case in point. Unfortunately synod was more ready to grasp privileges than to fulfil responsibilities.

In some other respects, however, Tufnell continued to insist on the retention of certain prerogatives in his own hands. One such matter was the appointment of archdeacons. In 1863 Benjamin Glennie had been appointed by Tufnell first Archdeacon of Brisbane; but as Glennie was fully occupied in the big parish of Warwick, he was scarcely able to fulfil effectively the administrative duties of an archdeacon, though he did act as commissary while the bishop was away in England. Synod both in 1870 and 1871 urged the appointment of a suffragan bishop or additional archdeacons, and the diocesan council went so far in 1872 as to suggest the name of a possible new archdeacon.<sup>325</sup> The bishop, however, took no notice and refused to be forced into action in a matter which he regarded entirely as a personal prerogative.

There were other disagreements about respective spheres of authority, but above all the financial issue was still outstanding. Even after synod was established the bishop made no immediate move to hand over the control of the properties and funds vested in him. He gave some general account of the nature of the funds at his disposal at the synod of 1868, but took no further action.<sup>326</sup> The result was a thinly veiled attack on him in 1869 in the form of a motion complaining of the unsatisfactory nature of the situation. The motion was withdrawn, but it was determined to appoint a select committee to report back to a special synod early in 1870 on the condition of diocesan finances. This committee carefully cross-questioned the bishop, and its report gives a clear picture of the financial position of the diocese.<sup>327</sup> It shows that apart from the £6000 made available by the Colonial Bishops Council, a total of almost £16,000 had been contributed from England towards the funds of the diocese. Expenditure had been almost £17,500, the deficit of £1,500 having been met out of the bishop's own pocket.

This document gives some indication of Bishop Tufnell's considerable achievement in setting the diocese on a secure economic foundation. Most of the money raised was the result of his own personal exertions: yet there is nowhere any record of appreciation from synod, but only of complaints that Tufnell had seen fit to plead the poverty of his diocese in seeking funds. Nor is there any record of appreciation of that fact that Tufnell's own gifts saved the diocese from debt. It may be true that Tufnell's investment policy was not as successful as it might have been; yet the fact remains that from the time the finances and properties were vested in synod, the financial position of the diocese began to show a steady decline, which was to jeopardise the whole economic stability of the diocese. The diocesan council showed great timidity in its dealings with the finances handed over by the bishop. He offered them either the properties, in which almost £7000 was invested, or else the money itself. They insisted on the money which was placed out on fixed deposit at 4%<sup>328</sup>

If these funds had been more enterprisingly invested, there is little doubt that the financial position of the diocese could have been considerably improved. There was some justification in the comment of a contemporary observer:

The Bishop has been accused of want of energy, but his alleged inertness was gigantic energy compared with the masterly inactivity of the Synod after his departure.<sup>329</sup>

Constitutional church government had been achieved. But the fact was that the lay administrators still had much to learn before it could function really effectively.

## **vi. Church and People**

Looking back from a date forty years later Canon Thomas Jones, one of Tufnell's pioneer party, painted a rosy picture of church life in the 1860's. He recalled people who walked miles to church, and came three times a Sunday, and he had memories of every head of a family being at church.<sup>330</sup> "The Church in Brisbane was well attended because everybody used to go to Church then".<sup>331</sup>

These were the recollections of an old man: the contemporary statistical records present, however, a less glowing picture. It is true that in the sixties in Brisbane churches were fairly full: St. John's recorded an ordinary Sunday attendance of 300 in the morning and 250 in the evening, while the Wickham Terrace church averaged 300 in the morning and 375 in the evening. According to the official return the average Sunday attendances for the whole diocese were 2170 in the morning and 2750 in the evening, besides 500 at week-day services (referring mainly to mid-week evening services in small country centres). We must remember, however, that at this time, in 1869, the Anglican population of Queensland was only slightly

<sup>325</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 21 February 1872.

<sup>326</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1868, p.25.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid., 1869-1870, pp.43-45

<sup>328</sup> Ibid., 1872: Diocesan Council Report, pp.29-30.

<sup>329</sup> Week, 27 October 1877: Article, "The Anglican Church in Queensland", probably written by William Coote.

<sup>330</sup> Brisbane Courier, 2 October 1909

<sup>331</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1908

less than 40,000, so that even supposing that the morning and evening congregations comprised entirely different people, there was still only a small minority of nominal Anglicans at church on a Sunday.<sup>332</sup>

However, it must be remembered that a large number of people lived in places where regular church-going was impossible, while there were many others who attended church fairly frequently, though not every Sunday, so that the total number of people in contact with church life was reasonably high.<sup>333</sup>

There was, at all events, a clear improvement on church attendances on that of the previous decade, chiefly as a result of the pastoral work of the larger number of clergy who were now in the diocese.

A large proportion of the more prominent numbers of the community – those who through wealth or position occupied the public eye – seems to have attended church with some regularity, and to have desired to play an active part in church affairs. Many members of parliament and leading professional men fell into this category. It was a sign of respectability to go to church, and though the pew-letting system was beginning to decline, it was still common for well-to-do citizens to retain a family pew in their parish church. In 1869 nine of the old-established churches still had a pew-letting system for a proportion of their sittings. Indeed, an attempt by Bishop Tufnell to restrict the number of rented pews at the Wickham Terrace church aroused considerable opposition from a section of the congregation. The bishop regarded pew rents as one of the chief causes of the estrangement of the labouring classes from the church. In this regard his thinking was far in advance of that of most of the leading laymen.<sup>334</sup>

The church services were rather lengthy by twentieth century standards, and still generally consisted of Matins, Litany and Ante-Communion. A move was made in the synod of 1871 – chiefly with lay support – for the shortening of the services in the summer months, and certainly services lasting up to two hours in the middle of the day must have been very trying, especially in view of the heavy clothing then common and the poor ventilation of most of the churches.<sup>335</sup> The bishop, however, regarded the desire to shorten services with some disfavour:

You, my brethren of the laity, ought not to desire to be deprived, and you, my brethren of the clergy, ought not to be willing, without good reason, to withhold any portion of the spiritual food and sustenance which, in the wisdom and piety of the Church, has been provided for our people. I recently took particular notice, and I found that the usual Morning Prayer, together with the Litany, ante-Communion office, and a sermon of reasonable length, with the singing of two hymns and the playing of a short voluntary before the sermon, with the repetition by the choir of the 'Gloria' at the conclusion of each psalm and a chanting of the canticles and the responses after the Commandments, occupied exactly one hour and forty minutes; and when I remind you that two hours is often not considered too long a time to devote to an evening's amusement – nay, that some feel themselves aggrieved if the entertainment provided does not occupy at least that time – you will, I think, acknowledge that it is not unreasonable, at least during the winter months, that one hour and forty minutes should be devoted to the Sunday morning service when we remember that the whole of the day is the Lord's.<sup>336</sup>

There was as yet little thought of counteracting the sub-tropical climatic conditions by means of services earlier in the morning, though Glennie's diary contains one reference to a service at 8 a.m. At least one observant visitor from England was inclined to put part of the blame for the spiritual backwardness of the Church of England in the colony on "the absurd tenacity shown by the ministers in adopting the very long services, of which so many complain in England, and which, in a tropical climate, are simply intolerable".<sup>337</sup>

The ideal, so far as church buildings themselves were concerned, was to make them replicas of the churches of the old country. This was very natural in a period when a large section of the population – laymen as well as clergy – were English-born and were anxious to keep things as they had known them at home. People tend to be particularly conservative in so personal and intimate a part of their lives as their religion. The consequence was that pseudo-Gothic architecture, then flourishing in England, became the normal style of ecclesiastical building, and even wooden churches were built with the steep roofs and high pointed windows of the Gothic style. Thus the original Wickham Terrace church

<sup>332</sup> A striking indication of the way the church must have been out of touch with many of those who were nominally Anglicans is given in the official returns of marriages. In 1865, for example, only 158 marriages were solemnised in the Church of England, compared with 305 in the Roman Catholic Church and 190 in the Presbyterian Church, both of which bodies were distinctly inferior in numbers to the Church of England. See *V. & P.*, Q'ld Parlt., 1866, p.1101. One factor in this loss of weddings to other churches was, however, the license fee which made it more expensive to be married in an Anglican church. See *Brisbane Synod Proceedings*, 1879, p.20.

<sup>333</sup> Figures based on statistical returns attached to *Brisbane Synod Proceedings*, 1869-70.

<sup>334</sup> *Brisbane Courier*, 20 February 1864.

<sup>335</sup> *Brisbane Synod Proceedings*, 1871, p.15.

<sup>336</sup> *Ibid.*, 1873, p.8. : Bishop's address.

<sup>337</sup> Allen, C.H., *A Visit to Queensland*, p.233

was widely criticised for not being of ecclesiastical design, because it had a low-pitched roof. The popular ideal was summed up by the description of a new pseudo-Gothic wooden church at Lutwyche:

The architect has endeavoured to produce, as far as the materials at his disposal would admit, a building which should remind those who frequented it of the quiet English village church, and at the same time prove the possibility of combining the ecclesiastical character with the use of common every day materials.<sup>338</sup>

While the numbers attending church were fairly large – at least by the standards of a later age when church-going was less fashionable – there was much vagueness of doctrine and a low level of communicant life. The total number of communicants recorded in the whole diocese in 1869 was only 830. St. John's, for example, with its morning congregation of 300, had only 50 communicants on its roll. The Wickham Terrace church, under the definite teaching of Thomas Jones, did better with 150. The Country districts often had a poorer record, and Roma parish could record only 6 communicants. Monthly Communion was still the normal practice, and the greater part of the congregation left the church before the Communion itself.

The clergy whom Tufnell introduced were for the most part, however, men under the influence of the Oxford movement, and it was not long before they began to mould the doctrinal outlook of the diocese and its habits of worship. Colonial bishops generally gathered around them men of the same school of thought as themselves, and as we have seen the introduction of clergy depended primarily on the bishop. Tufnell, though he was no extremist, was a relatively advanced churchman for his day, and he attracted priests of similar churchmanship. The same was happening in the opposite direction in Sydney, where the strongly evangelical Bishop Barker was filling his diocese with low churchmen. There was in consequence already discernible the cleavage in standards of churchmanship that was to mark the development of the dioceses of Brisbane and Sydney. The differences in churchmanship tended to harden along the lines of diocesan boundaries, and they were more prominent than in England because the clergy who came to the colonies included some who were enthusiasts for winning a new diocese to their particular ecclesiastical party. They were either enthusiastic evangelicals or enthusiastic Catholics: the great bulk of middle-path men were not so keen on the hardship of colonial service and preferred to stay at home.

Clashes between the Catholic-minded clergy and the vaguely low-church laity of Brisbane were inevitable. Already in some of the struggles that we have noted between the bishop and some of the laymen there was an element of doctrinal cleavage; for Tufnell's conception of episcopal authority was part of his Catholic doctrine of the church as a divine society, in which the bishop had the right to exercise apostolic functions. Closely linked with this understanding of the church was an emphasis on the importance of the sacraments, particularly Holy Communion, and on the value of clothing worship in dignified and beautiful ceremonial. The ceremonial was still of a very simple kind, but the changing attitude was typified in a sermon preached by John Sutton at the dedication of the new All Saints' church in 1869:

You know the feeling that has been growing up lately for splendour and decoration in the service of God. It may be running wild here and there, but it is not to be despised or condemned. Thoughtful men knew that it must be so years ago, apart from its being right or wrong, for there would be a reaction upon the abominably cold, barn-like appearances of places of worship.<sup>339</sup>

One aspect of this trend to beauty in forms of worship was the greater attention being paid to music in church services. In the forties, music had been little employed, and was still rather crude in Brisbane in the 1850's. Bishop Tufnell, however, introduced the Salisbury Hymn Book, which he had used in England, and encouraged singing to beautify and enliven church services.<sup>340</sup> The appointment of R.T. Jefferies to take charge of the music at St. John's in 1873 marked an improvement in musical standards: applications were invited for boys and men for a properly trained choir; the Sunday services were made fully choral; and an anthem was sung at both morning and evening services. It was a beginning of the fine performance of church music which had always been in the best tradition of the Church of England.<sup>341</sup>

Such changes as these had no special doctrinal significance, yet they were apt to arouse the concern of the conservative laymen who liked the services to be as they had always been. When changes had a doctrinal basis as well, they naturally stirred up even more intense emotions. So it was that priests like Duncan Mackenzie at Maryborough, John Sutton at Gladstone (and later, St. John's, Brisbane), Thomas Jones at All Saints, and J.W.D. Hoare at South Brisbane, were all at some time or other at loggerheads with their congregations on matters of doctrine or worship. What aggravated the matter was the youth of most of them which caused their teaching to be discounted by some as the exuberances of young men

<sup>338</sup> Brisbane Courier 1 December 1866: quoted in Addison, K.H., The Growth of Lutwyche Parish.

<sup>339</sup> Quoted in Appendix, Kissick, D.L., All Saints' Church, Brisbane.

<sup>340</sup> This hymn book was the cause of heated controversy because of the wording of some of the hymns, especially the one commencing, "Jesu, Son of Mary". These words were taken, quite incorrectly, as implying a Roman Catholic doctrinal attitude to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Brisbane Courier, 15 and 21 April and 3 May 1865.

<sup>341</sup> Information based mainly on cuttings in possession of R.T. Jefferies' daughter, Miss E. Jefferies.

who had not yet grown up.<sup>342</sup> At all events, changes were soon evident. The sacraments began to be emphasised more, and the increase in the number of confirmation candidates to 280 by 1869 indicates the fruits of training in definite standards of churchmanship. Holy Communion was put forward as the chief service of the church, and some of the clergy in the sixties began to take the 'eastward position' at the altar, instead of following the low-church custom of celebrating at the north end.<sup>343</sup> Undeterred by cries of popery from some members of their congregations these young priests gradually moulded a better instructed laity and a more reverent and dignified kind of worship.

The opposition of some of the laity to those trends found expression in the establishment in Brisbane of a so-called Free Church of England. In 1866 the Reverend Edward Tanner, the Maryborough pioneer of evangelical outlook, was brought to Brisbane to assist Thomas Jones at the Wickham Terrace church. In the mornings he held a service at Milton, an outstation of the parish, but in the evenings, to help accommodate the overflow congregation from the parish church, he conducted a service in the School of Arts. Many of those who were discontented at St. John's and Wickham Terrace began to gather around him, and before long there were suggestions that he should commence rival morning services in the city itself.<sup>344</sup> Jones opposed this suggestion, and Tanner in consequence decided to resign and take up an appointment in Sydney;<sup>345</sup> but before leaving, he significantly called upon the people to remember that the church was not composed of bishop and clergy alone. Tanner himself made no move to form a schismatic body, but the congregation he had gathered were only too glad when, two years later, the Reverend C. Searle came to Brisbane, and without a license from the Bishop set up a place of worship along evangelical lines.<sup>346</sup>

Searle described this 'Free Church of England', as it came to be called, as "a refuge to members of the Church of England from the ritualistic and rationalistic tendencies of the established Church at the present day."<sup>347</sup>

After Tufnell had refused to license Searle, he energetically set about raising funds for the building of a church, which was finally erected in Edward Street and known as Christ Church. For a time a considerable congregation was built up: two hundred people gathered at a soiree to celebrate the first anniversary,<sup>348</sup> and among a festive gathering of 400 the following year were included C.W. Blakeney, judge and synodman, and one of the churchwardens of St. John's church. There were plans for extending the organisation of the Free Church, and of building up a rival system to the official Church of England.

After a time, however, various matters of dissension crept into the life of the Free Church. Bishop Tufnell's continued refusal to confirm candidates prepared by an unlicensed clergyman created difficulties,<sup>349</sup> and under Searle's successor, the Reverend P.P. Agnew, a priest whose license had been withdrawn by the Bishop of Sydney, the Free Church began to lose influence.<sup>350</sup> The regular Anglican clergy were anxious to heal the schism,<sup>351</sup> and in 1872 a motion was passed in the diocesan council that the lease of Christ Church be taken over by the Diocese of Brisbane, and that Agnew be appointed a travelling agent to collect funds on behalf of synod. Tufnell refused to give his sanction to the latter proposal, but the building was taken over, and the Free Church of England died a natural death.<sup>352</sup> The Free Church had no lasting significance, but its short-lived existence did reveal the presence of an undercurrent of opposition both to tractarian innovations and episcopal authority.

It would be a mistake to suppose from this account of doctrinal cleavage that the clergy were nothing but radical young innovators and the laity simply negative obstructionists. Among them were a few who were more concerned with

<sup>342</sup> One layman at the Wickham Terrace church complained that, "At present they had a lot of youths' they wanted some men of standing who would have influence in the community". Brisbane Courier, 1 January 1864.

<sup>343</sup> The description of the change at St. John's to the eastward position by an irate correspondent is not without interest: "Of late the minister of St. John's has been edging to the corner of the table, which he has at length turned and the result is that the entire of the communion service, with the exception of the commandments, is now performed by him with his back to the people, just as mass is at St. Stephen's". Brisbane Courier, 2 May 1865. Perhaps it should be mentioned that the fears of the malcontents were not entirely without justification, as one of the young clergy at this time, J.W.D. Hoare of South Brisbane, later became a Roman Catholic, after his return to England. St. Andrew's Parish Magazine, December 1928.

<sup>344</sup> Brisbane Courier, 16 August 1866

<sup>345</sup> Ibid., 18 August 1866

<sup>346</sup> Searle had been the incumbent of Rockhampton, and had been the only priest absent from the Diocesan Conference of 1867.

<sup>347</sup> Brisbane Courier, 15 June 1870.

<sup>348</sup> Ibid., 19 January 1870.

<sup>349</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 7 December 1870.

<sup>350</sup> For details of Agnew's dispute with the Bishop of Sydney, see Barker, F., A Statement of Facts in Answer to the Letter of the Rev. P.P. Agnew (Sydney, Reading & Wellbank, 1865).

<sup>351</sup> See, for example, the conciliatory letter of the Rev. T. Jones, Brisbane Courier, 26 May 1870.

<sup>352</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 19 June 1872. From September 1872 the Diocesan Council met in a building called the "Synod Hall, Edward St.", which was apparently the former Christ Church.

controversy than with the extension of the Kingdom of God. But always there was the solid core of the church who, whatever their opinions on controversial matters of faith or liturgy, pressed on tirelessly in the task of living and spreading the Gospel. In the country districts, particularly, some of the clergy had to cover vast areas, and were cut off from any regular fellowship with their fellow priests. In 1869, for example, the one clergyman at Maryborough had to care for twenty centres; Dalby had 13 centres, and Leyburn 11.<sup>353</sup> Travel on horseback or on foot in the rougher districts, and by buggy elsewhere, was slow and tiresome, though it often had its compensations in the personal contacts that it made possible along the way. Congregations in most of the little country centres were still small --from 2 to 30 the priest at Maryborough reported for his services at station homesteads in 1865 --and they varied tremendously according to vagaries of weather. The work of these country priests was often exhausting, and frequently dispiriting in the lack of response apparently aroused, yet their annual reports reveal a work carried out faithfully and well.<sup>354</sup>

If Benjamin Glennie was the typical figure of the church before separation (though, of course, he lived and worked long after that) it was the Reverend Tommy Jones – as he was familiarly known in later days – who typified the clergy of the Tufnell and Hale era. Coming to Queensland with Tufnell's party in 1860, Jones served more than half a century in the diocese, until his death in 1918.

Jones was a product of the Oxford movement, and his outlook was always strongly catholic. Towards the close of his life he wrote:

I am disappointed. The church is losing her hold on the people, both here and at home in the old country. The mind of the Church of England is not yet moving in the direction of the Catholic Revival, and there is no hope for the Church until she gets out of the groove she is in. Respectability has killed us; we are out of touch with the working man.<sup>355</sup>

In that statement is revealed the nature of his catholicism. He was not merely concerned with the outward trappings of religion, though he as much as anyone was a lover of beauty and dignity in the furnishing of churches and the ceremonial of worship.<sup>356</sup> But his was a catholicism that looked outwards to embrace all men and sought to fulfil their deepest needs; and because he believed that the Church of England as it existed in the nineteenth century was not embracing all men nor meeting their deepest needs, he felt it as his mission to take some part in changing the outlook of the church. The right way, he believed, would be found in taking a path which avoided "the extremes of Puritanism on the one hand and the errors of the Papacy on the other".<sup>357</sup>

Behind all that Jones did was a spirit of love and zeal for souls; and so strong were his convictions that he was prepared to fight with all his power against anyone who stood in the way of what he conceived to be right – be it the bishop or the ultra-respectable members of his congregation. A comment was made on him later in his life by one who was a shrewd judge of men: "A warm-hearted, turbulent, eccentric person... Is inclined to be 'agin the government' ".<sup>358</sup> It was a fair judgment; and in his early years, until he became something of an institution, Jones was frequently involved in controversy. He had arguments with his congregation; he not infrequently led attacks in synod and diocesan council on some of Bishop Tufnell's policies; he was almost refused institution to a benefice by Bishop Hale on a complaint on ritual matters made by Archdeacon Glennie;<sup>359</sup> and it was only through the intervention of Sir James Dickson that Bishop Webber agreed to license him again after a bitter disagreement on policy. Yet he always came through, and rather enjoyed the scrap, and ended his life universally beloved by all who knew him.<sup>360</sup>

The thing above all that endeared Jones to his fellow citizens was that with all his strong opinions there was nothing of the bigot in him. At a time when rigid sabbatarianism prevailed in the church at large, Jones could be seen on a Sunday afternoon umpiring a cricket match at one end, while the Reverend John Sutton umpired at the other end – provided the players had been to church in the morning.<sup>361</sup> He regularly patronised the theatre, much to the disgust of some of the Non-conformists. The puritanical Queensland Evangelical Standard was particularly incensed on one occasion when the majority of the Anglican clergy of Brisbane – doubtless including Jones – went to see Hamlet instead of going to a meeting of the Bible Society. "The modern theatre cannot safely or consistently be patronised by clergymen", thundered the

<sup>353</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1869; Statistical return.

<sup>354</sup> The annual reports of the missionaries supported by the S.P.G., in S.P.G. "E" Mss. cast considerable light on the state of the church in the outlying districts.

<sup>355</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1908.

<sup>356</sup> See, for example, Jones' comments on his aim of making the worship of the church "a little more worthy of the divine characteristics". Minutes, Annual Vestry Meeting, All Saints' Church, 3 April 1877.

<sup>357</sup> From a sermon preached in 1865, Kissick, D.L., op cit., Appendix.

<sup>358</sup> David, A.E., Private Notes on the Diocese, written for the information of Archbishop Donaldson, 1904.

<sup>359</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 12 November 1881.

<sup>360</sup> Much of this information has been obtained in interviews with Thomas Jones' daughter, Mrs. C.M. Bancroft, and from cuttings preserved by her. There is also useful information in the Canon Jones Papers, Oxley Memorial Library.

<sup>361</sup> Browne, Spencer, A Journalist's Memories, p. 121.



journal.<sup>362</sup> When Jones dared suggest in a sermon that it might be the church's role to purify the stage, the same paper was horrified: the stage was not to be purified, but condemned.<sup>363</sup>

Jones' character had all the ingredients -- love, generosity, zeal, definiteness, loyalty and unconventionality -- that appealed to his fellows, and once the bitterness of the earlier disputes in which he played a part was forgotten, he became an almost legendary figure, outside the bounds of the church as much as within it. Perhaps more than any other single figure he helped to shape the direction of the early development of the Church of England in Queensland, and to set it on the path of broad catholic outlook that was consistently to be its mark. On Jones' death, his place in the history of the church in Queensland was summed up by Canon E.C. Osborn:

No clergyman who has laboured in the Church in Queensland has ever won such love and affection as Canon Jones did during the years he lived and worked among us.<sup>364</sup>

It was not only among the clergy that great zeal and devotion was manifested in the early life of the diocese. At a time when the numbers of clergy were hopelessly inadequate to meet the needs of expanding settlement, much inevitably depended on the work of faithful lay men and women. In not a few places, in town and country alike, services were regularly maintained by lay readers when clergy were not available, and so people who might have lost the habit of church-going were kept within the active life of the church. In his address to the first synod Bishop Tufnell particularly made mention of men like Macarthy and Drew, Lutwyche and Nicholson, who kept church services going in the outer parts of Brisbane; in the country the work of laymen was even more important. Tufnell envisaged the use of laymen as a positive way of overcoming the shortage of clergy.<sup>365</sup> In order to put the whole matter on a sound footing he went to pains to draw up definite rules for the licensing and demeanour of lay readers.<sup>366</sup> He hoped to use the laity not only for conducting services in the absence of a clergyman, but also for visiting and teaching. To some extent these hopes were fulfilled: the Sunday schools were staffed by laymen (or rather, more commonly, by lay women), and some visiting was done, chiefly in connection with canvassing for money. For the most part, however, it must be admitted that it proved difficult to persuade the laity to engage in positive evangelistic work.

At least on some of the country homesteads it was the custom for the family and members of the staff to gather together on Sundays while the head of the household read prayers and together they sang some well-known hymns. In such cases Sunday was observed as a real day of rest from unnecessary labour, and even reading had to be restricted to suitable books. In this way the practice of the spiritual life was maintained, even though the normal ministrations of the church were unavailable.<sup>367</sup>

Meanwhile in most of the little centres of population there were the faithful few among the laity whose outstanding devotion was the mainspring of local church life. Often working under very unfavourable conditions, and among people who were apathetic or hostile to religion, their loyalty and faith was a great inspiration. Such were John Nicholson, and his wife Mary, pioneers of church life at Grovely on the outskirts of Brisbane, whose surviving letters reveal a vivid picture of Christian devotion at its best. Their simple evangelical religion was intensely real, and it was their great labour of love to spread the same spirit among those with whom they came into contact. A letter of Mary Nicholson describing a typical Sunday reveals something of their zeal:

After family prayers, Mr. N. goes to the Germans with his Bible and dictionary. They with their Bibles follow him, and trace a great deal. He teaches them in fact wholly by texts. At 10.30 the boys come. I begin with them all. At 11 Mr. N. returns, and takes the deaf pupil who necessarily requires exclusive teaching. We keep them till 12 or 12.30, according to circumstances, beginning and ending with prayers. About ¼ mile distant, at the end of one of the Banana Groves, you would see from our door the top of a white canvas tent, glistening in the sun - this is the abode of Irish laborers. We send them books in the morning, and about 2 p.m. Mr. N. goes to them and remains till 3. On his return we look out the Psalms, Lessons and Sermons, and prepare for the 4 o'clock service. Preparation is needed, and rest too I assure you, for this teaching is not so easy as it used to be in the Sunday School -- it is a great strain and requires more effort. We have two rows of seats all the way down each side of our long table, at the end of which is a raised desk, covered with a piece of damask -- on which is placed a cushion and on this is our dear large Bible. Mr.N. stands in front of this -- on his

<sup>362</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 1 November 1879.

<sup>363</sup> Ibid., 26 August 1875. An illuminating sarcastic comment in the same journal some years later points to the relationship between this interest in the artistic side of life and the reintroduction of colourful ceremonial into the church, which were both aspects of the anti-Puritanism of the catholic-minded clergy. Speaking of a colourful service in All Saints' church, the Standard snorted: "When men in ecclesiastical robes can perform such comedies in the Church on Sundays no one can wonder that they should go to the theatre on a week-evening". 8 November, 1879.

<sup>364</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1918.

<sup>365</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1869 : Bishop's address, pp. 5-6.

<sup>366</sup> Ibid., 1871, p.43.

<sup>367</sup> For example, see Banks, Mary M., Memories of Pioneer Days in Queensland, p.40. She remarks that these bush Sundays, though restricted, were happy.

right are 3 deaf hearers, and 2 rows of lads and boys -- on the left are chairs for females -- at the back and in front are forms for girls... You see our attainments are not very great at present -- still we must be thankful for the day of small things.

O may God in his mercy grant that a blessing may come to many in this house, and that the seed which is here sown may spring up and bear fruit to His glory! To get hold of the rising population in this land is indeed very important.<sup>368</sup>

The simple delight that the Nicholsons enjoyed in making plans for building their little church, and their hopes for making it a spiritual centre for the district shows their real love for their church and all that it stood for. In their own paddocks forty thousand bricks were made for the church, and little by little they watched it rise. They had the governor to lay its foundation stone, and finally the church of St. Matthew's, Grovely was complete. Outside their district they were little known: but it was such people as these who made the church the power that it was in the life of the community.

On 28 February 1874 Bishop Tufnell sailed for England. He had not formally resigned the see, and little public notice was taken of his departure. Yet it came as no surprise when news came through from England that the bishop had resigned, and indeed as early as September, 1873, the Colonial Church Chronicle had foreshadowed this decision. Tufnell was not an old man – he was still only 60 years of age – but he was weary. He was weary not so much from the physical exertion of an extensive diocese as from the mental strain of striving to fulfil a huge task in the face of opposition even from some whom he might have expected to be on his side. There were not many regrets at his departure. His opponents, both outside the church and within it, blamed him for the imperfections in the church, and even his friends and supporters admitted that in some respects he had not been eminently successful.<sup>369</sup> It was no doubt with a considerable sense of personal relief that Bishop Tufnell laid down the cares of office.

Yet looking back with the perspective that time can give, we may say that Tufnell's achievement was greater than either his friends or his antagonists gave him credit for at the time. He came to Brisbane with definite principles, unpopular though they might be: and in fact most of his principles were much sounder than his contemporaries recognised.

He had a vision of the diocese as a branch of the Anglican Communion, within the wider Catholic Church; he knew what the role of a bishop should be; he saw the need for sound long-term organisation in manpower, finance and ecclesiastical administration. These were things that many people in Queensland quite failed to understand. The pity was that he lacked the ability to handle men, to take influential men into his confidence, and to take the advice of wise friends. He never quite understood the differences between the colony and the home country, and the consequent adaptations in planning that these differences necessitated. This was what brought about the failure of his educational policy. Like many Englishmen coming to an Australian bishopric he lacked the flexibility to transplant successfully the English church into Australian soil. The Australian church was still too English to plant, and was finding climatic conditions in Queensland very trying.

Tufnell knew where he wanted to go, and he got part of the way to his goal. He established a sound form of synodical government; he increased the number of clergy from 3 to 25, with a corresponding growth in parochial organisation; he saw buildings spring up throughout the settled parts of the diocese; he gathered together a sum of money sufficient to put the diocese on its feet. But though he knew where he wanted to go, he failed to take his people -- certainly his laymen, and to a lesser extent even his clergy – with him. There was a gap between bishop and diocese, a gap which the diocese was constantly seeking to close by breaking down the bishop's plans; and it was insofar as Tufnell allowed his plans to be broken down that he failed. Under constant provocation he allowed too much power to fall into the hands of laymen and clergy whose outlook was parochial rather than diocesan, and the danger was that unless a strong bishop should succeed him, the diocese might drift from the unity which Tufnell had sought to a kind of Episcopal congregationalism.

One contemporary observer, who differed from most of his fellows in his estimate of Tufnell's episcopate, made a fair judgment:

I affirm that in addition to laying a firm foundation for the maintenance of the Bishopric, he was a moving efficient instrument in educing out of confusion and disorder, an organised system which, adequately worked, would leave the Anglican Church in the colony second to none in a vigorous vitality.<sup>370</sup>

<sup>368</sup> Nicholson Papers, Oxley Memorial Library.

<sup>369</sup> For example, the antagonistic Queensland Evangelical Standard, 16 December 1875: "It was a great misfortune, both for the Episcopal Church and for the colony, that her first Bishop in Queensland possessed so few qualifications for the office he was appointed to fulfil". Cf. the estimate in the Australian Churchman, 3 March 1877, with no particular axe to grind: "No one who knows anything of the Queensland diocese will aver that his episcopate was a success".

<sup>370</sup> Week, 27 October 1877, article "The Anglican Church in Queensland", probably by William Coote. A similar favourable judgment on Tufnell was expressed by Sir Maurice O'Connell, Brisbane Courier, 22 July 1874.

The tragedy was that through short-sightedness and inefficiency on the part of various people the system was not adequately worked. The episcopate of Tufnell's successor saw the increasing failure of a system which was essentially sound, but which was not given a chance to operate as intended.

## CHAPTER 7: THE DRIFT TO CONGREGATIONALISM.

### i. Mathew Blagden Hale : Second Bishop of Brisbane

Not long before Bishop Tufnell's resignation, one of the parochial councils of the diocese had passed a somewhat impertinent resolution. Among other opinions it affirmed that "His Lordship is too far advanced in years to perform the arduous duties of a missionary Bishop..."<sup>371</sup> At that time Dr. Tufnell was less than sixty. In 1875 the Right Reverend Mathew Blagden Hale, Bishop of Perth, was appointed Bishop of Brisbane. He was aged sixty-four! Therein lies much of the story of the Brisbane episcopate of Dr. Hale.

As a result of the changed legal status of the colonial church since Tufnell had been appointed, the selection of the second Bishop of Brisbane was no longer a matter for the Crown. By the new constitution of the diocese, the bishop was to be elected by synod from nominees submitted by the clergy. The right of electing their own bishop was a novel matter for members of synod, and in fact this was the first time that any Australian diocese was in a position to exercise the right of election.<sup>372</sup> There was consequently considerable interest in the special session of synod that met in November 1874 under the presidency of Archdeacon Glennie to proceed to the election. Glennie himself urged that a clergyman already in the colonies should be elected,<sup>373</sup> but though the clergy favoured proceeding to election, the majority of the lay synodsmen wanted the right of appointment delegated to the Archbishop of Canterbury. As a result of this failure of the orders to agree, the appointment lapsed to the Australian bench of bishops.<sup>374</sup>

There was one striking thing, however, that synod did: with grand assurance it guaranteed the next bishop a stipend of £1000, from which he was to meet all expenses, including travelling costs. The fact that Bishop Tufnell had never received much more than £400 a year did not deter them: nor did it lead them to devise new ways of raising the additional money required. Nevertheless, the promise was made – and kept: but only by drawing upon general diocesan funds to such an extent that the bishop had to make considerable contributions from his stipend to keep the diocese solvent.

It was Bishop Augustus Short of Adelaide who was chiefly responsible for selecting Hale for the vacant see. Hale and Short had been friends for years, and when Short had been appointed first Bishop of Adelaide in 1847, he had taken Hale with him to be his archdeacon. The primate, Bishop Barker, concurred in his appointment to Brisbane, probably glad that a man of known evangelical views should go there. Hale himself, however, was aware of the doubts raised by his advanced years, particularly as he had suffered considerable discomfort from lumbago during his last year in Perth.<sup>375</sup> He wrote in a letter:

I remonstrated against their putting a man of 64 in such a position. But nevertheless, as I have always professed to go by duty and not by choice, I said that if the Bishops should unanimously say that it would be for the Church's advantage that I should go, I should consider that a sufficient indication of my duty and would go.<sup>376</sup>

The disqualifying effect of Hale's age is further underlined by the fact that when he had contemplated resigning the see of Perth in 1870 in his sixtieth year, it had been remarked that a few years more "must, in all human probability, saddle him with very serious hindrances to the performance of duties such as necessarily fall to the lot of a Bishop in an Australian Diocese".<sup>377</sup> However, it was eighteen months since Bishop Tufnell had left. The bishops were anxious to fill the gap, so they agreed unanimously that Hale was the right man, and following the call of duty Bishop Hale accepted translation from Perth to Brisbane.

Mathew Blagden Hale came from a well-known English family, and was descended from the eminent judge, Sir Mathew Hale.<sup>378</sup> During his period at Cambridge he had come under the influence of Harold Browne, a deeply earnest and powerful evangelical, who later became Bishop of Ely; and Hale himself remained in the evangelical tradition throughout his life.<sup>379</sup> On his election to Brisbane he had already been twenty-eight years in Australia. As Archdeacon of Adelaide, he had had wide experience both of pastoral and administrative work, as well as some years' experience of aboriginal missionary work

<sup>371</sup> Minutes, All Saints', Brisbane, Parochial Council, quoted in Kissick, D.L., All Saints' Church, Brisbane, p.51.

<sup>372</sup> Australian Churchman, 14 November 1874.

<sup>373</sup> Among those favoured for the position were Canon Vance of Melbourne and Dean Russell of Adelaide, though the name of the Reverend Lord Charles Hervey, who had paid a visit to Queensland to see his son not long before, had also been mentioned. Australian Churchman, 17 October 1874 and 7 November 1874.

<sup>374</sup> Ibid., 19 December 1874.

<sup>375</sup> Alexander, F. (Ed.) Four Bishops and their See, p.29

<sup>376</sup> Typescript, Hale Family Letters, p. 604, in possession of the bishop's son, Mr. Arthur Hale, of Redcliffe.

<sup>377</sup> Australian Churchman, 23 July 1870.

<sup>378</sup> It was a family tradition that the Christian name be spelt with one "t". For biographical details of Bishop Hale see Appendix 11.

<sup>379</sup> Hawtrey, C.L.M., The Availing Struggle, p.40.

on the mission station which he founded at Poonindie. He had always been keen on mission work, especially among those whose condition was particularly depressed. Indeed, his first thought after ordination had been to go to the West Indies to try to do something to alleviate the condition of the negroes there, and it was this kind of pastoral work among the least privileged groups in society that was always his first love.

As first Bishop of Perth Hale had had to do the same kind of pioneering work that had fallen to Tufnell in Brisbane. He did this work capably, though hardly brilliantly, for his strong point was direct pastoral work with individuals and small groups rather than administration or large-scale planning.<sup>380</sup> Why he should have been considered specially suited for Brisbane is a mystery, except perhaps as a reward for long and faithful service, though at that time the Diocese of Brisbane afforded a scarcely more rewarding field of labour than did Perth.

In many respects Hale's long experience of Australian conditions was of advantage for his episcopate in Brisbane. There was not the need for acclimatisation and adaptation that was necessary for most newly arrived bishops from England. Yet there were, at the same time, real disadvantages. Obviously, Hale was an elderly man, with his best years already behind him. If the Diocese of Brisbane had already become a settled and developed organism, whose life was running on an even course, the maturity and wisdom that come with age might well have been of great value. But the church in Queensland was still in its pioneering phase. There was need for vision and vital initiative to consolidate the somewhat shaky beginnings that had been made. This was not the work for a man of 64. It was not that Hale was lacking in energy: in fact, he displayed great zeal and hardiness – more than his younger predecessor – in long pastoral tours through the bush. But he had passed beyond the youth that sees visions, and makes great plans, and vigorously carries them into effect. Hale's instinctive reaction was not far wrong when he wondered whether he was not already too old for the task.

There was another disadvantage in Hale's long sojourn in Australia. He was no longer in close contact with England: he had no doubt grown away from his friends at home. This meant that he lacked those personal contacts, so essential for colonial bishops in the formative stages of their dioceses, which alone could ensure a regular flow of men and money to keep the work of the diocese going. The time had to come, of course, when the colonial church would have to stand on its own feet; but that time had not yet arrived. At this stage, so much depended on the bishop's personal ability to command resources of men and money. In Hale's time the flow of clergy from England dwindled to a trickle; the large gifts of money from private subscribers in England almost ceased; and even the regular grants from the S.P.G. were discontinued. The result was a creeping paralysis which gradually came over the organised corporate life of the diocese.

Hale himself was a quite saintly man: "the greatly beloved Bishop Hale", was the fitting description of him given by one of his clergy.<sup>381</sup> He was a man of deep spiritual life, who firmly believed that every task must be undertaken in the spirit of faith and prayer. "Pray, my dear friends! Pray earnestly! Pray continually!"<sup>382</sup> This was the keynote that he sounded in his first speech in Brisbane, and it was a precept which he practised himself. He saw every setback as a call to more earnest prayer, an opportunity for deeper faith: and his love of God overflowed into an abundant love for his fellow man, especially when he saw them downtrodden or oppressed. He had a fervent evangelical zeal for the souls of men, and this provided the incentive for his long pastoral tours, strenuous undertakings for a man of his years. West he travelled as far as Charleville, north to Blackall, back eastward to Rockhampton and the coastal towns.<sup>383</sup> He preferred to show his care for the western people and to underline the need for regular ministrations to them by setting an example in his own pastoral work rather than by preaching about it in Brisbane. That was his method always – to show forth in his own life the lessons that he wanted to teach his people, to show by humble service what the Christian life ought to be. He cut a very different figure from the popular caricature of the pompous prelate, and a humorous comment in a contemporary journal showed the contrast which people observed between his methods and those of his predecessor:

Episcopacy is going to the native dogs of late. Clear-starching is at a discount, and leather gaiters take the place of cloth ones. We should like to know what sort of a bishop this Dr. Hale is, to be making a more practical matter of religion in the way he does. Why can't he remain quietly in his study at Bishopsbourne, and write theses against something or somebody, and get his name up? Who is he that he should rob his office of all dignity, by neglecting the parochial visitations to which we have always been accustomed in the shape of episcopal visits to Queen-street in a buggy driven by a staid but lean coachman, and drawn by a staid and sacerdotal gelding, the whole turn-out somehow suggestive of a form of prayer for persons afflicted with shopping? How can we be expected to have any respect for a prelate who goes scampering away to the Never-Never country on horseback, to the utter disarrangement of his

<sup>380</sup> For further details of Hale's Perth episcopate see the relevant chapters in the histories of the church in West Australia, viz., Alexander, F. (Ed.), Four Bishops and their See, and Hawtrey, C.L.M., The Availing Struggle.

<sup>381</sup> Archdeacon E.C. Osborn, in Church Chronicle, August 1921.

<sup>382</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 December 1875.

<sup>383</sup> A typical passage from his letters reveals the strenuous nature of his journeys: "I have just reckoned up my distance since I left Roma, it is 709 miles. I have travelled every day except the Sundays, one day at Mitchell Downs and two days at Tambo: and thank God, have been extremely well and hearty all the time....." Hale Family Letters, 23 June 1877.

necktie... Why can't Dr. Hale let things 'slide', while he takes a trip to England, and enjoys refined society, and preaches neat sermons about the lack of spiritual ministrations in the enormous diocese under his charge, and make collections, and then come back and put the biggest portion of them into the endowment fund?<sup>384</sup>

In a sense Hale's weaknesses as a bishop were the converse side of his very virtues. Like so many of his kind he was no disciplinarian. His gentleness was such that it required a great deal of provocation before he would take firm action, and the result was a spirit of indecisiveness in dealing with his clergy. From the beginning there was a rift between himself and some of his priests, especially those who had worked under Tufnell. Sutton and Jones in particular found Hale's evangelicalism restrictive after the sympathy which Tufnell had shown to their high church practices, and they were not always quick to follow the bishop's mild admonitions. From this lack of firm leadership a growing spirit of divisiveness was discernible in the diocese.

Likewise, Hale's very humility and pastoral zeal made him more ready to do self-denying personal pastoral work than to organise and depute others to do it. He lacked the ability to delegate work in the right directions: he believed that if he set a good example, he would lead others to follow – but all too often they saw that he was doing the work, and left him to go on doing it. As a parish priest he would have been splendid – faithful, devoted, helpful to individuals. But he lacked the organising and administrative ability necessary for a bishop in a large diocese. The same fault occurred in financial matters. Only his own financial sacrifices enabled the diocese to remain solvent; but for the diocese to be supported by its bishop's private means was a stopgap expedient that could prove ultimately harmful. It was noble of him to make the sacrifice, but it was not good for the diocese that he should do so.

## ii. The Losing Battle

When Hale arrived he was greeted with considerable enthusiasm. His predecessor had not been popular, and the people welcomed him gladly, and he was greatly encouraged by their warmth:

My reception here is most hearty and encouraging: The people seem quite disposed to do everything they can to help me. But, under any circumstances, it is a great undertaking.<sup>385</sup>

The sober comment at the end was well justified; and already at Hale's arrival there were hints of potential dangers in his proposed policy.

One such indication was given on his arrival, as he replied to the greetings of Archdeacon Glennie and the representative clergy and laity. He told them that he wanted to leave much responsibility in their hands, as he needed to travel in the country and see it at first hand. There was much that was praiseworthy in this plan; but the first need of the diocese was firm leadership from headquarters. For eighteen months there had been no bishop. Glennie had been administering the diocese, but he was not a forceful administrator. The laymen were greedy for power, but so far they had shown little sign of the initiative and responsibility necessary to make them effective leaders. Nevertheless the bishop pursued his announced policy. He declared to his first synod that his place was in the provinces, travelling from place to place, rather than in the city.<sup>386</sup> In his first full year in the diocese, he was able to attend only 10 of the 24 meetings of the diocesan council.<sup>387</sup> After that Hale changed his methods, and spent much more time in Brisbane, partly because he knew the country districts fairly thoroughly by that time, and partly perhaps because he realised that central direction was a pressing need. But he had made a bad beginning, so far as the lagging organisation of the diocese was concerned.

The other hint of potential difficulties lay in the disquiet felt by some of the clergy about published reports of Bishop Hale's friendly relations with the Protestant churches in Western Australia. News had seeped through of extremely affectionate leave-takings in Perth, and the extreme Protestant paper, the Queensland Evangelical Standard, looked forward to Hale's arrival with such joyful anticipation that the relatively high church clergy of Brisbane regarded his advent with some apprehension.<sup>388</sup> They were suspicious of what they regarded as a policy of pan-Protestantism, and there was an underlying current of tension over this matter throughout Hale's episcopate. From time to time this tension developed into

<sup>384</sup> Queenslander, 1 April 1876.

<sup>385</sup> Hale Family Letters, 14 December 1875.

<sup>386</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1876, Bishop's Address, p.7.

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., 1877, appendix I, p.iii

<sup>388</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 25 November, 1875, gives an account of farewell to Hale in Perth by the Congregational ministers of that city; and on 9 December 1875, makes interesting comments on the effect his arrival might have on the Anglican clergy of Brisbane: "His sympathies appear to be more with Christianity than Romanism, which will be something new to us in the Anglican Church in Brisbane." An editorial comment in the same issue remarks: "Bishop Hale, if belonging to the truly Protestant Church of England, as we believe he does, may have some little trouble to get... 'most of our clergy' to wear his Protestant spectacles."

an open rift, which was particularly noticeable because it was in the two city churches of St. John's and All Saints' that Hale felt most ill at ease.

The Reverend John Sutton, Rector of St. John's, who was always a difficult man to work with, became especially estranged from the bishop. The quarrel began in 1877 when Sutton resigned from the diocesan council after a difference of opinion about the allocation of the S.P.G. grant; and it came to a head when the bishop requested the removal of a cross and candlesticks from the altar of St. John's following a petition from some of the parishioners. Sutton took no action to comply, and the bishop finally insisted that they be removed. Sutton unwillingly agreed, but not without making a studied protest against the bishop's ruling by absenting himself from the synod service held in his own church.<sup>389</sup> The following year the bishop retaliated by breaking with tradition and holding the synod service at All Saints', and quietly but bluntly rebuking Sutton (without mentioning his name) in his presidential address to synod.<sup>390</sup>

This was typical of a kind of friction that continued throughout Hale's episcopate. The catholic-minded clergy, while appreciating their bishop's zeal, believed that in his dealings with the Non-conformist churches he sat too lightly on essential principles of the Church of England. Nor was it only the high churchmen who were dubious of Hale's inter-church relationships. The majority of the clergy had inherited from the traditions of the English establishment strong prejudices against Non-conformity which they brought with them to Australia, quite apart from doctrinal differences.

To Hale, as an evangelical, many of the things that the high churchmen regarded as essential marks of the church were simply externals to the Christian life. Nevertheless these differences of outlook need not have caused such nagging tensions if Hale had been a stronger disciplinarian, and held more tightly the reins of diocesan government. As it was, trivial differences were magnified by indecisive discipline, and became a constant source of friction. As the church in Tufnell's time had been weakened by divisions between bishop and laity, so in Hale's time there were frustrating divisions between bishop and clergy.

Hale already knew from his Western Australian experience that the twin problems of the colonial church were manpower and money, and he recognised that the supply of the former was partly conditioned by the availability of funds to support them. When Tufnell left, diocesan finances were by no means adequate; but there was a basis on which to build, and an energetic organiser could have used Tufnell's foundation to erect a stable diocesan economy. The laymen had claimed that once financial responsibility was put into their hands there would be no further difficulty. The fact, however, turned out very differently, and the unreality of the grandiose promise of an Episcopal stipend of £1000 a year was shown by the fact that pending the arrival of Bishop Hale in 1875 diocesan finances were so parlous that Bishopsbourne itself was being let to tenants from month to month to supplement the meagre income.<sup>391</sup>

The bishop knew from his experience in the west that Anglicans had still not adapted themselves to the situation created by the discontinuance of state aid,<sup>392</sup> so he quickly set about trying to accomplish what Tufnell had never succeeded in doing, in creating a strong central diocesan fund. The movement was launched at a public meeting in Brisbane in 1876. A General Church Fund was inaugurated to provide a central revenue for the shipment of clergy, assistance for stipends in bush district, and aid to building projects. Supported by prominent laymen like Charles Lilley and John Douglas, the bishop called on the people to rally behind the scheme, and particularly stressed the responsibility of the big companies and property owners to give generously. One speaker hopefully suggested that an income of £5000 per annum should be the goal.<sup>393</sup>

The response, however, was pathetic. The great expectations of general support once the finances were taken out of the bishop's sole hands remained unfulfilled. The glib promises of sufficient income evaporated, and by the end of 1876 Hale was so desperate that he carried out his threat to send his resignation of the see to the metropolitan, Bishop Barker. The decision to resign was a deliberate attempt to stir the diocese from its apathy. The repercussions were immediate: Bishop Barker addressed a circular letter to Archdeacon Glennie and the clergy and laity of Brisbane. Speaking of Hale's resignation, the metropolitan commented:

I cannot, however, ask the Bishop to withdraw it, because I know my doing so would be of no use, for this step has not been taken without much prayerful consideration, and I must add that I cannot but feel that he is fully justified in making a stand against the narrow congregational system he complains of, and also against the neglect of the too obvious duty of caring for the people in the country districts.<sup>394</sup>

<sup>389</sup> *Ibid.*, 18 April, 1878, 27 April 1878 and 14 May 1878.

<sup>390</sup> Brisbane *Synod Proceedings*, 1879, p.9f.

<sup>391</sup> *Minutes*, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 27 July 1875.

<sup>392</sup> *Brisbane Courier*, 17 December 1875.

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, 24 March 1876.

<sup>394</sup> Circular letter from Bishop Barker, 5 February 1877. A copy found in *Hassall Correspondence* Mitchell Library.

Barker went on to call for real support for the General Church Fund, so that there might be some ground for persuading Hale to withdraw his resignation.

The threat of resignation had for a time the desired effect. Throughout the diocese there were expressions of regret that the bishop should contemplate such a step,<sup>395</sup> and Hale finally relented, and determined that he would himself undertake a full-scale appeal for funds. Throughout the diocese he travelled: he addressed parochial councils and meetings of parishioners; he spoke to wealthy landholders and businessmen; and though the work of soliciting funds was far from agreeable to him, he succeeded in collecting more than £2200 by the middle of 1877, including a contribution of £300 of his own.<sup>396</sup> With some sense of satisfaction he could report to the synod of 1877 that at last the General Church Fund was on a sound footing.<sup>397</sup> It was ominous, however, that almost all that had been accomplished was through the bishop's personal exertion. He could not debase his office to that of permanent fund-collector – and it would be wrong for him to do so. But he hoped that once a start was made it would gather pace under the direction and efforts of the diocesan council and lay committees, who had been so vociferous in their demands for financial responsibility. The feeling that some measure of economic stability had been achieved by the diocese was indicated by the enactment by the synod of 1877 of a canon to establish a Clergy Widows' and Orphans' Fund.<sup>398</sup>

Hale's hopes that a stable system of diocesan finance had finally been achieved were, however, soon dashed to the ground. At the synod of 1878 it was reported that the General Church Fund appeal had only been "fairly responded to".<sup>399</sup> By 1879 there was a dangerous decline in the credit balance of the fund, and the defeat of a motion by the laymen that the stipends of the clergy should be a first call on parish finances indicated a growing lack of confidence in the financial stability of the diocese.<sup>400</sup>

By 1880 the position was becoming critical once more, and the whole tone of the bishop's address to synod was one of disappointment and discouragement. Hale's own response to the situation was typical:

As matters now stand, it looks as if we must not only abandon all hope of sending the ministration of religion to places still destitute, but that we must even withdraw the clergymen from the districts which have been recently occupied. I do pray God with all my heart, that we may not be driven to this extremity...I propose that this house, 'Bishopsbourne' should be let; it ought to, and I have no doubt would, bring in a handsome rent. I could live in a less expensive house, and the difference between the one rent and the other would be something towards the needful funds. I beg you not to think that it would be any sacrifice to me to make this exchange: the relief which it would afford to my mind would far outweigh any personal or family inconvenience.<sup>401</sup>

It was the sort of fine gesture that Bishop Hale would make, but the suggestion was sufficient to stir the diocesan council to one of its rare bursts of action. An urgent letter was circulated throughout the diocese, and a select committee was set up by synod which made constructive recommendations. Unfortunately, however, as so frequently occurred, these positive proposals were only partially carried out. A paid travelling secretary was appointed, but the most important suggestion for the establishment of local committees in each parish of the diocese became a dead letter.<sup>402</sup>

By this time the General Church Fund was £1300 in debt.<sup>403</sup> By means of an intensive campaign the travelling secretary succeeded in clearing this debt, but only after Hale had promised to pay half of it out of his own pocket if the diocese would find the rest.<sup>404</sup> Yet even this special effort only eliminated the accumulated deficit, and once the emergency appeal was over, losses mounted at the same desperate rate as before. By May 1881 the diocesan treasurer was insisting that expenditure must be ruthlessly reduced, and even urged that no more clergy should be brought to the colony until funds were available.<sup>405</sup> To make matters worse, the annual S.P.G. grant of £300 was discontinued from 1881 owing to the parlous state of the funds of that society.

<sup>395</sup> E.g. Minutes, Warwick Vestry, 28 February 1877.

<sup>396</sup> Week, 3 November 1877.

<sup>397</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1877, Bishop's Address, p.8.

<sup>398</sup> Ibid., 1877, p. xi. The canon provided that the clergy should contribute 2½% of their stipend towards the fund, and that offertories on Trinity Sunday, or some other suitable day, should go towards it. This was significant as establishing a principle of assessments to be paid from the parishes to diocesan funds. The canon itself, however, produced little concrete result during Hale's episcopate.

<sup>399</sup> Ibid., 1878 p.ii

<sup>400</sup> Ibid., p. 23 and p.iii

<sup>401</sup> Memorandum from Bishop Hale to Diocesan Council, quoted in Queensland Evangelical Standard, 22 May 1880.

<sup>402</sup> For the report of the committee, see Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1880, p. 21.

<sup>403</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 6 May 1881. In the twelve months ended June 1880, income had been just over £300 and expenditure £1700.

<sup>404</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 12 March 1881.

<sup>405</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 6 May 1881.



It was clear that the life of the diocese was being strangled by the constrictive effects of poverty. The bishop called for the diocesan council to take more vigorous action, and the council retaliated by replying that, so far as approaches to the wealthier sections of the community were concerned, "appeals to such persons would come with far more effect if made by the Bishop personally."<sup>406</sup> It was a degrading position for bishop and church alike. In the community the deplorable weakness of the Church of England was universally admitted; but what saddened the bishop was not so much that the prestige of the church was low, but that thousands of human souls were being deprived of the spiritual nourishment which the church ought to be giving to them. In 1882, with the debt accumulating once more, the bishop issued throughout the diocese a pamphlet entitled Our Present Position. The grief in the saintly bishop's heart rings through its words:

My heart has been wounded by the appeals made to me for the ministration of religion and for some crumbs of the bread of life. And if this is all that I have been brought here for – if, having looked upon this destitution and heard these cries for help, I am now to remain powerless for want of means, and am compelled to say to these people that I can do nothing to help them – then, I must say again, my having been brought here at all has been a mistake...<sup>407</sup>

Even this moving appeal brought only the same result as before – a temporary improvement, following by a gradual increasing debt, so that by the time Hale's episcopate ended, the deficit was more than £400, even though expenditure had been reduced to the barest minimum.<sup>408</sup> It was a story of miserable failure by the members of the church to rise to the obligations laid upon them: the inherited traditions of large endowments and state aid had left disastrous consequences for the Anglican Church in Queensland.

While these pitiful efforts were proceeding to keep up with current expenses, there was naturally no possibility of building up the endowments of the diocese which Bishop Tufnell had so carefully established. By 1884, Hale's last year, the see endowment was still only £9650, a sum not very different from that left by Tufnell.<sup>409</sup> The investment policy pursued by the diocesan council was very timid, and for a long time most of the money in the endowment fund was put out at fixed deposit on a low rate of interest. If it had been wisely invested in property at a time when property values were steadily rising, it might have been built up to a very considerable sum.<sup>410</sup> The result was that when Dr. Hale laid down his office the diocese was leading nothing more than a hand-to-mouth existence.

This condition of financial stringency was related in two ways to the spiritual state of the church at this time. First, it gives a rough index to the strength of attachment of people to the church; their unwillingness to contribute more freely to the church's work suggests a widespread religious indifference. It is true that part of the trouble was that church people had simply never been trained to give; but we cannot ignore the fact that many, even of regular churchgoers, did not care enough to give with any degree of generosity. The financial failure of the church in the early eighties stands out particularly darkly in contrast with the relative prosperity of commercial life at the time.

Secondly, the real poverty of the church inevitably had the effect of weakening still further its hold on the people. Progress was constantly restrained because of lack of material resources. Restrictions had to be placed on the importation of sorely needed clergy, building projects were delayed especially in the less prosperous parishes, and above all so much of the attention of the bishop and other diocesan leaders had to be devoted to keeping the diocese from bankruptcy that their real spiritual work had to be partially neglected.

The way in which the church's task was being interfered with by pecuniary considerations was well illustrated by the memorandum from the diocesan treasurer in 1881, suggesting that no more clergy be introduced from England on guaranteed stipends. The number of clergy did not actually decline during Hale's episcopate. Indeed, after many fluctuations in the clerical strength during his ten-year term, there were 35 clergy at his departure, as against 25 when he arrived, and in addition, there were many more clergy in the far north as a result of the creation of the new diocese of North Queensland. But this was a period of rapid growth of population and great expansion in the inhabited area of the colony. Towns like Charleville, Blackall and Tambo were becoming significant centres of population, and whereas during Tufnell's episcopate there was no real demand for clergy in the far west, by the seventies and eighties the need was very real. On his first western tour Bishop Hale discussed the possibilities of resident clergy being provided for Charleville and Blackall, and for short periods priests were sent there. The Reverend C.W. Houlbrook spent some months at Charleville in 1876-77;<sup>411</sup> Blackall had a resident priest from 1878 to 1880; the Reverend John Alldis ministered in the Aramac and Murrumbidgee

<sup>406</sup> Ibid., 1 July 1881

<sup>407</sup> Quoted in Queensland Guardian, 8 March 1883.

<sup>408</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1885, p.ii.

<sup>409</sup> Ibid., 1884, p. iv.

<sup>410</sup> For a comprehensive criticism of the financial policy of the diocese, see an article, probably by William Coote, in Week, 17 November, 1877. Similar criticisms are expressed in Queensland Guardian, 31 May and 30 August 1883. It needs to be remembered that investments in land were a risky proposition, and might not yield the immediate and consistent returns required by the diocese.

<sup>411</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 1 February 1879.

districts in 1883-84;<sup>412</sup> even outlying Clermont and Copperfield had periods of regular ministrations in 1887 and 1880. But these were isolated endeavours, and the shortage of clergy and lack of funds prevented the establishment of stable parishes in these outlying areas. In Hale's time Roma remained the most distant centre with more or less continuous ministrations.

The general pattern was that parishes in the Brisbane area, as well as the older and more settled country towns, were maintained with continuous ministry. The main coastal towns – Maryborough, Rockhampton, and later Bundaberg – fared well, as did the settled inland centres like Ipswich, Toowoomba, Drayton, Warwick, Dalby, Roma Stanthorpe and Allora. Other areas, including the sometimes populous, but often unstable mining towns and the far western settlements had to depend on the chance of men and money being available from time to time. It must be remembered, however, that in some of these places the services of the church were maintained by laymen when no priest was available.

The failure of the church to meet the conditions of the outback was illustrated by figures quoted in 1877, though it must be said that the position improved in the later years of Hale's episcopate. It was estimated then that the Anglican population of the diocese was 55,000, who were cared for by 25 clergy, one of whom as registrar of the diocese was not fulfilling parochial responsibilities. Of these clergy 22 were stationed in what might be called more closely settled areas, including the south-eastern corner of the colony, and the larger provincial towns like Dalby and Mackay. In this area lived more than 36,500 Anglicans. This meant that the other 18,500 members of the church were cared for by only two clergy.<sup>413</sup> In view of this it may be readily understood why the bishop found himself touching on the subject of the spiritual destitution of the west in every speech he made.<sup>414</sup>

Hale was very conscious of the need to build up his staff or priests, but there were times of despair when he, like Tufnell before him, tended to place the responsibility on synod, or even on individual parishes, to find their own clergy when vacancies occurred. Several of the men who came to the diocese during 1882 and 1883, for example, appear to have been directly introduced by the initiative of parochial nominators, without the bishop's intervention. Most of these men came from other Australian colonies. During Hale's time there were three chief sources of supply of clergy.

England remained the chief potential source, but as we have seen, Hale's lack of close English contacts placed him at a disadvantage here. He believed that English priests were the best prospect, because they were likely to be of higher quality than those who were locally ordained after meagre training, or who came from other colonies, often because of disagreements or failure there.<sup>415</sup> Early in his episcopate he appointed commissaries in England to seek out a number of suitable clergy, and authorised them to offer a guaranteed stipend of £300 per annum, with an additional £75 for travelling expenses to Australia.<sup>416</sup> By this method a number of priests were introduced, but the promise of the stipend was more often than not far grander than the fulfilment. By 1880 the bishop sadly recorded that one priest guaranteed £300 had only been receiving £200, and that another priest had been forced to leave the diocese because his stipend was not being paid.<sup>417</sup>

Another difficulty about some of the newcomers from England was the character of the men themselves. Perhaps because they were not personally scrutinised by the bishop or someone else who understood colonial conditions, an unusually large proportion turned out to be failures in one way or another. In some cases they were men who had not been very successful in England and came to explore new fields; others of them were quite adequate for their work at home but were not able to adapt themselves to the cruder conditions of colonial life. In his crisis report of 1881, W.L.G. Drew, the diocesan treasurer, strongly urged that it was a mistake to send clergy fresh from England to the outlying districts,<sup>418</sup> and the bishop himself referred to the "extreme difficulty" of finding the right sort of men:

The fact is that the tests which men are subjected to, in actual life, in a colony, are, in certain respects, much more severe than the tests which are applied to them in the mother-country. In England, whatever may be a clergyman's duties, those duties are set before him according to certain settled and long-established usages. He is placed, as it were, in a particular groove, and all his surroundings are calculated to assist in keeping him in that groove. In colonial life he finds no such groove. Here each man must depend on his own power of self-guidance, and upon the help and strength which he receives from above in answer to his prayers. And in this way it happens from time to time, that men

<sup>412</sup> Smith, L.P.G., Diamond Jubilee, St. Andrews Church of England, Longreach.

<sup>413</sup> Week, 10 November 1877.

<sup>414</sup> Hale himself made this comment about his speeches at a meeting of the diocesan council. Quoted in Queensland Evangelical Standard, 18 August 1877.

<sup>415</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1884, Bishop's Address, p.9.

<sup>416</sup> Ibid., 1877, Bishop's Address, p.7.

<sup>417</sup> Ibid., 1880, Bishop's Address, p.9.

<sup>418</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 6 May 1881.

who seem to have discharged their duties extremely well in the mother-country failed when they were transplanted to a colony. We have had painful experiences of this tendency in this Diocese.<sup>419</sup>

In his later years in the diocese Hale employed a less haphazard method of choosing men from England, namely by working through the principal of the missionary theological college, St. Augustine's Canterbury. By this time a greater number of ordinands in England were receiving at least part of their training in theological colleges, which were consequently becoming a fruitful source of supply of clergy, and three of Tufnell's original party had received this form of training.<sup>420</sup> St. Augustine's specialised in preparing men for overseas work, and was therefore of special interest to colonial bishops. At his final synod Bishop Hale was able to report that a number of young men had come to the diocese from St. Augustine's, and were filling various curacies.<sup>421</sup> Henceforth a much greater proportion of the priests who came to Queensland were to be men who had received theological college education.

The second major source of clergy was the southern colonies, and during Hale's term there was a greater intake from the south than either before or after. Of eight new priests reported in 1883, most had come from southern dioceses.<sup>422</sup> This was partly due to Hale's evangelicalism: there was more incentive for evangelicals from Sydney and Melbourne to come to Queensland to work under Hale than there had been under Dr. Tufnell, or Hale's successor Dr. Webber.<sup>423</sup> The policy of encouraging parishes to seek their own clergyman fostered this flow from the southern colonies: parochial nominators for the most part had little knowledge of suitable clergy from England, but they sometimes had contacts in New South Wales and Victoria. It was in this way that the Reverend J.H.L. Zillman, great orator and broad churchman, became Rector of Ipswich. Ipswich was at the time the wealthiest parish in the diocese, and the egotistical Zillman attracted great crowds to hear him preach. But the soundness of his doctrine scarcely matched his golden-mouthed eloquence, and his colourful but unstable ministry left little permanent mark.<sup>424</sup> For the most part it was true that the priests who came to Brisbane from southern dioceses were not the ones who did the most solid and enduring work.

The other possible way of obtaining additional clergy was significant, namely the ordination of local candidates. We have noted that a synod sub-committee had recommended the acceptance of local candidates for ordination in 1873, provided they had a three-year training period in the diaconate under an experienced priest. It fell to Hale to put into effect this policy of ordaining local men. He adopted this expedient somewhat against his will, because he realised the lack of facilities for training priests locally. At his first synod in 1876 he remarked that he had ordained only one deacon in his nineteen years as a bishop; but he regarded the situation as so urgent that special measures were justified. In short, the ordination of local candidates was regarded as an emergency measure rather than as a normal source of supply for the ministry.<sup>425</sup> In the early years the locally ordained men were undoubtedly regarded as inferior, and though some of them laboured with great devotion for many years, their lack of educational background was apt to put them at a disadvantage, at least psychologically, in comparison with their English colleagues.

Bishop Hale appointed Archdeacon Glennie to be his examining chaplain, to be responsible for examining these local candidates, and Glennie removed to Toowong in order to be centrally situated for his work as archdeacon and examining chaplain.<sup>426</sup> Two local candidates were ordained in 1877, and two more in 1878, including the Reverend William Morris, who laboured faithfully for many years as first Rector of Bundaberg. The shortage of clergy was so severe, however, that the original intention of a long period in a curacy under an experienced priest was often neglected, and Morris , for

<sup>419</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1880, Bishop's Address, p.8.

<sup>420</sup> By 1874 there were 10 theological colleges in England, of which 6 had been founded since 1860. Few university graduates attended these colleges, however, and their students were commonly regarded as inferior to those who were ordained after graduating from a university. See Bullock, F.W.B., A history of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England, p. 112 and passim.

<sup>421</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1884, Bishop's Address. Boggis, R.J.E., St. Augustine's College, Canterbury lists the students of the college, and shows the names of at least 23 who worked in Queensland up to the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century.

<sup>422</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1883 Bishop's Address, pp.7-8

<sup>423</sup> At least six men trained at the extremely evangelical Moore College, Sydney, came to Brisbane during Hale's time. See Loane, M.L., A Centenary History of Moore Theological College, Appendix.

<sup>424</sup> Zillman's autobiography, Career of a Cornstalk, reveals his egocentricity. . He records (p.47) that when he left Ipswich the Premier, George Thorn, who was a member of his congregation, said to him, "Ah, you should have stayed with us and we would have made you the next Bishop of Brisbane." Zillman comments: "...though I say it, worse men than myself have been appointed Bishops in this my native Australia." Zillman was a son of one of the original German missionaries at Nundah. He trained for the ministry of the Church of England, probably because he saw there an opportunity for advancement. Because he was not appointed to an archdeaconry in the Diocese of Ballarat he eventually left the Church of England and became a wandering independent preacher. His novel Mitre versus Gown behind a thinly veiled story reflects episodes in his own life.

<sup>425</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1876, pp. 7-8

<sup>426</sup> From 1872 to 1876 he had been stationed at Drayton.

example, went straight to the pioneering work in the Bundaberg district on his own. Provisions for preparing local candidates for ordination could not be described as satisfactory: yet it was a significant step, marking the beginning of the indigenisation of the ministry, which was to be a turning point in the history of the church. It was still to be a long time before a majority of the clergy were natives of the country: but at least it was a beginning.

The transfer of Glennie to Brisbane also marked an important development in diocesan administration. When Glennie had first been appointed Archdeacon of Brisbane by Bishop Tufnell there had been criticism of having an Archdeacon of Brisbane who was Rector of Warwick,<sup>427</sup> and indeed, except for the times when the bishop was away, Glennie's work as archdeacon appears to have been quite nominal. Hale's predilection for pastoral work at the expense of administration had thrown more responsibility on Glennie's shoulders, and his appointment to Brisbane marked a greater use of him as an active archdeacon. In 1881 the appointment of the Reverend James Matthews as Archdeacon of Warwick marked a further step in the division of the diocese into real archdeaconries, and so the machinery for more effective diocesan administration was being provided.<sup>428</sup>

One further point should be noticed about the provision of clergy for the diocese during Hale's episcopate. Apart from Hale, every Bishop of Brisbane until Archbishop Sharp (in 1921) came straight from England, and imported many of his leading clergy with him. Mostly these men were of the same school of thought as their bishop, and their ability made them influential in the diocese, and helped consolidate the point of view of their bishop. Hale brought no group of influential priests of his own evangelical outlook. During his episcopate evangelical clergy did come, but they were mainly men of lesser calibre from the south, who were 'birds of passage', and the most influential clergy in the diocese were still the Tufnell men like Jones and Sutton. This was the chief reason why Hale's evangelicalism left no permanent mark on the doctrinal tone of the diocese, and the arrival of a host of able and essentially catholic-minded priests with Bishop Webber consolidated the catholic leanings of the Diocese of Brisbane.

The ineffectiveness and lack of dynamic purpose in diocesan organisation were reflected in certain other aspects of the corporate life of the diocese. One of the chief planks in Tufnell's platform had been a comprehensive system of church schools. In Hale's episcopate the educational structure of the diocese, at least so far as day schools were concerned, collapsed entirely. It would be unfair to blame Bishop Hale for this, because already by the time Tufnell left, the Royal Commission which was to recommend the abolition of government aid to church schools had commenced its work, and the Act of 1875, which put the seal on their recommendations, was virtually inevitable. But certainly Bishop Tufnell would not have accepted the closure of the church schools without a fight, as did his gentle successor. Of course, the schools could still have remained open, provided the members of the church were willing to pay for them out of their own pockets; but many Anglicans were not really convinced as to the necessity of church schools, and it would have needed much stronger pleading than Bishop Hale was capable of to provide the means for the church schools to be kept open. As it happened, the financial collapse of the diocese ended the possibility of maintaining the schools, and by 1877 not one Anglican day school was still operating in Queensland.<sup>429</sup>

Hale scarcely seemed to grasp the significance of the fact that as a result of the 1875 Act, not only would the church schools be closed, but there would be no religious instruction given in school hours in the state schools. In reply to a question at the synod of 1876 he lamely said that he had no intention of seeking to organise religious instruction for the state schools as he deemed it impracticable.<sup>430</sup> Later he occasionally referred to the subject, and mildly urged the restoration of religious instruction in the schools, but he refused to take a lead in pressing the government to act. On one occasion he urged the parents to plead for religious instruction in the schools,<sup>431</sup> but a little later the Bishop-in-Council decided against taking action on a synod recommendation for a memorial to the government on the subject, on the grounds that it was a matter of political controversy, and therefore should be avoided for the present.<sup>432</sup> How different from the days of Bishop Tufnell! Some few years later, the outbreak of larrikinism was attributed by the bishop to a lack of religious education, in a strangely modern comment:

It is terrible to know the prevalence of youthful depravity amongst us; it is terrible to hear of the doings of these bands of lawless youths and men for whom a new name has had to be invented... They have been grievously sinned against.<sup>433</sup>

Yet even this conviction led Bishop Hale to no positive action. It was left for the next decade to initiate the long campaign for the restoration of religious instruction into the schools.

<sup>427</sup> E.g. Brisbane Courier, 30 January 1864.

<sup>428</sup> Matthews was already Rector of Warwick, having been originally Glennie's curate there.

<sup>429</sup> Week, 15 September 1877.

<sup>430</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1876, p.13.

<sup>431</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 25 January 1879.

<sup>432</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1881, Bishop's Address, p.10.

<sup>433</sup> Ibid., 1884, p.10.

In synod, too, there was a general atmosphere of ineffectiveness in debate and action. Hours of talk were frittered away in recriminations, fears and disagreements. The deficiency of strong leadership was apparent in 1876, for example when it was decided to take steps to seek the repeal of Bourke's Church Act, which was apparently still binding on the older parishes, even though it conflicted with the constitution of the diocese. The decision was sound, but no action was taken to follow it up. The fixing of parish boundaries was raised, but they remained largely undefined until the later years of Hale's episcopate. After six years of delay a resolution to establish a church book depot was finally put into effect in 1875, but by 1883 the depot was allowed to close down again.<sup>434</sup>

Perhaps the best indication of this indecisiveness lay in the failure of synod to agree on the establishment of a tribunal to try cases of ecclesiastical offences. Since 1871 synod had accepted the principle that such a tribunal should be set up in accordance with provision made in the diocesan constitution. Not until 1878 was a canon introduced, only to be referred back to the diocesan council. The following year the proposal was defeated on a vote by orders, the majority of the clergy being firmly opposed to having laymen on a jury to try cases that might involve matters of doctrine. In 1882 another similar canon was introduced, and after almost a week's turgid discussion in committee, was defeated on the third reading, again on the clerical vote, despite the bishop's pleading.<sup>435</sup> It is interesting that the stumbling block of lay representation on the tribunal was the same one that was to delay acceptance of the proposed constitution for the Church of England in Australia in the following century.<sup>436</sup> In the sphere of missionary work there was a similar ineffectiveness. Hale, like Tufnell before him, had placed missions high on his list of priorities. He came to Brisbane with a reputation for interest and experience in working among the aborigines, in consequence of his pioneering work among them at Poonindie in South Australia.<sup>437</sup> In his very first speech in Queensland he said that he hoped to draw up a plan for mission work among the Chinese, Melanesian and aboriginal races of the colony,<sup>438</sup> and at the synod of 1877 he particularly stressed, with some prophetic insight, the importance of the work amongst the Chinese race, in view of the "important part which it is evidently destined to play in the world's history in future years."<sup>439</sup> On the strength of his reputation, Bishop Hale was appointed chairman of the Aboriginal Commission set up by the government to advise on steps for the improvement of the condition of the aborigines.<sup>440</sup>

As in other respects, however, largely as a result of poverty, very little came of all these pious hopes. No work at all was undertaken among the aborigines in the diocese during Hale's episcopate. A brief effort was made to work among the Chinese by means of a Chinese catechist, a joint venture of the Bishops of Sydney, Brisbane and North Queensland, but the man selected soon left, and the project came to an inglorious end.<sup>441</sup> Among the kanakas, individual work was done with good effect by clergy within their own parishes, especially at Bundaberg and Maryborough (and also at Mackay, which by now was in the new Diocese of North Queensland), but it was a work that depended almost entirely on local initiative, and was not in any sense centrally organised.<sup>442</sup> In any venture that required diocesan organisation and unanimity little achievement could be recorded.

### iii. The Spiritual Condition of the Diocese.

The picture of the church in the seventies and early eighties so far has been one of unrelieved weakness in central administration. Yet there is another side of the picture which needs to be remembered if we are to have a balanced view. On the diocesan level, church life was undoubtedly weak; but on the parochial and personal level there are indications of considerable vitality, of greater stability in the religious life of the more settled parishes, and of attempts to make a more positive contribution on certain social questions.

In this last matter Bishop Hale, together with leaders of various other churches, took an active part in an organisation called the Society for Promoting Social Purity. Its object was to fight against vice, particularly prostitution. The bishop wrote and spoke on the matter frequently during his later years, and particularly urged the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act of 1868 which, he claimed, encouraged vice by virtually licensing it.<sup>443</sup> It was partly as a means of making a positive approach to such social evils that the synod of 1883 gave its approval to the formation in Brisbane of the Girls' Friendly Society,

<sup>434</sup> Week, 20 and 27 October, 1877; Queensland Guardian, 12 April 1883.

<sup>435</sup> Brisbane Courier, 16 and 21 June 1882. Also Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1878, 1879, 1882 *passim*.

<sup>436</sup> A complete revised Tribunal Canon was passed in 1889 under Bishop Webber, without serious opposition. This measure left the tribunal only to determine facts, while the actual judgment rested with the bishop.

<sup>437</sup> Hale had written a book called The Aborigines of Australia.

<sup>438</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 December 1875

<sup>439</sup> Synod sermon preached by Bishop Hale, printed in Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1877, p.xvi.

<sup>440</sup> Rayner K., Attitude and Influence of the Churches in Queensland on Matters of Social and Political Importance p. 124

<sup>441</sup> Ibid., pp. 112-3

<sup>442</sup> Ibid., pp. 104-5

<sup>443</sup> Queensland Guardian, 28 June 1883.

which had been founded in England some years before. It aimed to bind together girls and young women in a Christian fellowship, such as would encourage the Christian ideals of purity and service.

The duty of the church towards the immigrants who were flowing regularly into the colony was also being recognised in the eighties, and various clergy were delegated to meet immigrant ships, to welcome newcomers and help them with problems of accommodation and employment.<sup>444</sup> It was a further indication of a broadening of the church's work as it passed beyond its absorption in its own pioneering problems.

At the same time there was evidence of vitality in the ordinary life of the parishes, where congregations were large, and progress was being made with new buildings. In 1878 the Brisbane churches of All Saints' and Holy Trinity, Fortitude Valley, recorded average attendances of 400 to 600 in the mornings and 400 to 500 at Evensong. Similar large congregations were reported in the main provincial centres: Ipswich, Toowoomba and Warwick all averaged 300 to 400 people at both morning and evening services. At this time, the population was growing, but even the biggest parishes were of workable size. Maryborough and Rockhampton, with about 3000 Anglicans on their rolls, had the largest numbers of people; Ipswich recorded about 2500 church people; while St. John's and Fortitude Valley each estimated the numbers of their people at about 2000. Many of the parishes were much smaller than these, but especially in the country, great distances more than outweighed the advantages of smaller populations, so as far as ease of ministrations was concerned.<sup>445</sup> Roma was a typical case: Bishop Hale was recorded as warning the rector to be careful not to trespass into New South Wales on the south, nor into Blackall parish in the north!<sup>446</sup> Each parish in forwarding its statistics was invited to enumerate the needs of the parish. The replies make illuminating reading. One parish, the Logan and Albert district, put their wants succinctly as, "Another clergyman and the means to pay him". St. John's Brisbane, was even more blunt under the same heading of "Wants": "Many; but there is no prospect of their being attended to".<sup>447</sup>

As part of the growth of stability of church life during these years there was a greater regularity of services in the larger parishes, and a more careful attention paid to the dignity and reverence of worship. In 1878 at least three parishes – St. John's and All Saints' in Brisbane, and St. Paul's, Rockhampton – had a celebration of Holy Communion each Sunday; most commonly, however, it was still twice a month, and in some cases only once a month. More parishes were now having early morning celebrations of Holy Communion, though this still occurred in fewer than half of the parishes. The number of communicants was still small in most cases, though it showed a decided improvement on the previous decade.<sup>448</sup> It was still quite exceptional for week-day services to be held regularly, though by 1878 morning prayer was being said daily in St. John's. Holy days, which in earlier years had been almost completely neglected, were now better observed: both St. John's and All Saints'; for example, had daily Matins and Evensong during Holy Week, though there was no celebration of Holy Communion.<sup>449</sup>

For the most part, however, the norm of worship was still taken as attendance at Matins or Evensong on Sundays, with the specially devout coming to Holy Communion, and hardly anyone ever going to church on week-days.

In the more settled parishes, especially those with clergy of more catholic leanings, the services were now being conducted with more dignity and ceremony. The use of the surplice, even for preaching, was now quite customary, though there were a few to whom it was still a badge of ritualistic innovation.<sup>450</sup> A few churches by this time had surpliced choirs, though there were some parishes where this remained a novelty until the turn of this century.<sup>451</sup>

If in the city and bigger country towns there were noticeable improvements in the standard of conducting services and in the resulting reverence of worship, the same was not always true in the outlying districts. Sometimes this was due to circumstances which neither priest nor congregation could control. A travelling chaplain, such as the Reverend Frederick Richmond, found that the environment was rarely ideal for reverent worship. In one town where the service was held in the court house, a drunk in the neighbouring lock-up demonstrated his piety by loudly yelling alternately with the hymns and

<sup>444</sup> Ibid., 8 November 1883.

<sup>445</sup> Figures in this paragraph are based on Statistical Returns attached to Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1879.

<sup>446</sup> Quoted in historical notes compiled by Archdeacon W.P. Glover on the Parish of Roma.

<sup>447</sup> Statistical Returns, attached to Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1879.

<sup>448</sup> e.g. All Saints; averaged from 12 to 50 communicants at the early celebration each Sunday; St. John's averaged only 11 at the early service and 28 at the late one held once a month; Ipswich averaged 50 to 60 communicants twice a month.

<sup>449</sup> Queensland Guardian, 22 March 1883.

<sup>450</sup> e.g. a correspondent in the Queensland Guardian, 8 November 1883, could still write: "My advice to the Protestant clergy would be not to yield to this Ritualistic innovation. Leave the surplice in the pulpit to the Romanizing clergy. They have made it the badge of a disloyal faction. Let them keep it, and let us be thankful to be able to show to the eye that we are not ashamed of the Protestant Reformation.

<sup>451</sup> Although surplices were worn by choirs in the "advanced" churches at this time, no cassocks were worn under them. There were some amusing but heated arguments as to the desirability of choirs wearing these "petticoats", e.g. Queensland Guardian, 15 March 1883.

chants.<sup>452</sup> Among the workers in the shearing sheds Richmond found considerable active unbelief and vigorous rationalism, and confessed to being somewhat afraid of a shearing shed and its noisy occupants.<sup>453</sup>

In other cases the lack of care about church services was due to the hangover of the earlier nineteenth century carelessness about forms of worship. There could be little excuse for the laxity demonstrated in arrangements for a service at Miles conducted by a visiting priest from Dalby:

A table without a covering stood at one end of the hall, behind this the clergyman took his stand in his travelling costume, without any surplice or even a stole; for a time, indeed, I fancied it must be a meeting-house preacher, but evening prayer was 'gone though', a couple of hymns from Ancient and Modern book sung; and then a discourse from the officiant, all about the woman in red, and giving these poor neglected Christians something more like a stone than the bread they so much wanted.<sup>454</sup>

The same report went on to say that although he did not have to leave the town until late the next morning, the visiting clergyman neither conducted a morning service, nor took the trouble to visit any of the church people in the town. The fruits of the revival of church life were still very unevenly distributed!

One indication of the vitality of church life in the more settled areas was the construction of a number of large and imposing churches of stone or brick. During Hale's episcopate four of the biggest churches in the diocese were constructed, at South Brisbane and Fortitude Valley in the metropolis, and Maryborough and Rockhampton in the country. St. Paul's, Rockhampton, constructed under the energetic, if controversial, leadership of the Reverend W.A. Diggins, was in later years to be erected into the cathedral church of the new see of Rockhampton. The construction of new churches saw an intensification of the war against the old pew-letting system, and though many of the churches continued to maintain the old custom, a greater proportion of the seats were now free, and many churches dispensed with pew rents altogether. It was the clergy who urged the abolition of pew rents, rather than the laity – another indication that the laymen with most influence in the life of the church were those who belonged to the wealthier section of the community. An interesting sidelight on the pew-letting system is revealed in a letter sent to one pewholder in Maryborough by the church authorities, pointing out that sub-letting of sittings could not be permitted!<sup>455</sup>

By 1880, Bishop Hale, already in his seventieth year, was realising that the time was approaching when he must resign. Having had the experience of coming to the diocese after the long interregnum that followed Tufnell's resignation, Hale determined that the same should not happen again. He persuaded synod to pass a canon providing that the bishop-designate might be elected immediately a bishop announced his intention of resigning, instead of being compelled to wait until the see was actually vacant.<sup>456</sup> With the prospect of his resignation coming close the old bishop gave his synod in 1883 another sound piece of advice from his own experience: he urged them to be willing to delegate the appointment of the next bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Hale realised that such was the state of the diocese that a completely new approach was needed, and that the next bishop must be someone in a position to bring men and money in large quantities from home.<sup>457</sup> The following year Bishop Hale announced his resignation, to take effect from March 1885. Wisely, the special synod that met under the presidency of the aged Archdeacon Glennie agreed to follow their bishop's advice. Their request to the Archbishop of Canterbury to select the next bishop of Brisbane was perhaps the wisest act of synod in its rather undistinguished career.

Bishop Hale must have gone home to England a disheartened man.

Indeed it would seem as if a complacent lethargy had stolen over, and kept down the dormant energies of no small portion of the Church in this diocese.<sup>458</sup>

As a summary of the condition of the church at the end of Mathew Hale's episcopate this was all too accurate. Some parishes, to be sure, were alive and active. But great areas of Queensland went unshepherded; finances were drifting; synodical government was proving ineffective; and the church was failing to make a marked impact on public affairs.

Hale had done his best, and his personal life had been a model of devotion, faith, zeal, and humility, that left its mark on the lives of those with whom he had to deal. But his best work was as a pastor, not as a diocesan bishop, and it was tragic that a man whose life contained so much of goodness was placed in a position in his closing years for which by age and nature he was not really suited. The diocesan organisation and unity envisaged by Bishop Tufnell had been gradually

<sup>452</sup> Richmond, F., Queensland in the Seventies, p.6.

<sup>453</sup> Ibid., p.71

<sup>454</sup> Queensland Guardian., 15 March 1883.

<sup>455</sup> Perry, H., St. Paul's Maryborough Centenary, p.17.

<sup>456</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1880. p.11.

<sup>457</sup> ibid., 1883, p.11.

<sup>458</sup> Queensland Guardian., 3 May 1884.

disintegrating since the formation of the first synod in 1868. Assurance of unified action when constitutional government was given to the diocese had dissolved into ineffective talk. Parishes did as they pleased, and it was true to say, as one contemporary writer remarked, that the diocese had drifted into a state of “formalized congregationalism”.<sup>459</sup> What was needed was a leader of vision, strength and determination: such a leader was soon to come.

---

<sup>459</sup> Week, 15 September 1877.



## CHAPTER 8: THE BOOMING NORTH.

### i. The Earliest Phase.

North Queensland was one of the last parts of the Australian continent to be settled. Tropical heat and isolation combined to make it an unattractive proposition for early settlers, so when Queensland became a separate colony in 1859 and the Diocese of Brisbane was established, the north presented no problem at all for the church. There were, of course, thousands of aborigines, but the time had not yet come when the dreams of organised missionary work among them were ready to materialise. White settlement had not commenced.

For this reason no serious thought was given to the question of the northern boundary of the Diocese of Brisbane when the letters patent were drawn up in 1859. For some reason the old Diocese of Newcastle had extended north only as far as the 21<sup>st</sup> parallel – a little to the north of where Mackay was later to be built. Presumably it was felt better to give the bishop a quite definite northern boundary, beyond the existing or anticipated bounds of settlement, than to include the vast tropical areas of the north. By the time of the creation of the Diocese of Brisbane, Rockhampton was still the northernmost centre of population, so there appeared no need to alter the old northern boundary.

It was not long after separation, however, that the picture began to change. In April 1861 the township of Port Denison, later to be known as Bowen, was founded, and grew steadily; by 1865 the port and surrounding districts had a population of some 1200 people. Then in 1863 agents of Captain Robert Towns took up land near the site of the later Townsville, and within a few years there was a thriving little seaport springing up on the site.

With commendable vision Bishop Tufnell took early action to supply the spiritual wants of these northern settlers. Only a few months after the settlement at Bowen he had purchased a block of land there at the first sale of land in Brisbane,<sup>460</sup> and in 1863 he licensed the Reverend F.J. Grosvenor to perform an itinerating ministry in the Bowen district. At first it scarcely seems to have been realised that in this action Tufnell was technically exceeding his jurisdiction. Details of the boundaries fixed by the letters patent had been forgotten, and it was taken for granted that the Diocese of Brisbane covered the whole of the colony. The question first arose in regard to the possible invalidity of marriages solemnised by a priest who was licensed by a bishop without jurisdiction in the district concerned.<sup>461</sup>

Governor Bowen took advantage of Bishop Barker's metropolitanical visitation in 1864 to clarify the matter of boundaries, and it was agreed that in view of the terms of the letters patent the Bishop of Sydney should exercise jurisdiction, in his capacity as Metropolitan, over any territories not expressly included in other dioceses.<sup>462</sup> Bowen regarded this as a convenient arrangement:

For several years to come there will be little for him to do; and at some future period the northern moiety of the existing Colony will doubtless be erected into a separate Bishopric. The most central position for the new See would be the town of Cardwell in Rockingham Bay, which will probably become also the Capital of the new northern territory – I would venture to express an earnest hope that the future Bishop of Cardwell, whenever appointed, may be selected with a view to his being the head of a well-organized system of Missions to the Aborigines.<sup>463</sup>

Bowen, who had just returned from a visit to the north, showed remarkable foresight. In one sense it was a pity that the north did not come under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Brisbane, because this meant that at least until the ecclesiastical Province of Queensland was formed forty years later there was no unity of development of the life of the church in southern and northern Queensland. On the other hand, the Diocese of Sydney had more resources immediately available to supply at least some limited ministry to the expanding north, in a way that the missionary Diocese of Brisbane could not. Besides, the obvious inconvenience of treating North Queensland as an outpost of Sydney created pressure for the early establishment of a new northern diocese as soon as the growth of population in the north made it feasible. Brisbane might well have proved far less willing to relinquish northern territories than was Sydney.

Governor Bowen's concern for missionary work among the natives in the north weighed heavily with him. As early as 1861 he had urged this need on the English government, and when the Queensland parliament agreed to the principle of granting land for mission stations and giving financial assistance to industrial schools for the aborigines the governor urged

---

<sup>460</sup> Doherty, W.J., *The Bowen Book*, p. 17. The price paid was £155.10.0 Tufnell apparently kept the land in his own name, even after returning to England, and his failure to pay the rates caused the government to threaten to resume the land. To prevent this Bishop Stanton paid the rates in 1882. See Stanton to Prebendary Tucker, 28 February 1882, *S.P.G. 'F' Mss., Letters from Australia*, Vol.IV.

<sup>461</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 14 August 1864, Despatch no.41.

<sup>462</sup> This decision was confirmed by the attorney-general of England, who also ruled that marriages performed north of the 21<sup>st</sup> parallel by clergymen under Tufnell's licence were valid. *V. & P.*, Queensland Parliament, 1865, pp. 475-477.

<sup>463</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 14 August 1864, Despatch no 41.

the home government to encourage the S.P.G. or some other missionary society to take up work in the far north.<sup>464</sup> He had the site already chosen – Somerset, on Cape York Peninsula, where a military station had recently been established to form what Bowen somewhat romantically termed ‘the Singapore of Australia’.<sup>465</sup> Following these requests the S.P.G. sent the Reverend F.C. Jagg, with a lay schoolmaster, W.T. Kennett, to Somerset. The Queensland Government provided them with quarters, school materials and tools; but the mission soon ran into difficulties. Jagg left for Brisbane at the end of 1867, and though Kennett worked on courageously, gaining the confidence of the aborigines and even being adopted by one tribe, his work was hindered by the harsh conduct towards the natives of a group of constables who replaced the marine garrison. Government aid was withdrawn in 1868, and soon afterwards Kennett resolved to return to England, and the mission came to a disappointing end.<sup>466</sup>

Up to 1870, Bowen was the only place in the north with a resident priest, and even this district experienced the rapid succession of changes of incumbent which was a recurring feature of church life in the outlying areas.<sup>467</sup> Occasionally there were priests who stayed a number of years in one place, but for the most part such districts were characterised by a succession of short incumbencies. This was partly due to the character of the clergy: it is noticeable that among the early clergy at Bowen, for example were men like C. Searle, E. Tanner and J.K. Black, all of whom became involved in controversy during their ministry in other parts of Queensland. Some of these men seem to have been of unsettled habits, and came to the outposts of settlement precisely because they had been involved in troubled situations elsewhere. On the other hand, some of them carried out able and devoted work, and J.K. Black, though of an argumentative temperament,<sup>468</sup> carried out long and arduous pastoral visitations, and did notable service by drawing public attention to maltreatment of the aborigines by some of the whites.<sup>469</sup> The fact was that changes in clerical personnel were by no means entirely the fault of the clergy themselves. They were men working under extraordinarily difficult conditions. The flocks to whom they ministered included some of the toughest people in the colony, people who were out of touch with the church and had no interest in spiritual matters. There was no settled church life; buildings had to be constructed and paid for; and there was always the risk of population suddenly shifting from one centre to another in a community that was living largely on mining activities. Booms and depressions followed with alarming rapidity on the diggings, and for many years to come the whole social and economic life of North Queensland was very unstable indeed. For a clergyman to hold out in one place for five or six years, as Black did with success at Bowen, was no small achievement.<sup>470</sup>

In the late sixties and early seventies a series of gold discoveries brought a surge of population into North Queensland – Ravenswood 1868, Charters Towers 1872, the Palmer 1873 and Hodgkinson 1876, among others.<sup>471</sup> Boom towns shot up in unexpected places. In 1876 when Canon O’Reilly of Sydney made his tour through the north, he reported Cooktown as a booming town, with a main street two miles in length, with a collection of forty ‘pubs’ and a population of three thousand Europeans and another thousand or two Chinese. Charters Towers was its equal, at least in its abundance of hotels.<sup>472</sup> Quarrelling, drunkenness and immorality were rife: it was clearly no easy sphere of work for the church.

Bishop Barker did what he could to supply clergy. Up to 1870 Townsville had to depend on occasional visits from the clergyman at Bowen, though the highly respected police magistrate, James Gordon, was in the habit of conducting regular Sunday services in the absence of a priest. By 1870 these temporary measures could no longer suffice, and following representations from two meetings of church people, Barker sent the Reverend James Adams to be incumbent of Townsville.<sup>473</sup> A visit by Bishop Tufnell later the same year for Confirmation encouraged the church people, and by October 1871 the first St. James’ church, forerunner of the later cathedral, was ready for dedication.<sup>474</sup> With the swelling population in the interior, Adams found that he had a great territory to cover, and spent a quarter of his time on the goldfields at Ravenswood and Gilberton.<sup>475</sup>

In view of the difficulties involved in the work of the church in such a region, it is surprising that Bishop Barker sent such inexperienced clergymen from Sydney. During the seventies four of the men sent directly from Sydney – James Adams (Townsville 1870), John Done (Townsville, 1875), John Spooner, (Bowen 1873), and Herbert Heath (Bowen 1876), - had

<sup>464</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 3 September 1864, Despatch no 45.

<sup>465</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 16 July, 1864, Despatch no 31.

<sup>466</sup> Pascoe, C.F., Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G., p. 413 For more detailed accounts, see Mission Field, May 1869, pp. 126-130, and June 1869, pp 158-162.

<sup>467</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1895, shows that Bowen had 12 incumbents in its first 32 years.

<sup>468</sup> See, for example Brisbane Courier, 5 July 1871.

<sup>469</sup> Thompson, H.P., Into All Lands, p. 414. For further details see Mission Field, April 1870, pp.130-141.

<sup>470</sup> Australian Churchman, 10 May 1873.

<sup>471</sup> Doherty, W.J., The Townsville Book. P.101.

<sup>472</sup> Australian Churchman, 1 and 7 January 1876.

<sup>473</sup> Minutes of Committee, St. James’ , Townsville, May and June 1870.

<sup>474</sup> Ibid. October 1871.

<sup>475</sup> Ibid., Annual Meeting, 1872.

just recently graduated from Moore Theological College when they came north, and were either still deacons or else newly-ordained priests.<sup>476</sup> Nevertheless these young and inexperienced men did very creditably in at least forming a foundation for greater things to come, and in holding the fort until the first bishop with his clerical reinforcements arrived. When Bishop Stanton came the Sydney men were all withdrawn from the north, their task having been completed. In the meantime, not only did Sydney provide the clergy; the Church Society of Sydney also sent a steady contribution of money which reached a total of about £1000 by the time the bishopric was established.<sup>477</sup> There was an additional small grant from the S.P.G.

The opportunity that was open if the church could throw in adequate resources was demonstrated by several incidents in the mid-seventies. In 1874, for example, the Reverend William Kildahl from Townsville paid the first clerical visit to Cooktown. Five hundred came to the evening service, and a committee of “fourteen gentlemen, government officials, merchants, bakers, and professional men” was formed to make arrangements for obtaining a resident clergyman.<sup>478</sup> Unfortunately the man appointed died within a month of his arrival, as a result of his previous hard ministry at Copperfield further south.<sup>479</sup> His successor, the Reverend R. R. Eva became much respected, but his firm advocacy of temperance appealed neither to the forty hotelkeepers nor their clients. Yet the success of the missions conducted by Canon O’Reilly at Cooktown, Charters Towers and Townsville demonstrated the harvest that was ready to be reaped.<sup>480</sup> The Roman Catholic Church was already active in the north, but the comparative absence of other denominations left the field open for the Church of England to make rapid headway. For the present, however, it was a matter of promise rather than of actuality. As one priest wrote in 1873, “I am working now entirely in faith. I can see no fruit of my labours as yet.”<sup>481</sup> The four clergy in the north in 1876 were only a handful; there were only five churches – Townsville, Bowen, Cooktown, Charters Towers and Millchester; and only 142 actual communicants were listed in the four parishes, though average Sunday attendance at worship totalled about eight hundred.<sup>482</sup> It was clear that a bishop with a new team of vigorous clergy would find plenty to do.<sup>483</sup>

## ii. Creating a Bishopric.

That a diocese was created in the north after the influx of population to the goldfields is not surprising: what is remarkable is the fact that there was serious planning of a new diocese even in the sixties, before the population of Europeans exceeded a few thousand.

We have noted Governor Bowen’s dream of a northern diocese and colony in 1864, but this was still only a dream. Yet in 1866 the governor was again writing to England, urging the need of a new diocese upon the home government, and asking that the missionary societies might be encouraged to provide finance for its endowment.<sup>484</sup> At this time, with the north so sparsely populated, Rockhampton was regarded as the logical centre for a new diocese, which would, however, extend to the far north of the colony, and so far did the plan progress that while Bishop Barker was in England in 1870, a report came back to Australia that the new diocese centred on Rockhampton had been formed, and the name of the first bishop-elect was actually announced.<sup>485</sup> Such an announcement was certainly premature; for not only was there insufficient money in hand, but the synod of the Diocese of Brisbane wrecked the scheme by obstinately refusing at a special session in 1871 to give up any part of the diocese as then constituted to a northern see.<sup>486</sup> Six months later, synod reversed this decision, but it was too late for Barker to proceed with the plan before returning to Australia. The main reason for the opposition in the Brisbane synod appears to have been the unwillingness of the people in the northern parts of the existing Diocese of Brisbane to lose their connection with the capital.

As it happened, the delay in the scheme was a blessing, because the proposed diocese was as yet insufficiently developed economically to support an efficient diocesan machinery. In any case, Rockhampton would not have been a satisfactory see city for the new mining areas of the farther north. Yet, for some years more, the plan continued to be that Rockhampton should be the see city. In 1874 Canon R.L. King was sent from Sydney to stir up enthusiasm for the project, and it was resolved that,

<sup>476</sup> Based on clergy list, Loane, M.L., A Centenary History of Moore Theological College, Appendix p.180ff.

<sup>477</sup> Australian Churchman, 13 June 1878.

<sup>478</sup> Ibid., 6 June 1874.

<sup>479</sup> Ibid., 4 July 1874.

<sup>480</sup> Ibid., 1 and 7 January 1876.

<sup>481</sup> Mission Field, May 1873, p. 156. Letter from Rev. W. Kildahl.

<sup>482</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 13 January 1876.

<sup>483</sup> For further details of the period before 1878, see Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, chap. 2.

<sup>484</sup> Bowen to Sec. of State for Colonies, 18 December 1866, Despatch No 70.

<sup>485</sup> Australian Churchman, 17 December 1870. This announcement aroused the church people at Bowen to petition the Archbishop of Canterbury for Bowen, not Rockhampton, to become the centre of the proposed northern see. Mission Field, July 1871, p. 201.

<sup>486</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, Special Session, February 1871.

... steps be now taken to commence the effort to provide a suitable endowment for the proposed bishopric of Rockhampton, and that the central and northern districts be asked to join in the effort.<sup>487</sup>

A committee was formed in “Rockhampton to follow up the proposal, and Barker himself met with the diocesan council in Brisbane to secure its approval.<sup>488</sup> Yet there was little enthusiasm, and within a few months the fund was lagging badly, and the feeling was growing both in Brisbane and the north that the proposal was premature.<sup>489</sup>

With the startling increase in mining activity in the north, it became clear that it was there, rather than to Rockhampton, that attention should be turned, and that if strong support were to be secured, the see city must be in the far north.<sup>490</sup> With this in mind, Bishop Barker undertook an extensive confirmation tour in the north in 1876. At every settlement he called a meeting to explain the need for a bishopric, and to call for subscriptions and promises. He visited Bowen, Ravenswood, Charters Towers, Townsville and Cooktown, as well as smaller places.<sup>491</sup> One vexed question that Barker had to face concerned the site of the see city, especially in view of the intense rivalry between Townsville and Bowen. With artful diplomacy, and without making any definite commitment, the bishop suggested that Townsville might be the most appropriate centre, “with, as it were, a country residence at Bowen”.<sup>492</sup> This, however, was to be a constant source of grievance until the bishop of the new diocese actually arrived, and as late as 1878 the collector for the Bishopric Fund had to deny rumours that Townsville had been definitely settled upon as the bishop’s residence.<sup>493</sup> This probably accounts for the adoption of the name of North Queensland, rather than Townsville, for the new see.

Barker’s tour did a good deal to arouse interest in the bishopric, and some £2400 was promised towards the endowment fund.<sup>494</sup> With other donations and promises already made in the south, the total came to about £4000, and with the prospect of help from the S.P.G., Barker felt justified in going ahead with arrangements for the formation of the new diocese during his visit to England in 1877-78.<sup>495</sup> With progress thus far advanced, Dean Cowper, who was administering the Diocese of Sydney in the bishop’s absence, gave the Reverend John Done of Townsville instructions to undertake a fund-raising tour in the north. He was to collect the promised subscriptions offered during Bishop Barker’s tour of 1876, as well as any new money that might be available.

Done’s letters to Dean Cowper give the picture of a devoted man facing every conceivable difficulty. He disliked intensely the business of begging for money, but he persevered against great odds. In a district of transient population, he discovered that many of those who had promised subscriptions had left the area; there were others who had changed their minds; and his work was hampered by suspicions and doubts in some places – at Bowen the rector would not co-operate, at Mackay there was uncertainty whether or not they were to be included in the new diocese, at Cooktown there was the excuse that they would wait until the bishop actually arrived.<sup>496</sup> To make matters worse, 1878 was a time of intense unemployment and depression. “I never saw so many men out of employment as there are at the Hodgkinson”, wrote Done in one letter.<sup>497</sup> The once flourishing Palmer field was almost deserted by Europeans;<sup>498</sup> and of Charters Towers he wrote:

I could not have come at a worse time to collect the funds for the Bishopric at this field. The whole field is in a state of depression, the storekeepers etc. can hardly get one half of their bills paid...<sup>499</sup>

The result was that only a portion of the sum promised was collected. But the bishopric plan was too far advanced to be halted now. Indeed the first Bishop of North Queensland had already been selected and consecrated, and was already preparing for the long journey to commence in his new sphere of work.

<sup>487</sup> Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 20 June 1874. See also Cowper, W.M., Episcopate of the Right Reverend Frederic Barker, D.D., p.p. 299f.

<sup>488</sup> Brisbane Courier, 22 July 1874.

<sup>489</sup> Australian Churchman, 7 November, 1874.

<sup>490</sup> E.g. see views expressed in Ravenswood Times, quoted in Australian Churchman, 11 March 1876.

<sup>491</sup> Cowper, W.M., op. cit., p. 334

<sup>492</sup> Townsville Herald, 1 August 1876.

<sup>493</sup> Rev. J. Done to Dean Cowper, 16 August 1878.

<sup>494</sup> Pamphlet, An Appeal for Funds towards the Endowment of a Bishopric for Northern Queensland. This pamphlet is undated, but was probably issued in 1878.

<sup>495</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1877, Primate’s Address, p.17.

<sup>496</sup> Rev. J. Done to Dean Cowper, 16 August and 11 September 1878.

<sup>497</sup> 16 August 1878.

<sup>498</sup> Rev. J. Done to Dean Cowper, 11 July 1878

<sup>499</sup> Rev. J. Done to Dean Cowper, 4 July 1878.

### iii. George Henry Stanton: First Bishop of North Queensland

It was Bishop Barker himself who, after careful enquiries in England early in 1878, invited the Reverend George Henry Stanton to become first Bishop of North Queensland.<sup>500</sup> Barker, zealous evangelical that he was, knew just the sort of man he wanted; and it was with incredulity that news was received in Australia that Barker had chosen Stanton of Holborn for the new diocese, for the famous Father A.H. Stanton, of St. Alban's Holborn, was universally known as one of the leaders of the 'ritualists'.<sup>501</sup> But it was from another Holborn parish, Holy Trinity, St. Giles-in-the-Fields, that the bishop-elect came, and as might be expected of a nominee of Bishop Barker, he was regarded as a man who would bring 'sound Protestant and Evangelical teaching in the highest places in the Church'.<sup>502</sup>

In Bishop Stanton evangelicalism was seen at its purest and best. He was a man of lively faith and of deep love of souls, and he wanted nothing more than to be able to spread the Gospel wherever opportunity presented. From childhood he had been conscious of a vocation to the sacred ministry, and since the age of eighteen had been a fervent evangelical; yet there was nothing of that narrowness of spirit that characterised some types of evangelicals. Dean Cowper looked forward to the new bishop's "building up a sound Evangelical Church upon the principles of the Reformation."<sup>503</sup> But Stanton's conception of the Church of England and its mission went much further than the Reformation:

The comprehensive Church of England, un narrowed by any arbitrary limits or test of membership; scriptural in doctrine, apostolic in discipline, ancient in her historic lineage, yet modern in her sympathy with the religious movements of our time – at once Catholic in her retention of primitive faith and practice, Protestant in her rejection of mediaeval and Tridentine accretions; firm, yet flexible – its Liturgy and Formularies bearing the strata of thought and devotion deposited through the centuries of changeable experience – the Church of Keble, Kingsley, and Simeon, of Stanley, Bickersteth, and Pusey, is constitutionally capable of forming affinity with the mixed elements of colonial religious life.<sup>504</sup>

Here was Stanton's position in a nutshell. In personal attitude to religion he was an evangelical: he regarded Bishop Barker as his greatest friend and adviser in Australia,<sup>505</sup> and his diocese was predominantly evangelical in tone during his episcopate. But he was always much more concerned with the reality of a man's religion than in the outward forms in which it was clothed, so he welcomed, and was genuinely tolerant towards, all who were spiritually-minded and zealous, no matter to what school of thought in the church they belonged.<sup>506</sup>

Stanton was a man of prayer. He considered carefully, and with earnest prayer, Bishop Barker's invitation to come to North Queensland before he accepted, and with his acceptance he made a further decision that could not have been easy. He announced at his farewell meeting that he would not return from the colonies after a term of work, but would remain there until he could work no more.<sup>507</sup> His refusal of a lucrative living in England in 1885 showed him to be as good as his word, and though he was translated from North Queensland to Newcastle in 1890, he remained at his post there until his death in 1905. He accepted a colonial bishopric after prayer because he saw it as the vocation to which God had called him, and because it was his vocation, he would not turn aside from it.<sup>508</sup>

Closely related to this deep sense of vocation was the power of perseverance that marked Stanton's character. He knew that no sudden burst of energy would suffice:

We must do everything for the improvement of our Church – quietly, steadily and self-denyingly. No mere splash will suffice. Years of indifference and infidelity cannot be recovered and righted by one spasm of devout energy....<sup>509</sup>

Some of the clergy whom he sent out ahead of him were soon disillusioned with the conditions they found: not so Stanton.<sup>510</sup> He had come prepared for a hard time, and when he found it, he simply girded himself for the task. He came back from a visit to England in 1881 with many disappointments to report, and more to face within the diocese. Yet the spirit of determination breathed through the report which he delivered to his diocesan council on his return:

<sup>500</sup> Cowper, W.M., *op.cit.*, pp.354ff.

<sup>501</sup> The confusion is described in Queensland Evangelical Standard, 22 June 1878.

<sup>502</sup> The Record, quoted in Australian Churchman, 28 March 1878.

<sup>503</sup> Dean Cowper to Stanton, 12 June 1879.

<sup>504</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1884, Bishop's Address, p.7.

<sup>505</sup> Ibid., 1883, p.4.

<sup>506</sup> Cf. the estimate of Bishop Gilbert White, who worked with him and knew him well: "He had left behind the Evangelicalism of earlier days without adopting the position of a High Churchman. If it is needful to define his position, he was probably more a Broad Churchman than anything else, but he had a keen appreciation of the need and value of decency, order and beauty in worship, and his mind was so large and tolerant that it is almost impossible to class him with any party". Carpentarian, April, 1906.

<sup>507</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 18 January 1879

<sup>508</sup> Monthly Record, December 1885.

<sup>509</sup> Stanton to Rev. H.A. Mason, 11 October 1878, quoted in North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.3.

<sup>510</sup> Cf. Australian Churchman, 29 March 1879 and 26 July 1879.

We live in the childhood of this Church and colony. Our character and credit are at stake. Coming generations will criticize our work. We dare not be indifferent nor dwarf ourselves below the measure of our responsibility. If difficulties dispute our progress, let stouter courage be roused to conquer them. If our beginnings be small, let our energy build it into another proof of what monuments can be reared on mean foundations....Among the twelve goodly sister Dioceses of Australia, beautified with churches and enriched with endowments, let none surpass in comeliness the young Diocese of North Queensland.<sup>511</sup>

Amid the changing fortunes that North Queensland was to experience in the years ahead, such determination was a valuable quality.

There was in Stanton none of the arrogance that sometimes accompanies this sense of destiny in great men. Humility was the very keynote of his character. His first act after his selection was to learn to swim and to ride, so that he would be equipped for conditions in his strange new environment.<sup>512</sup> He wrote to the churchwardens of the parishes in the diocese in words of unaffected simplicity:

I come to you desirous of becoming an affectionate self-denying, helpful brother and friend to everyone within and without our Communion... I shall still have much to learn, but my fellow-churchmen will be patient and moderate in their expectations.<sup>513</sup>

There was none of the condescension which some of the bishops who came from England appeared to show towards the "colonials". Indeed, Stanton explicitly set out a different ideal for his episcopate. He came, he said, not as "a mediaeval princely Bishop", but as "a Bishop of the nineteenth century".<sup>514</sup> Certainly, he could hardly have looked less prelatial than when he went on his country tours, "calling at every hut and house on the way",<sup>515</sup> dressed in his broad-brimmed straw hat, with handkerchief around his neck, and linen jacket and stout riding-leathers.<sup>516</sup> His sermons on these occasions always contained a wealth of simple and homely illustrations that carried their message home even to the most unlearned congregations.

What made Stanton so effective a pioneering bishop was that these spiritual qualities were matched by a realistic vision and practical efficiency in planning and administration. The clergy whom he chose to come with him were selected with a view of being "godly, consistent and efficient workers".<sup>517</sup> There could be no better summary of the ideal that the bishop kept before himself. Godliness must be accompanied by consistency and efficiency. He could not be described as worldly; but he was "down-to-earth", a quality that counted for much in the crudity of the North Queensland bush. This will become more apparent as we examine the means by which Bishop Stanton set the new diocese on its feet.

#### iv. Australia's First Tropical Diocese.

It was on the Feast of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, 24 June 1878, that George Henry Stanton was consecrated by A.C. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, and a number of other bishops including Bishop Barker. He did not, however, sail immediately for Townsville: first he attended the Lambeth Conference, and then spent some months in England searching out a team of clergy and raising funds, so that almost a year elapsed before he was actually enthroned in his diocese. Five of his clergy, under the charge of his chaplain, the Reverend H.A. Mason, preceded him, and with their arrival the three Sydney clergy in the north were withdrawn.<sup>518</sup> Consequently there was, so far as the clergy were concerned, a completely new start, only the Reverend Albert Maclaren, of Mackay, not being transferred. Maclaren and his parish had belonged to the Diocese of Brisbane, but the boundary was moved from the 21<sup>st</sup> to the 22<sup>nd</sup> parallel, so that it came into the new diocese. Nevertheless the young clergy of Sydney had done a valuable missionary task in blazing the trail for those who were to follow.

It was not an attractive prospect for Stanton and his pioneer band. The bishop recalled to his first synod some years later that the diocese had appeared to him from England as a place "whose bishopric was unendowed, whose clergy were recalled to Sydney, whose treasury was empty, and whose shores were considered hot and inhospitable".<sup>519</sup> The population of the diocese included something less than 20,000 Europeans, of whom about 7,000 were believed to be Anglicans, many of the others being Germans and Danes. Besides, it was estimated there were 15,000 kanakas and

<sup>511</sup> From printed Statement of Bishop Stanton to N.Q. Diocesan Council, 1881.

<sup>512</sup> White, G., "Memoir of Bishop Stanton", in North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.5.

<sup>513</sup> Letter dated 8 August 1878, quoted in Queensland Evangelical Standard.

<sup>514</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 24 May 1879.

<sup>515</sup> Stanton to Preb. Tucker, 15 July 1881, S.P.G."F" Mss., Letters from Australia, Vol. IV.

<sup>516</sup> Pamphlet, Sketches of Life and Work in North Queensland, 1882.

<sup>517</sup> Stanton to Bishop M.B. Hale, quoted in Australian Churchman, 24 October 1878.

<sup>518</sup> Minutes of Committee, St. James', Townsville, 21 November 1878.

<sup>519</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1883, Bishop's Address, p.4.

another 10,000 Chinese, as well as an indeterminate number of aborigines.<sup>520</sup> There was one railway under construction between Townsville and Charters Towers; elsewhere transport was by Cobb and Co., or private buggy, or in view of the state of the roads, more comfortably on horseback. With the steady flow of immigrants being introduced by the government,<sup>521</sup> the population was increasing steadily, and Stanton's initial band of eight clergy in a diocese with a nominal area of 300,000 square miles were faced with no small task.

In view of the scarcity of clergy, it was inevitable that work should be limited almost entirely to the Europeans, though Albert Maclaren at Mackay devoted considerable attention to the kanakas, much to the chagrin of some of his white parishioners.<sup>522</sup> After conferring with the Bishops of Sydney and Brisbane, Stanton tried to do something for the Chinese by arranging for a Chinese catechist to work among his countrymen in North Queensland, but in the face of the strong antipathy of many of the Europeans he did not persevere for long. Among the aborigines, no effort was possible at all.

For the European work, however, the bishop speedily organised his resources. Even before he arrived in the colony he had arranged placements for the eight clergy in his initial group,<sup>523</sup> and his first step on arrival was to tour the main centres of the diocese to see the needs and meet the members of the church. He quickly recognised the pressing requirements: money, clergy, property and buildings.

Stanton adopted the usual principle of church finance of building up large endowment funds to provide a stable income for the diocese. He set about a vigorous fund-raising campaign while awaiting departure from England, and raised almost £3800, of which he allocated some £1450 to the See Endowment Fund, and used the rest as the nucleus of a General Fund to send out his new clergy and provide money for the purchase of sites. Having private personal means, the bishop did not worry unduly at first about building up the small see endowment to the requisite proportions, and when in 1880- he had to return to England because of the death of his father, he seized the opportunity to collect another £5,000, which he put into a special Mission Chaplains' Fund. Returning home, however, he found the financial position critical. The time in which the guarantee from the English societies for a £2,000 subsidy to the see endowment was to expire in 1882, and before it could be claimed, £8,000 must be in hand from other sources. Despite gifts of £1,000 from the Diocese of Brisbane and £500 from Sydney, the fund was still some £2,000 short. At the end of 1881, Stanton issued a stirring appeal: and it was some indication of the respect in which the bishop was held that more than the money required was subscribed within a few months – a rare achievement in the pioneering days of the church in Queensland. The result was that by 1883 the see endowment had reached the respectable figure of £10,800, and as a result of sound investment policies by Archdeacon Henry Plume, it exceeded £15,000 by the end of Stanton's episcopate. From a very shaky start, North Queensland thus speedily became the best endowed see in the colony.<sup>524</sup>

The personal sacrifice involved for a man of Stanton's temperament in this intensive campaign to raise money was very great. It was not so much his own personal contributions that were costly – though they played no small part in keeping the diocese alive in these early years – but begging for money was abhorrent to the gentle nature of Bishop Stanton. "I am utterly sick of raising money", he wrote to Henry Plume in 1881.<sup>525</sup> Nor did the stabilisation of the See Endowment Fund much relieve the pressure, because contributions to the General Church Fund on which the expansion of the church's ministry and property was dependent, were so poor as to endanger the continued growth of the diocese. In 1882 only £40 was subscribed to this fund from within the diocese.<sup>526</sup> It was a repetition of Bishop Hale's experience in Brisbane. Nevertheless through the bishop's own efforts and the gradual stabilisation of parish life, the position improved to such an extent that by 1882 the S.P.G. grants for the support of the bishop could be discontinued, and by 1889 all S.P.G. grants could cease. Limited aid had to be given again in the crisis of the nineties, but it appeared by the end of Stanton's episcopate that the pioneering days were safely negotiated.<sup>527</sup>

Within the parishes, as they became settled, the greater part of the income came from subscriptions rather than church collections, and when the response became slight, the women were called in to help. The motion passed by the committee of St. James', Townsville, in 1879, indicated how the men were ready to 'pass the buck'. It was carried, "that the Rev. H.

<sup>520</sup> Stanton, G.H., Letter to Contributors to the North Queensland Church Fund in England, 28 October 1879.

<sup>521</sup> Estimated at 1,000 per year through Townsville in 1882. See article by Mrs. H. Plume, in Sketches of Life and Work in North Queensland.

<sup>522</sup> Syngé, F.M. Albert Maclaren, p.11.

<sup>523</sup> North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.3.

<sup>524</sup> These figures have been calculated from statistics given in the following sources:- Trustees of N.Q. Diocese (Bishops Barker, Hale and Stanton), Letter, March 1880; Stanton G.H., Letter to Members of the Church of England and Others in North Queensland (undated, but almost certainly the end of 1881); N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1883; Minutes, Diocesan Conference, 1885; Northern Churchman, March 1921; and Queensland Evangelical Standard, 23 July 1881.

<sup>525</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 25 June 1881.

<sup>526</sup> Stanton, G.H., Letter (to the clergy and people of the diocese), 12 April 1883.

<sup>527</sup> Pascoe, C.F., op. cit. p.414

Plume shall wait upon the ladies of the congregation to ask their assistance in raising funds for the proposed alterations".<sup>528</sup> Pew rents, which were still common in the north, raised quite a large sum. But on at least one occasion, when all conventional methods failed, a rather novel scheme was adopted. In Townsville, about 1887, when the Reverend C.G. Barlow was incumbent of St. James', a lottery was held in aid of church funds, with prizes such as allotments of land and horses.<sup>529</sup>

Despite these efforts money was generally short in the parishes, and it was frequently the clergy who suffered. Stipends were often as low as £200 or £250, a miserable pittance in view of the staggering cost of living in the boom economy. As in southern Queensland the clergy had sometimes virtually to collect their own stipend,<sup>530</sup> and one clergyman became so desperate that he even threatened to sue the bishop for £443 arrears of salary.<sup>531</sup>

This financial instability in the parishes was one of the chief factors that made it difficult for Bishop Stanton to realise his goal of a large and efficient body of clergy. He did manage to build up his numbers from the original eight, and by the first synod in 1883 there were eleven clergy in the diocese besides the bishop, including five of those who had originally come out. There had also been some reinforcements from the south, as three newly ordained men had come up from Moore College after the formation of the new diocese.<sup>532</sup> Bishop Stanton on his trip to England in 1880, and Archdeacon Plume on his visit in 1884, both looked for candidates for the diocese, and within Stanton's episcopate seven men were ordained from St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, for work in North Queensland. But the combination of climate, unsettled economic and social conditions, and general hardships of colonial life, made it difficult to keep men, and the great curse of Stanton's episcopate was the constantly changing nature of the ministry, and the consequent instability of parish life. This was Stanton's greatest concern, and towards the end of this time in North Queensland the bishop wrote back to England:

This Diocese is a merely transit one – a gangway from England to the Southern Dioceses. Men do not stop here after two or three years. I cannot expect otherwise. This is tropical Queensland, and the drift of population is always southwards.... I always have gaps. No young Australians can be got, they 'love this present world' too much. Hence all my men must come from England. I will gladly take them, say , for two years and then pass them on to some Southern Bishop, according to a plan which I have made with the Bishops. I really cannot go on much longer at this disheartening work – trying to fill a sieve. <sup>533</sup>

Nevertheless there was a backbone of priests of extraordinarily fine calibre in the diocese. Three of Stanton's clergy later became bishops themselves – C.G. Barlow (Stanton's successor in North Queensland), Gilbert White (Carpentaria, and later Willochra), and E.A. Anderson (Riverina), - no mean record for so small a diocese. There were others no less valuable. Henry Plume, one of the early arrivals, remained for ten years of valuable service in Townsville, and became the first archdeacon of the diocese in 1883; his departure was "Universally regretted by the entire Diocese".<sup>534</sup> There was that colourful character, W.F. Tucker, a later Dean of Ballarat, who sprang into the limelight in the 'Russian scare' of 1885 by having himself appointed 'Hon Chaplain to the Bowen Defence Force', in which capacity he set about organising the defences of the little town.<sup>535</sup> But one of the noblest of them all was the fervent Albert Maclaren, who laboured at Mackay from his ordination in 1878 until 1883; he originated work among the kanakas, and later was to play a heroic part in the foundation of the New Guinea mission, which resulted in his untimely death. There were for the bishop consolations as well as disappointments among his clergy. Among the laity, too, the bishop had some great supporters, none of them more loyal than Stanton's close personal friend, the grazier Robert Christison.<sup>536</sup>

<sup>528</sup> Minutes of Committee, St. James' Church, 12 August 1879. The ladies raised £100.

<sup>529</sup> Northern Churchman, May 1921. Some years later, when he was Bishop of North Queensland, Barlow expressed regret at having used such methods of raising money. See Official Report of the Church Congress Held at Hobart, 1894, p. 195.

<sup>530</sup> E.g. Monthly Record, March 1885.

<sup>531</sup> Diocesan Diary, 15 February 1888.

<sup>532</sup> Loane, M.L., op.cit., pp. 40 and 180 ff.

<sup>533</sup> Mission Field, November 1890, p. 430. Cf. also his comments to Gilbert White, quoted in North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.7.

<sup>534</sup> Diocesan Diary, 23 January 1888. In a letter, Stanton to Preb. Tucker, 6 May 1880, S.P.G. "F" Mss., Letters from Australia, Vol. IV, Stanton describes Plume in these terms: "so prudent, so sound-headed and whole hearted, so capable of steering a course among the social & ecclesiastical reefs that are more numerous than the coral barriers along our coast".

<sup>535</sup> Monthly Record, November 1885.

<sup>536</sup> According to Bishop Gilbert White, Christison, the pastoralist of Lammermoor, had vowed that if he were blessed by God in his pioneer venture, he would give a tenth part back to the church. This vow he fulfilled. See White, G., Thirty Years in Tropical Australia, p. 221. Christison's warm admiration of the bishop was shown in the eulogy he delivered at a meeting in England in 1881 when he spoke in support of Stanton's appeal for funds. See Burnett, M.M., Christison of Lammermoor, p. 195 ff.



The acquisition of sites and the erection of churches attracted a major part of Bishop Stanton's attention from the first. Writing to his supporters in England in 1879 Stanton set out his policy:

Land is still exceedingly cheap, and should now be secured for future Church property before capitalists come to raise its price. Roman Catholics have been long and hard at work. They have bought land everywhere. Their chapels and schools are in every place. The Church of England is miserably behind; our church buildings are small and shabby; we own no land or property.....<sup>537</sup>

Stanton followed up his intentions vigorously. He instructed his clergy to buy allotments on the diggings before they rose in price, and his own diary records his constant watch for suitable sites for future buildings. A list at the back of the Diocesan Diary for 1884 gives details of land bought in 17 different towns, and of properties given to the diocese by the bishop himself in two other places. It would have been easy to sit back and wait for money to be available before obtaining land; but Stanton had too much sense of the needs of the future for that.<sup>538</sup>

Buildings followed more slowly, and had to depend on the gradual accumulation of funds within the districts, aided by grants from the S.P.G. or General Church Fund. In Stanton's episcopate most of the main centres were provided with churches and parsonages, though the sudden birth of new towns and demise of old ones made building particularly difficult. In view of the shortage of funds and the instability of population, no attempt was made to build permanent churches at this time, though some of the wooden buildings, notably the second one built at Charters Towers in 1884, were of considerable proportions.<sup>539</sup> In the early years, however, all sorts of temporary accommodation was employed for services. Court houses were commonly used; on the diggings services were sometimes held in the open air, or more commonly in the living room of a hotel; while in Cairns a bond store was used, until it became so full of goods that a church had to be erected.<sup>540</sup>

Stanton particularly concerned himself with the project of building a worthy cathedral in Townsville. Soon after he arrived he had the crude little church of St. James' improved, with a more spacious chancel and new interior fittings,<sup>541</sup> but it was still quite inadequate as a parish church, not to speak of a cathedral. In 1882 Townsville was already a flourishing town of more than six thousand people, and the bishop was deeply conscious of how unworthy St. James' was as the main church of such a community:

The little wooden Church on Melton Hill is one of the few surviving relics of rough, early times – its size too small for the crowded congregation, and its style too insignificant as the Church of a port which receives some thousands of immigrants yearly who would become sooner reconciled to their new country by the sight and service of a good Home-like Church.<sup>542</sup>

Like Bishop Webber in Brisbane, Stanton looked forward to a cathedral, not simply as a large central church, but as the heart of the diocese. It would be the centre of a group of church buildings – a bishop's residence, a small diocesan college, library and church offices. It would have residentiary canons who would not only supply the cathedral services, but lecture in the theological college, and throughout the diocese.<sup>543</sup> It was not as grandiose a scheme as Bishop Webber was to propose for Brisbane, but both ideas sprang from a common source, for there was current in England at the time a revival of cathedral life with the object of making the cathedrals centres of corporate diocesan life.<sup>544</sup>

Bishop Stanton was not to see the cathedral built during his episcopate, but he did set the scheme into operation so that it could be carried on by his successor. In 1884 synod approved the principle of a cathedral,<sup>545</sup> and the Sydney architect, Arthur Blacket, was engaged to draw designs. Blacket submitted plans for an imposing stone building, supposedly adapted to site and climate, but drought and economic difficulties caused postponement of the scheme. By 1887, however, Stanton was ready to proceed. He had himself collected £3,000 from nine subscribers, and at a special synod he had four canons

<sup>537</sup> Stanton, G.H. Letter to Contributors to the North Queensland Church Fund, 28 October 1879.

<sup>538</sup> Cf. Stanton to Preb. Tucker, 21 July 1882, S.P.G. "F" Mss., Letters from Australia, Vol. IV: "I am become an awful land-grabber! But some future Bishop will reap rich advantage, though I may not live to look upon it. The Church can afford to wait. Here is our advantage. I am working for half-a-century hence."

<sup>539</sup> Bishop Stanton tried to improve the standard of the churches by insisting on examining plans of the new churches. Speaking of the existing buildings he commented: "Churches out here are the ugliest erections you can conceive – something between a barn and a log-house." Mission Field, July 1880, p. 217.

<sup>540</sup> Diocesan Diary, 10 August 1883.

<sup>541</sup> Minutes of Committee, St. James' Church, 3 December 1879.

<sup>542</sup> Article by Bishop Stanton, in Sketches of Life and Work in North Queensland.

<sup>543</sup> This scheme was first outlined by the Rev. W.F. Tucker, Monthly Record, February 1884, and was taken up and expanded by the bishop. See Diocesan Diary, 10 May 1887.

<sup>544</sup> Cf. Benson, E.W., The Cathedral; Its Necessary Place in the Life and Work of the Church, p. 109, pp 138 ff. and passim.

<sup>545</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1884, p.8.

appointed (two nominated by the bishop, one each elected by the clergy and laity); and on the commemoration of Queen Victoria's Golden Jubilee, on 21 June 1887, the first sod of the cathedral was turned.<sup>546</sup> Progress was till far from smooth, however; funds remained a problem, and the building operations had to be delayed, and finally it became necessary to substitute brick for stone.<sup>547</sup> Nevertheless the first part of the cathedral was ready for consecration by Stanton's successor in 1892.

By this means the basic structure of the new diocese was built up. One other thing was necessary – the establishment of synodical government. Synods had become the normal method of church government in Australia by this time. When Stanton arrived, he had been advised both by Bishop Barker and Bishop Hale not to establish synodical government immediately, but to wait until some degree of experience and stability was achieved. This was sound advice; yet Stanton did not want to play the autocrat, so he founded a diocesan council to assist in the administration of the diocese, consisting of all the clergy and twice as many laymen. The council met monthly, so that in so extensive a diocese many of the members could only be represented by proxy.<sup>548</sup> Nevertheless, it was quite a happy expedient, as it allowed for a kind of constitutional government, freed from the formalities of a synod which could have proved cumbersome in a diocese in its formative stage. By 1883, however, Stanton felt that the time had come for a formal synod to be called. Yet Stanton never became entirely convinced as to the value of synods, and his doubts were revealed in a letter written at a later date from Newcastle:

I am bothered into sheer heresy about Synods and sceptically think that they are a clever device of the Evil one to keep good men from their Parishes, and to addle their brains against preparing sermons.<sup>549</sup>

This was perhaps one reason why, after the first two synods in North Queensland in 1883 and 1884, it was resolved to hold them only every alternate year, with a less formal conference in different parts of the diocese in the intervening years.

The first synod in 1883 adopted a constitution for the diocese. The fundamental provisions, binding the diocese to the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty Nine Articles, were almost identical with those in the Brisbane constitution.<sup>550</sup> It is interesting to note that there was still a financial voting qualification at church meetings: those who had reached the age of twenty-one, and who were pewholders or contributors of not less than one pound annually to church funds, were eligible to vote.<sup>551</sup> There was also a limitation on the bishop's right to veto resolutions of synod. A matter that had received the bishop's vote could be raised again at the next synod. If the matter were agreed to by two-thirds of each of the clerical and lay orders, and the bishop still dissented, it was to be referred to the provincial synod, when such should be formed, or in the meantime to the Primate together with one clerical and one lay member of the primatial see.<sup>552</sup> In effect, this limitation on the bishop's absolute veto was not very restrictive, yet it did express the principle that the bishop was not by himself the whole voice of the church.

The bishop and clergy enjoyed the biennial clerical conferences more than the formal meetings of synod. These conferences were held in different parts of the diocese in order to strengthen the sense of diocesan unity. At the first one at Charters Towers in 1885 clergy and laity seem to have been present, but in 1887 there appear to have been only clergy at the conference at Cooktown. The discussions in 1885 are interesting, because they reveal the way in which these English clergy were trying to grasp the need to adapt themselves to Australian conditions: indeed, there appears to have been more awareness of this need in the north than elsewhere in the colony. For example, among the matters considered was the desirability of earlier services than the torrid traditional hour of eleven; shorter sermons were discussed (and approved – particularly by the laymen); the adaptation of ecclesiastical architecture to local conditions was another topic; and the question of pew rents came under consideration. It is true that for the most part, the weight of opinion favoured the traditional methods rather than the suggested innovations. Yet the very fact that such things were seriously discussed so early in the life of the diocese suggests an awareness of the issues involved.<sup>553</sup> In fact the need for simplification of the services had already been recognised in the production in 1883 of a special Service Book for the bush, and a Diocesan Chant Book, by the Reverend Henry Plume.<sup>554</sup>

These diocesan developments began to be reflected during the eighties by a higher standard of church life at the parish level. In the main centres churches were usually full on Sundays, and a popular preacher like C.G. Barlow, first at Charters Towers and later at Townsville, drew overflowing congregations. In these centres the services themselves took on the

<sup>546</sup> Townsville Daily Bulletin, 3 March 1887 (Cutting preserved in Diocesan Diary), and Diocesan Diary, 21 June 1887.

<sup>547</sup> Minutes, N.Q. Synod, 1889: Report of Cathedral Building Committee.

<sup>548</sup> First Report of the General Church Fund 1879-81

<sup>549</sup> Stanton to Gilbert White, 20 May 1892, quoted in North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.7.

<sup>550</sup> See Appendix I.

<sup>551</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1883, p.14

<sup>552</sup> Ibid., p.13

<sup>553</sup> Minutes, N.Q. Diocesan Conference 1885.

<sup>554</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1883, p.6.

traditional dignity of the English church, in contrast to the rough-and-tumble affairs of the diggings. In Townsville, the monthly Communion of the seventies was replaced by a regular morning celebration every week.<sup>555</sup> Stability was not nearly so readily attainable in the outlying towns. The bishop could never be quite certain what was happening at the distant centres. On his visit to Cloncurry, for example, in 1887, he found the once-flourishing town almost deserted following a gold rush to Croydon.<sup>556</sup> So a clergyman was sent to Croydon,<sup>557</sup> yet three years later when Stanton visited Croydon, his diary noted: "Found Church abandoned. No interest; no lock on church door; general unconcern. Wesleyans strong."<sup>558</sup> It was to be some years yet before these conditions could be overcome.

The general tone of the diocese remained evangelical, yet at least so far as the clergy were concerned, it was by no means uniformly so. Each morning of the diocesan conference started with an early celebration of Holy Communion – a practice generally associated with the catholic revival – and from various parishes came complaints about the practices of their high church incumbents. At Mackay as early as 1879 Albert Maclaren defended the use of sacramental confession as provided in the Prayer Book.<sup>559</sup> Within a period of two years there were reports of party strife at Cooktown, Port Douglas and the Herbert River. Yet the incidents that provoked these storms were mostly very trivial; there was nothing like the ritual wars that were being waged in England at the same time, and they arose in part from an attitude of possessiveness that typified many of the laity in their relations with the clergy at this time. Some of them liked to think of the clergyman as a kind of servant, who ought to do their bidding; it was such an attitude that was reflected in the annoyance among the Charters Towers congregation in 1883 if their popular incumbent, C.G. Barlow, went away on a visit to preach elsewhere.<sup>560</sup>

In 1890 Stanton accepted election to the see of Newcastle. He believed that he had completed the pioneering task he had come to do, and he looked forward to the opportunity of the closer, more settled church life that would be found in the older-established diocese. At 55 years of age, he was passing the prime of life, and he was wise to accept a post that involved less active physical work and in which he could become something of an elder statesman among the Australian bishops.

Stanton's task in North Queensland had been similar to Tufnell's in Brisbane. If the two might be compared, it cannot be doubted that Stanton was the greater success. In some ways his task was harder, in some ways easier, than that of the Brisbane pioneer. It was easier in the sense that the pattern of diocesan development in Australia was now more settled: there was no doubt about the legal rights of a bishop and the role of synods; the approach to finance in missionary dioceses was clearly marked out; and the colony itself had grown into an ordered way of life, so that there were no longer the vexed questions of relations between church and state that had marked Tufnell's episcopate. Yet in other respects there were greater difficulties in North Queensland. The economy was so unstable, the population so fluctuating, the conventions of civilised life so overturned in the feverish search for wealth on the diggings, that one could never be sure from month to month what the future might hold. In the south there was a steady, reasonably sure, if unspectacular, development; in the north it was 'boom or bust'. Dependable laymen were even fewer than in the southern parts of the colony, and if anything, the comings and goings of many of the clergy were even more frequent.

In the face of this situation, Stanton and his band of pioneer clergy made a good start. In many respects the bishop combined the virtues of Tufnell and Hale, without at least some of their more noticeable defects. He had Tufnell's vision of what a diocese should be, but he had as well the powers of leadership and the understanding and sympathy of his laymen that enabled him to carry his plans through. He had the evangelical zeal and personal humility and self-sacrifice that characterised Hale; but he also had the drive, efficiency, and overall control that Hale had lacked. Indeed, it seemed when he left the diocese that an era of steady progress might be expected. A series of crises was to negate this hope: but a firm enough foundation had been laid for the church in the tropical diocese to rise up again after the disasters of the next twenty years had done their worst.

<sup>555</sup> Service Register, St. James' Townsville. In the seventies Holy Communion had been celebrated monthly, alternately in mornings and evenings.

<sup>556</sup> Diocesan Diary, October 1887.

<sup>557</sup> Ibid., August 1887

<sup>558</sup> Ibid., 10 July 1890

<sup>559</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 6 December 1879, Stanton's attitude to Maclaren well illustrates the bishop's spirit of broad-mindedness. "He has full liberty to exercise any little preferences, such as the eastward position & C. (Confession), for I shall never contract the wise liberty that the Church has given. I am giving him whatever 'backing up' he needs...." Mission Field, January 1880, p.5. It is interesting to note that Maclaren was later refused a license to officiate in the Diocese of Sydney – Queensland Guardian, 15 March 1883.

<sup>560</sup> Monthly Record, November 1883. The prevailing low-church attitude to the clergy is amusingly reflected in the hints in the official diocesan paper as to ways of discouraging the clergy. The hints reflect the puritanical, evangelical tone of the day: Among the hints given were: "hear him 'now and then'....do not find the text in your Bibles...never attend the prayer meeting...occasionally get up a little gaiety for the young folks. This will be very effectual about the communion season". - Monthly Record, January 1884.

**PART IV: THE CHURCH COMES OF AGE.**

## CHAPTER 9: STRENGTH THROUGH UNITY.

### i. William Thomas Thornhill Webber: Third Bishop of Brisbane

“A diocese which not the wildest optimist could designate a bed of roses”: so was the Diocese of Brisbane described by an ecclesiastical journal in 1885.<sup>561</sup> This was to put it mildly. The new bishop found on his arrival not only a state of virtual insolvency, but a great spiritual inadequacy as well. He could not abstain from commenting at a meeting soon after his arrival on the lack of pastoral work due to the shortage of clergy, the almost complete absence of the working classes from the churches, and a “fossil air” hanging over many of the parishes.<sup>562</sup>

In fact, in relation to the changes that had been transforming the English church in the nineteenth century, the church in Queensland was a quarter of a century behind the times. There was a reason for this. There had been no injection of leadership fresh from England since Bishop Tufnell had arrived in 1860. Hale had been in Australia since 1847; so had Benjamin Glennie. Other leading clergy in Brisbane like Jones, Sutton and Matthews had all come to Brisbane about 1860. Those new men who had come from England had lacked either the seniority or the ability to supply the leaven required for the Brisbane loaf. The result was that the diocese had remained a kind of ecclesiastical backwater. Perhaps the estrangement between two good and earnest men, Bishop Webber and Thomas Jones, (by this time, Archdeacon), may best be understood as the inevitable clash between the new dynamic approach from England and the old-fashioned church life of Brisbane.

Fortunately Webber knew what to expect before he came. When the Archbishop of Canterbury was asked to select a new bishop, he was given a full account of the dispirited state of the diocese, and was asked to choose the right man to face this situation. His choice was ideal. Webber was not the type of man ever likely to have been nominated to a bishopric in England, but he proved so suited to the needs of Brisbane at this time that his episcopate was to become a turning point not only for the Diocese of Brisbane, but for the church in the whole of Queensland; for Webber’s influence was eventually to extend far beyond his own diocese, especially because three of the priests whom he introduced into Queensland were later to become diocesan bishops within the province, and they carried the influence of Webber’s methods and outlook with them. These were Nathaniel Dawes, first Bishop of Rockhampton; Montagu Stone-Wigg, first Bishop of New Guinea; and George Frodsham, third Bishop of North Queensland. After Webber’s death, Frodsham described him as ‘the master whom I admired and loved’,<sup>563</sup> and it is clear that Webber’s influence went deep in the work of his subordinates. It is scarcely too much to say that his episcopate was the pivotal point of the history of the Anglican Church in Queensland.

It was not lightly that William Thomas Thornhill Webber accepted the Bishopric of Brisbane. Webber was a city man: he loved London, and all his roots were in London’s soil. For twenty years he had been vicar of the parish of St. John’s, Red Lion Square, which he had personally founded and built up to be one of the most vigorous parishes in the metropolis. He was contented there in the fine parish life that he had built up around him, and yet he was conscious that the time had come for his organising ability and experience to be employed in some wider sphere of service. In 1881 there had been some consideration given to appointing him Bishop of Barbados, but a combination of medical advice in the light of his rheumatic condition and Webber’s own doubt as to whether such a diocese would give the best outlet to his kind of ability restrained him from accepting. At that time he wrote to Randall Davidson<sup>564</sup> that his experience in pastoral work and parochial organisation would “apply more to a growing colony needing to be organized (e.g. Australia, Canada etc.)...”<sup>565</sup> Yet Webber had no desire to select his own work:

However one has no right, or, I hope, wish, to pick & choose one’s sphere. One’s clear duty is to go where one is sent subject only to the condition that there is sufficient work to be done & that there wd. be reasonable hope that the climate wd. not have the effect of rendering one incapable of doing the work.<sup>566</sup>

In the light of this background, it is not hard to see why Webber was a natural choice when the next Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. E.W. Benson, was charged with the selection of a bishop for a diocese with such peculiar difficulties as Brisbane then presented. Webber’s own opinion of his organising ability was confirmed by his fine record at Red Lion Square (a neighbouring parish, incidentally, to the one from which Bishop Stanton had gone to North Queensland). He had created a great parish from nothing, and though he had spent twenty years on the task, he was still in the prime of life, being not yet fifty years old. In a district that was not particularly wealthy he had raised just under £50,000 and built a fine church on which no debt remained. The way in which his five thousand parishioners flocked to church is shown by the fact

<sup>561</sup> Australian Churchman, 19 November 1885.

<sup>562</sup> Ibid., 30 April 1886.

<sup>563</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1904-5, p. 43

<sup>564</sup> At that time, chaplain to Dr. A.C. Tait, Archbishop of Canterbury, later himself Archbishop of Canterbury.

<sup>565</sup> Webber to Rev.R.T. Davidson, 2 January 1882 (dated in error 1881 in the MS), in Tait Papers, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>566</sup> Ibid.

that he had five services each Sunday morning – a most unusual thing for this period – as well as a great children’s service in the afternoon and an evening service. Morning and evening services were held every day of the week, and Webber with his three curates and ‘a number of Religious ladies’ were kept very busy with pastoral work.<sup>567</sup> He was not a great preacher, and the impediment in his speech that affected his pronunciation of ‘r’s’ was a disadvantage; yet his sermons were always sound and solid.

It was only after serious thought and prayer that Webber agreed to accept the offer of the see of Brisbane. Surviving letters among Archbishop Benson’s correspondence reveal Webber as a man who weighed all considerations before reaching a decision, but who, having made it, was inflexible in carrying it through. He consulted men like Sir Robert Herbert, the first premier of the colony, who could throw light on conditions there. He searched out all the available information about the state of the church and received from Bishop Hale’s brother-in-law among others, “a most depressing account of the state & possibilities of Brisbane as a sphere of Church work”<sup>568</sup> He weighed his decision particularly carefully because, like Bishop Stanton, he firmly believed that a colonial bishopric was a life’s work, and should hold out no hope of return to the home country. So it was with complete awareness of all that was involved that he finally accepted. “The truth is the diocese has never yet had a chance”, one of his contacts had told him.<sup>569</sup> He was determined to see that it had its chance.

Webber’s very appearance revealed something of those qualities of determination and stubbornness that were to characterise his Brisbane episcopate. He was a short, stocky man, with a bald dome-shaped head and bushy reddish beard that gave him a patriarchal air. His eyes had a firm, deliberate expression that could be steely to those of his subordinates who fell into disfavour, but which lit up gently for the children, whom he loved very dearly. He never married, but the Sunday school which he established at his own home at Bishopsbourne for the children of the surrounding district revealed the other side of a character that to some appeared harsh and forbidding.

It was particularly as a money-raiser that Webber had achieved fame, though this was not necessarily the part of his work that he enjoyed most. It was not really congenial to him, but he was an intensely practical man who had learned at Red Lion Square that a parish could not be built up without money, and who translated that lesson to his diocese when he became a bishop. Some of the stories told about his methods of money-raising are undoubtedly apocryphal: but they do at least show the legend that had grown up about his success in the art.<sup>570</sup> The fact was that money-raising was not for Webber, as it had been for Hale, an unpleasant task conflicting with and hindering his spiritual work. He had a sacramental approach to life which saw the spiritual as being expressed through the material. He grasped the fact that if the Kingdom of God were to be built up in Queensland it must have the external means of accomplishment: a strong church administration, adequate finance, sufficient clergy, and worthy church buildings. These were all necessary preliminaries to and parts of the work of building up the Kingdom of God. And though he would prefer to be involved in more directly spiritual and pastoral work, he saw his task as being so to put the machinery of the church in order that its spiritual work could be effectively accomplished. The unfortunate thing was that throughout his career Webber was in positions where he was compelled to devote attention to finance and organisation, and as a result he found it increasingly hard to concentrate on other matters.<sup>571</sup>

Webber was such a good organiser that the observer might be tempted to judge superficially that he believed sound organisation alone could solve all the church’s problems. This was not in fact so. Underlying all that he did there was in Bishop Webber not a confidence in himself alone, but a deep, yet simple, faith in the power of God as the source of all his strength. His was not the sort of faith that concerned itself with details. He was not the kind of man to suffer intellectual doubts, nor to be concerned with fine points of doctrinal expression: but he had a genuine trust in God, and a living faith in the Catholic Church as the instrument of God and in the Church of England as a vital part of that Catholic Church. It was this faith that underlay his call to synod in the midst of the setbacks and troubles of the mid-nineties:

<sup>567</sup> Brisbane Courier, 19 March 1885. These were religious sisters, but the terms “sister” or “nun” were still suspect in the Church of England.

<sup>568</sup> Webber to Archbishop Benson, 13 February 1885, Benson Papers, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>569</sup> Quoted in Webber to Abp. Benson, 13 February 1885, ibid.

<sup>570</sup> e.g. Page, N.B., The Church and Parish of St. John the Evangelist, Red Lion Square, Holborn, quotes a letter that Webber was alleged to have written to the old colonels taking the waters at Bath: “Dear Sir, if God has granted you a cure you could not show your gratitude better than helping me in my work, and if by chance the cure has been withheld, no doubt you will remember me in your will”. More genuine is the fact that his reputation led the Times of London humorously to warn all those who had money to be out of town when he visited London on one of his money-raising trips from Brisbane.

<sup>571</sup> Bishop H.H. Montgomery wrote to Archbishop Randall Davidson after Webber’s death that “Clergy going to him on spiritual questions felt that he was bored. I don’t think he ever took a quiet day – I don’t think he could have.” Memo dated 6 February 1904, Davidson Papers, Archiepiscopal Correspondence Lambeth Palace.

If we have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, with its expansive power and latent force of growth which can disturb the massive stone; if we have faith in our Church's mission, and our own, above all, in the hidden might of Him who is the real worker – for the work is His and not ours – if we can in that faith so exercise self-control, so discipline and subordinate our individualism as to bring about that loyalty, that unity of action, which is of the essence of force and of movement, and the condition – as He has taught us – of the exercise of His power, then we have with us the secret of irresistible advance, and of a progress which cannot be stayed. In a strength which is made perfect in weakness, we may face our stupendous tasks with faith's imperturbable determination:-

'Who art thou, O great mountain? Before Zerubbabel thou shalt become a plain'.<sup>572</sup>

He was the Zerubbabel whose vocation it was to level the mountainous difficulties that hindered the work of the church in Brisbane, and it was this faith in his vocation in God's service that was the key to Webber's work. It proved the basis for his stubbornness, his willingness to risk unpopularity, and his readiness to give his life whole-heartedly to the task in hand. It was this faith that led him at the beginning to give up his comfortable parish for the hardships of a run-down colonial bishopric,<sup>573</sup> and it was the same faith that led him at the end in his mortal illness to make the weary journey back from England to Brisbane, so that his last ounce of energy might be spent in completing his task so far as possible.

Webber's great attribute was that he had the vision to see things whole, and with that vision, powers of determination and leadership to translate it into reality. He saw that no patchwork reconstruction of the diocese could suffice: a new sense of unity was needed in place of the congregationalism that had come to mark the life of the church, and he saw that this unity could only be achieved through a radically new approach to the administration of the diocese. His very first synod address, just after his arrival, gave a hint of his outlook:

The needs of our day will not be met merely by a re-production of the past. We must draw from the Church's treasury things new as well as old.<sup>574</sup>

Here was where Webber succeeded in doing what his predecessors had failed to do. Tufnell had had a vision, but lacked the powers of leadership to carry it through against the inertia and opposition of influential people who could not or did not understand. Hale, fine man though he was personally, had lacked the breadth of vision, and had tried to lead the diocese piece-meal. Webber knew what the church ought to be. To him, the church was God's visible instrument in the world, and the diocese was the basic unit of church life, and the bishop was its natural leader. And because he knew he had the ability to lead, he was impatient with men of lesser stature who either wilfully opposed his plans, or through incompetence or slowness could not keep pace with him. So he quarrelled bitterly with Thomas Jones, whom he had made an archdeacon; some others of his clergy, once they earned his displeasure had a trying time; and of the diocesan registrar, A. Alexer Orme, there is a revealing note in some private comments left by Archdeacon A.E. David: "his spirit has been quite broken by the late Bp. And he has been accustomed to be told to do everything."<sup>575</sup> Yet among his more able subordinates he inspired real affection, and one of his clergy later remarked that "if you were not afraid of him, his manner was that of a tender father and wise counsellor".<sup>576</sup>

Men did not always find Bishop Webber easy to work with, nor easy to agree with, yet they respected his vision, his energy, his determination, and above all his willingness to spend and be spent in fulfilling what he conceived to be his mission. Towards the end of his episcopate there were strong criticisms of his plans and activities, particularly in relation to his obsession of building a magnificent cathedral; yet even amidst these criticisms it is striking how often it was said of Webber that his work would not be truly appreciated for years to come. It was true. At the time many of his policies seemed grandiloquent, and his methods autocratic: but from the perspective of half a century later it is clear that William Thomas Thornhill Webber was, more than any other single man, the architect of the Anglican Church in Queensland in the twentieth century.

His object was clear in his own mind:

It would certainly be a cause of much thankfulness to me if during my tenure of this responsible post, the diocese could have been so brought into working order, that when the pastoral staff of the diocese passed into younger and abler hands such successor might find something like proper organization which is a necessary condition of effective work.<sup>577</sup>

<sup>572</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1896: Bishop's address, p. 51.

<sup>573</sup> Cf. Webber's farewell sermon at Red Lion Square: "When I received the Archbishop's letter inviting me to seriously consider whether I would allow him to designate me as Bishop of that vast diocese, my first impulse was to ask to be excused, but the more earnestly I went over the matter the more I was led by concurrent circumstances to believe that I ought to go, and after all it is in the concurrence of circumstances that we may not infrequently trace the will of God..." Australian Churchman, 8 October 1885.

<sup>574</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1885, Bishop's address.

<sup>575</sup> David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS)

<sup>576</sup> Tomlin, J.W.S., in article in Church Chronicle, February 1955.

<sup>577</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, Bishop's address, p. 21

There was his aim: to provide the conditions in which his successors might be able to build up the spiritual life of the church unhindered. In fulfilling this aim, Webber left no part of the life and organisation of the church in his diocese untouched by his administrative genius. In a later chapter we shall discuss new methods employed by the church in his generation to meet the changing conditions in society and thought of the day. In this chapter we shall go on to consider the reconstruction of diocesan machinery, which was the prerequisite of all other progress.

## ii. Unity in Diocesan Finance

On 16 November 1885 Dr. Webber landed in Brisbane, in company with Bishop Barry, the Primate.<sup>578</sup> He wasted no time coming to grips with the problems of the diocese. He already knew that in Bishop Hale's episcopate financial weakness had strangled the church's progress, and when he arrived the position was still grave: the debt on the General Church Fund was gradually increasing, and was prevented from growing at a more drastic rate only by deliberate self-imposed restrictions on the extension of the ministry of the church. Nor did the decision of the diocesan council to offer the new bishop an increased stipend - £1,250 instead of the old figure of £1,000 - help matters. To meet this increased expenditure, some church properties had been sold as a means of supplementing the see endowment capital by some £6,000 to a total of £15,716. Even so, the income from this fund was still £300 below the amount required to meet the bishop's stipend.<sup>579</sup>

Webber's initial actions only worsened the situation. He imported a considerable number of priests from England, who had to be equipped and transported, and this was costly. He also insisted on the addition of a new wing to Bishopsbourne, so that it might become a more adequate social centre for the diocese such as he conceived a bishop's palace ought to be, and this required additional expenditure. The prospect was not encouraging!

It was not long, however, before Webber settled down to the task of raising funds, and there was little question that he personally would direct operations, and if necessary collect money himself. It was not that he regarded this as the true function of a bishop: but he knew that until the diocese could be made financially stable no other progress could be made, and he knew from experience that he had real ability at money raising. One thing he insisted upon: money for spiritual work should always be raised by direct giving. The use of entertainments to raise money for the church was abhorrent to him, and even sales of work he viewed doubtfully. It was not that he disapproved of entertainment or commerce, but he believed that it was unworthy for money to be given to God's work by circuitous means. Even with his great ambition to see his beloved cathedral plan brought to fruition, he refused to deviate from the rule of direct giving only.<sup>580</sup>

Early in 1886 Webber began his career of fund-raising by launching the Bishop of Brisbane's Fund at a public meeting in Brisbane. Already the Webber techniques were apparent. For popular enthusiasm to be aroused, he saw that people must have a sense of new beginnings being made, so he gave a new name to what was essentially an old thing, because the new fund was virtually identical in purpose with Hale's General Church Fund. This was sound psychology, and he used this principle again and again: whenever one appeal lost its immediate attraction, he allowed it to be dropped, and launched a new one, so that church people were constantly enthused with a succession of new causes.

Then, too, Webber recognised the importance of a powerful initial impact: so he started his new fund - as he did on similar occasions later - with an impressive public meeting to which the governor and leading citizens were specially invited. The bishop, and other civic leaders, customarily started the appeal with their own generous donation so that an impressive beginning was ensured.<sup>581</sup> Again Webber was never apologetic in his approach: he did not plead for money, nor hesitatingly ask for small amounts, but put the challenge clearly, and made it clear that he expected a big response. In 1894, for example, he launched a Central Sustentation Fund with a goal of £50,000, to provide a central endowment to assist in paying the stipends of the clergy. It was an impossible target, especially in view of the recent financial collapse in the colony, and probably Webber never expected to reach it; but by lifting his goal high, he succeeded in collecting much more than his apologetic predecessors had done.

Nevertheless even the energetic bishop found the inertia of Brisbane churchmen hard to break. One Brisbane newspaper found it interesting to speculate on the outcome of the battle:

There is grit in Bishop Webber. He will need it. He has discovered that there is both work and gold in Queensland. But the owners of the gold are not usually workers in the Church. There is grip in rich men. What they gain they hold tightly... He has been out 'prospecting'....His new chum ardour was a little chilled. The 'prominent laymen' at Toowoomba 'expressed doubts' as to the success of the bishop's proposal for establishing a go-ahead fund...Will Dr.

<sup>578</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 November 1885.

<sup>579</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1885, Diocesan Council Report, p.ii.

<sup>580</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1898.

<sup>581</sup> Brisbane Courier, 13 April 1886.



Webber's grit be able to relax the rich men's grip? If his grit and their gold could get mixed a little they would form a serviceable amalgam for Church purposes.<sup>582</sup>

It must be admitted that the bishop did not find it easy to break the rich men's grip. It was with some disappointment that he reported to synod in 1887 that the diocesan subscription list, the biggest for some time, still included only 101 names out of 92,000 churchmen in the diocese.<sup>583</sup> Yet even so, Webber found cause for some satisfaction, because there was an increase of 60% to diocesan contributions, apart from the additional £4,000 being paid by the laity towards the stipends of the eighteen additional clergy whom he had already introduced into the diocese.

Coming as he did from England with its rich church endowments, Bishop Webber, like Bishop Tufnell before him, was inclined to place his confidence in the policy of building up large central endowments, the income from which would supply a goodly proportion of current expenditure. So he determined to build up three capital funds – a Mission Chaplains' Fund to support itinerant clergy in the scattered country districts; a Central Sustentation Fund to supplement the stipends provided by the parishes; and a bigger See Endowment Fund to stabilise the bishop's own income. Besides this, he wanted a large sum for the endowment of the new diocese which he wished to form in the northern parts of the existing diocese.

It was clear to Webber that in view of the lack of training of people in Queensland to give generously to the church, the only way to build up such funds was by canvassing in England. He used the Lambeth Conference of 1888 as a convenient opportunity to make his first trip to collect funds and recruit additional clergy, but after that he made regular visits to England for the same purpose. The great depression of the early nineties, followed by the Brisbane flood of 1893, made his second trip even more urgent, as it resulted in a real financial crisis for the church, which up to that time had been gradually attaining to solvency under Webber's sound administration.

These English trips were no holiday jaunts for Webber. On the first visit in 1887-8 he preached in 45 churches, secured 16 clergy and collected £9,000 or more, mainly towards the Mission Chaplains' Fund and the Rockhampton endowment fund, and some also towards his favourite project of a new cathedral.<sup>584</sup> Five times in his episcopate he made such visits to England, and spent long periods away from the diocese in consequence. On his visit in 1893-4 he preached in no fewer than 110 churches and collected £7,000.<sup>585</sup> It was nothing like the total of £55,000 that was ostensibly his aim, but now and throughout the rest of the decade, money was increasingly difficult to obtain in England. This was not surprising, because England like Australia, was hit by the depression, and in particular the owners of Australian properties, whom Webber specially made his target, were suffering from the slump in Australia. Besides this, there was now a constant procession of colonial bishops to England on the same mission as the Bishop of Brisbane, and increasing competition made successful hunting more difficult. Moreover, Webber's old friends and supporters were gradually dying off, and new contacts were not easy to make.

There was a basic question, however, asked both in England and Australia towards the end of Bishop Webber's episcopate, with regard to his policy of seeking money in England, especially for his cathedral project: was it proper to seek English money for the church in what was an increasingly prosperous Australian colony? Webber found this question being raised in England,<sup>586</sup> and at home the Courier openly criticised the bishop for a policy which it claimed would create an unfavourable impression in the home country. On two grounds Webber and his supporters defended the policy. One was that the large number of immigrants being received from England gave England a special responsibility for the spiritual provision of the colony. The other was that much of the profit of Queensland's pastoral estates and industry went to England and those who derived their wealth from Australia were bound to put part of it back into spiritual work there.<sup>587</sup> Webber did not convince all his critics: but it is certain that it was only his policy of going to England and campaigning there with boundless energy that enabled the Diocese of Brisbane to be put on its feet financially. He must have collected a sum not far short of £30,000 on his five trips. Indeed, it was the exhaustion brought on by his last campaign that ultimately led to his death.

Webber was nevertheless realistic enough to perceive that it was only a matter of time before the English funds must run dry, and that the church in Queensland must aim to be entirely self-supporting. Indeed, the object of his English collections

<sup>582</sup> Brisbane Telegraph, quoted in Australian Churchman, 5 February 1886.

<sup>583</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p. 18. This number, of course, was only those who subscribed to the diocesan fund, and does not include subscribers to the funds of the various parishes.

<sup>584</sup> Ibid., 1889, bishop's address. See also St. John's Parish Chronicle, August 1888 and January 1889.

<sup>585</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1894-5, p. 20. See also Church Chronicle, January 1895; also a copy of a letter of Bishop Webber in the London Times setting out reasons for his appeal, Church Chronicle, February 1895.

<sup>586</sup> It is interesting that Bishop Barry, supporting Webber at a London meeting, justified his appeal on the ground that while it would be wrong for Sydney or Melbourne to make appeals in England, "missionary dioceses like that of Brisbane had a perfect right to do so with confidence". – Church Chronicle, October 1894.

<sup>587</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1902, quoted figures showing that £17,400,000 out of £18,800,000 interest on Queensland public loans in the past 17 years had gone to England.

was to cover extraordinary needs, so that in ordinary financial affairs the colonial church might learn to pay its own way. An important step, indicating a change of spirit within the diocese towards unity in place of the old parochialism, took place in Brisbane in 1887, when a meeting of representatives of the metropolitan parishes agreed, with one exception, to make a voluntary assessment from parochial funds to the diocese for the purpose of maintaining diocesan administration. Several parishes agreed to give 5% of their annual income, the others to give a fixed amount.<sup>588</sup>

This big step forward towards diocesan unity in finance indicated the effect that strong leadership emanating from the bishop was having on the atmosphere of the diocese. In synod shortly afterwards, the Treasurer, T.M.King, moved that all parishes should follow the example of a 5% voluntary assessment.<sup>589</sup> The principle was not formally established, however, until a special synod in 1897 made the assessment payable from parish to diocese the first charge on parochial resources.<sup>590</sup> For the bishop this was a great victory, because not only did it assure the diocese of a regular and stable income, but it asserted the principle, which he so firmly believed in, that the diocese and not the parish should be the basic unit of the church:

You have tried the congregational principle long enough, and it has failed, as it ever must, as being out of harmony with the organic constitution of the Church, whatever may be the case with other bodies differently constituted... It was essentially Congregationalism, or rather, at bottom, however unconsciously, a merely self-regarding individualism, that brought about the cutting away of the old foundations; and it is the same spirit which has so far hindered the placing Diocesan affairs on a sure foundation...So long as people talk Church principles and act Congregational principles, so long will the Church fare badly; for Congregationalism is essentially self-regarding, and individualist, where true Churchmanship is altruistic.<sup>591</sup>

No system of parochial assessment could be satisfactory, however, unless parish revenues were adequate, and the striking feature of the last fifteen years of the nineteenth century was the steady growth of parish income, despite the setbacks of depressions, unemployment and flood. Standards of giving were still by later standards very poor: but in comparison with an earlier period they showed great improvement. There were various reasons for this. It was gradually being realised by church people that there were no church endowments in Australia, and that the church did in fact depend on the support of its people, as its leaders had been vainly proclaiming for decades. It takes a long time to change traditions and ingrained habits in these matters, especially habits connected with religion, in which men are particularly conservative. There were other significant factors too – the leadership and financial teaching of Bishop Webber, the more adequate pastoral work being done now that there were more clergy, and the general sense of purpose that pervaded the church under the strong leadership of the bishop. Indeed a committee of synod in 1892 went so far as to recommend an envelope system for weekly freewill offerings, such as the Baptists used. For Anglicans this was a quite revolutionary suggestion, and although it was not widely employed for some time to come, it did imply the growth of a new conception of church finance.<sup>592</sup>

There was even some indication that the economic events of the nineties caused some changes of mind among church leaders about the reliability of the endowment system of finance. The first reaction to the depression of 1893 was to argue that if the church had been properly endowed, this depression would not have been so disastrous in its consequences for the diocese.<sup>593</sup> Some years later, however, the experience of the loss of income when the value of the See Endowment Fund collapsed in the financial crash, caused second thoughts. An editorial in the Church Chronicle commented:

It is certainly an open question whether the Church of England will not be driven more and more to abandon its method of accumulating endowments and to rely upon a percentage system over the whole income of the Diocese...It is true that the system, at first blush, when compared with that of endowment, seems wanting in security, but after the experience which this and other Australian Dioceses have passed through in respect of the investment of capital funds, it would seem to be the less precarious of the two.<sup>594</sup>

Whether doubts about endowments were justified may be argued: but the important fact is that there was a growing awareness of the need to increase the proportion of the church's income that derived from the regular giving of church people, and this marked a turning point on the road to self support of the church in Queensland.

It cannot be said that Bishop Webber achieved all his financial aims. Most of the endowment funds which he established fell short of their goal; the very payment of his own stipend was precarious during most of his episcopate owing to the financial crisis which particularly affected the See Endowment Fund; the amounts contributed to the church from within the

<sup>588</sup> St.John's Parish Chronicle, June 1887.

<sup>589</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p.32

<sup>590</sup> Ibid., 1897 (Special Synod), p.24

<sup>591</sup> Ibid., p.25

<sup>592</sup> Ibid., 1892, Report of Committee on Systematic Almsgiving.

<sup>593</sup> E.g. Editorial Church Chronicle, January 1894.

<sup>594</sup> December 1897.

colony still fell below his anticipations. Yet Webber's achievement was remarkable. The immediate impact which he made is shown by the figures of annual income to diocesan (not parochial) funds in the years before the depression struck:<sup>595</sup>

1885-6	£2,240
1886-7	£2,838
1887-8	£3,125
1888-9	£1,792
1889-90	£13,373
1890-1	£12,103
1891-2	£10,839

The sudden leap in income once Webber started collecting money in earnest is striking. It has been estimated that in the eighteen years of his episcopate he added to the capital funds alone of the diocese about £57,000.<sup>596</sup> All of the basic funds of the diocese were established. It was hard and tiresome work to achieve this: but in doing it Bishop Webber ensured that none of his successors would need to repeat the task.

### iii. A United and Vigorous Clergy

If Bishop Webber's financial achievement stands out so clearly in the history of his episcopate, it is partly because it is the aspect of his work which can most readily be illuminated statistically. Amid all his financial achievement, however, the bishop never lost sight of the fact that finance was simply the groundwork for the provision of the human agents through whom the church's real work could be accomplished; and perhaps greater than his monetary success was the radical transformation effected in the life of the diocese by the building up of a numerous and remarkably capable body of clergy.

There can be no doubt that up to this time the clergy had been not only numerically inadequate for a diocese of the size and population of Brisbane, but with some notable exceptions, had been made up of men of the second rank. Many of those brought from England had proved ineffectual in Australian conditions; the men imported from southern dioceses, often trained at Moore College, had shown considerable zeal but were intellectually inferior to the English clergy; while the men ordained within the diocese had lacked the opportunity either of sound academic or pastoral training. On his arrival Bishop Webber found only 34 clergymen in his diocese, and the number of resignations proffered to him on his arrival made him wonder whether any were going to remain.<sup>597</sup>

Webber was deeply conscious of the need to provide proper facilities for local candidates to be trained for holy orders, and his concern to found a theological college in Brisbane and to foster vocations to the sacred ministry will be considered in a later chapter.<sup>598</sup> For the beginning, however, he believed that England must remain the primary source of recruitment for the clergy, and he set about the task with his customary thoroughness and vigour. It was not long after his own arrival in Queensland than new clergy began to follow, as a result of contacts which he had made before he left England.

Bishop Webber was a keen supporter, if not the originator, of the "five year plan", by which young English clergy contracted to go to a colonial diocese for a definite term of five years. The plan had real advantages. There were many of the younger English clergy, who, while not desiring to pull up their roots entirely and spend the rest of their lives in the untried conditions of the colonies, were prepared to do so for a limited period. These included some of the more able young priests, men who might expect eventual high preferment if they stayed in England. Webber's plan was that after ordination in England such young men should serve an English curacy for two years, and then offer themselves for colonial service for five years. Normally they would still be single, a condition which Webber regarded as very desirable for priests in the Australian outback, yet it did not involve a compulsory permanent celibacy, which was contrary to the usual Anglican tradition. A great advantage of the scheme was that it would permit a continuous infusion into the colonial diocese of new blood and ideas fresh from England, which would be a constantly invigorating factor in the life of the colonial church.

On his visits to England the bishop urged his plan indefatigably. The co-operation of the English bishops was essential, because an important part of the scheme was that men who went to the colonies should be accorded seniority on their return to England, equivalent to those who had remained at home for the same period. Webber wanted to go even further: at the Anglican Missionary Conference in 1894 he read a paper in which he urged the formation of a specific "Foreign

<sup>595</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892

<sup>596</sup> Estimated by Archdeacon A.E. David, ibid., 1904, p.43

<sup>597</sup> Australian Churchman, 5 February 1886.

<sup>598</sup> See below, Chap. 12, (i).

Service Order”, of young clergy who would offer their names as being willing to go wherever needed in the colonies for the five year period.<sup>599</sup>

Behind this five year plan there was not only the desire to get more men, but to create an arrangement whereby the very cream of the younger clergy of England would be encouraged to serve in the colonies. For many years there had been a prevailing attitude in England that men “ordained for the colonies” were in some way inferior.<sup>600</sup> With this attitude Bishop Webber was not content. He was determined that the best men were needed for the harder conditions overseas, and they should be helped to come. This view, expressed in earlier years, it is true, by men like Bishop Hale, and now convincingly urged in high places in England by Dr. Webber and other colonial bishops, was clearly expressed by Webber’s coadjutor, Dr. Nathaniel Dawes:

No graver mistake can possibly be made than to look to the colonies as furnishing a convalescent home for the morally defective, or as affording favourable scope for retrieving an unsuccessful past. Moreover while individual character is subjected to greater strain and to more rigid and suspicious scrutiny, so also in the fierce glare of publicity, both in town and bush life, unreality, affectation, effeminacy, or laxity of conduct on the part of our clergy, are not the less but the more productive of scandal than in the crowded thoroughfares of old country life.<sup>601</sup>

Although Webber’s proposal for a Foreign Service Order in the home church did not formally take effect, the view which he had propounded so forcefully in the councils of the church in England was not without fruit. He was careful to stress the advantages of such a proposal to the English church itself, inasmuch as the young clergy would benefit from the experience of colonial work. The principle was given the benediction of the Lambeth Conference of 1897, and it is not without significance that three members of the committee which approved of the five year plan were Bishops Webber; Dawes and Stretch.<sup>602</sup> This semi-official acceptance of the scheme was the basis of the establishment of bush brotherhoods in subsequent years, and it is not coincidental that the first Australian bush brotherhood was founded in this very year, 1897.

It still remained to ensure that the best possible men were introduced under the five year system. One of Webber’s greatest attributes was his ability to judge character; and as he made himself personally responsible, on his visits to England, for selecting the men who came to his diocese, the result was very beneficial. When he saw a man whom he thought suited to the diocese, he put to proposition directly to him.<sup>603</sup> To maintain the flow of clergy in between his visits to England, the bishop appointed two commissaries in England to represent him. What is specially significant is the men he chose – the Reverend H. Scott Holland and Canon A.J. Mason, two of the best known clergy in England, who would be most unlikely to choose mediocre men. It is significant, too, that both were quite definitely of the catholic school of thought. On his return from Brisbane the Reverend Bernard Wilson also became Webber’s commissary, and with his thorough knowledge of the needs of the diocese, became a close and valuable link between Bishop Webber and the home church.

The results of Webber’s determination to build up a first-rate body of clergy in the diocese were soon apparent. Eighteen months after his arrival in Queensland the number of clergy had risen by fifty percent from 34 to 51.<sup>604</sup> By 1889 there was a further rise to 61. This great increase in the clerical staff of the diocese within only four years transformed the whole outlook: large parishes previously worked single-handed received curates; new parishes were formed in the growing suburbs of Brisbane, and in country towns which were steadily developing; and the great spaces of the far west were for the first time receiving systematic (though still inadequate) attention.

It is true that from 1890 there was no marked increase in the number of clergy in the diocese. Indeed in 1900 there were only 58 clergy, and when St. Clair Donaldson came to succeed Webber the number was down to 55. It must be remembered, however, that by this time the new Diocese of Rockhampton had been formed out of the original Brisbane diocese, and the total number of clergy in the combined area was more than it had been a decade before. There were powerful factors at work to keep the number of clergy fairly static after 1890. By that time the end of the first five year period had been reached, and the flow of clergy returning to England balanced the steady influx of new men. Further, there

<sup>599</sup> Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion, 1894, p.266

<sup>600</sup> The attitude towards colonially ordained clergymen was even worse, e.g. the Colonial Clergy Act of 1874 had imposed disabilities on clergymen ordained in the colonies, who wished to exercise their ministry in England. Cf. Clark, H.L., Constitutional Church Government, p. 72.

<sup>601</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1891.

<sup>602</sup> Davidson, R.T., The six Lambeth Conferences, p. 208. At this time Dawes was Bishop of Rockhampton and Stretch Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane.

<sup>603</sup> E.g. the Reverend B.P. Walker recalls meeting Bishop Webber after a confirmation in an English parish where he was serving as a curate. After talking to him for some time the bishop asked directly: “Why don’t you consider coming out to Brisbane?” He came – and stayed.

<sup>604</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p.5.

were already signs of a drying up of the English reservoir.<sup>605</sup> The number of ordinands in England was diminishing, and the continued expansion of the colonial churches meant that more and more overseas bishops were now making what Archdeacon David termed “annual or biennial predatory expeditions into English Dioceses” to recruit men.<sup>606</sup> At the same time, Bishop Webber’s personal contacts diminished as the years passed, and in particular he was out of touch with the younger English clergy. Besides all this there is evidence of doubts among English priests as to the reliability of the promises made about stipends in Australian dioceses. Rumours had spread in England – and they were not always without foundation – of stipends being in arrears, and this naturally created doubts about coming to Australia. In 1892 Bernard Wilson reported from England an “utter lack of confidence in the Australian Church” in this regard.<sup>607</sup> It was partly to overcome these misgivings that Webber tried to have the principle accepted that stipends be paid through the central diocesan office.

These difficulties in no sense detracted from Bishop Webber’s achievement with regard to his clergy. It was not only that numbers were for the first time relatively adequate. The quality of his clergy was also at a remarkably high level: indeed, it is doubtful if any other colonial diocese had a better team of clergy at this period, and it may be doubted whether it has been excelled in Brisbane since. Some indication of the calibre of Webber’s men is indicated by the fact that six of them became bishops – Nathaniel Dawes, Montagu Stone-Wigg, G.H. Frodsham, R.A.H. Hay, Henry Newton and H.H. Dixon.<sup>608</sup> To these might be added J.F. Stretch, whom Webber imported from Ballarat to become his coadjutor bishop in 1895, and who later became Bishop of Newcastle. Between them, these “Webber men” were to play a considerable part in the growth of the Church of England in Australia.

Apart from those who were later elevated to the episcopate there were others of outstanding ability who in various ways made no lesser contribution. Mention has already been made of the Reverend Bernard Wilson. Although he worked in the diocese only five years, returning to England at the end of 1890, Wilson made an impact on the church in Queensland out of all proportion to his short ministry in the colony. Not only as examining chaplain did he lay foundations for what could later develop into thorough theological training of the clergy, but as Vicar of St. John’s he transformed the mother parish into a real diocesan centre as the pro-cathedral, and prepared the way for its further transformation, so dear to Bishop Webber’s heart, into a genuine cathedral. It was he who established the St. John’s Parish Chronicle, which, while not the first parish paper in the diocese, was the one which by its broad diocesan outlook was able to be painlessly changed into a diocesan paper. As the Church Chronicle it first appeared at the beginning of 1891, just after Wilson had returned to England. Just as valuable as his work within the diocese were his continuing labours after his return to England.<sup>609</sup> It was he who sent out some of the most able of clergy like R.A.H. Hay and J.W.S. Tomlin;<sup>610</sup> it was he who negotiated, in co-operation with his successor at St. John’s, Montagu Stone-Wigg, for the beginning of a sisterhood and a branch of the Church Army. The results of these efforts will be considered more fully in a later section.<sup>611</sup> So highly, indeed, was Wilson esteemed that he was offered the bishopric on Webber’s death in 1903, and it was only on the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury that he declined.<sup>612</sup>

Quite different in abilities and temperament was A.R. Rivers, who came to the diocese in 1892. The bishop quickly recognised his energy and powers of organisation, and he was appointed an archdeacon in 1896, with a roving commission as canon missionary. Webber always pursued the policy – albeit sometimes an unpopular one – of making appointments with a view to ability, and not seniority.<sup>613</sup> Rivers was still a comparatively young man, and he served the diocese as archdeacon until his appointment in 1920 as Dean of Hobart. A man of artistic temperament,<sup>614</sup> Rivers had that restless,

<sup>605</sup> e.g. by 1896 the Bishop of London was complaining of an inadequate supply for his own diocese. Mentioned in Bishop Webber’s synod address, Brisbane Year Book, 1896.

<sup>606</sup> Ibid., 1902, p.32 David presided at this synod owing to the bishop’s absence.

<sup>607</sup> Quoted by Bishop Webber, ibid., 1892 p. 55.

<sup>608</sup> Dawes, Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1889-1892 and Bishop of Rockhampton, 1892-1908; Stone-Wigg, Bishop of New Guinea, 1898-1910; Frodsham, Bishop of North Queensland, 1902-1913; Hay, Bishop of Tasmania, 1919-1944; Newton, Bishop of Carpentaria, 1915-1922 and Bishop of New Guinea, 1922-1936; Dixon, Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane 1932-1961.

<sup>609</sup> Wilson became particularly famous as vicar of the greatest parish in England, Portsea, where he succeeded Cosmo Gordon Lang, later Archbishop of York and Canterbury, and had as his senior curate, and was succeeded by Cyril Garbett, later Archbishop of York. Garbett was strongly influenced by Wilson’s example. See Garbett, C.F. (Ed) The Work of a Great Parish, p. 41 ff. Also Smyth, C., Cyril Forster Garbett, p.72 ff.

<sup>610</sup> Cf. Church Chronicle, August 1898, for Hay’s appointment, and February 1955 for Tomlin’s recollections of his own selection by Wilson.

<sup>611</sup> See below, Chap 12.

<sup>612</sup> Minute Book: Various Committees (Church House): Minutes of special committee of the diocesan council to consider the election of a new bishop, 12 November 1903 and 15 December 1903. For further details, see below, Chap 11.

<sup>613</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1898, Bishop’s address, p.130.

<sup>614</sup> Rivers composed, among other things, a musical setting for the Eucharist, which was quite widely used.

energetic nature which often typifies such men, and which made him so suited to his itinerant work in the diocese, whether as organiser of the Church Society, head of the Gayndah brotherhood (the precursor of the later Bush Brotherhood), or as Archdeacon of Toowoomba. Sacrificial to the point of carelessness in the use of his own money, he was a first-rate organiser for diocesan funds; hampered in his own family relationships by a difficult and domineering mother, he was a faithful and loving friend and father to clergy, catechists and people under his care; tired and near-exhausted from constantly drawing upon physical and spiritual reserves, he always appeared to be ready to go the extra mile. He was well summed up by his fellow archdeacon who knew him so well, though he differed from him so much in temperament: "Both in regard to energy and ability I regard him as the ablest and best of the clergy".<sup>615</sup>

Among the many priests of great ability who came to the diocese in the Webber era, there is one who stands pre-eminent in his influence, devotedness and capabilities. From the time he came to Brisbane in 1891 the Reverend Arthur Evan David rapidly rose to become the key figure in the diocese next to the bishop himself. Never deliberately obtruding himself in the bishop's presence, yet always ready to step forward and take over the reins of administration during Webber's long absences in England, David was a loyal subordinate, who was in some respects greater than his leader. It was his efficient, unobtrusive ability that made it possible for Bishop Webber to concentrate on his own distinctive role. Though it did not always appear to the casual observer, David was a man of genuine humility, as revealed by his willing, though never obsequious, subordination to the leader whom he deeply respected, but with whom he not occasionally disagreed. He, too, might well have been the next Bishop of Brisbane: the clergy wanted him, but the wife whom he had married in 1900 was unpalatable to the laity, and this prevented his election.<sup>616</sup>

David came from an intelligent and cultured family, his brother being Sir Edgeworth David, the eminent scientist-explorer. He was himself a man of sharp intellect, and had been engaged in academic work in England as vice-principal of the Leeds Clergy School, and on his return to England from Brisbane he joined the staff of the Ely Theological College. Yet he was no abstract scholar: he was a practical and efficient administrator, and had the knack of immediately stepping into the bishop's shoes as soon as he departed on an overseas trip; he was a shrewd judge of men, as the pithy comments on the personnel of the diocese, which he left for Bishop Donaldson, illustrate; he had a humility that enabled him to be loyal to his superiors, yet a confidence that enabled him to exercise firm authority when it was his duty; he had a ready tact that helped smooth the troubled waters that sometimes eddied around the rock of Bishop Webber's stubbornness,<sup>617</sup> and a deep sympathy, that often lay dormant, but came to the surface whenever there was need; he had a keen understanding of the Australian temperament, and of the qualities needed in the Australian church. Above all, these qualities were directed and unified in a deep spiritual life based on regular prayer and real self-discipline that left its mark on the young men whom he trained for the ministry in the Brisbane Theological College. It was he who set the standard of theological training, built around an ordered devotional life that continued to be the tradition of the later St. Francis' College. Indeed, there was hardly an aspect of the life of the diocese that was not in some measure touched by David's personality. His own fear – an unjustified one – was that he had so become a jack of all trades that he was master of none.<sup>618</sup>

It was in 1891 that David came to the diocese to succeed Bernard Wilson as examining chaplain. His appointment in 1893 as a canon residentiary marked his first term of administering the diocese in the bishop's absence, which was to become almost second nature to him in the next ten years. At the end of the following year he became Archdeacon of Brisbane, and even after Stretch was appointed coadjutor bishop in 1895 it was still David who was Webber's administrative deputy, as Stretch had his headquarters at Roma and was out of touch with day-to-day diocesan affairs. The difficult and trying period of Bishop Webber's long final illness was handled by David with consummate tact and skill, and the deep silence that came over synod when he announced that he had sent his resignation to the bishop-elect, Dr. Donaldson, was expressive of the genuine regret felt at his departure. It was a hard decision for David, but a wise one, which he refused to retract, despite earnest requests from the clergy. He knew that his creative work had been done, and that his role had been so inextricably linked with that of Bishop Webber that it would be impossible for him to be anything but a hindrance to a new bishop with a fresh approach.<sup>619</sup> So a few days after Donaldson's arrival, David left, amid glowing tributes from all sides. He left everything at the fingertips of the new bishop: and the unselfishness of his departure was a fitting end to the unselfish role he had played under Webber. His great contribution had been that in so many ways he was the opposite of

<sup>615</sup> David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS)

<sup>616</sup> Brisbane Year Book, Special Synod, October 1903. Bishop Stone-Wigg was another of the nominees, together with Bishop A.V. Green, of Ballarat. Green was finally elected, but declined. There is, of course, no mention in the records of synod as to why David was not elected, but this story has been confirmed independently by several clergy who were in the diocese at the time. The matter was also alluded to in a letter, Rev. B.R. Wilson to Abp. R.T. Davidson, 29 July 1903, Davidson Papers, Archbishopial Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>617</sup> David once described himself as "a sort of oilcan for the late Bishop". Brisbane Courier, 20 December 1904.

<sup>618</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1905.

<sup>619</sup> A.E. David, to Abp R.T. Davidson, 1 November 1903 and 23 January 1904, Davidson Papers, Archbishopial Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

Webber: he had those very qualities which his bishop lacked, and the two were almost perfectly complementary. Without the archdeacon the bishop could not have achieved what he did.

We have given deliberate attention to the personalities of the men whom Webber introduced to the diocese. More will be heard of their work later. This was a creative period in the history of the church in Queensland. The environment was ripe for creativity in the church: but it was only the presence of men of initiative, who seized opportunities and applied their talents to them, that made the period from 1890 to 1920 so significant in the growth of the church. When we examine the new avenues of work that the church undertook at this time, we shall find that for the most part it was not Bishop Webber himself, but his subordinates, who developed new methods of work. Webber's own contribution was that he sensed the needs of the time, and made sure that he brought to Queensland the right men to meet these needs.

The bishop himself was the unifying force behind all these varying personalities. It not infrequently happens that a team of able individuals disintegrates because of the very force of their character. This was not so in Webber's diocese. Partly this was because they all had a real devotion to the common task; partly it was because they shared a common churchmanship that was strongly catholic without being in any sense extreme; but above all it was because they were united behind a strong and determined leader in their bishop. They did not always agree with him, but they respected him; he sometimes scolded them, but he had a deep regard for their ability and loyalty. He was speaking from his heart at the last synod at which he presided when he expressed his gratitude for

such a band of clergy as well might make their Bishop the envied of many another Diocesan – and not in Australia alone: for their moderation in matters of ritual: for the entire absence from our Diocese of what the poet has termed 'the falsehood of extremes': for their marked obedience to the apostolic injunction 'do nothing of party spirit': for their unsparring labours: for the spirit of loyalty to their Bishop: for the spirit of brotherhood among themselves.<sup>620</sup>

#### **iv. The Cathedral as the Symbol of Unity.**

The most tangible memorial to Bishop Webber in Brisbane is undoubtedly the cathedral church of St. John the Evangelist: for while the cathedral was not built until after his death, it was he who conceived it, and poured his whole being lovingly into its planning. It was only his determination in the face of strong opposition that translated what most people dismissed at first as an extravagant dream into a glorious reality by 1910. It was not just that Webber wanted a central church of architectural distinction. The cathedral project was dear to him because it symbolised his vision of a strong, united diocese – an expression in stone of the transformation he was seeking to bring over the diocese as a whole.

There was, it is true, a practical and urgent need to replace the old St. John's church. It had not been particularly well built in the first place, and the original structure had been twice added to since its consecration, first by the addition of two more bays on the nave, and again by the addition of a duplicate nave and chancel, which not only gave a 'queer lop-sided appearance' to the interior,<sup>621</sup> but also weakened its quality as the new section was built only of rubble and plaster.<sup>622</sup> Some two years before Webber arrived in Brisbane it was reported that the church was quickly falling into ruin, and that rain came in nearly all over the building.<sup>623</sup> Its seating capacity of five hundred was certainly sufficient for ordinary Sundays, but throughout the nineties people had to be turned away on the great festivals, and it was an impossible building for any large diocesan functions or ceremonies. The need to build a new enlarged St. John's could not be questioned.

It was, however, no ordinary large church that Bishop Webber had in mind, and the stunned reaction of synod when the bishop suggested that a sum of £100,000 might permit a beginning to his scheme can easily be imagined.<sup>624</sup> The lack of public enthusiasm for so obviously foolhardy a scheme was indicated by the fact that fewer than a hundred people bothered to come to the meeting held to launch it, despite the fact that the governor himself had consented to preside.<sup>625</sup> It was in fact a one-man project from the start. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury mildly rebuked Bishop Webber for considering such an ambitious plan at this stage of the life of the diocese.<sup>626</sup>

If the plan had not been so integral part of his programme for reconstruction of the diocese, Webber might well have given it up in despair. But even before he landed in Brisbane the idea was rooted in his mind,<sup>627</sup> and it was one of the first matters that he broached to synod within a few days of his arrival. It is significant that in all his early utterances on

<sup>620</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1901 Bishop's address, p. 49.

<sup>621</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1904.

<sup>622</sup> Ibid., November 1904.

<sup>623</sup> Queensland Guardian, 22 February 1883.

<sup>624</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1886, Bishop's address, p.23.

<sup>625</sup> Brisbane Courier, 13 April 1886.

<sup>626</sup> Archbishop E.W. Benson, to Webber, 1 May 1888, Benson Papers, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>627</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 November 1885.

the subject, it was linked with a call to unity in the diocese. Webber believed that the church must be one, and that the unity of the church must be visibly expressed. He regarded the bishop as being not simply an administrator or teacher, but as being the centre of unity of the church. The diocese, not the parish, was the basic unit of the church's life: and the bishop, by virtue of his episcopal office – not of his personality – was the one around whom diocesan unity was to be built up. The cathedral was the bishop's church, where his cathedra was placed, and just as the office of bishop must be strongly exercised, so must the cathedral church be a strong and visible centre of unity for the whole diocese. To Bishop Webber, unity was essential, both for theological and practical reasons; and the cathedral was to be the symbol, both theologically and practically, of the unity of the diocese. The whole diocese would be united in working to build it; the people of the diocese would gather in it for diocesan festivals and important services; and in return through its residentiary canons, the cathedral would serve the diocese and help to knit the parishes into a more visible unity.

There were other elements, too, in the bishop's determination to build a glorious cathedral. The sacramental teaching of the catholic revival had made its mark upon him, and he regarded it as vital that in an increasingly materialistic society there should be an outward and visible sign in the centre of the city pointing men to higher spiritual values:

This Cathedral is sorely needed as the quickening centre of church life and of evangelic, educational, and missionary work; while, with its upward spires, breaking the skyline of our temples of trade, it will lift up as a constant reminder, in the midst of our mercantile vocations, that 'a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth'.<sup>628</sup>

This was one reason that impelled him to shift the site of the building from that of the old St. John's in George Street to the elevated ground above Adelaide Street, where its towers, he believed, would more nearly dominate the city.<sup>629</sup> For the same reason the soaring grandeur of Gothic architecture represented Webber's ideal for such a building. At the same time, within the life of the diocese itself, the cathedral was to serve as a norm for standards of architecture and for beauty of worship, music and ceremonial.<sup>630</sup>

The bishop strove to put these ideals into effect by the provisions of the Cathedral Canon, passed by synod in 1892.<sup>631</sup> This canon provided that the bishop himself was to be dean of the cathedral, so that there might be no risk of an independent dean whose policies might clash with those of the bishop, as had happened in some cathedrals elsewhere.<sup>632</sup> Provision was made for four residentiary canons, who would be paid from the cathedral endowments, and would fulfil a specialist function in the diocese: one would be the sub-dean, one the principal of the theological college, and the other two probably canons missionary (including, perhaps, a coadjutor bishop). There might be up to six honorary canons, who would receive no stipend, but might occasionally preach and assist in the greater chapter.<sup>633</sup> Lay canons were also provided for.<sup>634</sup> The legal establishment of the cathedral was completed by the passing of an act of parliament in 1895 which incorporated the lesser chapter as a body capable of holding property.<sup>635</sup>

Such was the theory: but all this would mean nothing unless the bishop could get the cathedral built. Actually Webber did not expect to see the building complete in his lifetime, and he declared at the outset that it took at least three episcopates to build a cathedral; so he contented himself with trying to have the first portion constructed. In the early years of his episcopate little progress was made. It is true that the diocesan council agreed to instruct the eminent English architect, John L. Pearson, to draw up plans,<sup>636</sup> and a building fund was set in motion as a memorial to Queen Victoria's golden jubilee in 1887.<sup>637</sup> Other pressing matters, however, took the chief attention of bishop and diocese. What funds were available were required to bring out clergy and build churches, endowment was required for the proposed Diocese of Rockhampton, and the drought, depression and flood of the early nineties diverted attention from the cathedral. Nevertheless, the bishop never allowed the hope to fade, and the fact that he pressed ahead with the Cathedral Canon in 1892, at a time when the cathedral scheme seemed quite dead, shows that it was never far from his mind.

<sup>628</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1901: Webber's address at the laying of the foundation stone of the cathedral.

<sup>629</sup> Brisbane Courier, 25 August 1899.

<sup>630</sup> Church Chronicle, August 1898, in a special supplement details the various reasons put forward for the necessity of a cathedral.

<sup>631</sup> It should be noted that the word "canon" has two meanings. In one usage it is the enactment of an ecclesiastical synod; it is also the title of a member of the chapter of a cathedral, being used sometimes of lay members as well as clergy.

<sup>632</sup> Webber had already prepared the way for this measure by appointing himself Honorary Rector of St. John's parish in 1886, with a vicar to have actual charge of the parish. Cf. Australian Churchman, 5 February 1886.

<sup>633</sup> It was appropriate that the veteran, Benjamin Glennie, who had resigned his archdeaconry on Webber's arrival, had already been appointed to be the first honorary canon in 1886.

<sup>634</sup> For full provisions of the Cathedral Canon, see Church Chronicle, June 1892; and for Dr. Webber's defence of its provisions, ibid., July 1892.

<sup>635</sup> Brisbane Special Synod Proceedings, October 1895.

<sup>636</sup> Ibid., 1886 p.23.

<sup>637</sup> St. John's Parish Chronicle, June 1887.



The choice of Pearson as the architect was fortunate. He had designed Truro Cathedral, and Webber had come to know him, as he had designed his own church at Red Lion Square. He was the greatest ecclesiastical architect of the day, and his Gothic style had strength and simplicity that was reminiscent of the thirteenth century, yet had a character of its own.<sup>638</sup> Brisbane cathedral was to be one of his last great achievements, as he was already an old man, and died in 1897 before the foundation stone was even laid. It was perhaps his conception of his task as a church architect that gave him his greatness: the question, he declared, that ought to be asked of a church was not, 'Is this admirable – is it beautiful?', but 'Does it send you on your knees?'<sup>639</sup> It has been universally agreed that of the cathedral in Brisbane that question could be answered with an unhesitating affirmative.

As with all his financial schemes, Webber was a consistent opportunist in raising funds for his cathedral. His overall plan was always present in the back of his mind, but from time to time he directed public attention to whichever of his funds seemed most likely to receive support. In the case of the cathedral, he used a series of important royal occasions as opportunities to forward his plans. As we have seen, it was the golden jubilee of Queen Victoria that provided the initial impetus. The diamond jubilee, ten years later, proved another opportunity, especially as it became obvious that the Anglican Church had no suitable building for great public services to celebrate the occasion.<sup>640</sup> The death of the Queen early in 1901 enabled Webber to use the occasion to invite contributions to the cathedral as a memorial to the Queen, a procedure that aroused criticism from various quarters on sectarian grounds.<sup>641</sup> Bishop Webber was not to be deterred, however, and he cemented the royal connection by inviting the Duke of York (later King George V) to lay the foundation stone of the cathedral during his visit to Queensland later in the year.

Even with the use of these opportunities, progress was slow. From 1897 the cathedral project assumed first place in the bishop's attention, but by 1898, after years of sporadic appeals, only £6,000 out of the £33,000 required for the initial section was in hand.<sup>642</sup> The bishop did not now rest. By the synod of 1899 he reported good progress and issued a rousing challenge for support. Money continued to come in, especially from overseas, but what really brought fulfilment into sight was the sale of the old St. John's property, including the new Church Institute building, and the purchase in its stead of the property between Adelaide and Ann Streets that had formerly belonged to Dr. Hobbs, and included the original Government House of Queensland.<sup>643</sup> Whether the change in site from the central position in the heart of the business section of the city was ultimately advantageous may well be disputed: but there can be no question that it was the augmentation of the building fund by this means that enabled the project to go ahead. So single-minded was the bishop now about the scheme that he made a rushed trip to England in 1900 simply to discuss modifications in the plans with the architect. Another longer visit the following year to augment the funds was to be his last.<sup>644</sup>

At Webber's death more than £30,000 was in hand for the cathedral. Unfortunately the estimated price of the first section had increased, first to £37,000 and then to £43,000<sup>645</sup>. Yet the project was so firmly established that it was only a matter of time for its fulfilment. A visitor to Bishop Webber just a few days before his death recalls the aged and exhausted figure sitting in his chair surrounded by the plans of his beloved cathedral.<sup>646</sup> It was a pathetic scene, but it was in character: for the cathedral was the lifelong symbol of all Webber's hopes and plans for his diocese. It was fitting that when the first part of the building was completed, the mortal remains of William Thomas Thornhill Webber were solemnly re-interred beneath the high altar.<sup>647</sup>

<sup>638</sup> Clarke, B.F.L., Church Builders of the Nineteenth Century, p. 196ff.

<sup>639</sup> Quoted in Benson, A.C. The Life of Edward White Benson, Vol. I, p. 453

<sup>640</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1897. Bishop Webber was in England at this time, and reports circulating in England about the lack of such a worthy building in Brisbane stirred him up to collect several thousand pounds before he came home. Cf. Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1897, Bishop's address.

<sup>641</sup> The Brisbane Courier, and Methodist Leader, for example, both voiced such criticisms.

<sup>642</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1898.

<sup>643</sup> The St. John's property, which was now sold to the government for £33,000, had originally been a free grant from the government. The Church Institute building (later to become C.I.B. Headquarters) was added for an extra £3,000. The new property cost only £18,892. Out of this profit a temporary church, St. Luke's Charlotte St., had to be built for the St. John's congregation, and new diocesan offices had to be erected. There was a considerable amount left, however, to augment the cathedral building fund. Cf. Brisbane Year Book, 1901, p. 107, also Brisbane Courier, 24 and 25 August, 1899.

<sup>644</sup> An interesting detail is that Webber wanted the building to run parallel to Adelaide St., and not at right angles to it, as the architect finally aligned it. Cf. Brisbane Courier, 26 January 1900.

<sup>645</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1902, p. 34

<sup>646</sup> The visitor was the Rev. (later Bishop) H.H. Dixon. Information given in a personal interview.

<sup>647</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1910.

### v. Unity in Administration.

When Bishop Webber came to Brisbane centralised administration was, as we have seen, at a low ebb, and a spirit of parochialism prevailed in the diocese. It was certain with a bishop of Webber's theology, ability and temperament this situation would not long continue. His analysis of the state of the diocese ten years after he assumed office reveals his understanding of what the diocese needed:

What is it that we chiefly lack? In one word, moral purpose and all that it involves. We lack clear aims and well considered determination. We lack church statesmanship. We lack concentration. For though numerically the strongest by far of all the Christian bodies, we suffer from dissipation of force, and so fail to produce on social life that effect which is the ultimate test of a church's faithfulness.<sup>648</sup>

The bishop's aim, then, was to inspire through strong administration a sense of purpose in the diocese which might enable the church's message to be effectively proclaimed. For the bishop himself, and for synod, this involved a great deal of routine administrative business, the occasionally unpleasant exercise of firm discipline, and the dullness of enacting canons and having parliament pass bills to put the legal side of the church's life on a sound footing. To Webber the discipline and monotony involved in this legal and administrative work was a valuable spiritual exercise.<sup>649</sup>

Webber saw himself as the key to the administrative framework of the diocese. He was personally responsible for the selection of suitable men as coadjutor bishop and archdeacons. As dean of the cathedral he presided in person over the cathedral chapter, and regarded himself as the head of the residentiary canons, who were to be a spearhead of diocesan progress. He appointed a number of specialist lay officials and advisers who were in close and constant contact with himself. He welcomed the recommendation of the Lambeth Conference of 1897 that the diocesan bishop should exercise a limited jus liturgicum, that is, a right to make variations in the forms of service provided in the Book of Common Prayer within the limits provided by 'lawful authority', a term which proved so vague as to be the cause of frequent controversies from henceforth. In short, all the strands of ecclesiastical authority in the diocese were to lead directly up to the bishop himself.

It was not long after his arrival that Webber began an administrative reconstruction to bring the organisation of the diocese into line with long-tried English precedent. The mode by which English methods were adapted, however, left Webber with much more personal power than the typical English diocesan enjoyed. Within his first year the diocese was divided into smaller administrative units. The aged Glennie retired as archdeacon, being rewarded for his faithful service with the first honorary canonry of the pro-cathedral. Two new archdeacons were then appointed – Nathaniel Dawes, who had just arrived from England, and Thomas Jones, who had been in the diocese from its inception, and was now Rector of St. James' Toowoomba. Webber obviously wanted a blend of the old with the new; but Jones, who was appointed Archdeacon of the West, had little direct influence on diocesan administration, and the differences between him and the bishop soon grew so intense that he remained archdeacon for only a few years.

At the same time, the diocese was divided into six rural deaneries, designed particularly to bring some sense of coherence into the more scattered country areas. Apart from, the Deanery of Brisbane, the other five were all in the country – Ipswich, Toowoomba, Warwick, Maryborough and Rockhampton.<sup>650</sup>

These rural deaneries did not fulfil a very significant role in the actual administration of the diocese, but their occasional meetings did provide opportunities for the scattered clergy to come together for discussion and social intercourse. The predominance of the country deaneries was in part due to the fact that Bishop Webber himself spent comparatively little time in the country parts of the diocese: he was a city man, and he believed that his presence was needed at headquarters as much as possible.

It was this that made Webber particularly anxious to have a coadjutor bishop, who might take personal oversight of the country work. As early as 1887 he urged the need of a suffragan bishop, at least as a temporary expedient pending the division of the diocese, and suggested that income from the Peattie bequest (which was intended for mission work in outlying parts of the diocese) might be used for his upkeep.<sup>651</sup> Two years later, the consecration of Archdeacon Nathaniel Dawes as coadjutor bishop brought Webber's plan to fruition. The new bishop made Toowoomba his headquarters, becoming honorary Rector of St. James', with a vicar under him to carry on the regular administration of the parish. To Webber, however, this was simply a preliminary to the sub-division of the diocese. Even at Dawes' consecration he took the opportunity in his sermon to appeal for funds for a new Diocese of Rockhampton, and the transfer of Dawes'

<sup>648</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1895, p. 101, Bishop's address.

<sup>649</sup> See for example his comments on this at the special session of synod in January, 1897, called to deal with legal matters. *Ibid.*, 1897, p. 29.

<sup>650</sup> St. John's Parish Chronicle, October 1886.

<sup>651</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p. 10 Bishop's address. It was on this issue of the use of the Peattie Bequest that the bishop and Archdeacon Jones clashed severely.

headquarters to Rockhampton in 1891 was with the intention that he might take steps to organise the new diocese.<sup>652</sup> By handing over most of the country pastoral work to his coadjutor, Bishop Webber was able to concentrate upon his central administrative activities.

The appointment and consecration of Bishop Dawes raised a number of important questions. One concerned the mode of appointment of assistant bishops, for which there was no precedent in Australia. Bishop Webber adopted the practice, which has since become standard, that the principle of having an assistant bishop be approved by synod, but that the man himself be selected by the diocesan bishop. The appointment was understood to lapse with the voidance of the see, unless the incoming diocesan bishop should request the coadjutor to continue in that capacity. In later years, during Bishop Webber's long fatal illness, there was a suggestion that synod might elect a coadjutor bishop with the right of succession to the see, but there were certain doubts about this procedure. Synod chose to pursue a policy of 'masterly inactivity' (as Archdeacon David put it) while requisite canons were drafted; but in the meantime the old bishop died, so the situation did not arise.<sup>653</sup> Certain practical difficulties prevented the revival of this suggestion in later years.

There was another important constitutional question that arose in connection with Bishop Dawes' consecration. This was the first consecration to take place in Australia,<sup>654</sup> all previous Australian bishops having been consecrated in England on a mandate from the monarch to the Archbishop of Canterbury. For the first time, in Dawes' case, no such mandate was issued: it was a significant step on the way to constitutional independence for the Australian church.<sup>655</sup>

After Dawes' election to the new see of Rockhampton in 1892 Webber carried on for some time without either coadjutor bishop or archdeacons. This was in the nature of a temporary interlude in the absence of suitable senior clergy, however, and the appointment of A.E. David as Archdeacon of Brisbane in 1894, A.R. Rivers as Archdeacon of Toowoomba in 1896, and E.B. Trotter as Archdeacon of the West in 1902 brought about a division of the diocese which with variations has been roughly followed since.

There was still a need for episcopal ministrations in the west, however, and in 1895 Bishop Webber appointed John Francis Stretch to the position of coadjutor bishop. Stretch had been Dean of Ballarat: he was only 40 years of age, and was noted as a brilliant orator, and what was specially significant was that he was the first native Australian, educated and ordained in Australia, to be raised to the episcopate.<sup>656</sup> Webber himself took some pleasure in this fact, because he was sensitive to the criticism that the diocese was too English. Like Dawes, Stretch was allocated the bulk of the country work, and was appointed honorary Rector of Roma. Here in the west Bishop Stretch led an exhausting life, with constant travelling and frequently setbacks. Drought and flood, constant changes in clerical staff and long vacancies in incumbencies in some of the districts resulted in increasingly disconsolate reports coming from the bishop coadjutor to synod. What greatly aggravated the situation was the decline in income from the Peattie Fund, from which his own salary was drawn, so that by 1898 it was necessary to pay a third of his stipend from cathedral funds, while he in return spent a third of the year as a canon-in-residence at the cathedral.<sup>657</sup> The suspension of income from the Peattie Fund in 1900 due to a technical hitch in the will cut off the bulk of Bishop Stretch's income, and he was left in an untenable position. The situation was aggravated by temperamental differences between himself and Bishop Webber, and it was with some relief that Stretch resigned from the Diocese of Brisbane in 1900 to accept the position of Dean of Newcastle. Later he was to become bishop of the same diocese.

As well as making these appointments to senior positions among the clergy, Webber devoted early attention to the selection of a group of lay advisers, in order to ensure administrative efficiency. Official diocesan solicitors were soon appointed, and a diocesan architect, J.H. Buckeridge. A well-known Brisbane barrister, Graham Lloyd Hart, was made chancellor of the diocese, and A. Alexer Orme loyally served the bishop as diocesan registrar during most of the episcopate. The diocesan council contained a number of eminent and able laymen, mainly financiers and lawyers, with the addition of one or two civil servants, while the Treasurer of Synod, E.W. Walker, was noted as "the best Treasure the Synod has ever had".<sup>658</sup> In this way Webber gathered a business-like group of laymen who helped ensure the efficient administration of the business of the church.

<sup>652</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1891.

<sup>653</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1903, pp. 122 ff. and p. 140.

<sup>654</sup> In St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on 1 May 1889.

<sup>655</sup> This question was fully discussed in an article by the Rev. B.R. Wilson, St. John's Chronicle, June 1889. Wilson, however, had an exaggerated conception of the legal independence of the Church of England in Australia, and wrongly termed it "a perfectly autonomous body", and claimed it could revise its Prayer Book.

<sup>656</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1895. For further details of Bishop Stretch, see Elkin, A.P., The Diocese of Newcastle, pp 662-667

<sup>657</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1898, p. 136.

<sup>658</sup> David, A.E., Notes of the Diocese of Brisbane (MS).

Under Webber's inspiration, these men created machinery through which the work of the diocese could find purposeful expression. In 1890, for example, the old annual reports of Synod Proceedings were transformed into a full diocesan Year Book. Statistics were much more carefully gathered and tabulated than ever before, so that at least the outward signs of progress or decline could be readily noted. The old St. John's Parish Chronicle was expanded and transformed into the Church Chronicle, to be an official organ of the diocese through which the bishop could speak to his people month by month. Under a succession of able editors, and selling cheaply at a penny a copy, it was to become known as one of the best of Australian diocesan papers. New specialised committees were established in connection with synod to direct the widening work of the church in the diocese. By 1886 there were already committees to deal with such matters as Lands, Finance, Records, Immigration, Sunday Schools and the Book Depot, while an Origination Committee undertook the planning of new parochial districts. In short, the church was functioning quite definitely as a diocese, and no longer simply as a collection of parishes.

What was to be the crowning feature of diocesan unity, however, had little lasting success, at least in its original form. This was the Church Society, which was founded in 1895 in an effort to carry the spirit of diocesan unity down from the administrative level to the people in the parishes. As we have seen in earlier chapters, church societies played a prominent part in developing a spirit of unity and financial stability in a number of colonial dioceses in the nineteenth century. Newcastle and Sydney had been good examples. In varying forms, Tufnell and Hale had tried the same plan in Brisbane, but without success. Webber now endeavoured to succeed where they had failed. He took the opportunity presented by a gathering of about nine hundred church people to welcome the Bishops of Sydney and Newcastle to Brisbane in 1895 to advocate the formation of such a society. It was to complete the chain of diocesan unity:

The Society, if warmly taken up, will be found to supply by its practical method, the missing link in the chain of diocesan and parochial organization. Great, indeed, is the need of united effort, if the character of this young nation is to be built up on the foundation of the faith and fear of God.<sup>659</sup>

Translated into practical terms, however, the aims of the society were vague. Archdeacon Rivers spoke about "mutual intercourse and improvement". And Bishop Stretch talked eloquently about broadening parochial interests. Yet in practice the side of the society's work that related to collecting subscriptions – members paid an annual subscription of five shillings – seemed to be to the fore, and there was a great gap between the ideal and the practical working of the society. Nevertheless, under the indefatigable zeal of Archdeacon Rivers the Church Society got away to a good start: the first annual Diocesan Festival organised by the society in the Exhibition Hall under the chairmanship of Lord Lamington, the governor, was a great success.<sup>660</sup> By 1898, however, there were already disquietening reports of the closure of some parochial branches of the society, and by 1902 only a handful of people turned out for the annual meeting.<sup>661</sup> The fact was that the sense of diocesan unity had not yet overcome the spirit of parochialism at the level of the mass of the people in the parishes, and the aims and activities of the Church Society were not sufficiently explicit to sustain enthusiasm. It was not, however, entirely without lasting effect: for out of the principle of annual Church Society subscriptions arose the Home Mission Fund which was to become in later years the core of the social service work of the diocese.

A major part of Bishop Webber's overall plan for administrative unification and efficiency was the shaping of the diocesan synod into an adequate instrument of constitutional government. Synod had never functioned effectually from the beginning. In Tufnell's episcopate its work had been frustrated by the mistrust of the bishop's authority on the part of the laymen, and under Bishop Hale divisions between bishop and clergy, together with the lack of strong presidential guidance by the bishop, had led to ineffectiveness. Dr. Webber, though in many respects an exponent of monarchical episcopacy, had no desire for a weak synod, and indeed inefficiency there annoyed him as much as in any other field. It was with satisfaction that he commented in 1892 on "the better and more earnest spirit which has come over this our representative assembly during later years."<sup>662</sup>

The bishop was never backward in giving a strong lead to synod. His own synod addresses were long and detailed: on several occasions they took up twenty-five closely printed pages in the Year Book. It usually happened that synod agreed upon the course of action proposed by the bishop. Yet this was not because he forced his opinions on synod, but simply because his policy was seen to be sound, and because his own dedication to the cause of the church was recognised by synodsmen. There was opposition at times, but the bishop's firm and consistent policy usually won out in the end.

Webber saw that a thorough re-drafting of the canons of the diocese was needed. When he assumed office, the canons were in a chaotic condition, out of touch with practical needs, and consequently more heeded in the breach than in the observance. The bishop therefore embarked upon a comprehensive programme of legislation: year after year new canons

<sup>659</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1895.

<sup>660</sup> Ibid., May 1896.

<sup>661</sup> Ibid., July 1902

<sup>662</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p. 46 Bishop's address.

were passed, and old ones amended and revised, until by 1898 the bishop was able to report to synod that “no further legislation will be needed, at least during the present episcopate”.<sup>663</sup> So true was this statement that to the present day the canon law of the diocese as developed in Bishop Webber’s episcopate has remained the basis of diocesan canons. It was the diocesan chancellor, Graham Lloyd Hart, who was the legal brain behind the development of a coherent system of canons. In 1890 Hart was responsible for a thorough consolidation of the existing canons, gaps being filled in, and appropriate amendments made where necessary. The bishop also sought the advice of the eminent English ecclesiastical lawyer, Lord Selborne. A variety of subjects was covered by the new and amending canons of Webber’s episcopate: a tribunal to try offenders (1889), the structure of the diocesan council, the regulation of parishes, parochial assessments for diocesan funds, provisions for the widows and orphans of the clergy, the election of bishops for the diocese, the formation of the Diocese of Rockhampton, the prerogatives of the bishop, and other subjects as well. There was even a suggestion towards the end of Webber’s episcopate that the canons should be completely codified, and that such of the Canons Ecclesiastical of England of 1603 and 1865 as were relevant should be incorporated. The diocesan council wisely decided, however, that such a radical systematisation of canon law was a matter for the whole Australian church rather than one diocese.<sup>664</sup> Enough, however, had been done to ensure that the canons of the diocese could be in practice obeyed: this was a new situation for the church in Brisbane.

Legislative action was only one side of the reshaping of synod as an effective instrument of diocesan unity. Webber believed that all the property of the church should be under the control of synod, as the body representing the whole diocese. When he came to Brisbane he found that a large number of parochial properties were in the hands of private trustees, with the implication that these trustees were in a position to impose conditions on the use of such properties. To Webber this was dangerous in three respects: symbolically it typified congregationalism as against diocesanism; doctrinally it allowed the possibility of individual trustees’ imposing their whims on the use made of property, as for example, in regard to the mode of worship; and practically, there was considerable danger that unbusinesslike local trustees might damage the material interests of the church through sheer inefficiency. In 1887 Webber in his synod address urged the parishes to place their property into the hands of synod as trustee,<sup>665</sup> and so effective was this policy that by 1895 only 20 of the 97 churches in the diocese remained under the control of private trustees. In 1896 synod carried the same principle a step further, when it recommended to the parishes that all special trust funds in the parishes should have synod, or the treasurer of synod, as one of the trustees of the fund. This was to ensure that trust funds were not misdirected by local trustees. Further diocesan control over all church property was ensured by the decision of the Registrar of Titles that the consent of synod was necessary before trustees could mortgage church property.<sup>666</sup> All of this helped ensure that there would be no further misuse of parochial property or trust funds as had occurred in earlier years.

In another proposition for central control Webber was less successful. In earlier years there had been occasional suggestions that the stipends of the clergy should be paid at least in part from central funds, in order to remove such dependence of a priest upon his parishioners as might hinder him from fulfilling unpopular pastoral duties. Lack of funds and prevailing parochialism had made such a scheme quite impossible in earlier times. In 1886, and again in `1890, Webber mentioned the scheme to synod, and in `1892 a synod committee under the chairmanship of the Reverend James Matthews came out in favour of a plan for the payment of stipends from the central office. The plan was that a minimum stipend of £300 be guaranteed, and that the contributions of richer parishes would assist the poorer ones to reach this amount.<sup>667</sup> The depression and other urgent financial questions pushed the idea into the background for some years, and the financial crisis in the nineties resulted in a general trend to lower salaries. At a later age the principle of central stipends was to be raised again, but during Webber’s episcopate the synod contented itself with passing a canon in 1898 making it mandatory for a parish to pay the full stipend guaranteed to a rector on his appointment to the parish, and a resolution was passed recommending £300 as the minimum. It was probably fortunate that the central stipend payment plan was not pursued: for the practical difficulties and the loss of a sense of parochial responsibility would probably have outweighed all advantages.

Bishop Webber’s thoroughness was illustrated by another series of steps taken to ensure that the corporate life of the diocese was properly constituted. As we saw earlier, the constitution upon which the whole legal existence of the diocese and the authority of synod rested, was based upon a consensual compact without any legislative enactment. Many authorities on constitutional law believed that this was sufficient, and Judge Lutwyche had taken this attitude. Bishop Webber, and his chancellor, G.L. Hart, wanted, however, to make sure. What particularly concerned them was that the act of 1836, commonly called Bourke’s Act, which conflicted with certain provisions of the diocesan constitution, had never

<sup>663</sup> *Ibid.*, 1898, p. 142, Bishop’s address.

<sup>664</sup> *Ibid.*, 1900, p.63.

<sup>665</sup> Brisbane *Synod Proceedings*, 1887, p. 15.

<sup>666</sup> David, A.E., *Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane*.

<sup>667</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1892, p.110

been repealed; also, the original consensual compact had been lost some time after 1874.<sup>668</sup> A bill was therefore drafted, which after brief and almost formal consideration by a select committee, quickly passed through parliament. It repealed Bourke's Act, gave legislative sanction to the consensual compact, and incorporated synod as a body corporate, in lieu of the old arrangement whereby three officials of synod had exercised this function. The Church Chronicle waxed eloquent about the "most important measure" ever considered in synod, and spoke about the last link of erastianism being snapped.<sup>669</sup> In practice, however, the act made little difference; and because the constitutions of the Queensland dioceses specifically bound the church in Queensland to the English church, which in turn came under parliamentary jurisdiction in certain respects in England, it was not true that links with the state were snapped. The state with which the church was linked was not Queensland, however, but the United Kingdom. A further act was passed in 1901, enabling the corporation of synod to dispose of trust properties and invest monies so received in such a way as to fulfil the purposes of the trust. This was made necessary by the sale of the old site of St. John's to the government.

An act of more practical value to the church was one which was passed by the Queensland parliament in 1896, largely at the instigation of the church. This provided for the amendment of the Religious, Educational and Charitable Institutions Act of 1861, which had placed disabilities on the bequest of money for church purposes. With the increase of national wealth and the growing likelihood of bequests, this was a measure of considerable importance.<sup>670</sup>

In these various ways by constructing a sound administrative machinery and providing a suitable framework of synodical and parliamentary legislation, Bishop Webber completely reorganised the life of the church along diocesan, rather than parochial, lines. But he recognised that he was personally the pivot of the whole system, and it is perhaps in his exercise of his own spiritual authority as bishop that the new unity of administration is most clearly revealed. Webber was quite unashamedly a disciplinarian. The determination with which he pushed through the long-delayed Tribunal Canon, to provide for the trial of clerical offenders, clearly indicated his approach. By this canon the final judgment in the case rested with the bishop after the facts had been ascertained by the clerical and lay assessors. Nor was the bishop backward in enforcing disciplinary measures when need required. In 1891 he reported to synod that two clergymen had been lost to the diocese because he had felt it necessary to "minister the discipline of the Church".<sup>671</sup> Again in 1899 discipline was imposed upon the Reverend J.W. Henry, a priest who had formerly been a Congregationalist minister, who had exercised his ministry without the bishop's license and then defamed Webber for his firm attitude. Before being restored to the ranks of the clergy he was required to make a public acknowledgement of his errors at the bar of synod.<sup>672</sup>

Webber was determined to leave no loophole in the recognition of the authority of the bishop to exercise spiritual power. He had memories of the earlier theory – which high churchmen had always rejected – that episcopal jurisdiction derived from the royal letters patent. If this were the case, then the basis of his authority would have been cut away. In order to make his position perfectly clear and indubitably legal, he had synod pass the Bishop's Prerogative Canon in 1898, which set out distinctly the authority to be exercised by the bishop.<sup>673</sup>

It was not only in the discipline of refractory offenders that Webber revealed his determination to exercise firm authority. Soon after he arrived he gave instructions that the plans of all new church buildings were to be submitted for his approval. This was in order to prevent the perpetration of what he regarded as architectural monstrosities, which were both ugly and ill-adapted to the type of worship envisaged by the Prayer Book. The new spirit of tight episcopal control was even more clearly indicated by a small incident in 1895. The big annual Queen's Birthday Sunday School picnic fell on a Friday, and instead of simply ignoring the Prayer Book provision for the Friday fast, the members of the Brisbane Clerical Society requested the bishop for a special dispensation from the fast. A tone of decisiveness characterised the bishop's reply:

We, William Thomas Thornhill, by Divine permission, Bishop of Brisbane, do, by virtue of our ordinary and episcopal power, hereby grant the relief prayed for.<sup>674</sup>

The incident itself was unimportant: but that such a request could be made and granted in terms like these reflects the new tone of authority emanating from the bishop.

As a ruler of the diocese Webber was not a man to be trifled with, and in some respects he certainly played the autocrat. Yet he came to Brisbane at a time when decisive leadership was required, and though his tight control inevitably aroused

<sup>668</sup> Evidence of Rev. J. Matthews before Parliamentary Select Committee, V. & P., Q'ld Parliament, 1895, Vol. I.

<sup>669</sup> Church Chronicle, June and November 1895.

<sup>670</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1896, p. 46.

<sup>671</sup> Ibid., 1891, p.49

<sup>672</sup> Ibid., 1899, p. 70. The actual act of submission was "I, the said Joseph Wilson Henry, do hereby confess my error, and acknowledge my unfeigned regret for these my actions; and I hereby pledge myself to hereafter observe the due order of the Church, and to submit myself to the Bishop of the Diocese in all things lawful and canonical".

<sup>673</sup> Ibid., 1898, p. 138

<sup>674</sup> Church Chronicle, May 1895

some discontent and frustration, the fruits of diocesan unity were readily apparent as a result. For the first time the Diocese of Brisbane became a diocese in reality as well as in name.

#### vi. Unity Extended

It would be a mistake to think of the intensive work of Bishop Webber in building up the finances, manpower and administrative machinery of the Diocese of Brisbane as an end in itself. The unifying of the resources of the diocese had one ultimate purpose – the extension of the Kingdom of God by a more effective ministry in town and country. We have seen the anguish of soul experienced by Bishop Hale at his sense of failure to minister to the people in the outlying districts, and even in the more settled areas the weak resources of the church had appeared to be so diffusely scattered as to be well-nigh ineffective. Webber's aim was to make it possible for even the people in the farthest settlements to be brought into the unity of the church.

When Webber assumed office the situation was critical. There were only 33 clergy and 39 churches, scattered throughout the great area of the diocese, and no place west of Roma was receiving a regular ministry. By this time population in the isolated western areas was steadily growing, and towns like Charleville, Cunnamulla, and Mitchell, as well as others west of Rockhampton, were becoming sizeable centres.

Within a year of his arrival in Brisbane, the bishop undertook a personal tour of the entire western area, as far west as Charleville, and north to Muttaborra, which gave him a direct insight into the needs of the outlying areas. It was not easy travelling: railways covered only a portion of the journey, and the rest of the trip had to be covered in horse and buggy, on roads that scarcely deserved the name, and with the hindrance of floods that made the boggy country impassable.<sup>675</sup> The spiritual destitution revealed by this trip determined Webber to act, and everywhere he went he took the opportunity of conferring with the local laymen on the possibility of raising stipends for clergymen and on the choice of sites for future churches.

Decisive action soon followed the bishop's tour. Within a month of his return to headquarters the diocesan council was making arrangements to secure land at Blackall, Tambo, Augathella and Morven:<sup>676</sup> and this was only the beginning of a series of accessions of land throughout the outlying parts of the diocese, both by purchase and by gift. At the synod of 1888 it was reported that 27 new sites had been promised or secured within the past year. Ten years later, as a result of this far-sighted policy, the diocese possessed a total of 174 properties.<sup>677</sup> Not all of these sites were used immediately for building purposes, and some of them must have seemed unnecessary at the time. But Webber's vision undoubtedly saved the church much trouble and expense at a later period when good sites were harder to obtain, and much more costly.

Very quickly, too, a wave of church building unprecedented in the diocese was in progress. The 39 churches of 1885 had grown to 90 in ten years later, and to 110 by the turn of the century: and this in a period marked by severe depression, drought and flood. It is true that for the most part these churches were comparatively small wooden buildings; and in marked contrast with the dignity of the few churches built in Hale's time and the grandeur of the cathedral plan, the parish churches built under Webber were of quite simple design and proportions. The only exception in the way of larger permanent structures were St. Luke's Toowoomba, which was dedicated in 1897 as the result of the energetic work of the Reverend T. St. J. Pughe,<sup>678</sup> and the temporary pro-cathedral of St. Luke, Brisbane, which was to serve between the demolition of the old St. John's and the building of the new cathedral.<sup>679</sup> Yet the host of small new churches served a desperate need, and for the first time in many areas numbers of church people found themselves within reach of a church.

It must be admitted, however, that the utility of the new buildings was not matched by their beauty. Bishop Webber required the plans of new churches to be submitted to him for approval, and many of them were designed by the diocesan architect. In this way the serious ecclesiastical errors that had marked some of the earlier churches were avoided; but in the matter of architectural appreciation the bishop was the child of his age.. He came from the England of the pseudo-Gothic revival, and the soaring grandeur of Gothic architecture as he knew it in the great cathedrals and parish churches of England was his ideal. This he attempted to reproduce in Queensland. In his projected stone cathedral this could be done with fine effect: but the translation of the Gothic spirit into the medium of timber buildings, in a climate that could be searing hot on midsummer days, resulted in a crop of church buildings, which, however much they might dimly remind English immigrants of the churches they had left behind, were scarcely suited to Queensland conditions. The steep-pitched iron or slate roofs, the narrow high windows, in the side walls, the east windows behind the altar which admitted a dazzling flood of

<sup>675</sup> St. John's Parish Chronicle, October 1886.

<sup>676</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 13 October 1886.

<sup>677</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1899 Terrier of Church Lands.

<sup>678</sup> Church Chronicle, March 1897.

<sup>679</sup> The old St. John's was used for the last time on 7 August 1904, and St. Luke's was dedicated by Archdeacon David (after Bishop Webber's death) the following Sunday. Church Chronicle, August 1904.

light into the eyes of morning worshippers, and the attempts at wooden arches in the interior, became the familiar and unattractive pattern. The critical comments of the socialist William Lane's creation, 'Lucinda Sharpe', were candid:

They have in this sweltering climate exactly the same churches that are used in England and in the States, grave-like structures, with low doors and narrow windows, and walls proportioned in thickness to the wealth of the congregation. There isn't the slightest attempt at remembering that we're within 250 miles of the tropics and that the west wind makes it about as hot as if we were under the equator...And we are expected to go to these stuffy stifling uncomfortable churches, with all sorts of bonnets, and there to look as though we were enjoying ourselves in a serious and melancholy manner.<sup>680</sup>

We may sympathise: and true it was that in wanting its buildings "to look like churches" – on the English model – the church lagged behind the wisdom of domestic architecture which designed cool and practical homes in the colony. The danger of this was that the church tended to become a place apart from the ordinary affairs of life.

Sites and buildings, however, represented only the external framework of the church's real task. Bishop Webber saw that two lines of approach were necessary to extend the spiritual work of the church. Firstly, there must be a strong centre of church life in Brisbane, and especially at the pro-cathedral. This was to be a sort of spiritual power house from which mission chaplains and specialists would go out to do particular tasks throughout the diocese. Secondly, clergy must be placed in the neglected outlying districts under the special oversight of the coadjutor bishop. The first part of the scheme did not succeed as well as hoped. Distances were too great for the pro-cathedral to be a satisfactory centre, and the central mission chaplains whom Webber placed there had a habit of disqualifying themselves from the sort of work the bishop had in mind either by seeking a permanent incumbency or getting married. The residentiary canons, if they did outside work tended to become less and less residentiary, and to lose their practical connection with the pro-cathedral. The result was that the placing of men permanently in the outlying districts became more and more urgent.

Not long after Webber's first marathon tour, he sent the Reverend Bernard Wilson to Cunnamulla to lay the foundations for a permanent ministry there. Wilson worked with his customary thoroughness in this settlement of five hundred people, and formed a committee to raise funds, as a result of which the Reverend George Hall was able to be sent there for a time from the pro-cathedral.<sup>681</sup> This could not be more than a temporary arrangement, however, and it was not until the Reverend H.M. Shuttlewood took up work in Charleville, and the Reverend William Leeke in Cunnamulla, in 1888-9 that regular work began, while the consecration of Bishop Dawes at about the same time provided definite oversight for their work. Shuttlewood and Leeke faced incredible difficulties, and soon won the deep respect of the people of the west for their devoted work.<sup>682</sup> In his first pastoral tour the hardships involved in their work was driven home to Bishop Dawes:

It is only after traversing some of these vast tracts of bush country that one is able to realize either the extent or the difficulty of the Church's work in this Diocese. Isolated families are scattered far and wide over thousands of square miles of country, far removed from Church or School or good social influence and either out of reach of any Clergyman or receiving visits with such infrequency as to justify the complaint sometimes expressed that they are 'as sheep having no shepherd' – uncared for and unfed. It needs no prophetic gift to forecast that ere long these neglected children of the Church will become as ignorant of the simplest elements of morality and religion as any heathen of the 'Dark Continent'.<sup>683</sup>

It was true: it was not only the physical difficulties of distance, terrible roads and scattered communities that beset the pioneering clergy. But often their flocks had been so long separated from the life of the church that while they respected the work of their clergy, they were not so grasped by its importance that they were moved to respond either with regular attendance at worship or generous gifts of money.

There was for these isolated priests the terrible loneliness of being cut off from the visible corporate life of the church, and of living among people of widely different background and concerns from themselves. Yet for six years Shuttlewood battled on in Charleville, living at first in a stable, as there was no rectory, sometimes working on his own, sometimes with assistance. For a time he had the help of lay readers; and after Leeke left Cunnamulla in 1891 the bishop decided to send two curates to Shuttlewood, so that the whole of the south-west might be worked from Charleville, in an attempt to overcome the spiritual loneliness that the isolated priest must face. But one of them was killed in an accident, and the other left, and by 1894 Shuttlewood stood alone to represent the church in an area officially of 7,000 souls. After the departure of Shuttlewood clergy came and went with monotonous frequency, with the single exception of the Reverend L.H. Wickham,

<sup>680</sup> Boomerang, 31 December 1887.

<sup>681</sup> St. John's Parish Chronicle, January 1888.

<sup>682</sup> See, for example, letter in Church Chronicle, May 1891.

<sup>683</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1890 p.49



who stayed in the south-west for several years. Bishop Stretch had great difficulty keeping clergy in the area and the decline of the Peattie Fund made their financial support uncertain.<sup>684</sup>

Some stability was brought again to the church in the far west by the appointment of Edward Bush Trotter as Archdeacon of the West in 1902. Trotter had come from Trinidad for health reasons, and was already past middle age, but he worked virtually alone with incredible zeal. He was a rigid, old-type Tractarian in churchmanship, but his deep spirituality and unwearied travel won for him the sort of respect that Shuttlewood had had before him.<sup>685</sup> By the turn of the century, however, two things had become clear: the west was no place for married priests because of the need for constant absence from wife and family; nor was it a place for single priests in lonely isolation. Already in Rockhampton Bishop Dawes was trying to experiment with a new approach to bush work. On a small scale Archdeacon Rivers was carrying out a similar experiment at Gayndah. Of the foundation and work of these “bush brotherhoods” we shall say more later.

From all this it is clear that though the church had begun the extension of its work to the furthest extremes of the bush in Bishop Webber’s episcopate, this work had not yet achieved real stability. This meant that a great burden was borne by the small number of devoted lay men and women who in the various small centres conducted public worship and provided for the religious education of the children. Each centre of population had its little, faithful nucleus of church people who struggled against the predominant apathy in things spiritual, to keep a spark of religion alive until better things could come.

Notable as an example of what individuals and families were doing in various centres was the role of the Lethbridge family in Mitchell. In the nineties Mitchell was regarded as part of the Parish of Roma, but the rector was able to go there only once a month. Mrs. B. Lethbridge, however, had conducted a Sunday school since the early eighties, which by 1894 had risen from 8 to 87 children. She also gave week-day instruction to the children before school twice a week, while her husband conducted a service every Sunday in the absence of the clergyman.<sup>686</sup> When the Lethbridge family left Mitchell in 1907, Bush Notes contained a list of vacancies to be filled: Organist, Sunday school teacher, church caretaker, bell ringer, churchwarden, Band of Hope superintendent, ‘board and lodging’ of the clergy, stipend collector and church decorator.<sup>687</sup>

It was through the work of a few such families that the church lived on, even when the clergy were infrequently seen. Separated from the main body of the church they were still bound by an invisible bond of unity with the wider life of the Body of Christ.

On 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1903 William Thomas Thornhill Webber died at the age of 66. He was not unduly old; but he was physically exhausted. He had given all that he had.

No single individual will receive more detailed treatment in this history. This is not because Webber was personally the greatest man in Queensland church history. In many respects others of the bishops were greater than he, and perhaps many were more saintly in the usual meaning of that term. But he came to Queensland at a time when certain qualities were desperately needed in the Bishop of Brisbane: qualities of vision, courage, leadership and perseverance. He supplied just those qualities in such a way that under his leadership the church in Queensland was able to emerge from its despondency and torpor to a new and stirring sense of positive vocation. Webber saw that unity is strength; he believed in his heart that the bishop was the centre of unity of the church, and around his office – not simply his personality – he built a structure that in essence has not required re-shaping to this day. His influence went far beyond his own diocese, for especially through his example to Bishops Dawes, Frodsham and Stone-Wigg, he helped shape the future of four of the five dioceses of what was to become the Province of Queensland.

In carrying out this role he was regarded by some as “a sort of Prince Bismarck”, a “tyrant and oppressor”,<sup>688</sup> but those who knew him best found that his sound judgment and spirit of self-sacrifice in the cause he loved far outweighed any tendency to dictatorship. Insofar as he was autocratic, it was because he saw that the church in its chaotic state needed firm leadership, and that he alone could supply it. He had the faults of stubbornness, and lack of sympathy with those who lacked his own drive and efficiency. He was accused, not entirely unfairly, of being narrowly ecclesiastical in his interests; but that reflected the pressing need of the diocese at the time. In any case his work for education, and his concern over the social unquiet of the nineties belies a total lack of sympathy with the needs of the world at large. Some of the broader aspects of his work and thought remain to be considered in a later chapter. But for himself he would have been well

<sup>684</sup> Details of changes in clergy may be found in Brisbane Year Books and Church Chronicles for relevant years. See also Bush Notes, September 1926, for personal reminiscences of the early work of the church in the west: these however contain a number of inaccuracies of detail.

<sup>685</sup> David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS); also Tomlin, J.W.S., The Story of the Bush Brotherhoods, p.31.

<sup>686</sup> Details from a book of newspaper cuttings in possession of Mrs. Hassall, of Toowoomba.

<sup>687</sup> Bush Notes April, 1907

<sup>688</sup> Jocularly remarked by Bishop Dawes after Webber had enthroned him as Bishop of Rockhampton. Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 1 December 1892.

satisfied with the summing up of him by Archdeacon A.E. David in his funeral panegyric as “a wise master builder”.<sup>689</sup> The foundations were well and truly laid: others could now build upon them.

---

<sup>689</sup> For a fine appreciation of Webber’s life, see Archdeacon David’s address to synod, Brisbane Year Book, 1904, p.50.

## **CHAPTER 10: DIVISION AND WIDER UNITY.**

The last decade of the nineteenth century was a time of division in diocesan organisation in Queensland. Within the span of eight years three of the five dioceses that eventually were to comprise the province were founded – two of them, Rockhampton and Carpentaria, by division of the existing dioceses, and New Guinea as the result of quite new missionary enterprise.<sup>690</sup>

It might appear strange at first sight that Bishop Webber, the man who was so keen on unity within his own diocese, was at the same time a vigorous advocate of division by creating the new see of Rockhampton from the northern part of Brisbane. Yet there was in reality no conflict of ideas here. Webber held that as diocesan unity centred around the bishop, the diocese must be small enough for the bishop to be able to know, lead and shepherd it personally. So it was consistent that he toyed with the idea of a further division of the dioceses of Brisbane and Rockhampton, which would have amalgamated their western areas into one new bush diocese.<sup>691</sup>

Beyond these divisions, Webber looked to the emergence of a wider unity, inasmuch as the new, more compact dioceses would be merged into an ecclesiastical Province of Queensland. For the formation of a province, at least three dioceses – preferably more – were required: so the formation of new sees in the last decade of the century must be seen not primarily as a process of disintegration, but rather as a step to a wider integration in one province.

The question might reasonably be raised, however, whether the further division of the Queensland dioceses at this time was not premature. The formation of the Diocese of New Guinea was undoubtedly justified, because its distance from the mainland, and its distinctive circumstances, made it a natural sphere of its own. Both Rockhampton and Carpentaria, however, were cast adrift on extremely shaky economic foundations, and their foundation was based on two assumptions, both of which turned out to be highly questionable. The first was that because of distance and poor communications, it was impossible for bishops to exercise real pastoral oversight over such extensive areas; the second was that there would be a steady and rapid rise in the population and production of these regions, so that the additional diocesan machinery thus created would be an economic proposition.

Both assumptions appeared reasonable at the time. No one could be expected to foresee the revolutionary improvements in communications that would ensue in the next half century, which would make it possible for bishops by use of telephone, air and modern road transport, to keep in personal contact with far greater areas. Even less could the bad seasons and economic instability in the years immediately after the formation of these dioceses be foreseen, with the resulting stagnation, or even decline, of population. The result, at all events, was that new dioceses were created which contained little variety of work inasmuch as they lacked almost entirely big city parishes, and which were founded on a very insecure economic base. Consequently they were beset by difficulties for many years after their formation, and even to this day they cannot be numbered among the most prosperous and stable dioceses of the Australian church.

### **i. The Diocese of Rockhampton**

Although pastoral settlement had early advanced into the Rockhampton district and its hinterland, central Queensland had received no such dramatic impetus to development as had been provided by the gold rushes further north. There was, it is true, great activity around the mines of Clermont and Copperfield in the seventies, and the more permanently important gold discoveries at Mt. Morgan in the eighties, but these did not attract the great influx of numbers that the northern diggings received; and, what was ultimately more significant, the central part of the colony lacked the agricultural potentialities of the north, which could provide a permanent livelihood for immigrants after the boom was over. So the growth of the central district had been relatively unspectacular, but by 1892 its population had reached some fifty thousand, scattered over an area of almost a quarter of a million square miles.

The history of church life in this area was scarcely such as to invite confidence for the future. Rockhampton was the one town that had had a virtually uninterrupted church life since Thomas Jones had gone there in 1861. Yet even in this town there had been problems. Before Jones' arrival Bishop Tufnell had been involved in a dispute with the Presbyterians over the use of an inter-denominational church which was built on land that was supposed to belong to the Church of England. The Anglicans finally moved out, and Jones used first a store, and then the court house, for his services, until the first St. Paul's church, a small wooden building, was erected in 1862.<sup>692</sup>

Church life, however, remained unstable, and quarrels between the rather fractious congregation and successive clergymen resulted in constant changes of incumbent. One frank church warden even advised a priest who was

<sup>690</sup> For New Guinea, see below, Chap. 13, ii.

<sup>691</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1900 Bishop's Address, p. 39f

<sup>692</sup> Articles by "Historicus", Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 5 December 1947, 2 January 1948 and 25 March 1948.

considering accepting the charge of Rockhampton in the seventies, that “my own opinion is that Rockhampton is by no means a desirable cure for a clergyman of the Church of England to undertake”.<sup>693</sup>

The arrival of the Reverend W.A. Diggins, in 1879, “a young man fresh from Oxford – the hot-bed and cradle of Ritualism”, as the correspondent of the Evangelical Standard described him, signalled fresh upheavals among the Anglicans themselves.<sup>694</sup> Some disaffected parishioners petitioned Bishop Hale, but the bishop’s investigations revealed that Diggins was not as extreme as his detractors claimed, though his advanced churchmanship did provoke a temporary manifestation of ‘Free Church of England’ activity under the leadership of a Dr. Hughes.<sup>695</sup> Nevertheless, Diggins displayed great zeal in his work and the disaffection died away, and for more than a decade throughout the eighties he ministered in Rockhampton and the district far around. For years he visited Gladstone for two weeks every second month,<sup>696</sup> and with his assistant, even extended his ministrations as far as Springsure. Considering the distance of the latter centre from Rockhampton, however, it is hardly surprising that the Springsure church committee wrote to Bishop Webber pleading “for a division of the said ‘Parish’ which is far too large to be satisfactorily worked from one centre.”<sup>697</sup>

It was under Diggins’ energetic leadership that the fine stone church of St. Paul was built in Rockhampton at a cost of £8,300 for the building and fittings – a very notable achievement for a town of this size. The building, consecrated in 1883 by Bishop Hale, with the assistance of Bishop Stanton and Archdeacons Glennie and Plume,<sup>698</sup> was a big psychological factor in the establishment of the new diocese. Whatever else was lacking, there was at least a church fit to become a cathedral!

If Rockhampton itself had the makings of a cathedral city, there was scarcely any other parish in central Queensland with a satisfactory church record. Gladstone was a town that was constantly fluctuating in both secular and church life. It had been constituted a parish soon after Bishop Tufnell’s arrival, and had had several incumbents in the seventies and eighties with gaps in between, but the lukewarmness of the congregation after the Reverend E.G. Moberly left in 1880 is indicated by the motion passed at a special meeting at which the local lay reader presided:

Those present were unanimous for the carrying on of the service, both morning and evening, on Sundays till the warm weather set in<sup>699</sup> [my italics.]

Further west, the picture was no brighter. In Muttaborra and the surrounding districts, the Reverend John Alldis had ministered in 1883-4, and from 1886-9 the Reverend G.M.L. Lester performed remarkable self-denying work, but then there followed a period without any resident clergyman. The Blackall district likewise had enjoyed some isolated ministrations from 1878 to 1880, and again from about 1890, but the fact that only four people came to the annual meeting of the parish in 1892, and that no one bothered to come to the adjourned meeting, did not augur well.<sup>700</sup> The position was well summed up by Bishop Dawes in his last report to the Brisbane synod before the formation of the new diocese:

The existing spiritual destitution in West-Central Queensland is a reproach to Christendom. The mere handful of Clergy who are labouring there are fighting resolutely against tremendous odds. But what can they possibly do to gain any real hold over a population of some 60,000, scattered over an area nearly four times as great as that of England and Wales?<sup>701</sup>

It was not an attractive picture: and it could not have been with a light heart that Dawes accepted the oversight of such a diocese.

As we have seen, it had been proposed as early as 1870 that the whole of northern and central Queensland should be formed into a bishopric centred on Rockhampton. Failure to gain any real response in the central region had led to the alteration of the scheme. Nevertheless, Bishop Webber initiated a new movement for separation not long after taking up his post in Brisbane. He spoke of the eventual need of a new see in his synod address of 1887,<sup>702</sup> and he did not take long to translate his suggestion into practical action with his accustomed vigour.

The bishop himself conducted a conference at Rockhampton at the end of 1887, and stirred up unanimous support for the principle of a new bishopric, and began extracting pledges of monetary support in his usual manner.<sup>703</sup> Thenceforth he did

<sup>693</sup> G.M. Johnson (church warden) to Rev. J.S. Hassall, undated, Hassall Correspondence (Mitchell Library).

<sup>694</sup> Queensland Evangelical Standard, 18 December 1880.

<sup>695</sup> Ibid., 6 November 1880, 27 November 1880, 11 December 1880.

<sup>696</sup> Minutes, Gladstone church committee, esp. 11 September 1883 and 28 December 1888.

<sup>697</sup> Minutes, Springsure church committee, 28 July 1886.

<sup>698</sup> Article by “Historicus”, Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 27 May 1952.

<sup>699</sup> Minutes, Gladstone church committee, 7 September 1880.

<sup>700</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1892.

<sup>701</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p.57. The estimate of population would seem to be excessive.

<sup>702</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p. 10.

<sup>703</sup> St. John’s Parish Chronicle, December 1887.

not rest. From the customary English sources, the S.P.G., the S.P.C.K. and the Colonial Bishops Council, he obtained promises of £1,000 each, contingent upon £12,000 being raised from other sources. He enlisted the aid of Bernard Wilson to advance the scheme in England, and by 1892 more than £10,000 was in hand for the endowment of the see, and it was decided that this was a sufficient beginning. The Brisbane synod consequently agreed to the division of the diocese in 1892,<sup>704</sup> and the clergy and representative laity of the parishes in the proposed new diocese met together to elect their first bishop. There was a strong feeling that he should be someone accustomed to the conditions of the bush:<sup>705</sup> and the choice of the beloved and faithful Bishop Nathaniel Dawes was almost inevitable. It was a unanimous election.

It was on St. Andrew's day, 30 November 1892, that the Right Reverend Nathaniel Dawes was enthroned in what now became St. Paul's Cathedral, Rockhampton. Bishop Webber, acting under mandate from the primate, Dr. W. Saumarez Smith, performed the ceremony.

The choice of Dawes was a good one. He had already proved himself as a hard-working and devoted priest and bishop, and was, as well, an able administrator, well trained in the practical school of Bishop Webber. He was a deeply spiritual man, and while he recognised the need of sound administrative and financial methods, and of a broad social policy for the church, he believed that the cultivation of genuine personal religion was at the heart of the work of the church:

We are not here to overlay the surface of society with a thin veneer of morality; to create a 'stream of tendency, not ourselves which makes for righteousness'; to daub with untempered mortar the walls of God's temple and call it religion. It is not our mission to register such religious opinions as may for the time being be approved by people generally, and by an ingenious sinuosity of teaching adapt and trim God's truth to popular sentiment, and thus submit a revised edition of Christ's gospel to the fastidious requirements of the nineteenth century....Our circle of good must have a centre, and that centre ourselves. We must prepare by personal religion and holiness for whatever we hope to effect for our age and generation.<sup>706</sup>

Genuineness and sincerity were the marks of Dawes' character. He was not one of the more colourful personalities in the church. Not for him was the fuss of sensationalism or excitement, but all that he did was orderly and well-grounded and enduring.

Dawes was, in fact, essentially a conservative. He had a strong sense of tradition, both in doctrine and church polity, and this made the outlook of the catholic revival attractive to him: not that he was in any sense a ritualist, and by nature he was very tolerant of other religious opinions, but he did appreciate the sense of continuity of the Catholic Church in its English embodiment that was emphasised by the Oxford movement.<sup>707</sup> It was typical of Dawes that in setting out four principles of policy to the first synod of the new diocese, he placed the principle of conservatism first, though it must be admitted that his other three principles – that the church must be constructive, adaptive and aggressive – distinctly qualified the first.<sup>708</sup>

The result was that with one very significant exception, there was little that was novel about the Diocese of Rockhampton under its first bishop.

In the main, there was simply a continuation under separate administration of the policies and methods that were already well marked out in the parent diocese. For this reason the early years of Rockhampton diocese can be considered fairly briefly. The one new feature of these years – the first Australian bush brotherhood – was so significant for the Australian church that it will be more fully discussed in a later chapter.<sup>709</sup>

Apart from the establishment of the bush brotherhood, the chief significance of the episcopate of Nathaniel Dawes was the influence and example of his personal life. There is no record of a word having been spoken against him. He was not the striking sort of public figure who arouses either intense affections or intense antagonism; but he became known and loved by his people throughout the whole of central Queensland. He was essentially a pastor, and even in his later years, when painful illness gripped him, and his thin legs seemed hardly able to support the weight of his bulky frame, he courageously pursued his long trips to every part of his diocese. The simple tributes paid to him by clergy and laity alike on his resignation bore the mark of genuine respect and affection.<sup>710</sup>

The same problems of manpower and finance as beset every Australian diocese in its pioneering days were the crux of the Rockhampton story. We have spoken of the unsettled spiritual background of the new diocese: yet in point of view of

<sup>704</sup> Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 1 December 1892.

<sup>705</sup> See, for example, resolution of Springsure church committee at the 1892 Annual Meeting in Minutes of the committee.

<sup>706</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1898, Bishop's address, p.196.

<sup>707</sup> According to Walsh, W., Secret History of the Oxford Movement, p. 53 Dawes was a member of the Anglo-Catholic Society of the Holy Cross in England from the time of his ordination. This book is a notoriously unreliable work of propaganda, but this detail may be accurate.

<sup>708</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1893, Bishop's address, p.28

<sup>709</sup> See below, Chap. 12, v.

<sup>710</sup> Rockhampton Church Gazette, August 1908.

population and social stability the diocese contrasted more than favourably with both Brisbane and North Queensland at the time when their first bishops arrived; and it might reasonably have been expected that Rockhampton, too, would make rapid strides in its ecclesiastical development.

Unfortunately, however, there occurred in the first decade of its life two economic disasters that completely crippled the prosperity of central Queensland. The diocese had no sooner been formed, with no funds whatever except the barest minimum endowment for the see to provide the bishop's own stipend, when the bank crash of 1893 occurred. Within a few months, eight of the eleven banks of the colony had closed.<sup>711</sup> Then, not long after that crisis was surmounted, central Queensland was gripped by years of disastrous drought which decimated flocks and brought gloom over the whole region. "Never since the white man planted foot in Queensland", the anxious bishop told his synod in 1903, "has there been greater or more widespread disaster than that occasioned by this seven years' drought."<sup>712</sup>

The effect of these successive disasters on the newborn diocese was crippling, and it is hardly surprising if the "sameness of thin, unremarkable gum trees and scrub, and the dry, brown burnt-up and dusty soil" seemed to newly arrived priests from England to symbolise Australian conditions.<sup>713</sup> From all around the diocese came reports of hardship and privation which naturally affected the church as everything else. From Springsure the Reverend John Hunt wrote that almost all the stock were dead; from Clermont reports were in similar vein; at Gladstone the hope was expressed that a new rector might be obtained for as little as £150 a year; while in the far west the ministrations of the church could only be maintained by the sacrificial work of the members of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, working at a nominal salary.<sup>714</sup> A good index of the economic state of the diocese was the abject failure of the Century Fund inaugurated in 1900 as a three-year drive to raise £3,500 to complete the see endowment and provide a diocesan registry. By the end of the period less than £400 had been received.<sup>715</sup> The bishop himself failed to receive the full stipend that had been promised him; and even after the partial recovery that followed the drought the diocese could only promise him a pension of £115 a year for his retirement after his fifteen exhausting years of service in the diocese.<sup>716</sup>

In the face of these problems Dawes' task was an unenviable one, but his training in the Webber school stood him in good stead. Within his diocese, sufficient money was obviously unobtainable. This was due not only to the drought, but also to the fact that hardly any wealthy churchmen resided within the diocese: "Those who derive wealth from our soil do not live upon it. They reside for the most part in England".<sup>717</sup> The relative failure, as in Brisbane, of the Church Society, removed the hope of a steady income from that source,<sup>718</sup> while the extent of the first synod assessments scarcely showed promise – a total of £13, of which half came from the cathedral parish!<sup>719</sup>

In this situation Dawes took the only possible course, and joined the other colonial bishops on their sortie for English funds at the time of the Lambeth Conference of 1897. This must have been one of the most successful visits made by any Australian bishop to England: for from it resulted not only the formation of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew to supply clergy for the far west, but also the direct collection of £6,000,<sup>720</sup> and the establishment of a Rockhampton Auxiliary which was to continue the work of the collecting funds for the diocese. With Miss Halford as its secretary, this auxiliary was to provide a steady source of income, which, with the funds now coming through the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K., alone kept the diocese from bankruptcy. The fact that on the tenth anniversary of the diocese, it could be reported that some £50,000 had been raised for the work of the church, including £20,000 from outside sources, indicated the remarkable achievement of Bishop Dawes.<sup>721</sup>

The maintenance and increase of the supply of clergy presented an even greater problem than that of finance. Not only was there difficulty in paying a living wage to the clergy; but the very nature of the diocese, consisting as it did of scattered country parishes, with the single exception of Rockhampton itself, created difficulties. There was no variety of work for the clergy in such a diocese. The priest who had grown exhausted after a hard period of service in the bush could not easily be moved to the more settled and rewarding work of a city parish within the diocese. The country districts could be extremely trying, and there were some magnificent instances of devotion to duty by a number of the clergy. Perhaps the most notable

<sup>711</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1893, p.32.

<sup>712</sup> *Ibid.*, 1903, p.7, Bishop's address.

<sup>713</sup> G.D. Halford in *Australian Bush Leaves*, December 1897.

<sup>714</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1903, p. 7, Bishop's address; also *Monutes*, Gladstone Church committee, 16 February 1897.

<sup>715</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1900, p. 308; and 1903 p.18.

<sup>716</sup> *Ibid.*, 1908, p. 18.

<sup>717</sup> *Australian Bush Leaves*, June 1897.

<sup>718</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1899 p. 246; and 1902 p.22.

<sup>719</sup> *Ibid.*, 1893, p.11.

<sup>720</sup> *Ibid.*, 1897, p.173.

<sup>721</sup> *Church Chronicle*, January 1903.

was G.M.L. Lester who, after a period in the west in the eighties, returned to become Archdeacon of the West in 1894. There, alone, he covered great tracts of land until the advent of the bush brotherhood to relieve him. G.D. Halford spoke of him, when he arrived, as

the wonderful Lester, who has been missioner, and rector, and archdeacon of the whole diocese, and Bishop too, during the last two years.<sup>722</sup>

Lester's bed in Longreach was the floor of the vestry," amid hundreds of huge cockroaches". Yet these awful conditions were only worse in degree than those of other parishes. The priest at Clermont ministered to 6,000 people scattered over 30,000 square miles,<sup>723</sup> and averaged 30 miles a day on horseback. John Hunt, at Springsure, had a similar area, with 4,000 people, embracing 10 townships, 41 stations, and 15 state and provisional schools. To cover this territory, he used trains, horseback and bicycle!<sup>724</sup>

Under these circumstances it is not surprising that during Dawes' episcopate of fifteen years, of some 44 clergymen who had worked in the diocese only 11 remained in 1907.<sup>725</sup> What is perhaps more surprising is that some of them stayed so long under such conditions – men like John Hunt and A.H. Julius, who each spent more than fifteen years working in these conditions in bush parishes.<sup>726</sup> There was in these men a spirit of self-sacrifice of quite heroic proportions.

Growth in man power and buildings was not spectacular, but it was steady. There were 7 clergy besides the bishop at the foundation of the diocese.<sup>727</sup> This number rose gradually until it reached its peak of 13 in 1905, of whom it is interesting to note that 7 were graduates of an English university. It was still a pitifully inadequate figure, but it was all that could be afforded in the light of diocesan finance anyway. The number of churches in the diocese increased from 9 to 27 from 1892 to 1907<sup>728</sup>. They were all, except St. Paul's Cathedral, small wooden buildings, but they did serve as a symbol of the extension of the work of the Kingdom of God throughout central Queensland.

Of the constitutional and administrative aspects of the new diocese, little need be said, for in most respects the precedents of the mother diocese were closely followed. Dawes was himself doubtful of the value of a synod at first in view of the undeveloped state of the diocese; but he believed that as the Rockhampton parishes were already accustomed to synodical government through their former affiliation with Brisbane, it would be a retrogressive step to abandon it. Besides, the need of a corporate body to hold property made it desirable.<sup>729</sup> The existing canons of the mother diocese were accepted in toto, and subsequent Brisbane legislation such as the Bishop's Prerogative Canon was imitated later. The constitution of the diocese was itself a close replica of Brisbane's, but with one significant omission: there was no specific reference to the decisions of the Privy Council as a basis of settlement of disputes. This was doubtless a reaction to some of the unsatisfactory ecclesiastical decisions of the English courts in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, since the Brisbane constitution had been formulated.<sup>730</sup>

In 1908, with the illness that was to bring about his death already racking his weary body, Bishop Dawes forwarded his resignation from England. As "a real father in God"<sup>731</sup> he had steered the diocese through as troubled a beginning as any Australian diocese has had. Yet in the very magnitude of the problems besetting the church in central Queensland were the conditions for a new creative step that was to be of great significance for the Australian church – the actualisation of the long-contemplated idea of a bush brotherhood. It was this above all that distinguishes the episcopate of Bishop Dawes,

<sup>722</sup> Australian Bush Leaves, December 1897. The reference to his being bishop refers to the administrative responsibilities that fell to him in the bishop's long absence in England in 1896-7.

<sup>723</sup> Ibid., March 1898.

<sup>724</sup> Ibid., June 1899. At this time Hunt had another priest and a lay reader working with him.

<sup>725</sup> Church Gazette, November 1907.

<sup>726</sup> From Springsure Hunt moved on to the even more arduous work of the early years of the New Guinea Mission.

<sup>727</sup> These original clergymen were:-

A. Richards	-	Rockhampton
R.A. Morgan	-	Mt. Morgan
C.L. Wallace	-	Clermont
J. Hunt	-	Springsure
R.T. Gardner	-	Blackall
A.H. Julius	-	Gladstone
F.D. Pritt	-	North Rockhampton

See Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 1 December 1892.

<sup>728</sup> Church Gazette, November 1907.

<sup>729</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1893, Bishop's address, p. 31.

<sup>730</sup> Clarke, H.L., Constitutional Church Government, p. 141.

<sup>731</sup> Speech by Canon Kenny at synod, reported in Church Gazette, August 1908.

and it was fitting that the date of his passing from this life, 14 September, 1910, was the anniversary of that new movement that was his greatest achievement.

## ii. The Diocese of North Queensland.

In the north, as in the south, division was in the air in the nineties, with similar factors working towards division and similar difficulties in achieving success. In the north, however, the different nature of the economy, which had been based so largely on mining in the eighties, made for some variation in the total picture.

We have seen that by the time Bishop Stanton agreed to accept translation to Newcastle in 1890, he had built up a sound foundation for church life in North Queensland: both spiritually and materially there seemed nothing to prevent a steady development along the lines which he had initiated. In such a small and isolated diocese, however, much depended on the personality and ability of the new bishop, and keen interest attended the synod which met under Stanton's presidency early in 1891 to choose his successor. No detailed provisions for an episcopal election had as yet been laid down by the synod, but it was agreed that the right to elect should rest with the whole synod.

Only two candidates were considered, both of them priests of the diocese, and from the beginning it was clear that the choice would fall upon Canon Christopher George Barlow, Vicar of St. James' Townsville. The only other nominee, the colourful W.F. Tucker, withdrew his name in order that the election might be unanimous.<sup>732</sup>

The election of Barlow was greeted with enthusiasm by the clergy and laity alike within the diocese, but the news was received with very mixed feelings in other parts of Australia. Barlow was a man of powerful personality: he charmed and attracted almost all who came into contact with him, and from his first curacy he had been intensely popular with the laity in his parishes.<sup>733</sup> But he lacked that formal education usually regarded as essential for the properly qualified clergyman, and his youthfulness – for he was only in his early thirties – suggested that even in the school of experience his training was not yet complete. Many of the bishops on the Australian bench were consequently quite shocked at the election, and there was even talk of a veto, as the election had to be confirmed by all the bishops of Australia. The threat did not materialise, but it became a matter of discussion, even in the public press.<sup>734</sup> To Barlow, always a man of strong emotions, this talk was extremely upsetting. He wrote to the primate:

Had I anticipated such an unhappy course as the suggested veto, I would on no account have accepted the office in the first instance. But I could not well withdraw in the face of the strong feeling here, or I would thankfully have done so.<sup>735</sup>

The bishops' opposition to the election was widely criticised in Australia, as stemming from ecclesiastical conservatism, and implying an anti-Australian attitude, inasmuch as Barlow was the first clergyman ordained in Australia to be raised to the episcopate.<sup>736</sup> There was a slight element in truth in this criticism, and there appears to have been some residual feeling of inferiority about colonial ordinations. The primate and the Bishop of Goulburn, for example urged Barlow to go to England for his consecration, because, as Barlow wrote, 'it would strengthen my position in view of my being a 'colonial advanced' clergyman'.<sup>737</sup> It was only the insistence of the diocesan council of North Queensland that led to his consecration in Australia.<sup>738</sup> At the same time, however, it must be recognised that there were very real and reasonable doubts on the part of some of the bishops. Particularly they were afraid that the appointment of such a relatively uneducated bishop might be a precedent that would lead to the lowering of educational standards in the ministry of the Australian church, and they suspected that the election was based on local emotional considerations.

Barlow had in fact been educated for a commercial, rather than an ecclesiastical, career, and had received very little training in theology. Bishop Stanton had been impressed by his character and ability, and on his visit to England in 1881, he arranged for the young Barlow to come to North Queensland where he was ordained the same year. Of Irish birth and Welsh education, Barlow was a highly-strung, emotional and gifted man, with all the strengths and weaknesses that go with

<sup>732</sup> Northern Churchman, November 1904.

<sup>733</sup> E.g. a letter from a parishioner of Mackay to Bishop Stanton, dated 11 February 1882, shortly after Barlow had arrived as curate: "Barlow is making great headway among the people and will be a favourite of all – his sermons are really splendid".

<sup>734</sup> Bishop Webber even made an oblique reference to the matter in his synod address, Brisbane Year Book, 1891, p.48

<sup>735</sup> Barlow to Bishop W. Saumarez Smith, 30 April 1891, Bishop Barlow's Letter Book.

<sup>736</sup> See, for example, Sowden, W.J., "Australia, A Native's Standpoint", in Clark, C.M.H., Select Documents in Australian History, 1851-1900, p. 796.

<sup>737</sup> Barlow to another bishop (apparently Stanton), 30 April 1891, in Barlow's Letter Book.

<sup>738</sup> Barlow to Bishop W.S. Smith, 28 May 1891, in Letter Book. Little interest seems to have been taken in the consecration, which took place in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, 25 July 1891. Only the minimum three bishops were present and only 150 people, most of whom left before the completion of the service. The Banner and Anglo-Catholic Review, August 1891.



such a personality. He was vigorous and energetic, as he demonstrated in his parish at Charters Towers, in his labours in building St. James' Cathedral, and in his work for the separation of the Diocese of Carpentaria. He made a deep and immediate impression on people with whom he came into contact: for the most part they immediately liked him, though he was apt to clash with others who were themselves intense and emotional. For this reason his first curacy under the saintly but excitable Albert Maclaren was a time of tension for both of them. He was a man for whom people formed a deep affection, as the very popularity of his election to the bishopric indicated, and as his remarkably successful ministry at Charters Towers demonstrated:<sup>739</sup> even the hard-bitten miners flocked in great numbers to hear him preach. His own affections for others were similarly deep: to Bishop Stanton, whose protégé he was, he was specially close, and his own reason for not wanting to go to England for consecration was that "I must part with the personal pleasure I have been anticipating of receiving Consecration at your dear hands".<sup>740</sup> Running through his personality was an intense brand of spirituality, which found expression in his eloquent sermons. There were few to surpass him as an orator; and it was his extempore preaching above all that won him his reputation.

Yet these qualities had their corresponding defects. Though there is no evidence that he deliberately encouraged a personal following, it does seem that much of Barlow's success was built on the basis of his own personality. When that was removed, there remained comparatively little result. Apart from the creation of the new Diocese of Carpentaria, it is doubtful if he left much permanent mark on the Diocese of North Queensland in the kind of way that Bishop Webber was doing in Brisbane, or Bishop Dawes in Rockhampton. His policy lacked that carefully reasoned wisdom that alone can achieve lasting results, and his great achievement of creating, almost on his own, the diocese to the north, proved to be of somewhat doubtful wisdom. He was in some respects the very opposite of Bishop Webber – as stubbornly determined as his contemporary, but on a different basis. Webber's aggressive determination was carefully calculated; Barlow's was essentially emotional. They had little personal contact, but when they did, there was an undercurrent of clash of personalities.<sup>741</sup>

Christopher Barlow, in short, was a man of powerful gifts and marked weaknesses. His was a personality whose balance was delicately poised, and this was the secret of his power. It was tragic that at the very end of his life this balance was disturbed and his early death at Cooma in 1915, thirteen years after he had left North Queensland, was hastened by a nervous breakdown.<sup>742</sup>

Barlow's ten year episcopate saw the emergence of a critical state in the economic stability of the diocese, which did not become fully apparent until the arrival of the next bishop. It would be quite unfair to place the blame for this primarily on Barlow's administration, for the north shared with the southern parts of the colony those economic difficulties that threatened ruin to every aspect of organised life in Queensland. The financial crisis and the drought did not bring such an immediate threat to North Queensland as to the newly organised Diocese of Rockhampton: the northern diocese had bigger endowments, and was already in a relatively stable condition by the beginning of the nineties; nor was it so completely dependent on the pastoral industry as was Rockhampton. But as the years passed, the economic position deteriorated. The prices of metals fell on the world market, and the mining industry was noticeably affected;<sup>743</sup> there was a bad cyclone in 1896 that damaged church buildings and caused distress to the whole community;<sup>744</sup> and the long drought at the turn of the century capped the rest. It presented the church with a trying situation:

Perhaps it would be difficult to find in Australia's history any similar chapter into which so many disasters and misfortunes could be cast. Where a financial crisis that would have paralysed any less resourceful country than our own – where plagues of almost Egyptian severity threatened to sweep our pastoral and agricultural industries out of existence, where cyclones, drought and floods, succeeded each other in cruel procession – surely all these things have been against us; for the Church of the people must always share the sorrows of the people.<sup>745</sup>

<sup>739</sup> Mackenzie, A.P., "Christopher George Barlow, Bishop, A Reminiscence and Sketch by his First Warden", an article in Southern Churchman, 15 October 1915. Cf. also the judgment of Archdeacon W.F. Wentworth-Shields, Southern Churchman, 15 September 1915: "In every parish, large or small, he had been personally known and personally beloved. Hosts of small generous acts made him hosts of friends. He was everyone's confidant".

<sup>740</sup> Barlow to Stanton, 30 April 1891. The name of the addressee is not now legible on this letter in Barlow's Letter Book, but the contents make it virtually certain that it was to Stanton.

<sup>741</sup> This clash is reflected in a letter, Barlow to Webber, 1 September 1898, in Barlow's Letter Book. Speaking of the proposed new diocese, Barlow wrote: "How much are you and your Diocese going to do? Why not hold with your left hand the Cathedral Scheme and put your right to the creation of this new Diocese, for which the Church in Queensland is in much urgent need. You could do miracles in this direction if only you would". Webber's reply is not extant, but it needs little imagination to guess his reaction to the implied aggressiveness of this letter!

<sup>742</sup> White, G., Thirty Years in Tropical Australia, p. 220.

<sup>743</sup> E.g. the depression noted in Herberton, Minutes, N.Q. Diocesan Council, 4 August 1893.

<sup>744</sup> Ibid., 6 May 1896.

<sup>745</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1898-9, Bishop's address, p.44.

The resulting financial difficulties were grave. Already by 1894 the diocesan council reported that it had no funds for working expenses, and reckless expenditure by certain parishes, in the expectation that debts would somehow be met by the diocese, caused concern.<sup>746</sup> What made matters particularly difficult was that all of the capital of the see endowment was invested in local property: and this fund, which had increased in value and income so strikingly in the eighties, now declined in precisely the same fashion as property values crashed. In 1901, the bishopric endowment capital, which had been set down as £15,000 a decade earlier, was officially reckoned at less than £12,000, and its real value was undoubtedly less than this. Its income in 1901 was only £450, and it was to decline still more in subsequent years.<sup>747</sup> On this fund depended both the bishop's salary and the cost of maintaining Bishop's Lodge.

Bishop Barlow took sound measures to meet the financial difficulties arising from these extraordinary conditions. The synod of 1894 agreed to the establishment of a Society of the Treasury, a sort of northern version of the church societies which had been typical features of many Australian dioceses in the nineteenth century; but it appears to have had little more success than its counterparts in Brisbane and Rockhampton. The failure of this voluntary method led to the adoption of the assessment plan in 1900. In Stanton's time, in 1889, an assessment of 1% of the value of the stipends of the clergy had been imposed for the central funds of the diocese, as well as a small assessment for the expenses of synod itself.<sup>748</sup> This does not, however, appear to have been systematically enforced, and in 1900 a new assessment of 3% of the value of stipends was imposed.<sup>749</sup> By this time, however, most of the parishes were in such a sorry financial condition that it was difficult for them to pay even this meagre assessment.

The result was that the diocese had to fall back on the usual source of help in such emergencies – the English church societies. In the nineties the Colonial and Continental Church Society came to the rescue with an annual grant of £250;<sup>750</sup> the S.P.G., which had ceased its grants in 1889, again came forward in 1892, and again in 1900, with promises of further aid for several years;<sup>751</sup> and the Bishop raised £1,700 for a special emergency fund during his visit to England for the Lambeth Conference of 1897. Yet despite these efforts, Barlow does not appear to have been fully aware of the gravity of the financial condition of the diocese, and the action of the diocesan council in increasing the already existing diocesan debt by proceeding with the erection of Bishop's Lodge in 1900 at a cost of more than £2,000 when the financial crisis was reaching its peak only worsened the situation. But above all the concentration of energy and financial resources at such a time on the creation of a new diocese whose own economic position would be more than questionable was a matter of very doubtful wisdom. Yet it must be remembered that the project was not Barlow's responsibility alone, and no one, either in his diocese or among the other Australian bishops, seems seriously to have questioned the desirability of the new diocese at the time. It is easy to be wise after the event.

It would be a mistake to judge the health of the diocese merely from its financial position. There were, on the contrary, many evidences of healthy life, which suggested a steady growth in other directions. In 1898, for example, the same year in which Barlow spoke to synod about the extent of the economic disasters, he also reported a healthy growth in various other ways. Parishes had increased in number; the cathedral had been partially completed and consecrated; the number of clergy – now thirty – had almost doubled during his episcopate; and the division of the diocese into two archdeaconries under Gilbert White and Francis Pritt, had made administration more efficient.<sup>752</sup> White had been archdeacon since 1892, and was also responsible for examining candidates for ordination, of which more will be said later. Pritt, who had come to the diocese from Rockhampton in 1894 to undertake work among the kanakas on the Herbert River, was becoming known for his self-denying work among both coloured people and Europeans.<sup>753</sup>

In 1902 Bishop Barlow left the diocese, following his election to the bishopric of Goulburn. It was clear when he went that there were certain problems to be faced: but neither the incoming bishop, nor the churchmen of North Queensland, realised how critical the position was. The power of Barlow's personality and his ready optimism had made the financial position seem less serious than it was. The withdrawal of his personality, and the departure with the personable bishop of a number of his clergy, followed rapidly by cyclonic disaster on a scale hitherto unknown, were to render it necessary for the new bishop to undertake a task of almost complete reconstruction.

<sup>746</sup> *Ibid.*, 1895, Diocesan Council Report, p. 19

<sup>747</sup> *Ibid.*, 1901-2, p.7.

<sup>748</sup> *Northern Churchman*, September 1904.

<sup>749</sup> *N.Q. Year Book*, 1900-01, p.66.

<sup>750</sup> *Ibid.*, 1898-0, p.64.

<sup>751</sup> *Ibid.*, 1900-01, p. 58. Also Pascoe C.F., *Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G., 1701-1901*, P.414

<sup>752</sup> For further details of parochial progress, see Rowland, E.C. *The Tropics for Christ*, pp 33-36.

<sup>753</sup> Pritt was, with Frodsham, nominated to succeed Barlow as bishop; but he withdrew his name for the election. See *Special Synod Proceedings*, June 1902.

### iii. The Diocese of Carpentaria.

If the Diocese of Rockhampton had turned out to be a somewhat hazardous venture, the Diocese of Carpentaria was more so. It had an even more inadequate history of church life; it had no single town of even moderately large proportions; its economy was unstable in the extreme; it was unwieldy in shape, and in parts almost totally inaccessible to communications, and it consisted of a conglomeration of races – Europeans, aboriginal Chinese, Japanese, Melanesian and Torres Strait islander – each with their separate customs, languages and traditions. In its work among the Europeans the diocese lacked the resources to be self-supporting, while in its missionary work among the other races it lacked the united support of the rest of the Australian church, which alone could have made success possible. Its foundation came at a time of economic and commercial depression, and its European population was markedly declining. Humanly speaking, in fact, the prospects of the new diocese appeared desperate; or, to put it another way, its foundation was a remarkable venture of faith.<sup>754</sup>

The new diocese, established by the Diocese of Carpentaria Canon, passed by the synod of North Queensland in 1900,<sup>755</sup> consisted of the Cape York Peninsula north of Cairns, the Gulf Country, the islands of the Torres Strait (where most of the people came under the sphere of the Congregationalist London Missionary Society), and the whole of the Northern Territory.<sup>756</sup>

Cooktown and Port Douglas since the late seventies, and Normanton and Corydon since the eighties, had had resident clergy, though with frequent changes and generally long gaps between incumbencies.<sup>757</sup> Thursday Island, which had become the administrative centre since the annexation of the Torres Strait Islands by Queensland in 1877, had the most settled record of church life after Cooktown. Here the unfinished Quetta Memorial Church, erected as a memorial to those who lost their lives in the shipwreck of the S.S. Quetta in 1890, at least served as a presentable church, and the Reverend W. Maitland Woods, who had become incumbent in 1890, built up a regular parish life.<sup>758</sup> On helpful factor was the presence on Thursday Island as Government Resident of the Honourable John Douglas, the former Premier of Queensland and one-time active layman in Brisbane, who as a churchwarden gave a strong lead in church life.<sup>759</sup> Yet even so, the level of spiritual life was not high. Even by 1896 the average number of weekly communicants was only eight, though attendance at other services was better.<sup>760</sup>

By 1895 plans for the new diocese were already being formulated, and the primate (Dr. W. Saumarez Smith) and the Bishop of Newcastle (Dr. Stanton) visited Thursday Island that year to reconnoitre.<sup>761</sup>

The fact that the former Bishop of North Queensland accompanied the primate suggests that he was collaborating with Bishop Barlow in the movement for division. Indeed, perhaps this helps explain why the plan went ahead despite such unfavourable conditions, for Stanton's recollections were of rapid expansion of population and economy in the Gulf Country, and on the basis of those memories he encouraged the formation of the new diocese. By the time the setbacks and decline of population of the later nineties came, the programme for separation was so far advanced that it was virtually too late to turn back; in any case, the advocates of the new bishopric had so convinced themselves as to its necessity that they would regard the fall of population as only a temporary phenomenon.

It was essentially Bishop Barlow, however, and he alone, who carried the scheme through, and whatever may be said of his wisdom there can be no question of his zeal. He set off early for the Lambeth Conference of 1897, in order to beat the other colonial bishops to the English loot – and to good effect, because he collected on that visit more than £10,000 for the endowment of the new diocese.<sup>762</sup> Thus in one swoop he ensured the establishment of the see. Barlow's purpose was

<sup>754</sup> So the first issue of the Carpentarian put it, January 1901.

<sup>755</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1900-01.

<sup>756</sup> The boundary of the new diocese was stated by the Canon as follows: A line running from the border of the Northern Territory at 19 degrees 30 minutes S. to 144 degrees E., and then by a line running due north to 16 degrees 40 minutes south and then by a line running due east to the coast, intersecting Port Douglas and Cairns.

In 1913 the Diocese of Carpentaria sought to have Cairns included in its boundaries, but this was not agreed to by North Queensland. See Carpentarian, October 1913.

<sup>757</sup> Carpentarian, October 1907.

<sup>758</sup> Further details are contained in Thursday Island Parish Gazette and pamphlet, Quetta Memorial Church.

<sup>759</sup> One of the few encouraging things about the diocese was the succession of Government Residents at Thursday Island in the early years who were keen churchmen. Douglas was followed by Hugh Milman (himself a member of a well-known clerical family) and then came W. Lee Bryce.

<sup>760</sup> Thursday Island Service Register.

<sup>761</sup> Minutes, N.Q. diocesan Council, 4 June 1895.

<sup>762</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1890-01, Diocesan Council Report, p.89. The English societies, as usual, provided a large part of this sum, the S.P.G. alone contributing £1,500. See Thompson, H.P., op.cit., p. 415. The bishop of Adelaide, because of his

twofold. On the one hand, he argued that the increase in the number of settlements and of population since the formation of the Diocese of North Queensland warranted division of the diocese, so that the bishop might exercise real oversight over all his people.<sup>763</sup> On the other hand, he pointed out that missionary work, particularly among the aborigines and Japanese, could be more effectively carried out if the diocese were more compact. Both ideals were admirable, but unfortunately the new diocese was provided with insufficient resources to fulfil either.

It was Bishop Barlow who virtually chose the first bishop of the new diocese. Writing to the primate, Barlow put forward the name of Archdeacon Gilbert White, whom he had already suggested to several of the other bishops:

I don't think it is my place personally to nominate him – I am not aware that I can do more than suggest to the Primate. I think all that need be done is that you propose him to the Bishops. It will be enough in my opinion for you to submit him (being yourself satisfied) to the Bishops. You may remember that Bishop Barker of his own (word indecipherable) chose my dear Predecessor, and this seems to be a similar case.<sup>764</sup>

Under the circumstances of the new diocese no better choice could have been made. White was consecrated in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on 24 August, 1900, and enthroned by Archdeacon Pritt in the Quetta Memorial Church on 18 November. So the last of the dioceses of Queensland came into existence.

If it is true, as we have argued, that the early history of the dioceses in Queensland was strongly influenced by the character, ability and capacity for leadership of their founding bishops, this was both more and less true of Carpentaria. It was more true inasmuch as the clergy were so few that the bishop's personality counted for a great deal – if he failed there was no host of able subordinates to make up for his defects. Indeed, for a brief time in 1901, the bishop virtually was the diocese, for there was only one other priest with him, and he was fulfilling not only the work of bishop of the diocese, but also that of vicar of Thursday Island, head of the theological college and director of mission work.<sup>765</sup> Yet at the same time, distances and poor communications placed the clergy very much on their own resources, and the bishop's direct influence could not be so continual as in the more closely settled dioceses. As a diocesan publication pointed out in 1903, the nearest parishes to the bishop's residence at Thursday Island were 400, 450 and 800 miles away respectively!<sup>766</sup> The same problem is strikingly illustrated by the fact that when Bishop White undertook his great horseback tour to the southern limits of the Northern Territory in 1901, the easiest way to return to headquarters at Thursday Island was via Adelaide and Melbourne!<sup>767</sup> Clearly the sort of bishop required for such conditions would be quite different from the traditional English conception of an episcopal dignitary.

Gilbert White would not have been a successful bishop of a large urban diocese: indeed, he had not been a particularly successful parish priest.<sup>768</sup> He had just the qualities required, however, for a diocese like Carpentaria. He knew the climate, and it suited him – indeed he had originally come from England to a warmer climate because of lung trouble. He understood the conditions of the bush, and was not prone to the disillusionment that a man fresh from England might experience. He knew the monotony and loneliness of the bush, and he understood the trials which his isolated clergy had to endure:

I know, as no one else can know, the isolation and loneliness of your lot; two years, some of you, without the sight of a brother priest; long months alone in the burden and heat of the long tropical days uncheered by the sight of any friend to whom you can, consistently with your duty, open your whole heart. I know the terrible strain on faith and hope of ministering to scanty congregations, standing at apparently forgotten and neglected altars, watching the crowds that, even on God's day, hasten past the house of God to some sport or amusement, wondering how man can be so deaf to the message of Christ, so blind to the beauty of His holiness. I know these things; I have felt and feel them with you.<sup>769</sup>

---

concern about the Northern Territory, gave support to Barlow and signed with him the printed appeal that was circulated in England.

<sup>763</sup> N.Q., Year Book, 1898-9, Bishop's Address, p. 49. Barlow put the increase in settlements from 8 to 53, and of European population from 19,000 to 130,000. However the first figure for settled places appears much too small, and the second population figure too large.

<sup>764</sup> Barlow to Abp. W.S. Smith, 16 March 1900, in Barlow's Letter Book.

<sup>765</sup> Carpentarian, April 1901.

<sup>766</sup> Pamphlet, The Diocese of Carpentaria, 1903.

<sup>767</sup> Carpentarian, April 1901.

<sup>768</sup> In Bishop Barlow's Letter Book, there is a rough draft of a letter to Bishop Webber in which the suitability of "A" – obviously White – for the bishopric is discussed. This is one of the points made in this draft.

<sup>769</sup> Bishop White's address to Diocesan Conference, 1904, reported in Carpentarian, October 1904. The same thoughts find poignant expression in a poem, "The Lonely Priest", written in 1915, in The Poems of Gilbert White.

Here was his great strength: he shared to the full the hardships of his clergy, he asked nothing of them that he was not prepared to do himself, and what he lacked in brilliance he more than made up in earnest spirituality, dependability and pastoral zeal.<sup>770</sup>

There was no glamour about Gilbert White, either in appearance or personality. Dr. Wand vividly pictures him: “tall, gangly, with spindly legs and straggling beard, he looked like a Victorian caricature of a parson”.<sup>771</sup>

Yet beneath his heavy sermons and hesitating conversation lay “his usual wealth of knowledge, his innate kindness, his shrewd wit, and his ultimate humour”,<sup>772</sup>

Nor was there any glamour about the trappings of his episcopal office. His princely stipend was £300, which included travelling expenses<sup>773</sup>; his bishop’s ‘palace’ was the old Thursday Island rectory which he shared with his sister, the Vicar of Thursday Island, and the students of the theological college; his carriage was a saddle, and his outdoor episcopal attire was frequently the rough dress of a bushman. His was a deeply disciplined life, and amid all the distractions of his widespread diocese, he never lost his priestly vision. Wand sums up his character well:

Without a touch of genius, he is revealed as typical of those second-class men by whom the greater part of the world’s most worth-while work is done, men whose devotion to duty and steady use of all their talents enables them to surpass in actual accomplishment their more brilliant but more erratic colleagues.<sup>774</sup>

When the diocese was founded in 1900 the total population included some 16,500 white people, 7,400 Chinese, Japanese and Melanesians, and about 35,000 aborigines, scattered over the northern-most part of Queensland and the whole of the Northern Territory.<sup>775</sup> To minister to this scattered flock there were, besides the bishop, four priests, three of whom were committed to leave for appointments in other places, leaving for a time only the Reverend H.W. Curtis, of Croydon. Apart from the see endowment, which was bringing in income at a much lower rate of interest than had been the case with the endowments of the other Queensland dioceses in earlier years, there was little money except for the bursaries for students at Bishop’s College, provided by Lord Beauchamp. At the end of the first full financial year, it was reported that the total income of all the parishes in the diocese – to meet parochial as well as diocesan expenses – was only £2,131.<sup>776</sup> In short, the situation gave little encouragement.

Yet Gilbert White set about husbanding and increasing the meagre resources of the diocese little by little. By means of his own long and exhausting tours, the bishop tried in some measure to fill in the gaps caused by lack of clergy. On his famous tour of 1901, for example, he covered territory never previously visited by a clergyman, and some of those to whom he ministered had had no opportunity of attending church for many years past.<sup>777</sup> Vacant parishes were gradually filled with resident clergy, which embraced all the European settlements in the diocese. There was at the same time a small beginning of missionary work among aborigines, Melanesians, and Japanese, so that the bishop could report by 1910 some 7 white and 5 native missionaries on three stations.<sup>778</sup> Some early ventures of the diocese were surprising, in view of the meagre resources available: it might hardly be expected, for example, to find a regular diocesan paper being published from the start, and even more surprising was the foundation of Bishop’s College to train theological students in 1901, and a small girls’ school the same year, and a diocesan high school in 1906.<sup>779</sup> These ventures were, however, short lived, and their failure reflects the wholly inadequate means available for such enterprises.

---

<sup>770</sup> This zeal had already been demonstrated by White’s fantastic feat of carrying out pastoral visitations in his huge parish of Hughenden by bicycle. The parish was 400 miles by 200. In Thirty Years in Tropical Australia, pp. 35-7, for example, White describes one bicycle journey of 285 miles to visit various stations. The same faithful devotion was shown in his ministry to the lepers on Friday Island, at a time when leprosy was still held in great fear.

<sup>771</sup> Wand, J.W.C., White of Carpentaria, p. 7.

<sup>772</sup> Ibid., White was a true pastor at heart, and in a short work, The Pastoral Ideals of a Bishop, he set out his own picture of the true bishop. There should be an annual visitation to each parish, lasting at least two days; he should personally know all his ordination candidates, and make contact with each confirmation candidate; times must be set aside for reading, study, and preparation of addresses; he must watch over finances, and take care in presiding over synod, and he must be prepared personally to pioneer new missionary ventures. White modestly disclaimed having attained to these ideals, yet his episcopate exemplified all that he had written.

<sup>773</sup> By the end of his episcopate it had risen to almost £400.

<sup>774</sup> Wand, J.W.C., op. cit., p.99.

<sup>775</sup> Abstract of Proceedings of the First Conference of the Diocese of Carpentaria, 1902, p.15.

<sup>776</sup> Carpentarian, July 1902.

<sup>777</sup> Ibid., July 1914.

<sup>778</sup> Ibid., October 1910. The growth of missions will be more fully discussed below, Chapter 13, (ii).

<sup>779</sup> Ibid., April 1901 and October 1906.

The fact was that while the number of clergy and parishes was slowly increasing, the internal economics of the diocese were growing more difficult throughout the first decade of its life. The bishop expressed the problems to the diocesan conference of 1910:

During the last two years the strain of financial depression in the North has been acute. You have seen the members of your congregations depart for more prosperous centres, and an almost impossible burden thrown on the few that remain....It is a sore grief to me that just at the time when the diocese is perhaps more fully manned than it has ever been with faithful and loyal clergy, a time of outward depression has made your labours so difficult and so trying<sup>780</sup>.

That year the income of the eight parishes was only £1,358 – much less than in the first year of the diocese. The white population was only two-thirds of what it had been in 1901, the number of Asiatics was less, and the aborigines were believed to be a dying race.<sup>781</sup>In such circumstances, it was not surprising that the coming and going of the clergy, which we have noticed in the outlying parts of the more settled dioceses, was even more marked in Carpentaria. In the first ten years, some 25 clergy worked in the diocese; at the end of that time only 5 remained. For married clergy, in particular, the position was almost impossible, with constant travelling and irregular payments of salary; but it is easy to understand the feelings of the laymen who complained to the bishop: “We have to spend all our life here; why will not the clergy stay a little longer with us?”<sup>782</sup>

As with the other Queensland dioceses there was some reliance upon English support in the early years: yet it is significant that after the initial endowment had been raised, a much greater proportion of the external support of the diocese came from Australia than was the case in any other diocese. There was a Carpentarian Association in England which sent a trickle of money to the diocese,<sup>783</sup> but an increasing proportion came from Australia itself, and most of the priests were men who had been working in southern dioceses. Indeed, White set out as his deliberate belief at the first diocesan conference that the time had come to expect men and money from Australia rather than England, and he was accustomed himself to make an annual trip to the south to plead the cause of the diocese. The response was not as ready as he hoped. He found “suspicion and resentment” in the south at this milking of their resources,<sup>784</sup> and the support obtained was never adequate. But it has to be remembered that many of the southern dioceses were themselves barely out of the missionary stage: and the very help that was sought there suggests a significant growth in the maturity of the Australian church inasmuch as it was at least beginning to look to its own missionary responsibilities. For missionary work among the aborigines and Asiatic peoples the Australian Board of Missions was now beginning to provide support. For the European work, White had to depend largely on his personal appeals for southern money and clergy, but the allocation of £2,500 to the Carpentarian See Endowment Fund from the offering made throughout the Anglican Communion on the occasion of the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 was a big help. A large part of this amount was Australian money, allocated by the Australian dioceses to this particular purpose.

Of the constitutional and legal incorporation of the diocese little need be said. It was clearly impossible in the early years to attempt a system of synodical government. Parishes were so few and distances so great that it was quite impracticable. Instead an informal conference was held biennially, but even then, the parishes had usually to be represented by proxy delegates, as it was rarely that the laymen could make the long journeys necessary to attend, and the clergy were not always able to be there themselves. At first, property was still held by the mother Diocese of North Queensland in trust, as there was no legal corporate entity.

In later years Carpentaria was to become chiefly significant as a centre of missionary work among the native peoples, and so the character of the diocese became different and more purposeful. But the part that it later played in the life of the church in Queensland was to be in spite of, rather than because of, the conditions in which it was brought to birth. It was

<sup>780</sup> *Ibid.*, October 1910.

<sup>781</sup> When Archbishop Donaldson visited Carpentaria in 1911 he found that population had declined in some of the chief centres as follows:-

	1911	1901
Cooktown	900	1500
Croydon	1462	3245
Normanton	750	1200
Palmerston (Darwin)	600 whites 1000 Chinese	800 whites 2000 Chinese

At this time only two parishes provided a stipend of £200 or more. *Ibid.*, October 1911

<sup>782</sup> *Ibid.*, October 1910

<sup>783</sup> In 1904 English money for the diocese was over £400, but in 1910 it was reported as only £100. *Ibid.*, April 1905 and October 1910.

<sup>784</sup> *Ibid.*, April 1904.

essentially the faith, perseverance and self-sacrifice of one man – Bishop Gilbert White – that enabled survival in those early years, and made possible the emergence of its later peculiar missionary significance.

#### iv. The Province of Queensland

As with most of the creative achievements in the organisation of the church in Queensland at this period, the unification of the five dioceses which now occupied north-eastern Australia was largely the achievement of Bishop Webber. It is true that he did not live to see the plan come to fruition, and it was left to his successor to become the first archbishop: but the formation of the province was all but settled before Donaldson arrived, and it should be considered here as the logical consequence to the formation of the new dioceses.

As early as 1887 Bishop Webber spoke to his synod about the possibility of provincial organisation,<sup>785</sup> and as we have seen, an ultimate object of diocesan division was the creation of sufficient dioceses to form a province. It was not, however, until the creation of the Diocese of Rockhampton in 1892 that serious consideration of the matter was warranted, because a minimum of three dioceses was required to form a province.<sup>786</sup>

There were important reasons why a province was regarded as desirable. It was the traditional unit of ecclesiastical organisation from the very early days of the church; it provided a safeguard against unbridled diocesanism, which was always a threat in the Australian church, where strong-willed bishops and clergy were prone in their comparative isolation to initiate and cultivate particular diocesan interests and customs; and it provided the machinery through which the church could speak with a united voice in matters of public concern. It is true that all the Australian dioceses were loosely linked together in a provincial pattern, with the Bishop of Sydney as metropolitan,<sup>787</sup> but the degree of common action was so slight, and the powers of the general synod so limited, that this had had relatively little practical significance. In any case, the drive for a province within Queensland was set in motion in the nineties, before Federation, and it seemed logical for ecclesiastical divisions to correspond to colonial boundaries.<sup>788</sup> The urge to have dioceses corresponding to political divisions was a strong, one, and indeed, the formation of the Dioceses of North Queensland and Rockhampton had in one sense been the ecclesiastical counterpart of similar aspirations for division in the political sphere.<sup>789</sup> By the time Federation crystallised the new sense of Australian nationalism, the provincial movement had gone so far that its fulfilment was a foregone conclusion; and the supporters of an ecclesiastical province for Queensland argued that it was a necessary prerequisite to a strong national church.<sup>790</sup>

With the creation of the Diocese of Rockhampton in 1892, Webber immediately called for the formation of a province, now made possible for the first time by the existence of the requisite three dioceses. In 1893 both the Brisbane and Rockhampton synods agreed to the principle; in North Queensland, however, there was little enthusiasm. The diocesan chancellor, Mr. Justice Chubb, introduced a motion into the northern synod on the subject in 1894; but this was a formal courtesy measure, and neither Chubb nor Bishop Barlow showed any enthusiasm for the proposal. This lukewarmness was maintained in the north throughout the nineties. Webber made an abortive visit to Townsville in 1898 to secure a change of mind, but without success, and it was not until the formation of the Diocese of Carpentaria that Barlow and his synod reversed their attitude. There were several reasons for this. While Bishop Barlow was concentrating on collecting money for the endowment of Carpentaria, he had no leisure for other interests: once Carpentaria was established, he could turn his attention elsewhere. Besides this, there was a fear in the north that the proposed province would lead to domination by Brisbane: distance and poor communications would make full northern representation in the councils of the province rather difficult; but once there were two northern dioceses, the balance of power would not rest so clearly with Brisbane. There was something of an element of local jealousies and isolationism in this attitude, which was fostered by the fact that the historical connections of the church in North Queensland were not with Brisbane at all. Perhaps, too, the inferiority complex developed by Bishop Barlow as a result of the threatened veto on his election, might have influenced his attitude towards the proposed province.

<sup>785</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p.10.

<sup>786</sup> Determination I, 1881 General Synod.

<sup>787</sup> Bishop Tufnell, and presumably his successors, had taken the oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop of Sydney as metropolitan of Australia. Colonial Church Chronicle, July 1859.

<sup>788</sup> It is true that the boundaries of the proposed province went beyond the boundaries of Queensland, inasmuch as Carpentaria embraced the Northern Territory; but the Diocese of New Guinea was within Queensland boundaries until Federation. In any case, those portions outside Queensland were relatively unimportant insofar as population was concerned.

<sup>789</sup> For example, cf. leader in Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 1 December 1892.

<sup>790</sup> This view had been put forward by Bishop Harmer of Adelaide, and was warmly supported by the Church Chronicle and most Queensland churchmen. Church Chronicle, May 1899.

At the North Queensland synod of 1900 the new chancellor, A.W. Macnaughton, headed the opposition to the provincial scheme. He used the argument that in the light of federation and the new national Australian outlook, provincialism was “a dangerous and retrograde movement”<sup>791</sup>. The completion of the matter of Carpentaria, however, together with the persuasiveness of the Reverend G.H. Frodsham, whom Webber sent north to plead the cause, sufficed to win the day. Barlow wrote warmly to Webber that “I am most anxious to have the Province formed this year now that there is another Diocese created”,<sup>792</sup> and the North Queensland synod agreed by a large majority to enter into negotiations.

With the acceptance of the plan by the Carpentarian diocesan conference in 1902, it only remained to work out the details of the provincial scheme, and the election of G.H. Frodsham as Bishop of North Queensland the same year helped ensure that agreement would quickly be reached. The three chief mainland dioceses – Brisbane, Rockhampton and North Queensland – as well as New Guinea, all now had bishops of the Webber school. There was in consequence a great degree of personal amicability, as well as a close consensus of opinion of matters of churchmanship and administration. Circumstances were therefore ideal for the development of a strong province; and in fact the Province of Queensland proved to be the most closely knit and centralised of all the provinces of the Australian church.

With Webber ailing, Frodsham became the leading figure in the quest for a provincial constitution, while Archdeacon A.E. David played his usual solid role. One more hurdle, however remained. This was the opposition of the primate, Archbishop W. Saumarez Smith, of Sydney. The low-church primate probably feared a strong Anglo-Catholic bloc in the north, for the Queensland dioceses had an exaggerated reputation in Sydney for extremism, and the centralised provisions of the proposed provincial constitution must have appeared dangerous to the conservative archbishop.

One effect of this expected opposition from the primate was that a sense of urgency was brought into the constitution negotiations: if the new provincial constitution were complete before the meeting of the general synod of Australia, which was due to be held late in 1905, an appeal could be made to general synod against any attempted veto by the primate.<sup>793</sup> The threatened veto, however, did not eventuate, and on 28 August 1905 the primate promulgated the new provincial constitution. The province consisted of the Dioceses of Brisbane, Rockhampton, North Queensland and Carpentaria, and two months later New Guinea adhered to it also. The Right Reverend St. Clair Donaldson, Bishop of Brisbane, became the first archbishop.<sup>794</sup>

The constitution of the new province was in certain respects significantly different from those of the southern provinces, and the result was that from the beginning the Province of Queensland was a more definite entity than the Provinces of New South Wales or Victoria. The constitution was chiefly the work of Mr. Justice Chubb, who in turn sought the advice of Sir Samuel Griffith.<sup>795</sup> Perhaps Griffith’s experience with the Australian Commonwealth constitution is reflected in the principle that was adopted that certain specific powers be handed over from the diocesan synods to the provincial synod. The most significant factor, however, in the decision to commit certain powers to the provincial synod was a theological one, for catholic tradition favoured the province rather than the isolated diocese as the basic unit of church organisation, and under the influence of the Oxford movement, Queensland church leaders were anxious to follow catholic precedent.

The constitution provided for a provincial synod, to meet triennially in Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville in rotation. The synod was to consist of a House of Bishops and a House of Representatives, which were to meet together, but vote separately, a majority being required in both houses to secure the passing of a measure. The Bishop of Brisbane was to be metropolitan of the province *ex officio*, with the title of archbishop, and in return for this privilege, the Diocese of Brisbane was to give a share to the com-provincial bishops in the election of the new archbishop when the see became vacant. To the provincial synod was committed a number of special responsibilities: the establishment of an appellate tribunal as a court of appeal from diocesan tribunals; the regulation of inter-church relations; the promotion of home and foreign missions; questions concerning the marriage laws of the state in relation to the church; the promotion of religious and secular education; the education and training of candidates for holy orders; the transfer of clergy from one diocese to another; the formation of superannuation and insurance funds for the clergy; and other less significant matters. One important provision was that determinations of the general synod, which by the rules of that body, had to be accepted by

<sup>791</sup> N.Q. *Year Book*, 1900-01, p.75

<sup>792</sup> Barlow to Bp. Webber, July 1900, in Bishop Barlow’s *Letter Book*.

<sup>793</sup> Cf. A.E. David’s comment *Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane* (MS) in 1904: “The Primate is opposed to the formation of a Province for Queensland and will try to block the movement, consequently everything should be ready some time before General Synod which meets in October next year, so that if need be, an appeal can be made to that body – the Primate has no discretionary power in the matter and must be forced to submit the proposals for the formation of a Province to the Bishops of Australia and Tasmania. He is inclined to assume a power which under General Synod he does not possess, and he must be kept to the strict terms of the Determination”.

<sup>794</sup> David, A.E., *Australia*, p. 141.

<sup>795</sup> *Minutes*, Committee to Consider a Constitution for the Province of Queensland, 13 December 1904. Others who played a leading part in drafting the constitution were Littleton Groom and F.W.S. Cumbrae-Stewart.



individual dioceses before coming into effect, were to be submitted to the provincial synod for acceptance or rejection by the province as a whole.

There was one important provision that made the Province of Queensland quite different from those of New South Wales and Victoria:

All canons shall be promulgated by the President of Synod, and shall, when so promulgated, be binding thereafter upon all of the Dioceses of the Province. Provided always that nothing therein contained shall be or be construed in any manner contrary to or inconsistent with the ancient canons whereby the Diocesan Synods have the free administration of their own internal affairs.<sup>796</sup>

Theoretically, at least, on matters within its competence, the province was to supersede the diocese as the legislative unit.

Nevertheless, despite these apparent impressive powers of provincial synod, the province never became as significant a unit of church organisation as its authors had hoped. The tradition of diocesanism was deeply rooted, and the dioceses (or sometimes the parishes) continued to hold the purse-strings. At the same time, the growing national spirit within Australia, which looked towards a national constitution for the church as for the nation, was already threatening to render the province obsolescent as the major form of wider ecclesiastical organisation. A national church constitution was still many years in the future, but political federation clearly foreshadowed the shape of the future for the church.

For these reasons none of the provinces of the Australian church were destined to become very tightly knit together, but of them all Queensland undoubtedly developed the most cohesion. Partly this was due to the granting of real constitutional powers to the provincial synod of Queensland, but other factors of a quite different kind were no less significant. There was in Queensland a general consensus of opinion of matters of churchmanship, with none of the striking contrasts that divided the dioceses in New South Wales. Queensland also had a peculiar strategic importance, as embracing the missionary frontiers of the Australian church, so that while the province was one of the most varied in character in the Anglican Communion, it was provided with a direct challenge that helped foster inter-diocesan co-operation.<sup>797</sup> The personal element, too, was very important, for the stature and influence of a succession of archbishops, above all of St. Clair Donaldson, the first metropolitan, provided a focal point from which real bonds of unity radiated.

The constitutional unity that was achieved in 1905 coincided with a time when growing population and improved means of transport and communications made real cohesion a much more practicable matter than in the nineteenth century. It came at just the right time for the church to be able to carry on its work effectively in the changing Australian environment, and in a sense the formation of the province was a fitting climax to the work of the recently deceased Bishop Webber. In its own organisation the church was now better girded to meet the new and broader problems of the twentieth century.

---

<sup>796</sup> For the constitution in full, see Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1906, p.7 ff.

<sup>797</sup> Cf. comment of Bishop H.H. Montgomery, secretary of the S.P.G., in 1904: "The importance of the province of Queensland is due to the fact that the strategic frontier of Australia in the missionary sense is in Queensland. For here are to be found almost all the important missions of the Australian Church, three aboriginal reserves when the Mitchell River Reserve has been developed, all the mission work in North Queensland and Carpentaria, and the Diocese of New Guinea. More than this, probably nowhere so well as in Queensland will the 'alien problem' be faced, and, we trust, solved, for the sake of the British Empire". Quoted in Church Chronicle, October 1904.

## **CHAPTER 11: THE NEW LEADERSHIP.**

So far in our study we have followed diocesan boundaries fairly closely. In part this has been for the sake of convenience; but it reflects the fact that throughout the nineteenth century there had been no real unity of development of the church in Queensland. There had been great varieties in the nature and strength of church life from place to place, according to the type of leadership of the respective bishops, the effectiveness of the isolated itinerating clergy, and the economic cycles with their related fluctuations of population in certain areas.

From the beginning of the twentieth century, however, there was a much greater unity of development of the Anglican Church. Communications brought scattered congregations into closer physical relationship; a greater degree of economic unity was gradually drawing together the state as a whole; the new provincial structure provided a constitutional basis for the unification of the dioceses; and the powerful personality of St. Clair Donaldson, the first metropolitan, helped to translate formal unity into actuality. Accordingly we shall find that we shall be henceforth concerned less with individual diocesan developments and more with common elements in the life of the church throughout the state.

To meet the changing circumstances of the first two decades of the twentieth century the church was equipped with a new and broader kind of leadership. In Brisbane Bishop Webber was replaced by St. Clair Donaldson; in North Queensland the episcopate of G.H. Frodsham and the early years of what was to prove the long episcopate of John Oliver Feetham marked the emergence of a new spirit in that diocese; while G.D. Halford's Rockhampton episcopate, with its dramatic culmination in his renunciation, signified a new phase there. Even in the sparsely populated Diocese of Carpentaria, the incorporation of the Torres Strait Islands into the sphere of the Anglican Church involved important adjustments though this matter will be left for discussion in a later chapter.<sup>798</sup>

The bishops whom we have mentioned were many-sided men who brought a new breadth of vision to the church in Queensland, and we shall trace their varied influence in subsequent chapters. Under their guidance important changes began to emerge in the attitude and methods of the church in different aspects of its work. We shall look at some of these influential leaders as typifying certain trends in the life of the church up to the end of the first World War. It is not, of course, intended to imply that these men each had only one distinctive characteristic, or that others lacked these characteristics. What we are seeking to do is to see in their lives a reflection of trends operating in the church of which they were such distinguished leaders.

### **i. G. H. Frodsham and the End of the Organisational Phase.**

By the turn of the century it seemed that the groundwork of ecclesiastical organisation in Queensland had been completed. In Brisbane itself, thanks to the efforts of Bishop Webber, not only had the legal structure of the diocese been reorganised, but the supply of clergy, the financial resources and the number of buildings had been so increased that the framework for the growth of the church was firmly erected. In the northern dioceses, conditions were more rudimentary, but the basic aspects of organisation had been attended to, and it seemed only a matter of time for the work to be completed smoothly. The creation of the Province of Queensland appeared to complete the structure.

In southern Queensland these anticipations proved to be fairly true. Dr. Donaldson commented at his first synod on the thoroughness of the foundations laid by Webber, and in their general outline they needed little alteration.<sup>799</sup> In the north, however, where economic crisis combined with cyclonic fury to bring disaster to the finances and buildings of the church, a large-scale reorganisation of the diocese proved necessary.

When Bishop Barlow was translated to Goulburn, it was not immediately apparent how critical the affairs of the diocese were, and it was not primarily for his organising ability that the Reverend George Horsfall Frodsham was elected bishop. Frodsham, who had been brought out by Webber to be Rector of Toowong, had become well-known throughout Queensland for his leadership in the campaign for the Bible in State Schools. It was on a visit to North Queensland in 1900 that Frodsham had gained the respect of the clergy and laity of the north. On that occasion his mission had been to convince the dubious northern diocese of the wisdom of pressing on with the province, and his soundly reasoned argument had helped ensure the acceptance of the scheme. It was consequently on his reputation won in connection with these broader matters of church policy that Frodsham became known in the north, and it was more for his powers of statesmanship than for his efficiency as an organiser that he was desired as a bishop. His election finally was unanimous.<sup>800</sup>

<sup>798</sup> See below, Chap. 13, ii

<sup>799</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1905, Bishop's address, p.33.

<sup>800</sup> Archdeacon F.D. Pritt, the saintly priest who had pioneered work among the kanakas in the north, was also nominated, and vacated the presidency of the election synod, which had fallen to him as senior priest of the diocese. Later, however,

Bishop Frodsham was a man of very considerable ability. As he had already demonstrated with the Bible in State Schools League in Brisbane, he was an able organiser, though in his episcopate his efficiency assumed something of an authoritarian character, which never helped make him popular. In this respect he was very much of the Webber school, though strangely enough, the ageing Bishop Webber had not approved of his appointment to the bishopric in the north.<sup>801</sup> Indeed, it was success in certain organising tasks that Frodsham himself regarded as his great achievement. Writing in 1904 about the formation of the ecclesiastical Province of Queensland, in which he was so largely instrumental, Frodsham said that “by it I have justified my existence in Australia”, and he looked forward to achieving religious teaching in the state schools as the other great task before him.<sup>802</sup>

Bishop Frodsham was, however, far more than the routine efficient organiser. He was a man of broad and far-seeing vision. He was, as we shall see later, always to the fore in the early moves for the autonomy of the Australian church; he spoke forcefully and frequently on all kinds of social and moral questions, and was not afraid to use his influence with political leaders to advance righteous causes, especially when the welfare of the native peoples was concerned; and he was not afraid of hard work in grappling with difficult, and at times almost desperate, situations. Yet Frodsham as a diocesan bishop was never a popular leader. Others sensed in him a streak of vanity; and sometimes he seemed to act from expediency rather than fixed principle.<sup>803</sup>

When he took up his work in the north it became clear to the bishop that his diocese faced immense difficulties. Depression had crippled the income from the diocesan endowments which were almost entirely invested in property within the diocese, and long years of drought had greatly reduced the ordinary income of the parishes. In 1904 it was found that the bishopric endowment, which ten years previously had brought in an annual income of £650 towards the support of the bishop, now yielded only £172, while the mission endowment for the support of the ministrations of the church in outlying areas brought a yield of only £151 – less than half that of a decade before.<sup>804</sup> It was found that some of the parishes in their desperation had employed trust funds as a temporary expedient to tide them over, but had been unable to repay the monies so borrowed.<sup>805</sup> This in itself was bad enough; but it was capped by the fierce cyclone which struck the North Queensland coast in March 1903. In Townsville itself the result was appalling. Much of the town was destroyed, and church buildings suffered with the rest of the town. The cathedral was unroofed; three other churches in Townsville, and those at Ayr and Brandon were destroyed, as well as the rectory at Ayr; while the Bishop’s Lodge, Sub-Deanery and other buildings were damaged to a greater or lesser extent.<sup>806</sup> The total estimated loss of more than £6500 was a crippling blow to a diocese already in such grievous financial straits.

“This diocese is hopelessly involved”, wrote Archdeacon D.J. Garland to the S.P.G.<sup>807</sup> It was true; and not only economic burdens, but an unsatisfactory physical, social and moral atmosphere oppressed many of the northern clergy at this time. One of them, the Reverend Walter Williams of Richmond wrote of his impressions:

Downs without hills  
Bush without trees  
Rivers without water  
Grazing land without grass,  
Civilization without morals,  
Public houses without number, supplying the only palliative until the Church fulfils her mission in their midst.<sup>808</sup>

It was clear that the north, after its initial promise of sound organisation and prosperity, was in need of a thorough reorganisation such as Brisbane had experienced when Bishop Webber took up the reins there.

Frodsham quickly took steps to grapple with the situation. At his first synod a canon was passed introducing a compulsory assessment of six percent of gross income of all parishes to maintain the bishopric and diocesan administration.<sup>809</sup> So far

Pritt withdrew his nomination, and Frodsham’s election was unanimous. See N.Q. Special Synod Proceedings, 5 June 1902.

<sup>801</sup> Bishop N. Dawes to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 14 November 1902, S.P.G. ‘F’ Mss.

<sup>802</sup> Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 7 September 1904, S.P.G. ‘F’ Mss.

<sup>803</sup> Cf. comment of one of the early bush brothers: “Frodsham who got me out was a Pragmatist rather than a Catholic. He found that Catholics made a better response than Protestants, and were prepared to work harder for less pay; so he went after them.” See letter from Rev. C.G. Barclay to Br. Robin Warsop, 3 August, 1956, in Ravenshoe Papers.

<sup>804</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1904-5, p. 74.

<sup>805</sup> Ibid., p.42

<sup>806</sup> Ibid., p.73

<sup>807</sup> Archdeacon D.J. Garland to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 31 August 1903, S.P.G. ‘F’ Mss.

<sup>808</sup> Quoted in Our Work in North Queensland (a brochure published by the Colonial and Continental Church Society, 1905), p.30.

<sup>809</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1902, p.49

as possible the bishop was determined to attain self-support within the diocese, and to this end he enforced rigid economies, including for a time the entire closure of the diocesan office as a means of reducing costs of administration,<sup>810</sup> and the secretarial work was taken over voluntarily by members of the diocesan council, and by the registrar of the diocese, Archdeacon Garland. The added disasters of the cyclone soon made it evident, however, that local measures could not suffice, and Frodsham set about the exhausting routine, which he had learned from Bishop Webber, of travelling as a personal mendicant on behalf of the diocese. It was, with great distaste that Frodsham found himself forced to appeal to England for help, for as the strongest advocate in Australia of the need of autonomy for the Australian church he firmly believed in self-support. After a letter to the English church societies for help in the emergency,<sup>811</sup> he set about an extensive tour of Australia and New Zealand in search of support both for recouping the devalued endowments and repairing the cyclone damage. Frodsham met with moderate success, but it was already becoming clear that Australasian help would not be sufficient, when the bishop was critically injured in a street accident in Auckland and the whole project seemed doomed. Frodsham, however, was not to be thwarted; and with no little courage he set off for England when he was sufficiently well, ostensibly for a rest cure, but in effect to put his case before the English societies and church people at large.

It was May 1904 before the bishop returned to Townsville. The finances of the diocese were still far from stable, but the immediate emergency had been met and most of the damaged buildings restored.<sup>812</sup> Frodsham did not, however, rest content with this immediate improvement, but set about the entire reconstruction of the endowment system. Archdeacon C.V.P. Day was sent to England in 1905 to appeal for £7000 for the endowments.<sup>813</sup> Three years later Frodsham himself made a further tour to gather together both clergy and money, a remarkably successful trip which resulted in good financial support, the establishment of permanent auxiliaries in both England and Ireland, and the foundation of the Bush Brotherhood of St. Barnabas. On this trip Frodsham spoke on behalf of the diocese 174 times!<sup>814</sup>

By these painful efforts the economic state of the diocese was once more painfully restored to a sound condition. The allocation of £2000 from the offering made by the whole Anglican Communion in connection with the Pan-Anglican Congress in 1908 helped considerably, and by the end of Frodsham's episcopate the bishopric endowment fund stood at more than £18,000, yielding an annual income of £700. This fund was now reinvested in government securities instead of the apparently profitable but very unstable land investments which had proved so disastrous in the previous decade.<sup>815</sup>

Frodsham's greatest characteristic was that even in the most critical moments when it seemed that the church in the north must go bankrupt, he never lost his sense of distant vision. He blankly refused, for example, to accept money for the diocese which was raised by what he considered unworthy means.<sup>816</sup> Although anxious to encourage building projects, he refused on the basis of past experience of disaster to allow buildings to be commenced until three quarters of the cost was in hand, and insisted that properties be vested in synod before churches be built on them.<sup>817</sup> Even while funds were still very low, he used part of the contributions from England to start the nucleus of a cyclone fund to provide insurance against future disasters.<sup>818</sup>

The same far-sightedness applied to other aspects of Bishop Frodsham's policy. As usual, the supply of clergy was a pressing problem, especially as the withdrawal of Barlow's striking personality was accompanied by the withdrawal of a number of his clergy, and the thirty priests of 1900 were down to twenty by 1904. Some bishops would have lowered their standards for ordination candidates to meet this need, but not Frodsham. "I have no intention of lowering the standard of examination below that of the best Diocese in Australia". Frodsham told his first synod,<sup>819</sup> and after four years in the diocese he reported, not without some sense of satisfaction at his achievement, that he had ordained no deacon so far. It was not that candidates were lacking, but they were of insufficiently high standard.<sup>820</sup> This policy appeared to be

<sup>810</sup> Northern Churchman, September, 1904.

<sup>811</sup> Dated 12 March 1903, This letter may be found in Historical Records Folder, Diocesan Registry, Townsville.

<sup>812</sup> Among other contributions, the S.P.C.K. gave £500, the S.P.G. promised £100 a year for five years towards the bishop's stipend, and the Colonial and Continental Church Society increased its annual grant from £250 to £400. See N.Q. Year Book, 1904-05, p.31.

<sup>813</sup> See circular letter from Archdeacon C.V.P. Day, among Davidson papers, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace. According to Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, p.46, Day raised £3,000 for the diocesan endowment.

<sup>814</sup> Northern Churchman, March and April, 1909.

<sup>815</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1912, p.137 and p.181.

<sup>816</sup> Ibid., 1904-5, Bishop's address, p.43.

<sup>817</sup> Ibid., 1905-06, p.47

<sup>818</sup> Ibid., 1904-05.p.32

<sup>819</sup> Ibid., 1902-03 p. 49.

<sup>820</sup> Ibid., 1905-06 p. 48.

disastrous, and by the middle of his episcopate there were only a dozen clergy in the diocese: yet Frodsham's rigid policy paid dividends in the end, for not only did he leave his diocese with a staff of clergy as big as his predecessor had had, but they included a number of English priests of very high spiritual and intellectual calibre as well as a dozen Australians who formed the nucleus of an indigenous staff for the diocese. At the root of this changed situation was the foundation of the strong Bush Brotherhood of St. Barnabas at Frodsham's instigation, which we shall study in more detail in a later section.<sup>821</sup> At the same time the appointment of three archdeacons early in his episcopate enabled the more efficient administration of the diocese, especially while the bishop was away – though it must be admitted that one of the primary purposes of these appointments was to attract able priests to the diocese by offering them titles that appeared to involve considerable responsibility.

Bishop Frodsham's resignation of the see through ill-health in 1912 marks the completion of the initial phase of organisation of the institutional side of the church's life. As traditional methods of administration grew old-fashioned or inefficient further changes were to be made from time to time, especially in the period after the second World War. But by 1912 the groundwork was complete, and though Frodsham was very much a chip off the Webber block, he represented a further stage of development than his erstwhile master, because he had a broader Australia-wide vision and a more direct concern for the great social and moral issues of the age than had Bishop Webber. Indeed but for the fact that he came into office at a time when financial and administrative measures were the urgent requirement, he might have made even more of a mark as a statesman in the Australian church than he did.<sup>822</sup> His own summing up of his work was a fairly accurate one:

Have made many mistakes among you, but I think I can honestly say that I made them honestly. At all times I have tried to be a faithful administrator rather than a popular man. I have tried to be just. I have tried to be tolerant. I have tried never to abandon a principle or cause because it happened to be expedient to do so. I have tried to build solidly for the future. I have seen big things for Australia, but God has seldom allowed me to realise my visions.<sup>823</sup>

In the remaining quarter century of his life in England Bishop Frodsham was to see at least some of his visions begin to materialise.

Although we have taken Bishop Frodsham as typifying the final phase of the organisation of diocesan life we must not imagine that it was only in North Queensland that this process was taking place. The disasters that befell that diocese made the process more vividly apparent there, but the more regular growth of prosperity in the south, after the financial crises of the nineties and the drought of the early years of the new century, was accompanied by a refinement of the methods of organisation that had been built up by Bishops Webber and Dawes. Finance was still the crux of the problem, and the maintenance of even the most rudimentary work of the church was frequently hindered by the fact that church people still had not learned the lesson that a non-endowed church must receive much more active support from its members than they had been accustomed to give. Even in many settled parishes in Queensland the stipend of the rector did not exceed £200 with house, while in parochial districts and mission areas there was often trouble in finding even this small stipend.

The key to the problem was in persuading people to see that sporadic giving was insufficient, and in inducing some kind of regularity from them. So far, both on the parochial and diocesan levels, efforts had been primarily directed to obtaining a response to special appeals – apart from the church collections and subscriptions to the church societies, which in any case had never proved very successful in Queensland. There had been it is true, occasional efforts, at more systematic almsgiving. At the beginning of the church in Lutwyche, for example, parishioners were invited to sign a solemn declaration,

that I recognize as a sacred obligation the duty of supporting as far as my worldly means will allow, the officiating minister thereof for the time being; and also the duty of upholding the fabric of the Church, and providing proper means for the due performance of Divine Service.<sup>824</sup>

No commitment was entered into, however, for any specific monetary amount, so the practical effect of this pledge was indefinite. In the early nineties several parishes instituted envelope systems to encourage systematic giving, in imitation of the Baptist and Congregational churches,<sup>825</sup> and a synod committee in 1892 urged an envelope system for all parishes to

<sup>821</sup> See Below, Chap. 12, v.

<sup>822</sup> An important example of Frodsham's wider interests was the part that he played in the establishment of the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Townsville in 1909. It was Frodsham who was largely instrumental in having Townsville chosen as the site for the Institute, which remained there until its transfer to Sydney in 1930. For further details, see Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, pp. 140-143.

<sup>823</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1912, Bishop's address, p. 123. For further reflections on his North Queensland episcopate, see Frodsham, G.H. A Bishop's Pleasaunce (London 1915), passim.

<sup>824</sup> Quoted in Addison, K.H., The Growth of Lutwyche Parish, p.9.

<sup>825</sup> E.g. ibid., p.15 and Church Chronicle, June 1892.

encourage the systematic giving of a definite proportion of income to the church.<sup>826</sup> Nevertheless these proposals had only a very limited effect, partly because of poor organisation, and partly because many Anglicans, accustomed to a long tradition of sporadic and small offerings to the church, objected to the pressure upon them which they felt was implied by such a system.

In the first two decades of the twentieth century the unsatisfactory response of church people to the financial problem aroused concern among bishops and clergy. In Brisbane Archbishop Donaldson in a pastoral letter called upon his people to see almsgiving as an integral part of religious life and duty,<sup>827</sup> while in Rockhampton Bishop Halford urged that church people should adopt voluntarily the principle of the tithe – the giving of one tenth of their income to the work of God.<sup>828</sup> In both dioceses, commissions were set up by synod – in Brisbane in 1910, and in Rockhampton in 1914 – to consider the whole problem of stirring up a more positive attitude on the part of the laity to church finance.

The Brisbane commission produced some interesting figures which demonstrated the poor record of church giving. Returns from 25 parishes showed that the average offering per head at the morning service was only 4 3/4d., and at night it was 3 1/4d., and that at least 30% of those at church made no offering at all in the plate. The commission estimated that if every adult male contributed only one shilling a week towards the church, and every adult female sixpence, and every minor one penny, the income of the parishes of the diocese would be quadrupled. Both commissions recommended the universal establishment of envelope systems, so that, as the Brisbane commission commented, giving might be seen as “not a charity, but an obligation of Church membership”.<sup>829</sup> Both commissions recommended that a definite annual diocesan budget should be prepared by the treasurer, each parish being allocated a contribution which it was expected to raise towards the whole. The Rockhampton commission suggested this should be an amount in strict proportion to parochial income and should be obligatory on the parish; the Brisbane proposal was less rigid, providing for a voluntary assessment which parishes would raise as they saw fit. Other more detailed suggestions were also made about the possible division of parishes into sectors, each to be the responsibility of a collector.<sup>830</sup>

As so frequently happened with such commissions, their proposals were not carried out in full. Nevertheless some of their recommendations bore fruit, and the very careful analysis of the situation that was carried out helped to clarify ideas. In Brisbane there did follow a very real improvement of the financial situation. Two years after the findings of the Brisbane commission were published, the diocesan Year Book reported that “never before have the Diocesan balance-sheets been in so satisfactory a condition”.<sup>831</sup> In part this was due to the generally prosperous economic state of the country; but in part, too, it reflected a growing awareness by church people of their financial obligations. When, in accordance with the Commission’s recommendation, a system of voluntary assessment of the parishes in Brisbane diocese commenced in 1911-12, it proved successful from the very first.<sup>832</sup> Parochial income showed a marked increase: the total receipts of all the parishes in the Diocese of Brisbane, which had only risen from just under £20,000 in 1889 to almost £24,000 in 1904, rapidly increased to more than £45,000 in 1919. Inflation and increased population had their share in this increase, but it also reflected a changing attitude among church members. In Rockhampton there was a similar improvement, and in 1919 it was reported that an appeal to increase the endowments of the see had brought in more than £4,000.<sup>833</sup>

With the improved situation, stipends began to improve: in Brisbane a canon was passed in 1913 making £250 with house the minimum stipend for the rector of a parish,<sup>834</sup> and the Rockhampton synod resolved on the same rate four years later. There were hopes that the improved situation would make possible the long-advocated policy of paying the stipends of the clergy from a central fund, so as to free them from local domination. A Half Million Shilling Fund was started in Brisbane just before the war to provide capital to support this plan, but the outbreak of war crippled the project, and although in Rockhampton some clergy were paid from central sources, the plan was never worked out in full.

One other method was employed in Brisbane which attempted to drive home to members of the church their responsibility in finance. This was the Church Dues scheme, conceived and organised by Archdeacon A.R. Rivers. The very name suggested its intent: as originally outlined by Archbishop Donaldson to synod in 1913, it would have meant that the

<sup>826</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p.110

<sup>827</sup> Pastoral letter quoted in Bush Notes, March 1909.

<sup>828</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1910, Bishop’s address, p.15.

<sup>829</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1910, p. 103.

<sup>830</sup> For full reports of these commissions, see Brisbane Year Book, 1910. pp/100-104, and Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1914, p.56ff

<sup>831</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1912, p.3.

<sup>832</sup> Ibid., p.15.

<sup>833</sup> Figures based on statistics in Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1889; Brisbane Year Book, 1904 and 1919; and Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1919.

<sup>834</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1913.

churchwardens would actually suggest to each parishioner how much he should be expected to give.<sup>835</sup> As worked out by Rivers, however, the plan left out this aspect, which would undoubtedly have aroused complaints of tyranny: so it was decided to leave it to each person to decide for himself what was due from him to the church, and to have a collecting box which would be collected quarterly. Rivers wrote a letter to all parishioners throughout the diocese and in 1915 and 1916 visited a large number of parishes to explain the scheme. Through lack of consistent organisation the scheme never worked properly however, and by 1918 it was already clear that it had in effect collapsed.<sup>836</sup> Nevertheless, though it came before its time, it introduced the principle of obligation, which was much more successfully to be put forward in methods of church finance adopted more than a generation later. The difference was essentially not one of principle, but of soundness of organisation.

By the end of the first World War the church appeared to have its external structure and organisation well on the way to being the vehicle of, rather than a hindrance to, its spiritual work; and this was so for the first time in its history. The years ahead were soon to show that not all difficulties were yet overcome in this regard, but for the present at least, the great organising work which Bishop Webber had begun was brought to completion in the decade or more that followed his death.

## ii. St. Clair Donaldson and Ecclesiastical Statesmanship

The most influential of the new leaders of the church in the early twentieth century was Archbishop St. Clair Donaldson, whose qualities of leadership carried weight far outside the boundaries of his own diocese. As an all-round leader Donaldson stood head and shoulders above any who had preceded him: and in his life and work is most clearly typified the broadening of the life and influence of the church in the community at large. Donaldson was the right man for the right moment. Given the task of merely shaping order out of chaos such as had fallen to his predecessor in the see of Brisbane, Donaldson might have achieved less than Webber. But given the task of deepening the spiritual and moral impact of the freshly organised church upon individuals and society as a whole, Donaldson had a spiritual capacity, intellectual power, and prophetic vision that enabled him to exercise an influence that Webber could never have.

The very circumstances of Donaldson's selection for the bishopric of Brisbane threw a good deal of light on the state and needs of the diocese at the time. The closing years of Bishop Webber's episcopate had been marked by considerable lay dissatisfaction with the existing regime: the old bishop's ceaseless appeals for funds, especially for the cathedral, were arousing discontent; his begging trips to England were increasingly resented in an age of growing Australian nationalism; and the five-year plan for bringing out English clergy was in some quarters being misrepresented as a foisting of young inexperienced English clergy on to the Australian church. It was an anomalous situation, typical of this self-conscious stage of nationalism, that while the Australian church was failing to provide its own resources in either manpower or money, the laity were yet annoyed at the continued dependence on England.<sup>837</sup>

The laity, then, were restive and wanted a man with Australian experience, but preferably one who was not too closely tied to the methods of the Webber regime; while most of the clergy, on the other hand, were anxious to ensure that the new bishop should have English connections and would be a man who would hold on to the progress so hardly won by Bishop Webber's dogged perseverance. There was one man who would meet both sets of requirements – the Reverend Bernard Wilson, whose work in the diocese in the eighties had left such golden opinions behind him, a man who knew the Webber tradition to the full, and yet had a fine reputation in England as the vicar of Portsea, the biggest-staffed parish in the country. Wilson had already been sounded out about accepting the bishopric while Webber was dying, and in great perplexity of mind as to his duty in this situation he sought the advice of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Randall Davidson. The archbishop made a definite and illuminating reply. After referring to the unique importance of the great parish of Portsea, he went on:

It is not Portsea alone, but the Church of England that would suffer...It would only be justified if the call elsewhere were of so overwhelming a sort that disobedience was impossible. If you were called now to one of our foremost home Dioceses, or to the Primacy of Australia, or of Canada, or of India, I should feel that, other things permitting, you were bound to go. I cannot however put Brisbane on that level. I realise its importance, I care very greatly that the See should be rightly filled, and I am aware that it may in future be an even bigger position of responsibility than it is now. But I dare not say that for Brisbane you ought to leave Portsea: unless it be that the personal link fashioned by your long

<sup>835</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1913, Archbishop's address, p.21.

<sup>836</sup> Ibid., 1918, p.148

<sup>837</sup> Cf. comments by the Rev. B.R. Wilson to Archbishop R.T. Davidson: "There is a certain sanguine buoyancy of temperament about an Australian which outsiders call conceit. It is a delightful trait really, but it makes them very loth to believe that anyone else can do better for them than they can do for themselves." Quoted from a letter dated 13 December 1903, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

and admirable work in Brisbane Diocese seems to you personally to make its claim assume a different character from the highest claims elsewhere<sup>838</sup>.

Wilson demurred from the archbishop's estimate of the importance of Brisbane: "It is exceptionally important," he wrote, "and in right hands may become a very considerable power"<sup>839</sup> However, he accepted the primate's ruling and declined to accept nomination to the see of Brisbane.

The involved negotiations which finally led to the selection of the Reverend St. Clair George Alfred Donaldson as Bishop of Brisbane need not be followed through here. The apparent victory of the lay point of view which resulted in the election in synod of Bishop A.V. Green, Australian born and trained Bishop of Ballarat, to the vacant see, was frustrated by Green's decision not to accept translation; and in the end, after Bernard Wilson again declined on Archbishop Davidson's advice, the choice of the new bishop was delegated to the Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>840</sup> What are of special interest are the qualities which the Archbishop of Canterbury's advisers told him should be sought in the new bishop.

Davidson was not lacking in advice on this matter. Bishop H.H. Montgomery, the secretary of the S.P.G., whose experience in Tasmania made him a regular adviser on Australian matters, urged that the new bishop should be "a man of spiritual rather than financial attainments, to balance the late Bishop" He ought also to be a "missionary hearted man" because the proposed Province of Queensland had within it "two of the greatest missionary Bishops in the world – Carpentaria and New Guinea – and quite half the Province is wholly missionary."<sup>841</sup> Archdeacon David wrote that a

man concerned with social work and education was needed.<sup>842</sup> Bernard Wilson, writing of what he called the "decadence of the Episcopate" in Australia in comparison with the ability of the bishops of twenty years before, argued for a forceful and statesmanlike man.<sup>843</sup> It is clear that the Archbishop of Canterbury weighed all this sound advice very carefully in making his decision. He considered various possibilities, and finally his choice rested upon the Reverend St. Clair Donaldson, Rector of Hornsey in London, and despite Donaldson's refusal in the first instance on family grounds, the archbishop persisted until he agreed. It was a happy choice, and the months of confused negotiation appeared to have been overruled for good – as the early death of Bernard Wilson, the other likely nominee, was to emphasise a few years later. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself was very satisfied with his choice: He wrote to Archdeacon David:

I am more and more convinced that he is the very man for the position. His experience, his strength of character, his total freedom from any partisan views, added to his intense personal devotion and the buoyancy and energy of his temperament, mark him out as a man who ought to do admirable work as a Bishop in a great Colony.<sup>844</sup>

Donaldson was one of the best type of upper class Englishmen. His family belonged to the upper stratum of English society, and he himself had the typical Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, education which traditionally marked out many leading public figures in England. Donaldson, though he had never been to Australia before, had an interesting connection with this country, as his father had spent part of his life in New South Wales as a squatter, and had become in 1848 a member, and in 1854 the President, of the Legislative Council of New South Wales. He had the distinction of being – for a very short term of three months – the first Premier of New South Wales under responsible government in 1856, and the more doubtful honour of having reputedly fought in the last duel contested in Australia.<sup>845</sup> His father, however, died only a few years after Donaldson's birth, so his early education was in the hands of his devout, evangelical mother whose earnest religious spirit left a strong influence on her sons. It was not that Donaldson would have been described later in life as an evangelical in the narrow sense. He had an overwhelming sense of the Catholic Church and its sacramental life: but his essential Catholicism was always restrained and enriched by an evangelical simplicity and zeal.

Donaldson's varied experience in the ministry had fitted him well for the variety of duties that fell to him in his new sphere. He had worked among the slums of London at Bethnal Green and Hackney Wick; he was in close touch with the academic world and intellectual trends, especially through his brother who was Master of Selwyn College; and he had gained insights

<sup>838</sup> Archbishop R.T. Davidson to Rev. B.R. Wilson, 4 August 1903. Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace. This letter, though written the day after Webber's death, was written without knowledge of the fact that the old bishop had died.

<sup>839</sup> Rev. B.R. Wilson to Archbishop Davidson, 5 August, 1903, in Ibid.

<sup>840</sup> For the negotiations leading to the decision to delegate the appointment, see Brisbane Year Book, 1904 containing details of the special synods held in October 1903 and February 1904; also see minutes of the special committee of the diocesan council which was in contact with Bernard Wilson, in Minute Book: Various Committees (Church House).

<sup>841</sup> Bishop H.H. Montgomery to Archbishop R.T. Davidson, 5 February 1904, Archiepiscopal correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>842</sup> Archdeacon A.E. David to Abp. Davidson, 23 January 1904 in ibid.

<sup>843</sup> Rev. B.R. Wilson to Abp. Davidson, 5 August 1903, in ibid.

<sup>844</sup> Abp. Davidson to Archdeacon A.E. David, 6 May 1904, in ibid.

<sup>845</sup> For further details, see Dimont, C.T. and Batty, F. de Witt, St. Clair Donaldson, chapter 1.; also article, "Donaldson, St. Clair George Alfred", in Australian Encyclopaedia.



into the procedure of ecclesiastical administration and statesmanship in his three years as chaplain to Archbishop Benson. At that time he undoubtedly came to know Randall Davidson well, because the latter was a close confidant of the archbishop, and had himself formerly been chaplain at Lambeth Palace. It was consequently natural that after his consecration Donaldson was in a position to maintain a personal, though fairly sporadic, correspondence with Archbishop Davidson who was in office at Canterbury for the whole of his own term at Brisbane.

Donaldson's aristocratic background and upper class education was an advantage in many ways for his work, but it had its corresponding disadvantages. It gave him a breadth of spirit and dignity of bearing that marked him out as a leader from the start: but his natural dignity and easy relationships with those in the upper social ranks sometimes left the impression in Australia of a kind of snobbishness in the archbishop, which was far from conscious on his part. His bishop in London had said of him, "I never met a more straightforward, humble-minded man",<sup>846</sup> and his approach to his new responsibilities was one of humility and self-dedication;<sup>847</sup> but as Dr. Wand pointed out in a funeral panegyric after Donaldson's death, he 'could never understand what it meant to be poor...Yet his essential humanity made him at home even in humble surroundings.'<sup>848</sup> Though he possessed private means of his own, Donaldson regarded money as something to be used in trust, and many of the institutions of the diocese, not least St. John's College within the University, owed much to his personal liberality. Self-indulgence he regarded as one of the characteristic evils of the relatively prosperous era of the immediate pre-war years, and his sermons and meditations constantly turned to the theme of sacrifice, and commended fasting and self-discipline as an important part of the Christian life.<sup>849</sup> Though no teetotaler himself, he deliberately abstained from the use of alcohol during the war as an act of discipline and self-denial which he regarded as specially necessary in the peculiar national temptations provided by the wartime environment.

Prayer was at the very heart of Donaldson's life and work, and the quality of his life, his sermons, his attitude to public questions and even the routine of episcopal administration bore the marks of his devotional spirit. It was his daily habit to make a meditation on the basis of some verses of the Bible, and a series of notes on his meditations on the Acts of the Apostles at the very end of his Brisbane episcopate was published posthumously by his chaplain.<sup>850</sup> Here we see the archbishop taking the message of holy scripture as the basis of the problems of prayer, policy and administration that beset him. The account of the appointment of the seven in Acts 6, for example, led him to consider the importance of that dull administrative work which fell so much to his lot.

Administration may seem in itself a colourless, non-moral department of life. But negatively it is altogether on the moral side: it prevents evil. The inevitable tendency of human society is towards decay and confusion and dissolution, unless there is a watchful eye and ready hand to correct and adjust details every day...And here is your comfort in the weary round of administration. It is moral and spiritual work; common sense and wisdom are God's gifts: it is worth doing. It may be dull, unrewarding to the administrator. But it must be a matter of conscience to be faithful in detail.<sup>851</sup>

In this way, Donaldson lifted to God in prayer the various matters that came before him. In his meditations is reflected his awareness of his own special dangers – indecision, the tension between the need for rigidity on some occasions and compromise on others, the danger of losing hold of individual compassion in the zeal of administration. We see in these meditations a man of spiritual depth, conscious of his own weakness, but conscious, too, of the guidance and power of God working through his weakness. It is not surprising that he was much sought as a spiritual adviser and was an able confessor.<sup>852</sup>

As a preacher Donaldson had great ability, and some of his printed sermons make very powerful reading. His appearance in the pulpit was impressive, his well-built figure having a natural dignity that added weight to his reasoned, and sometimes impassioned, flow of eloquence.<sup>853</sup> Sometimes, however, the extreme busyness of his life prevented that thorough preparation that alone could permit perfect conciseness of expression, and at times he was known to make long pauses as he seemed to have to gather the thoughts that were to follow. Yet at his best, Donaldson was in the front rank of preachers, and he was at his best when preaching in the prophetic strain, when pointing out the significance of the Christian Gospel for the great questions of the day. The war, with the great social, political and moral questions that it brought to the fore, saw Donaldson at his best as a speaker, and we shall have cause to return to the statesmanlike way in which he portrayed the significance of the war to the Christian conscience. None of the great movements of the age

<sup>846</sup> Quoted in Dimont & Batty, op.cit., p.33.

<sup>847</sup> See, for example, his letter, Church Chronicle, January 1905.

<sup>848</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1936.

<sup>849</sup> Pastoral letter, Bush Notes, April 1906.

<sup>850</sup> Dobbs, J.H. (Ed.) UA Meditation of the Acts of the Apostles (London, 1937).

<sup>851</sup> Ibid., p.40f.

<sup>852</sup> Dimont & Batty, op.cit., p.71

<sup>853</sup> For a concise pen-picture of Donaldson's appearance, see Brisbane Courier, 20 December 1904.

escaped his searching attention – the intellectual trends, the social tensions stemming from the conflicts of capital and labour, the great moral problems which the war brought to the surface. Yet Donaldson never fell into the trap of allowing religious truth to be adapted to modern needs: rather he sought to test the modern world and its ways by what he believed to be the eternal truths of the Catholic faith.

There was never any doubt that Donaldson was the leader of his diocese. Like his predecessor he had a deep regard for the responsibility of the office of bishop. But whereas Webber had emphasised more especially the monarchical aspect of the episcopal office, for Donaldson the essence of it lay in his role as spiritual father. “Every bishop is a fountain of the whole spiritual life of the flock – Father in God: and by his Priests he admits every child into the family”.<sup>854</sup> So he was not so much the autocrat as his predecessor had been, and insomuch as there was a very definite leadership in the diocese, it was widely felt that it came from a triumvirate rather than a single man: for his archdeacon, H.F. Le Fanu, and his chaplain, the Reverend F. de Witt Batty, Donaldson had two friends who worked very closely with him in the administration of the diocese. As he was leaving Brisbane he made the comment in the privacy of his meditations, “Perhaps Le Fanu, Batty and I are too much for one place?”<sup>855</sup> At all events, they were to scatter, because Donaldson in 1921 resigned to return to England as Bishop of Salisbury, while Le Fanu and Batty, after each serving in turn as Coadjutor-Bishop of Brisbane moved on to be Archbishop of Perth and Bishop of Newcastle respectively, and to exercise a wide influence in the Australian church, the former as primate, and the latter as acknowledged leader of the movement for the autonomy of the Anglican Church in Australia.

Under this leadership an immense development took place within the life of the church in Brisbane, and indeed throughout the whole state, because in an indirect sense Donaldson’s inspiration went beyond his own diocese over the whole province of which he was metropolitan. The number of clergy in his diocese increased during his episcopate from 60 to 110; the religious community of the Society of the Sacred Advent grew from about 5 to 30; a flourishing theological college was established; an Anglican college was founded at his direct instigation in association with the new university, to which the archbishop gave every encouragement; the beginnings of a system of church secondary education were laid; and all in all there was a sense that the church was much more effectively grappling with the task of extending the Kingdom of God in Queensland. Most of these topics will be dealt with later: reference must, however, in passing be made to the fulfilment under Donaldson of the first part of Bishop Webber’s dream of a great cathedral.

For Donaldson the cathedral project never became the obsession that it had been for his predecessor: there was no need for it to be. Yet although Webber left more than £30,000 in the building fund, an amount almost sufficient, it was estimated, to complete the first phase of the project, the estimates of cost kept on increasing as the years went by, and by the time the building was consecrated on the feast of Ss. Simon and Jude in 1910, the total cost had been £62,000.<sup>856</sup> The result was that a considerable amount of collecting of money had to go on. There was continued opposition to the project because of this, but it is significant that the great drive to gather in the funds required took place while the archbishop was away in England in 1908. In Webber’s time no one but the bishop would have taken it upon himself to organise the project. At all events, there was great satisfaction in 1910 when the magnificent cathedral, generally regarded as the finest in the country, was consecrated. In only one respect did the archbishop fail in his intention: he had hoped to move the congregation of All Saints’ Church to the old St. Luke’s Pro-Cathedral, and so avoid having to two churches so close together. But the All Saints’ parishioners, firmly devoted to their church as the centre of the Anglo-Catholic movement in the diocese, refused to budge, and the archbishop had to give way.<sup>857</sup>

It is not, however, primarily in the building up of the physical structure of the church that St. Clair Donaldson is most remembered, but for his leadership in bringing the influence of the Church of England to bear much more effectively on the life of the state. The spiritual impact of the General Mission which he inspired, his efforts on behalf of the aborigines and other missionary enterprises, the pronouncements on public matters, and his personal influence on leaders in politics and business life made the voice of the church heard in all sorts of places. “Go for the enemy’s stronghold. The Queensland Club: the Trades Hall: the Race-course”, he wrote in his book of meditations.<sup>858</sup> That was his policy – to attack what was unchristian wherever it was to be found. It was because there were leaders of his calibre in the church that he found a situation that surprised him somewhat in Australia. Having spoken in an essay on the apparent lack of institutional power of the church in Australia in contrast to the position of the established church in England, he went on:

Paradoxically as it may seem, it is not an exaggeration to say that the Church still remains the paramount power in Australia. In spite of all the restrictions, the official ignoring of religion, the secular systems of education, the mutual

<sup>854</sup> A Meditation on the Acts of the Apostles, p.42.

<sup>855</sup> Ibid., p.63

<sup>856</sup> It was estimated that a further £60,000 would have been needed to complete the cathedral at that time. See Brisbane Courier, 29 October 1910. In 1959 it was estimated that the total cost of completion would be at least £750,000.

<sup>857</sup> All Saints’ Minute Book, minutes of special meetings, 17 June 1909 and 7 August 1909.

<sup>858</sup> A Meditation on the Acts of the Apostles, p.79.

competition of her various sections, the solid indifference in the great centres, the blank pagan ignorance in the bush districts, the terrible prevalence of the sins of purity, the heavy drinking to be found in many parts, the carelessness, the shallowness, the love of pleasure – in general, the surrender to this present world, Christian public opinion does still dominate the land. The sincere Christian man, whatever his faults, does command everywhere a sincere respect....<sup>859</sup>

However true in general these remarks were, we may see in them an autobiographical comment. Donaldson was finding that his prophetic and statesmanlike utterances were in fact attracting eager hearers. For the first time in Queensland, the Anglican Church under his leadership had been able to rise above its own immediate needs of pioneering and organising itself to play its vital role as a leaven of the whole community.

There have been in the history of the church in Queensland men who surpassed Archbishop Donaldson in particular characteristics. But as an all-round bishop he stands pre-eminent in the church. As father-in-God, man of prayer, preacher, administrator and thinker, but above all as prophet and statesman, he made a mark that has never been erased.

### iii. G.D. Halford and Anglican Self-Criticism.

A considerable part of our study so far has been devoted to considering the building up of the institutional organisation of the church. This is a reflection of the pioneering state of the church in the nineteenth century. With the growing maturity of church life, however, and the passing beyond the organisational phase, the early years of the twentieth century were marked by a growing concern with the question of whether the church was in fact succeeding in fulfilling its essential purpose. Now that it was no longer a matter of merely struggling to keep the head above water there was opportunity to take stock of the Church of England as a vehicle for the extension of the Kingdom of God in Queensland.

The result was that the first two decades of the new century were a period when leaders like Archbishop Donaldson not only subjected certain aspects of Australian society to searching criticism in the light of Christian faith, but when clergy and people within the church began to ask how well the church itself was measuring up to genuine Christian standards. Even before the turn of the century evidences of this soul-searching may be seen. There was, for example, increasing concern with statistics showing figures of church attendance, numbers of baptisms, confirmations, etc., as a check on whether real progress were being made in the extension of the church's ministrations. At first, these statistics were very incomplete and unreliable, as a commission pointed out in 1908,<sup>860</sup> but their increasing use points to a concern to face up to the realities of the situation. In a quite different way, the increasing importance given to retreats for the clergy suggests a trend towards facing up to the deeper spiritual realities. The first recorded three day clergy retreat had taken place as early as 1886 at Bishopsbourne, when 23 of the clergy took part, and in the nineties this became an annual occasion in Brisbane. The bishops in the early part of the twentieth century encouraged all their clergy to make an annual retreat, and in North Queensland under Bishop Feetham it became virtually a compulsory occasion.

This concern for soul-searching was in a sense a reflection of a world-wide situation. In England, for example, although the church was experiencing at the beginning of the twentieth century a period of great spiritual vigour, and there was perhaps more zeal and devotion being shown by great numbers of able priests as well as by lay people, it was becoming clear that actual church attendance was declining. The meagre statistics available for England suggest a steady decline in churchgoing in the second half of the nineteenth century,<sup>861</sup> and the decline in the number of ordinations from the peak figures of 1885 to those of 1901 showed a similar trend.<sup>862</sup> The slowly growing realisation of this situation in England was creating an atmosphere of self-examination in the church there as well.

The mood of self-criticism was early indicated in some searching articles written by Archdeacon A.E. David called Reflections of Fourteen Years just before he returned to England.<sup>863</sup> David pictured Australian character and religious life as having a charm, but an instability, characteristic of the adolescent stage:

It has all the attractiveness and all the faults of youth. There is the proverbial hospitality and generosity of temperament; there is the love of athleticism; and, indeed, of pleasure in all its forms; there is the assurance and 'cocksureness' of the average schoolboy; there is a versatility and power of adaptation which belong to those whose habits have not become stereotyped; there is the very successful concealment of any deeper feelings, especially those of religion; and there is,

<sup>859</sup> Essay by Donaldson in Church and Empire, Edited by J. Ellison and G.H.S. Walpole, p.157

<sup>860</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1908, p.40.

<sup>861</sup> According to Lloyd R., The Church of England in the Twentieth Century, Vol I, p.59, church attendance in London was down from one half to one fifth of the population between 1851 and the early twentieth century.

<sup>862</sup> In 1886 814 men were made deacons; in 1901 only 569. Ibid., I, p.155

<sup>863</sup> Published in Church Chronicle, November and December, 1904.

finally, a lack of continuity and dogged perseverance which we are accustomed to associate with the Anglo-Saxon race.<sup>864</sup>

David went on to suggest that the result was – and he was especially thinking of the Anglican Church – a kind of religion that led neither to empty ceremonialism on the one hand nor to fiery vigour on the other:

I very much question whether the type of religion in Australia in present circumstances will ever be of the character which strains after martyrdom. Something hereafter, maybe, will give it force and fire, but the whole of the present conditions seem to make for what is passive, if not comfortable, in religious convictions.<sup>865</sup>

The comparison inevitably came up between the strength of the Church of England and the Church of Rome.

Now, as compared with Romanism, the Church of England is a large, inchoate unwieldy mess. The difference is, to some extent the difference between an army and a mob. Nominally, we represent thirty-seven percent of the population; practically, as a Church, our influence in the community is almost a negligible quantity....We are disorganised, and we lack any policy. Our leading laymen are conscious of this weakness, and they are not seldom afraid to stand up and support the Church to which they belong...It lacks cohesion; it lacks *esprit de corps*; it lacks concentration of purpose; and, as the result of all this, it lacks efficiency, because executive and administrative authority is, to a large extent, disregarded.<sup>866</sup>

David was deliberately being pessimistic, because he had the purpose of emphasising the need of the Australian church to break the legal nexus which bound it to the English Establishment, and thus leave the Anglican Church in Australia free to grapple with its condition of weakness unhindered by the bonds of English legislation. Yet it was becoming clear to many critics that there was force in David's criticisms, and they typified the conclusions of that soul-searching that characterised these years.

What David said in these articles more and more people were beginning to think. Bishop Gilbert White in Carpentaria commented on the growing religious indifference, despite the fact that the work and earnestness of the clergy was no less than twenty years before.<sup>867</sup> As this concern spread throughout church circles, there was a move to evaluate the spiritual situation in a more comprehensive way. The result was two commissions - one set up by the Brisbane synod in 1907, which made its report the following year entitled The Religious Knowledge and Habits of the People of the Diocese, and another which presented a report to the Rockhampton synod in 1914 on the lack of definite churchmanship in that diocese. These reports, combined with available statistics for the other dioceses of the province, present an illuminating picture of the spiritual scene in Queensland.<sup>868</sup>

The picture presented by the commissions was a disturbing one. It was found difficult to estimate church attendance exactly, but the Brisbane commission concluded that no more than 15,000 of the nominal Anglican population of 130,000 in the diocese were at church on a normal Sunday, though this estimate did not include Sunday school attendance. The Sunday schools had an estimated 10,000 children on the rolls at this time. No attempt was made in the report to assess the number of communicants, but North Queensland figures for 1910 suggest that only 1,700 of more than 35,000 nominal Anglicans in that diocese made their Communion on Easter Day.<sup>869</sup>

This was bad enough, but the attendance of men was much worse than average, as it was generally reported that 75% of those at church were women. "The absence of men from Church is everywhere strongly remarked", commented the report, though this was less true in the bush districts than in Brisbane and the provincial cities. In the bush, however, church attendance was found to be "most erratic and fluctuating". Concomitant with the lack of church attendance, it was found that the custom of Sunday observance in the old sense was being broken down: work, sport and gambling were reported as alternative Sunday occupations, and one of the commission's correspondents commented that,

Many of the men, who are not engaged either shooting or fishing, spend Sundays in gambling and dodging the police round the back lanes of the town".

The Sunday school picture looked no brighter, although again the incompleteness of returns makes it difficult to draw accurate conclusions. The trend was, according to the Brisbane commission, towards lower Sunday school enrolments, though there was a slight improvement on the past in average attendance. Again, however, there was the same

<sup>864</sup> Ibid., November 1904. It is interesting that Archbishop Donaldson, writing in 1907, similarly compared the Australian church to the adolescent: "Ours is the normal condition of youth..." See Donaldson's essay in Ellison, J. and Walpole, G.H.S.(Eds), Church and Empire p. 166

<sup>865</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1904.

<sup>866</sup> Ibid., December 1904.

<sup>867</sup> Carpentarian, July 1905.

<sup>868</sup> For these reports in full, see Brisbane Year Book, 1908, pp 101-109; and Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1914, pp.

50-55

<sup>869</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1910-11, p.26

preponderance of females over males, particularly among the teachers in the Sunday schools, and to a lesser extent among the children. In North Queensland in 1910, for example, there were 35% more girls than boys enrolled in the Sunday schools, while there were four women teachers to every one man. Confirmation figures showed the same trend – 75% more females than males in North Queensland in 1910<sup>870</sup> and the same sort of disproportion could be seen in the south. In the Sunday schools teachers were in short supply, and many who were teaching were not fully competent. In short, the commission reported:

The Sunday school, as the principal agency now in existence for imparting religious knowledge, is not doing the work of training the children of the Church in a manner that is satisfactory.<sup>871</sup>

From Rockhampton came the same cry in 1914: the first reason given for the lack of religious knowledge was the inefficiency of the Sunday school system.

No less gloomy was the total view presented by the commission of the Brisbane synod on the state of religious knowledge of the people generally:

In city and suburbs the religious knowledge of young people is vague and most unsatisfactory. There seems almost a complete lack of any home teaching; what teaching is given is given by the Sunday school, and, in consequence of the meagre attendance at the schools, the ignorance of the mass is lamentable. With the majority, the Bible is almost an unknown book, and with the mass the use of prayer is practically non-existent. The religious knowledge of the children in the bush and outlying districts is lamentably poor. The great majority of these children are growing up in complete ignorance of any of the truths of religion....There is grave danger lest the children of the bush should become white heathen.<sup>872</sup>

Nevertheless, of outright unbelief the commission found very little evidence: the cause of the low spiritual level was seen not as lack of belief, but as “indifference, ignorance, immorality”.<sup>873</sup> This was felt to be encouraged by what one correspondent termed “frothy, exciting, sensuous, and unhealthy reading matter” which was commonly indulged in by the young.<sup>874</sup>

To meet this situation the Brisbane commission made a number of recommendations which did not contain much that was new. Statistics should be kept more accurately; organisations such as the Mothers’ Union, Church of England Men’s Society and White Cross League (to foster purity among men) should be encouraged; steps for the improvement of education in Sunday schools and after hours in day schools were suggested; and the wider use of religious sisters among the poor was advocated. In all of this, however, there was nothing that seemed really calculated to meet the great need revealed by the commission.

In a sense, the Rockhampton commission, six years after that in Brisbane, took over from where the former left off. It concentrated on one aspect of the subject revealed in the earlier investigation, namely the lack of definite churchmanship among those who claimed to belong to the Church of England. The guiding spirit behind this enquiry was the Reverend Farnham Maynard of Mt. Morgan, whose strong catholic sympathies and incisive mind gave direction and clarity to the investigation and the resulting report. That there was a definite lack of understanding of the meaning, privileges and obligations of membership of the church appeared clear, and the commission listed various reasons for this – indefinite teaching in Sunday schools and sermons; fear of the Roman Catholic church and of the authoritarianism that was popularly associated with it; the absence of a definite religious tradition in the country; and the lack of training of the clergy for taking part in the great social questions of the day. The commission saw the results that had been discovered by the Brisbane enquiry as following directly from this lack of clear churchmanship. It resulted in a failure to appreciate the Eucharist as the centre of worship, the meaning of priesthood in the Church of England and the need for regular almsgiving; at the same time it led to a corresponding readiness to be “broad-minded” to the extent of indifference.

The remedies proposed by the Rockhampton committee were more specific than those suggested by the earlier Brisbane investigators, and were centred around a more effective programme of educating Anglicans in the Catholic faith as received by the Church of England. Study groups should be formed, and tracts and books be readily available for sale; public lectures setting out the church’s faith should be given; the occasional offices of Baptism and Matrimony should be used as opportunities for instruction of those involved; the services of the church should be more clearly explained. In short, there was proposed the kind of educational programme that has since become a much more regular part of the activity of the church.

---

<sup>870</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>871</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1908, p.103

<sup>872</sup> *Ibid.*, p.104

<sup>873</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>874</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 107.

Do these commissions and their findings suggest a sudden deterioration in the spiritual state of the Church of England in Queensland and of its impact on the people at large? At first sight, it might seem so; yet it is doubtful if this was really the case. From the beginning of settlement we have seen that the church had faced an uphill battle in attempting to plant the religious life in an environment and amongst people that were for various reasons not very fertile ground. It was not only administratively and financially that the Anglican Church had been slow to adapt itself to its new environment. In its whole approach to definite church membership, and to the education of its members, it had lagged behind, and had failed effectively to make up the gap between itself and many of its nominal members that had existed from the beginning of its life in Queensland. So far it had still not faced up to the fact that a large proportion of its membership was, and always had been, purely nominal: it had not until this period grappled with the fact that a large proportion of its supposed members needed to be converted. The situation itself was not new: what was new was the dawning realisation of the true nature of the situation, which had existed in Queensland from the beginning. That this self-examination was at last being made was a sign not of weakness but rather of strength, for it meant that at last the church was beginning to recognise its deepest needs if it was to fulfil its real vocation.

It is against this background that we see the place of Bishop George Dowglass Halford as one who typified in his own life the self-criticism that was a mark of the Church of England in this period. Halford was one of those truly saintly men the very quality of whose lives constitute a permanent challenge to the spiritual flabbiness of the church around; and it was the very ineffectiveness of the witness of the church that stirred him to greater heights of charity and self-sacrifice. It was St. Francis of Assisi who was his ideal, and perhaps no figure in the history of Christianity in Queensland has so closely approached the great mediaeval saint in the quality of his life.

Halford first came to Queensland in 1897. He had been chosen by the Right Reverend B.F. Westcott, Bishop of Durham, out of the thirty priests of his diocese who had offered themselves for service abroad, to go as head of the first bush brotherhood in Australia, and for five years, with Longreach as headquarters, Halford and his fellow brothers worked with great perseverance against the inertia of years of spiritual emptiness in the west.<sup>875</sup> Halford's appointment as Archdeacon of Rockhampton in 1899 gave him a wider sphere of authority, and on finishing his term in the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, he became Rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, Rockhampton, which became under his influence a strong centre of spiritual life. Already by the close of his ministry at the cathedral, the idea of placing himself under complete obedience to some suitable bishop was becoming strong in his mind, and he returned to England in 1907 with the intention of spending a couple of years there, and then offering his services unconditionally to a bishop, with the hope that others would join him.<sup>876</sup> The offers of several bishoprics did not divert him from his purpose; but the unanimous call of the synod of Rockhampton, which met in 1908 to elect a successor to Bishop Dawes, was so strong that Halford somewhat unwillingly believed he must respond to the call of the diocese whose needs he knew so well. So on 2 February 1909, he was consecrated second Bishop of Rockhampton in St. Luke's Pro-Cathedral, Brisbane.

Of Halford's work as administrator of the diocese little need be said here. While carrying on along the general lines laid down by his predecessor, he brought a freshness into administration which was needed after the years of ill health which had hindered Bishop Dawes' work towards the end. Not long after taking charge, he set up a commission to report on the state of the diocese, which did valuable work in examining parochial boundaries, recommending sites for new churches, estimating the requirements of numbers of clergy, and detailing the financial condition of the diocese.<sup>877</sup> As a result of the findings of this commission, the bishop took steps to encourage the building of churches, and five new churches were constructed in the next two years; and later he made personal visits to the Australian capital cities and to England in search of money and men to equip the diocese for its work. The English visit unfortunately coincided with the outbreak of the first World War, and the result was an income of only several hundred pounds instead of the thousands that had been anticipated.<sup>878</sup> Nevertheless by the end of Halford's term £8,700 had been raised to build up the endowment of the see, and the number of clergy, which was only 14 at his first synod, was up to 22 by the outbreak of the war. The war itself resulted in a decline in numbers, but this was more than compensated for by the fine spirit of unity and devotion for which the Rockhampton clergy were noted. On his resignation Halford himself wrote that his successor would have "as brave and really devoted a body of priests as you'll find in Australia or anywhere else", men "with a lovely tradition of brotherliness and comradeship".<sup>879</sup>

Yet it is not for his work as administrator of his diocese that we look chiefly to George Halford, competent though he was in that kind of work. What makes his life specially significant, was his growing consciousness of the spiritual ineffectiveness of

<sup>875</sup> For details of Halford's early life, see Tomlin, J.W.S., Halford's Challenge, chaps. 1 and 2. Unfortunately this brief biography of Halford fails to do justice to the adventurous spirit of the man.

<sup>876</sup> Ibid., p.25.

<sup>877</sup> For full report of this commission, see Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1910.

<sup>878</sup> Ibid., 1914 p.25 and 1915 p.17

<sup>879</sup> Church Gazette, August 1920.

the church, and of the sense of his own personal vocation to do something about it. In his life we see the motif of self-evaluation in its purest form.

From the first, Halford's sermons, public addresses and synod charges called upon his clergy and people to face up to the fact of the failure of the church. In his very first presidential address to the Rockhampton synod, he gave a stirring call to look beyond the external details of church administration to the basic spiritual task. He went on:

Here, at the coast, we scarcely touch the lives of the working classes, and in the bush we do not reach the travelling population, and everywhere we fail to win men to confess Christ before their fellowmen. It is well that we should face this.<sup>880</sup>

He went on to ask how this great work was to be done, and his answer was:

Not by the work of the fourteen clergy – though we thank God for their faithful ministry – not by the work of the six lay readers though we are thankful for their devotion and service; but by the lives and prayers and service of the 1800 communicants...What we want at present everywhere is not first, more churchmen, but better churchmen.<sup>881</sup>

This was Halford's method, which he followed throughout his life. The first need was not breadth, but depth – a depth of spiritual life in the core of church people, and a depth of a spirit of sacrifice. And he recognised that if this were to be expected from his clergy and people, it must be shown forth first of all in his own life. So he declared to his synod in 1913 that it was the lack of the cross in the life of the church that was its real weakness. With real searching of soul, he put the question:

Brethren, I ask myself as Bishop, and I ask you clergy and laity, where is the mark of the cross in our Churchmanship today?<sup>882</sup>

It was the war, with the spirit of sacrifice that it evoked among the nation's fighting men that brought to a head in Halford's mind the failure of the church. In the warfare of the spirit in which the church was engaged, the anguished bishop could see so little of the spirit of sacrifice that was being displayed in the fight for national survival. The news of every additional casualty in the war weighed as a heavy burden on his soul, and the apparent powerlessness of the church to arouse a corresponding sense of sacrifice at the deepest level among her people seemed as a personal call to him to reveal ever more the quality of sacrifice in his own life. In his synod address of 1916, an address charged with intense emotion, he made the significant comment that "no great spiritual revival or extension of Christ's Church has ever arisen except from small and even obscure beginnings".<sup>883</sup>

As the war mounted to its last violent struggle in 1918 so did the intensity in Halford's soul. More and more he was beset with the sense of the inability of the church to carry any weight:

It commands no admiration from men and but small belief that it serves any useful purpose. It is not even worth attack, men can afford to ignore it, it is a negligible quantity, it simply doesn't count with a great majority. That is the plain situation today, and it may just as well be faced.<sup>884</sup>

These annual synod addresses reflect an inner conflict in the bishop's soul, the conflict between the need for sacrifice and the failure of the church to demonstrate it in practice.

It was in 1920 that Bishop Halford resolved the conflict in his own soul. With what appeared to the world dramatic suddenness, which took by surprise even his close friends, he reached a decision which was in fact the result of years of careful consideration. Announcing his intention to resign his office of Bishop of Rockhampton, he wrote:

I am about to renounce all that I possess to live the life of poverty for Jesus' sake. This, I have become convinced, is a call from God which I dare not disobey. I am constrained by the example of the Son of God, Who, though He was rich yet became poor; though He had all things, yet emptied Himself of all in love and service for man... I believe the Son of God, Who hung upon the Cross, is calling me, and I desire to have the marks of the Cross branded on me for the rest of my life.

He went on to link up his renunciation with his love for the Anglican Church:

There is also, I am sometimes conscious, adding its pressure, what arises from my love and belief in the Church in which God has placed me as an Englishman. I love the Church of my baptism, of so many wondrous communions, the Church through which God gave me priesthood. I believe in it: it has so much of special value: it does seem so possible that it might be specially used by God in the Reunion of Christendom: it might be so strong, so united for world service.

<sup>880</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1909, Bishop's address, p.11.

<sup>881</sup> Ibid.

<sup>882</sup> Ibid., 1913, p.10

<sup>883</sup> Ibid., 1916, p.12.

<sup>884</sup> Ibid., 1918, p.8.

But few things hurt more than that it is possible for persons today, as in Macaulay's time, to pour scorn upon it by contrast with the Church of Rome for its lack of the note of sacrifice. And I have to see that by comparison it does not seem to have the power to produce in any large measure the highest saints or to move its sons and daughters to give up absolutely everything without reserve for love of Jesus...I want to be one of those who are ready if He calls. That is the one thing at present which is clear. God is calling me to give up all that I possess, more literally to follow Jesus.<sup>885</sup>

The reaction to the bishop's announcement was immediate. Among the ill-informed the reactions could be summed up by a variety of words ranging from "mad" to "Rome"; among many thoughtful people inside and outside the church there was provoked deep admiration of the bishop's sincerity;<sup>886</sup> and among many of the bishop's close friends there was real puzzlement over whether he had chosen the right course. One thing was clear from it all: however the bishop's action was interpreted, it implied a self-criticism at the deepest level of the reality of the faith and devotion of the life of the Church of England. This was reflected in a troubled article by Halford's friend and deputy, Archdeacon G.H. Rogers:

Surely we need to reconsider, not what the office of a Bishop really is, but what we English Churchmen these many years have been requiring from our Bishops. We have asked them to be social leaders, we have just allowed them, and that reluctantly, to lead us in prayer: we have demanded too much service of tables; we have cared far too little for their ministry of the Word and Sacraments.<sup>887</sup>

Although it will take us outside the period we are concerned with in this part of our study, it will be convenient to follow through the sequel of Halford's renunciation. Halford in the quest for a rule of obedience which we have noticed in him since 1908 and before, placed himself wholly in the hands of his trusted friend and metropolitan, Archbishop Donaldson. Donaldson instructed him to test his vocation in the religious life with the Community of the Resurrection in England, but it was quickly clear that Halford's vocation was to be that of the wandering friar rather than the enclosed monk, and his burning desire was to bring the Gospel to the unchurched poor of Queensland. Halford therefore returned to Queensland, and with Donaldson's encouragement, hoped to group around himself an "Order of Witness", to consist of priests and laymen who would join him in a life of poverty, chastity and obedience, with headquarters (consisting of hut and chapel) at Tingalpa, outside Brisbane. There were from time to time several postulants, but the order failed to grow; yet Halford never grew discouraged, and as a solitary witness of the Kingdom of God, sometimes among the railway construction men around Wowan, sometimes among the miners and navvies in the Dawson and Callide valleys, sometimes among the new settlers in the Burnett, Halford moved about on foot or in an ancient car, living often in a rough tent on a diet that would have shocked even the poorest labourers.<sup>888</sup>

Frequently he answered calls to take parochial missions or clergy retreats; twice, unwillingly, he returned to Rockhampton to administer his old diocese in the absence of the bishop. It was only obedience that in 1935 made him heed the command of Archbishop Wand to come to live in Brisbane: the archbishop had heard of his serious state of health through heart attacks and insisted that he come to the city. Here he lived and continued to be a powerful influence on great numbers of individuals until his death in 1948.

What was the significance of the life of George Halford? Outwardly, it might have appeared to be a miserable failure. He gave up his bishopric where he had been a powerful influence for good; and his hope of founding an Order of Witness for the conversion of the unchurched of Queensland never came to fruition. Time and again hopes for the growth of the Order arose only to be dissolved again. Yet though all the failure of impressive organisation, Halford exerted an influence on great numbers of individuals, the ramifications of which it is not possible to estimate. There are many who have played an important part in the life of the church in Queensland whose lives were changed by their contact with Bishop Halford. Above all, his life was a living witness to that deeper spiritual reality which, in the early decades of this century, churchmen had begun to realise insufficiently marked the lives of most churchmen. Like St. Francis of Assisi he had sought to recall the church to the poverty of spirit of Christ himself. To outward appearance he was far from achieving complete success: but then the same might have been said of Christ himself at the end of His earthly life.

#### iv. John Oliver Feetham and the Catholic Faith

John Oliver Feetham, fourth Bishop of North Queensland (1913-1947) was nothing if not a product of the catholic revival in the English church. His long episcopate lies mostly outside the period we are now considering: but the Feetham legend – for such it has become – was already on the way to being established by the end of the first World War, and he already typified the kind of churchmanship that was becoming a mark of Anglicanism in Queensland. The catholic movement was making many changes in the life of the church in Queensland, and was giving it a different atmosphere from the more conservative south. Particularly was the contrast noticeable with the extreme low churchmanship of the Diocese of Sydney.

<sup>885</sup> Bush Leaves, 3 March 1920, quoted in Tomlin, J.W.S., Halford's Challenge, p. 34f.

<sup>886</sup> According to Church Standard, 26 March 1920, the matter was a great topic of discussion all over the country.

<sup>887</sup> Church Gazette, April 1920.

<sup>888</sup> Once for a period of six weeks Halford paid out only 9/9 for food. Quoted in Tomlin, J.W.S., op.cit., p.61.



While it is convenient to take Bishop Feetham as a type of the new trend, it must not be inferred that the catholic revival in Queensland was the work of any one individual. Indeed, as we have seen in earlier chapters, it was a progressive movement that had been exerting its influence since the arrival of Benjamin Glennie in 1848. Glennie himself was a moderately advanced churchman for his day; the offertory troubles of the 1850's had been in one aspect a conflict between high and low church points of view; and Bishop Tufnell and many of his clergy had been quite definitely influenced by the Oxford movement. Thus far, however, only the early stages of the catholic revival were represented – the reassertion of the catholicity of the Church of England, without those ritual and ceremonial alterations which marked the second stage of the movement in England. So far, all that was sought was the recovery of the catholic doctrine of the Book of Common Prayer: there was little suggestion that this doctrine should be given liturgical expression by reviving older forms of ceremonial, and even less suggestion that the 1662 Prayer Book itself might be improved upon as the official form of the church's worship.

In the 1870's and early 80's the catholic movement made little headway in Queensland, at the very time when it was taking new forms in England. The two bishops, Hale in the south and Stanton in the north, were both evangelicals, and Archdeacon Glennie's attitude was increasingly marked by this conservatism that naturally accompanies old age. Nevertheless, in many of the parishes, there was a trend towards greater reverence and orderliness in the conduct of services, more regular celebrations of Holy Communion, and an emphasis on the catholic heritage of the Church of England. In particular, All Saints', Brisbane under the long incumbency of the Reverend C.G. Robinson, (1877-1896) became known as the centre of moderate, but definite catholic teaching.<sup>889</sup>

It was not, however, until the advent of Bishop Webber in 1885 that a steady, if unspectacular, change began to come over the churchmanship of the Diocese of Brisbane. It was not that Webber was an extremist of any kind, and certainly he was no ritualist: indeed he came out with the reputation of being a non-party man, so far as schools of churchmanship were concerned.<sup>890</sup> By English standards this was fairly true: but marked changes had come over the norm of English churchmanship in the past quarter of a century which had barely touched Queensland, so that there were many who found their new bishop excessively high church by comparison with what they had known.<sup>891</sup> Webber's influence on the churchmanship of his diocese was, however, twofold: firstly, he encouraged men to come to Brisbane who, like himself, believed firmly in the catholicity of the Church of England, and who while not extreme ritualists wanted to see worship conducted with dignity and beauty; and secondly, his ideal for the diocese was one of comprehensiveness, of tolerating varieties of churchmanship, such as existed within the Anglican fold in England.<sup>892</sup> This policy was in contrast to the narrower evangelical policy of his predecessor.

During his episcopate Webber consistently maintained a policy of comprehension, and under his firm and fair rule in matters of doctrine and ritual, the diocese knew none of the fierce ritual controversies that racked the church in England in the nineties, and which were widely reported in the Queensland press. In 1899 Webber declared that he knew of no instance of ritual excesses in the diocese, and expressed the hope that party spirit would never arise.<sup>893</sup> Yet in the southern states, the Diocese of Brisbane appears to have been regarded as being of quite extreme churchmanship. A member of the Sydney synod protested in 1898 that Brisbane was a diocese where "if a man was a Protestant he had no place",<sup>894</sup> and two years later a speaker in Melbourne presented a vivid picture of Brisbane church people "deserting the Church in battalions on account of the advanced teaching of the clergy". The Brisbane Church Chronicle snorted in reply that "the wild absurdity of the charge will be patent to all our readers".<sup>895</sup> The fact was that Brisbane had been more generally touched by the impact of the Oxford movement than had the southern metropolitan dioceses; but by comparison with England there was little that could be called extreme. Indeed one of the factors that was kept in mind in the selection of Donaldson as Webber's successor was his freedom from partisan views, and one possible candidate for the bishopric was rejected as unsuitable because he had worn eucharistic vestments in the past. This indicates that the tone of the diocese was regarded as moderate.<sup>896</sup> Even so, rumours emanated from Sydney that Donaldson was an extreme high churchman; and Archdeacon David was constrained to explain to the Archbishop of Canterbury that "the Sydney point-of-view is early Victorian, so that a man of the most moderate views is regarded in the light of a Ritualist of the deepest dye".<sup>897</sup>

<sup>889</sup> Kissick, D.L. All Saints' Church, Brisbane p.60ff.

<sup>890</sup> See, for example, Brisbane Courier, 17 November 1885.

<sup>891</sup> Cf. the attitude of the parishioners of Christ Church, Milton, to their new bishop: Brisbane Courier, 29 April 1886.

<sup>892</sup> Cf. letter from Bishop Webber, Church Chronicle, August 1891.

<sup>893</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1899, Bishop's address, p.64.

<sup>894</sup> Quoted in Church Chronicle, October 1898

<sup>895</sup> Ibid., November 1900

<sup>896</sup> Bishop H.H. Montgomery to Archbishop R.T. Davidson, 15 February 1904, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>897</sup> Archdeacon A.E. David to Abp. R.T. Davidson, 18 June 1904, ibid.

The situation was not very different in the other dioceses of Queensland, though until after the turn of the century it was the Diocese of North Queensland that was least touched by the catholic revival. Even there, however, there was a changing atmosphere, and Archdeacon Gilbert White in 1895 counselled the clergy to use tact and reasonable explanation in their presentation of their teaching so as not to bewilder the old fashioned churchmen; and in an aside he commented significantly, “and it is not so long since nine-tenths of us were old fashioned churchmen too”.<sup>898</sup> White himself was an example of a growing appreciation, as his ministry proceeded, of catholic churchmanship, but when he became Bishop of Carpentaria, he laid down, with the express approval of his clergy, the limits beyond which ceremonial should not go. On one thing White was particularly definite, that the clergy were bound to obey the rubric of the Prayer Book obliging them to say the daily offices of Morning and Evening Prayer: “It is not within the right of the parish priest”, wrote the bishop, “to omit this at pleasure”.<sup>899</sup>

This latter point in a sense typifies the emphasis of the catholic movement in Queensland up to the beginning of the new century. Chief stress had been laid so far on the restoration of the doctrine and services of the church to their proper position after the laxity of the previous century – the use of the daily offices, the placing of the Eucharist as the central act of worship, the beautification of services by good music, the better observance of the church’s seasons and holy days, and emphasis on the disciplines of Lent and other seasons of fasting. The trend was shown by the commencement of a daily Eucharist at All Saints’ Brisbane, in 1904, though this was still very exceptional.<sup>900</sup> What was perhaps more significant was the displacement of 11 o’clock Matins as the chief Sunday service by a Choral Eucharist the following year.<sup>901</sup>

The first two decades of the twentieth century saw a marked change in the general level of churchmanship, at least among the clergy of Queensland. This was not primarily an indigenous development, but a reflection of the situation of the church in England. The years from 1890 to the Great War saw the full flowering of the Anglo-Catholic movement in England. It was a time when large numbers of the best types of university men were offering themselves for ordination; when great work was being done by bands of priests in the clergy houses of the London slums; when the social concern of the Oxford movement was coming to fruition under the leadership of men like Henry Scott Holland; and when the zeal for spreading the Catholic faith at home and abroad was at its highest pitch. The Anglo-Catholics were the vital force within the English church, and were searching for avenues of sacrificial service, preferably in some form of communal work, wherever it might be found. Work in a place like Queensland had its attractions: the lack of long traditions might seem to render more likely a victory for Anglo-Catholicism; the five-year plan for service abroad made possible a form of sacrifice that was not too permanent; the formation of bush brotherhoods opened the way to the expression of the romantic spirit of quasi-monasticism and adventurousness that was in the air, without the fuller restrictions of complete community life; and there were bishops who were doctrinally sympathetic and appreciative of zeal. So it was that a bishop like Frodsham, not really an Anglo-Catholic, encouraged men of advanced churchmanship to work in his diocese, for they more than anyone else had the spirit of sacrifice, zeal and intellectual ability that made their labours particularly attractive.

So it was that though Webber’s ideal of comprehension continued to be the policy of his successor and the other Queensland bishops, comprehension in practice proved favourable to the growth of Anglo-Catholicism. It was from the catholic party that pressure was exerted, and as a result doctrines and devotional practices that would have been frowned upon by nineteenth century bishops came to be accepted as permissible and even normal.

Probably the greatest single factor in this changing norm of churchmanship was the influence of men who came out to the bush brotherhoods. These included many priests of great spiritual and intellectual capacity, and the corporate brotherhood life gave them an *esprit do corps* which greatly increased their influence, especially in the smaller dioceses of the north. In North Queensland, for example, the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas formed a sizeable proportion of the whole clergy of the diocese. They formed a bloc in the diocesan synod, they adopted uniform practices throughout the whole Brotherhood area,<sup>902</sup> and after their term in the Brotherhood was completed, many of them, because of their ability, were appointed to important positions in their respective dioceses. One interesting indication of the operation of Anglo-Catholic influence through the brotherhoods was the remarkable gift of £7,000 to the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas by an Englishman, Philip Page. The condition of the gift was that the soul of Page’s brother be remembered at the altar for seven years, and Page himself specified that the money go to the brotherhood, and not to the bishop, so that it might,

<sup>898</sup> White, G. *The Intellectual Development of the Ministerial Life*, a paper read at Mackay in 1895.

<sup>899</sup> White, G., *Notes on Ritual for the Consideration of the Clergy* (Brisbane, 1902).

<sup>900</sup> *Minutes*, Annual Meetings, All Saints’, Brisbane, 1904.

<sup>901</sup> *Church Chronicle*, September 1905.

<sup>902</sup> E.g. the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas early adopted the rule that eucharistic vestments were to be worn in every church, and a Sung Eucharist at 10 or 11 was to be the chief Sunday service. See Barclay, C.C., “North Queensland in 1911”, in *North Queensland Notes*, October 1954.

strengthen the position of a future Prior-brother possibly sometimes in opposition to the policy of any future 'wobbling' Bishop which the unorthodox diocese may thrust upon itself.<sup>903</sup>

The result was – and not only in the brotherhood areas – that many changes were noticeable in the trappings of church life, especially in the conduct of church services. Candles and vestments became more common; the Eucharist, often rendered with considerable ceremony, became the chief service of the day; terms like 'Mass' and 'Father' began to be heard; sacramental confession was more widely preached and practised; mediaeval plainsong replaced the customary 'Anglican chant' in the cathedral at Townsville;<sup>904</sup> the bishops began wearing again the traditional copes and mitres.<sup>905</sup> Nor was it only a number of recognised extremists who were involved in these changes. In the early years of the century the Brisbane Church Chronicle, the official organ of the diocese, increasingly emphasised the catholicity of the Church of England, and Archbishop Donaldson in his sermons constantly drove home the central truths of the Catholic faith, though he was far less concerned than some of his contemporaries with what he regarded as its outward trimmings.

In looking at these changes it would be a grave error to suppose that they were the work of men who were merely concerned with the superficial externals of religion. There was, it is true, some whose characteristic temptation was to place excessive emphasis on outward and visible signs. Yet at the deepest level, the catholic movement was an attempt to meet the critical situation of feeble churchmanship which we studied in our last section. These were men who genuinely believed that the weakness of the Church of England was the aftermath of the cold and diluted Anglicanism of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century, and that the church needed to be aroused to the greatness and richness of its catholic heritage. The first phase had been to attempt to recall the great truths of the Catholic faith without external changes in worship and forms: but this, they believed, had failed, because actions speak louder than words, and only by clothing of teaching in visible forms could it really be driven home to the man in the pew. The restoration of rites and ceremonies which for generations had fallen out of use in the Church of England was seen, therefore, not as an end in itself, but as a means of getting back to the truths behind those forms.

Such was the theory: how well did it work out in practice? Looking back from the vantage point of half a century it may be seen that the results were neither as uniform nor as complete as was hoped. In religious convictions and in forms of worship people are perhaps more conservative than in any other side of life; and in many ways it is desirable that this should be so. Even though they might be rationally convinced of the value and propriety of changes, many lay people found it difficult to make a rapid adjustment; and many were genuinely bewildered, and found it hard to avoid the fear that Catholicism in the English church was not far removed from Roman Catholicism, against which years of traditions had nurtured deep prejudices. The result, then, was twofold: on the one hand there was evidence of a growth of reverence in worship, and of a deepening of the spiritual lives of many faithful clergy and laymen; but on the other hand there was a widening of that already existing cleavage between the clergy and the great mass of members of the church. The northern correspondent of the Church Chronicle made some perceptive remarks in 1909, even before the more radical changes there of the following decade:

There is a cleavage in the Church between the Laity and the Clergy to which it is folly to be blind. The overwhelming majority of the Clergy are High-churchmen at heart, the overwhelming majority of the Laity are, at heart, Low-churchmen. At first sight this state of affairs may appear most comforting to the High-churchmen. They may truly say that it clearly proves that the people who know what they are talking about are High-churchmen, while only those who are ignorant of theology are Low-churchmen. But in truth it proves much more. It proves that the teachers have failed to teach. The distinctive teaching of the Church of England is contained in the 'Book of Common Prayer'. Clergymen, of course, have mastered the principles of that book; and they are in consequence, dubbed 'High-Church'. The Laity is profoundly ignorant of that book, because the Clergy has failed in its mission to teach it to the people.<sup>906</sup>

The last part of this comment was an over-simplification of the position: but the basic contention of the cleavage between sanctuary and pew was undoubtedly true. Two years later, the same journal carried another article from the north, suggesting that the northern diocese was homogeneous: "the Bishop and his staff of Priests form a sort of mutual admiration society";<sup>907</sup> but whether there was alike homogeneity between the doctrine of clergy and that of the laity may be more open to question. It was well summed up by one of the Anglo-Catholic bush brothers in recalling his own early years in North Queensland: "The trouble was that the majority of the clergy had one religion and the laity another".<sup>908</sup> What was

<sup>903</sup> Quoted from notes in Historical Records Folder, in N.Q. Diocesan Registry.

<sup>904</sup> Northern Churchman, September 1919.

<sup>905</sup> Ibid., December 1910. The consecration of St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane in October 1910 was recorded as "probably the first time in the history of Australia where all the Bishops of a Province have worn their lawful and canonical vestments at the Eucharist".

<sup>906</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1909

<sup>907</sup> Ibid., June 1911

<sup>908</sup> Barclay, C.C., loc.cit.

true in the north was also true in many parts of the south of Queensland.<sup>909</sup> The truth was that too many of the young English priests assumed that the sharp changes which they introduced had really succeeded in a few years in changing an outlook that had been moulded over generations. That their hopes were by no means entirely fulfilled was demonstrated by the vexed disputes over these issues that followed in the succeeding decades.

It is against this background that we may examine the early years of the North Queensland episcopate of John Oliver Feetham: not that it would be true to say that Feetham was typical of the Anglo-Catholic movement, for he was such an individual personality that he was typical of nothing except himself.<sup>910</sup>

In background, however, John Oliver North Queensland, as he became well-nigh universally known, had much in common with many of the young English priests who were coming to Queensland at this time. The son of an English rectory, he yet possessed private means, and was enabled to enjoy the education of the well-to-do young Englishman. The Feetham boys turned out to be quite a distinguished family – three of them becoming priests, one a major-general, and one a judge. At Cambridge Feetham had a mathematical training, which had a marked influence on his whole mode of reasoning and speaking, because it trained him in the habit of dealing analytically with a subject – a kind of treatment that always marked his major speeches, whether synod charges or his famous school speech day addresses.

Like so many of the young well-to-do Oxford and Cambridge priests, he found an outlet for his desire for service in the slums of London, first as a layman at Oxford House, whose head at the time was the Reverend A.F. Winnington-Ingram, later Feetham's beloved Bishop of London, and then after his ordination at an East End parish in Bethnal Green. For Feetham, this was adventurous work, and the spirit in which he went out in 1907 to become principal of the Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd at Dubbo had something of that boyish spirit of adventure that always marked his whole attitude to the priestly vocation. He expressed it once in a synod address, and it typified the spirit of the early bush brothers:

There is nothing of such enduring and increasing interest as the progress of the human soul; no romance so thrilling as that of its sustained pursuit of holiness. It is the office of the priest to minister to this progress – to discern the spiritual needs of those who are not yet conscious of them; to make their hearts hungry with want; to kindle their hopes; to pray for them; to rejoice in their repentances; to assure them of God's pardon; to sustain their courage; to give thanks for their growth in grace; to glory in their conquests; to learn from each one something more of the mystery of godliness.<sup>911</sup>

Here was the heart of Feetham's outlook, that the work of deepening the spiritual lives of individual men and women was a great adventure, and that it was only by growth in the Catholic faith and through the church's means of grace that this could be done.

It was the combination of this boyish adventurousness, the deep concern for each individual, and the unconventional simplicity of the bishop that endeared him to all kinds of people. Though no one could have had a higher regard than Feetham for the tremendous importance of episcopacy, at the same time no one could have been less the 'proud prelate' than he. In his unconventional bush attire – for he would often be seen even in the streets of his see city dressed like a rough bushman – or in his habit of preferring to sleep in a tent under the stars rather than in a comfortable bed, he had the sort of approach to life that made bush people feel at home with him; and even as bishop of an extensive diocese, he regularly found time to go on pastoral tours with his bush brothers, visiting even the most isolated of his spiritual children. In all of this there was a touch of the actor in Feetham, yet it was so much part of him that it was at no time a forced role. His clergy well-nigh worshipped him, not so much for the eccentricities which the laymen enjoyed, as for the close personal relationship which they individually shared with him, and for the deep spirituality which so patently shone through him. Indeed, it was the quality of real holiness which the clergy of the diocese had discerned in him when he conducted their retreat in 1910 that caused them to elect him as their bishop when Bishop Frodsham resigned in 1913.

Yet Feetham's spirituality was never of the passive or contemplative variety. From prayer he must move to action: and he customarily moved with a decisiveness that would brook no opposition. He was not the man to suffer fools gladly, and it took a good deal to convince him that he was wrong, and with eagerness and determination he would carry through his policy.<sup>912</sup> His action was typical, at the 1925 synod, for example, when the laity in a vote by orders, rejected the advice of the provincial chancellor, Percy Hart, that the use of the Wills bequest of some £8,000 be at the bishop's discretion.

<sup>909</sup> See, for example, letter signed "Darling Downs", Church Chronicle, June 1913.

<sup>910</sup> For more detailed treatment of Feetham's life and work, see Norman, J., John Oliver North Queensland, and also Feetham, J.O. and Rymer, W.V. (Eds.), North Queensland Jubilee Book, especially pp.16-26. Norman's biography is in many respects a disappointing one, which fails to catch the real colour of one of the most colourful personalities in Queensland history.

<sup>911</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1914-15, Bishop's Address, P.25.

<sup>912</sup> Cf. article by Bishop Richard Thomas in The Willochran, October 1947.

After this defeat Feetham replied with a statement that the action “appears to me to mean that this Synod has assumed to override the law, and that its action should not be regarded as a precedent.”<sup>913</sup>

The following year it was announced that the diocesan council had given way to the bishop, albeit not very graciously, as to the mode in which the money should be spent.<sup>914</sup> It was a typical instance of Feetham’s determination to get his own way when he firmly believed he was right. He was, as Bishop Wand said after his death, ‘all power and brilliance and adventure; always with some fresh cause to espouse, some new battle to wage’.<sup>915</sup>

It was his very single-mindedness that not infrequently got Feetham into difficulties in his relationships with others outside his own diocese. He was too openly single-minded to be the good diplomat or statesman. His very straightforwardness and clarity of purpose made it difficult for him to be a successful negotiator with those whose points of view differed radically from his own, whether it were politicians, who cared little for the things of the spirit, or Sydney evangelical churchmen, who could scarcely help seeing Feetham as a raving papist. His metropolitans, notably Donaldson and Wand, who admired him tremendously, found that they constantly had to act as a buffer between him and others outside his own diocese with whom he had dealings. But on the other hand those who got to know him found that they could always be sure where they stood with John Feetham.

The thing that characterised Feetham’s outlook was his immense consciousness of the grace of God, which he firmly believed came to him and others through the Word and Sacraments of the church. It was this that made the Catholic religion so real to him: it was no question of frilly ceremonial – it was the heart of life itself. His whole life and work centred around the Eucharist; it was because he believed in the grace given in Confirmation that he always urged that children should be confirmed at an earlier age; and it was the consciousness of the grace of forgiveness that made sacramental confession so real a part of his own life and teaching. Towards the end of his life he recalled a question that he had been asked years before:

When I first came to North Queensland, they told me they hoped I was a Protestant. I said ‘I am not a Protestant, because I don’t know what Protestantism is’. And could they tell me? They could not tell me. Nobody can. Protestantism is quite indefinable. It is never the same for two generations. It is intensely divisive and splits into hundreds of competing sects.... Very well, then, I said, ‘Do you wish to know what I am, I am the Catholic Bishop of North Queensland. I have a contemporary who is the Roman Catholic Bishop of Townsville. The work of his Communion is of great importance, but it is only part of the work of the Catholic Church.’<sup>916</sup>

It was a typical Feetham utterance. He was conscious of belonging to that stream of catholicity running unbroken through the ages from Christ Himself. But it was catholicity in its broadest sense: no effeminate religion, but something that was full of power and zeal, that bore upon life in all its aspects – and Feetham’s part in all kinds of public questions will appear again and again in our history – and that sought to combine those aspects of religious truth understood by the names “catholic” and “evangelical”. John Oliver Feetham has become a legend of the Church of England in Queensland: and in that very legend we see something of how the appearance of the church was so markedly altered in the early decades of this century.<sup>917</sup>

---

<sup>913</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1924-5, p.34.

<sup>914</sup> Ibid., 1925-26, p. 42.

<sup>915</sup> Northern Churchman, November 1947.

<sup>916</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1947.

<sup>917</sup> For the promulgation of John Oliver Feetham as a ‘saint and hero’ of the Anglican Communion, see below, p.543.

## **CHAPTER 12: THE WEAPONS OF THE CHURCH MILITANT.**

By the generation from 1890 to 1920 the structural framework of the church was complete; but in the self-evaluation that thinking churchmen were making in these years, it was becoming clear that in town and country alike the church was failing to embrace within its active membership great numbers of people of all classes. As this realisation grew, the conviction arose that sole reliance on the personal ministry of the individual priest in his parish was inadequate in the face of the immensity of the evangelistic task.

In these circumstances the church began to forge for itself new weapons to fulfil its mission more effectively. At last practical measures began to be taken to make the long-envisioned hope of an indigenous ministry a reality; new avenues of Christian education began to be devised; an attempt was made to introduce religious communities as a normal feature of church life; new evangelistic methods began to be employed to bring the Gospel to the poor and unchurched in cities and suburbs; the problem of ministering to isolated bush communities was tackled in a radically new way; and within the parishes new organisations were developed to cater for the social and spiritual needs of different age groups. Individually these changes came gradually and for the most part quietly; but collectively, they represented a new wave of evangelistic impulse which may be regarded as the church's response to the challenging situation that was revealed in our last chapter.

### **i. An Indigenous Ministry**

In preparation for the Pan-Anglican Congress, of 1908, every diocese of the Anglican Communion was asked to submit the topics which were of greatest concern to it. It was significant that the reply sent from Brisbane listed "the supply and training of candidates for Holy Orders" as its first concern.<sup>918</sup> At the following provincial synod Archbishop Donaldson reiterated that the church's greatest task was "the formation of the Native Ministry".<sup>919</sup> Although it was only in the first decade of the twentieth century that any real progress was made towards meeting this need, the ideal of an indigenous ministry went far back into the previous century.

We have seen that although the great majority of the clergy continued to be drawn from England, steps had been taken from the late 1870's to ordain local men, and to attract northwards a number of Australian priests who had been trained at Moore College, Sydney. It was not, however, until the nineties that more concentrated attention could be devoted to this matter.

Bishop Webber, from the time of his arrival, recognised the need of an Australian clergy, and this not on pragmatic grounds alone, but on the sound principle that the Anglican church would never be truly rooted in Australia until it produced its own ministry.<sup>920</sup> At this time, however, conditions were not ready for self-sufficiency in clerical supply. Many of the parishes had not yet developed that regular and intensive spiritual life in which vocations to the ministry were likely to be fostered, and many of the promising young men in the colony lacked the educational opportunities that might equip them to be suitable candidates for ordination. There was, of course, no theological college, and Bishop Webber was not anxious to commence one until a university had been established, which would set a reasonable educational standard for the colony. In short, the whole educational and social climate militated against the emergence of a native ministry.<sup>921</sup>

Despite the difficulties, an important step forward was taken in 1886 with the appointment of the Reverend Bernard Wilson as examining chaplain to Bishop Webber. Wilson replaced the aged Archdeacon Glennie, and his appointment signified a concern for the more systematic instruction and examination of ordination candidates. Wilson was an extremely devoted and effective priest – as his later ministry as Vicar of Portsea, the biggest parish in England, indicated – and within the limited opportunities provided in the colony he helped considerably to raise the standard of the few local ordinands. Naturally, however, Wilson could do little more than offer spiritual and tutorial guidance, because he was heavily committed with many other responsibilities.

The training for the few young men ordained by Bishop Webber at this time consisted of a combination of guided reading with practical experience in assisting a parish priest. A typical case was that of Walter St. Leger Marshall, who, while working as a station hand in the far west, came under the influence of the Reverend H.M. Shuttlewood of Charleville. Marshall had the advantage of an English secondary school education, and studied for his deacon's examination while working as a lay reader at Charleville, and later at North Ipswich. He was finally ordained in 1891 at the age of 28. Another young man Alfred Davies also came under Shuttlewood's influence while working as a shop assistant in Charleville. His whole period of reading for the deacon's examination lasted only one year, yet the fact that the training was not entirely

<sup>918</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1906, p.41

<sup>919</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1909, p.13.

<sup>920</sup> Bishop's address, Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1887, p.5.

<sup>921</sup> Cf. comments on this subject by Rev. B.R. Wilson, Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion, 1894, p.49

deficient is indicated by the fact that Davies in later life rose to the important appointment of Archdeacon of Toowoomba.<sup>922</sup> Nevertheless, Webber recognised that such training for the sacred ministry, was quite inadequate, and he felt, too, the lack of suitable parishes in the diocese for the broad training of curates after their ordination.<sup>923</sup>

With the arrival of the Reverend A.E. David, who replaced Wilson as examining chaplain in 1893, ordination training was taken more seriously. David had been vice-principal of the Leeds Clergy School, and his work with ordination candidates was to be his primary responsibility, though the bishop increasingly placed other tasks on his shoulders as well. At first the training could only be a matter of "individual labours with some who from time to time are glad to come to him for instruction".<sup>924</sup> In 1897, however, a house became available on Wickham Terrace opposite All Saints', and without any fuss Archdeacon David gathered together four students to commence the Brisbane Theological College.<sup>925</sup> Here in somewhat austere conditions were the real beginnings of organised theological training under the firm discipline of the archdeacon. David expected sound academic standards; but from the start he set the tradition of a kind of training that was centred around the chapel as much as the lecture room. In this he established a pattern which was to be taken up by later St. Francis' College.

It was along these simple lines that the theological college continued for some years. Archdeacon David, more and more tied down with diocesan duties in Bishop Webber's later years, had the assistance of the Reverend Douglas Price, a minor canon of the cathedral; but the staff was inadequate, quarters were cramped, and finances were difficult.<sup>926</sup> Then, David's resignation in 1905 put an end to the old arrangements, and although the small number of ordinands carried on their training at Bishopsbourne itself under the tutelage of some of the scholarly clergy like H.F. le Fanu and F. de Witt Batty, it was obvious that some more permanent arrangement was necessary if large numbers of local men were to be trained for the priesthood.

Meanwhile it was not only in Brisbane that this problem had caused concern. In North Queensland Bishop Barlow was anxious to ordain local men, and having had no experience of university or theological college training himself, was willing to do so without very thorough preparation. The diocesan Year Book set out the conditions for those who desired admission to deacon's orders. They must make written application to the bishop not less than three months before ordination, and must sit for the examination held in November, about a month before the ordination. The subjects for examination included the Bible (including a little of the Greek Testament), Prayer Book, Christian Evidences, Church History and Pastoralia. A further examination was then held before ordination to the priesthood.<sup>927</sup>

To help such ordination candidates prepare for the work of the ministry, Bishop Barlow instituted a rank of sub-deacons. These were candidates for holy orders, who, having withdrawn from secular work, were appointed to assist a parish priest who was to guide them in their studies. They were admitted to their office with a short service, and their duties were,

In the absence of a priest or deacon to read morning and evening prayer, to catechise the young, to read the burial office if required, and by private exhortations and visiting from house to house, to promote Christian knowledge and holiness of life.<sup>928</sup>

Details were set out of their dress: while officiating, they were to wear a cassock, surplice and hood or tippet, and at other times 'a grave and sober attire'. At this time four of the North Queensland clergy had come to ordination through the office of sub-deacon: but the system was open to the obvious weakness of lowering the standards of clerical education, and it was perhaps its patent failure that caused Bishop Frodsham to enforce such rigid requirements for ordination candidates.

Surprisingly enough, it was in the newly organised Diocese of Carpentaria that the other formally constituted theological college was founded. Bishop Gilbert White, academically inclined as he was, had always been interested in the training of the clergy, and wasted no time in founding in 1901 a college, called Bishop's College, for training his own ordinands. It was only a gift from Lord Beauchamp, former Governor of New South Wales, which provided a bursary for three students, that made the venture possible; but from the beginning it was a doubtful undertaking.<sup>929</sup> The college building was the old

<sup>922</sup> These details are based on a manuscript of Bishop Webber now in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane.

<sup>923</sup> See Bishop Webber's comments on this subject, Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion, 1894, p.59

<sup>924</sup> Bishop's address, Brisbane Year Book, 1895, p.101

<sup>925</sup> Ibid., 1897, p.49. See also Kissick, D.L., All Saints' Church, Brisbane, p.77.

<sup>926</sup>

To save expense, the college actually moved into All Saints' Rectory itself, and David's salary was paid by the cathedral chapter. It was Webber's plan that one of the residentiary canonries of the cathedral should be reserved for the principal of the college, and that his stipend be paid from cathedral funds.

<sup>927</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1898-9, p.19

<sup>928</sup> Ibid., p.23.

<sup>929</sup> Carpentarian, January 1901.

Thursday Island rectory, which served also as the bishop's palace; its staff was the bishop – who frequently had to make long pastoral journeys away from Thursday Island – and the parish priest of the island; and its student body never numbered more than four: indeed, as few or none of the students were able to pay their own way, Bishop White could never afford to have more than four. Nevertheless several men were ordained from the college, and some of these lived to serve long and faithful ministries; and doubtless what they lost in the way of academic talent in their inadequate staff, they more than gained by close contact with such a wise and spiritual mentor as the bishop himself was. This indeed was Bishop White's chief justification for the college: he believed that in a diocese where the companionship of bishop and clergy meant as much as it must in the isolation of Carpentaria, it was good that the students should come to have an intimate knowledge of him.<sup>930</sup> After a few years, however, the practical disadvantages of an isolated theological college became apparent – expense, climate, and smallness of numbers of students and staff – and the establishment of an official provincial theological college provided a convenient occasion for the discontinuance of Bishop's College, and the transfer of its remaining students to Brisbane.<sup>931</sup>

From the time of his arrival in Brisbane in 1905 Dr. Donaldson awaited the opportunity to put theological training on a proper foundation, and the constitution of the newly formed Province of Queensland made the education of ordination candidates a provincial concern. As in so many other aspects of Queensland church life, it was Bishop Webber who took the initial steps, though he did not live to see the final outcome: for not only did he encourage Archdeacon David to begin a theological college, but in his will he left £1,700. to further the work.<sup>932</sup> With this sum it was possible to purchase the Eton High School, Nundah, from the Sisters of the Sacred Advent, to house a permanent college.<sup>933</sup> The following year the Reverend J.W.S. Tomlin was appointed principal, and given a residentiary canonry of the cathedral, and at the beginning of 1907 the new college officially commenced lectures with eight students.<sup>934</sup>

The appointment of J.W.S. Tomlin as first principal was a good one. Although he was in England when appointed, he had spent a number of years previously in the diocese, including a short time in charge of the Brisbane Theological College in Archdeacon David's absence. David himself regarded him as 'the most spiritual minded and valuable man as a parish priest in the Diocese', though "a little wanting in knowledge of the practical affairs of the world".<sup>935</sup> He set the college on a routine of disciplined life centred around the daily offices and meditation, yet at the same time had available a very able team of visiting lecturers who maintained a good intellectual standard.<sup>936</sup> The course was normally for three years, and was designed to lead to Th.L diploma of the Australian College of Theology. Students were expected to pay their own fees of £50 per annum if possible, or if they had to be assisted, to pay the loan back after ordination. It was further expected that they would abstain from marriage for five years after ordination, and that during that time they would hold themselves available to be sent anywhere in the province at the discretion of the archbishop.

From these small beginnings St. Francis' College began to fulfil the hopes of providing an indigenous ministry for the church in Queensland. To encourage young men to offer themselves for the ministry an Order of Postulants was formed in 1908.<sup>937</sup> Yet there was never an over-abundance of candidates of the required educational standard, and for a time from 1913 the higher Queensland educational standards resulting from the establishment of the university led to the lowering of the college entrance requirement to that of the Junior Public Examination.<sup>938</sup> Nevertheless, the second principal, Canon P.A. Micklem (1911-1917), who was one of the ablest scholars to have come to the church in Australia from England, succeeded in maintaining a good standard of scholarship as well as a high level of churchmanship at the college, and in 1911 with 16 students in residence, and another 25 members in the postulants' guild, the future looked very promising.

The onset of the first World War, however, had a drastic effect on the flow of local ordination candidates. By 1916 only four of the theological students were still at St. Francis', ten others having joined the forces, and for a time it became necessary to amalgamate the theological college with St. John's University College.<sup>939</sup> By 1918 the college was completely closed; and with the resignation of Micklem the previous year there appeared to have come a complete breakdown of local training for the ministry.<sup>940</sup> Already, however, the worst was past, and the end of the war brought back not only those students who had interrupted their studies, but others who during the war had become conscious of a vocation to the priesthood. Canon

<sup>930</sup> Abstract of Proceedings of the First Conference of the Diocese of Carpentaria, 1902, p.13.

<sup>931</sup> Carpentarian, October 1907.

<sup>932</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1906, p.87

<sup>933</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1905.

<sup>934</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1907, p.43. At first the college was commonly called the Nundah Theological College, but it was given the name of St. Francis College in 1910.

<sup>935</sup> David, A.E. Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS).

<sup>936</sup> For details of the kind of training given, see Church Chronicle, December 1906 and December 1908.

<sup>937</sup> Brisbane Year Book 1908, p.44

<sup>938</sup> Ibid., 1913, p.24

<sup>939</sup> Ibid., 1916, p. 16.

<sup>940</sup> Ibid., 1918, p.168.



W.C. Campling was brought out from England as principal, and under a rather more rigorous routine than before, the work of the theological training was re-commenced.

Even despite the late beginning of theological training and the interruption of the war, Archbishop Donaldson was able to report in 1921 that half the clergy in the Diocese of Brisbane were Australian born and trained.<sup>941</sup> The figure was not quite so high in the other dioceses, but already there had been great progress towards the indigenisation of the church in this state.

It was a development that had occurred just in time: because the flow of priests from England by this time had declined to a trickle, and the outlook would have been grim indeed if the local flow had not sprung up.

While this attention was being paid to developing an Australian priesthood, some thought had also been given to increasing the use of the laity in the church's work. In the early years of the new century the Queensland bishops encouraged laymen to offer themselves for training as lay readers, and with considerable success. By 1908 North Queensland had more than 30 lay readers, while a few years later Brisbane diocese recorded some 115 lay readers or catechists. In order to ensure that these men be qualified for their work, the provincial synod in 1909 laid down that they should normally have attained the Th.A. standard.<sup>942</sup> Meanwhile, for young laymen willing to serve as full-time catechists, a more thorough kind of training was provided at an institution set up at Cabarlah, near Toowoomba, under Archdeacon A.R. Rivers, in 1906. This was to be the headquarters of a lay brotherhood of catechists, and for some years this centre did operate: but it eventually suffered the fate of many such schemes, and its members either withdrew, or else desired to go on to ordination.<sup>943</sup>

In personnel, as in many other aspects, the church in Queensland presented a very different aspect in 1920 from twenty years before. As yet the leaders were still, virtually without exception, men who had been trained in England. But among the rank and file, Australians were becoming increasingly prominent, and it was only a matter of time before they began to assume places of leadership as well.

## ii. Christian Education

When Dr. Webber accepted the see of Brisbane in 1885 he requested of the Archbishop of Canterbury that the announcement of his appointment should mention that he was a member of the London School Board.<sup>944</sup> Webber had been closely concerned with education in London, and he intended to interest himself in this subject in Queensland; and it soon became clear that the mild acquiescence of the Church of England in the complete secularisation of education, which had resulted from the 1875 Education Act, would give way to a more critical attitude.

In the 1880's, apart from the schools of the Roman Catholic Church, there was no religious instruction given in the schools: it was prohibited in the state schools, and the Anglican school system which had been so hopefully initiated under Bishop Tufnell, had completely collapsed. The entire burden of religious training for Anglican children rested on the Sunday schools, which neither embraced all the children nor provided particularly effective teaching. By 1890 the inadequacy of this arrangement was being increasingly demonstrated by the religious ignorance of many young people, and even the members of the churches which had supported the secular system of education in 1875 were growing restive.

In the years from 1890 to 1920 the desire of Anglican leaders for more satisfactory methods of Christian education was channelled in several directions. First there was the campaign to reintroduce religious instruction into the state schools; secondly, there were moves to re-establish a system of schools under the direct control of the church; thirdly, there was interest in the foundation of a university; and finally, more deliberate attention was being paid to the question of Sunday school techniques. We shall consider each of these approaches to the educational question in turn.

It was in about 1890 that the movement for restoring religious teaching in the state schools began in earnest, and from that time it became one of the annual exercises of synod to pass an appropriate resolution on the subject. It was in October 1890 that a Bible in State Schools League was formed in Brisbane, under the leadership of Bishop Webber, composed of seven Anglican priests and three ministers each from the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches, the Baptists and Congregationalists being represented later.<sup>945</sup> This representation fairly signified the degree of enthusiasm displayed by the

<sup>941</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1921, p.5.

<sup>942</sup> Ibid., 1909, p.37. The Th.A. was the more elementary diploma given by the Australian College of Theology.

<sup>943</sup> See Brisbane Year Book, 1906 p.39, p.84; 1907 p.46

<sup>944</sup> Webber to Abp. E.W. Benson, 19 February 1885, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace. The request was made at the suggestion of the former premier of Queensland, Sir Robert Herbert.

<sup>945</sup> For the origins of the League, see Lilley, W.O. Reminiscences of Life in Brisbane, and Reflections and Sayings, p.27ff. The work of the League is also treated in some detail in my unpublished thesis, The Attitude and Influence of the Churches in Queensland in Matters of Social and Political Importance, 1859-1914, pp 52-63

respective bodies in the cause: from the start it was from certain Anglican leaders that the driving force behind the league came.

It was a long, hard struggle before it seemed that any progress was being made. A spate of sermons on the subject in July 1891 aroused interest for a while,<sup>946</sup> but mild antipathy from Roman Catholics, opposition from some of the Non-conformists, and the force of inertia resulting from years of inactivity combined to wear down the initial enthusiasm. The league consequently drifted rather aimlessly for the remainder of the decade, and even the indefatigable Dr. Webber became so immersed in economic and other problems that he failed to sustain a powerful lead.

It was about the turn of the century that a turning point came in the affairs of the league. The Reverend G.H. Frodsham, later Bishop of North Queensland, was appointed secretary, and through his energy and organising ability the league began to show renewed vigour. It was about this time that the official aim of the campaign was altered: originally the league had simply advocated general Bible teaching in schools by the regular school teachers, but now it began to campaign as well for times for specific religious instruction by the clergy to the children of their own denominations within school hours.

By this time, however, the subject had become an increasingly ticklish one from the point of view of successive Queensland governments, for while the churches supporting the Bible in State Schools League numbered more than half the population of the state among their nominal adherents, there was an increasingly hostile opposition to the league's programme from Roman Catholic and secularist quarters. The policy of successive premiers consequently appeared to stave off the issue. In 1900, for example, an interdenominational deputation found the premier, Robert Philp, sympathetic but evasive.<sup>947</sup> In response to a vague assurance from Philp the league organised a voluntary poll among the parents of state school children in 1902, and won an overwhelming victory for Bible teaching.<sup>948</sup> For a time the government gave way, and permitted religious instruction in the schools, but under pressure they withdrew the regulation again within a month.<sup>949</sup>

At that point the campaign might have ended in defeat: but there arrived from North Queensland in 1907, a new David to attack the secularist Goliath. Archdeacon David Garland was appointed organising secretary of the Bible in State Schools League, and with that characteristic determination which came to be associated with his name in later years, he set about renewing the campaign. As before, the evasion of politicians and the rapid turn-over of governments in this first decade of the century proved the great stumbling block. Philp promised a referendum, but then went out of office; the new premier, Arthur Morgan, after hesitation agreed to a poll, but then he retired to the Legislative Council; William Kidston, the next premier, first refused, then agreed, and then refused again to hold a referendum. Garland was not the man to take this sort of treatment; and the Bible in State Schools League determined to enter directly into the 1907 election campaign.<sup>950</sup> Branches were formed all over the state; sermons were preached; a League of Christian Voters was established; and every candidate was asked to declare his opinion on whether a referendum should be held. The result was a striking victory for the league; three-quarters of the members elected to the new parliament had accepted the principle of a referendum, and it appeared that the final battle was near.

Even yet the referendum was delayed another two years, and it was not until 1910 that the poll took place. Strong opposition to the league's programme came from the Roman Catholic Church, the Labour party and secularist forces, yet the final result was a clear-cut victory for the cause of religious teaching in the schools.<sup>951</sup> It was the clearest case of direct religious intervention in politics since the vexed educational struggles of Bishop Tufnell's day; and it was a personal triumph for Garland that success was accomplished without provoking that degree of bitterness and bigotry that might so easily have been aroused.<sup>952</sup> The Church of England was in the best position of all the Christian bodies to take advantage of the opportunity this presented, because it had a larger body of clergy than the other churches (except the Roman Catholic), stationed in almost every district in the state. Within a year of the referendum, Archbishop Donaldson jubilantly reported that already all but thirteen of the clergy of his diocese were teaching in the schools, and large numbers of children were being reached who had never come under the influence of the Sunday schools.<sup>953</sup> By the middle of the following decade the scheme was in full-scale operation, and Anglican clergy were teaching in some 460 schools throughout the state, and reaching more than 22,000 children.<sup>954</sup>

<sup>946</sup> Brisbane Courier, 27 July 1891.

<sup>947</sup> Church Chronicle, October, 1900.

<sup>948</sup> The vote was: 21,101 for; 1,427 Against. See Lilley, W.O., *op cit.*, p.39

<sup>949</sup> Church Chronicle, August and September, 1902.

<sup>950</sup> Ibid., November, 1906.

<sup>951</sup> The figures were 74,226 Yes; 56,672 No; 7,651 Informal.

<sup>952</sup> Brisbane Courier, 15 April 1910.

<sup>953</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1911, p.21.

<sup>954</sup> Figures estimated from statistic in the respective diocesan Year Books.

At first the ecclesiastical authorities were so delighted about the advantages of religious instruction in the schools that the difficulties which the future might hold were scarcely perceived. Particularly in the early years, many of the clergy who had had no training for this kind of work, found themselves in difficulties with large classes. Later, as numbers of children increased, and parochial activities became at the same time more intense, the time taken up in giving religious instruction in large numbers of schools, to big classes in uncomfortably crowded conditions, presented many problems. Particularly in the crowded schools of the years following the second World War, the clergy were to find themselves questioning the practicability of effective religious teaching in the schools by traditional methods.<sup>955</sup>

The policy of the Church of England in setting up church schools was closely related to the Bible in State Schools issue. Again and again spokesmen for the church declared that in principle they favoured a state system of education, but that if religious teaching were to be excluded from the state schools, the church might need to set up its own school system. As the Church Chronicle commented, while the campaign for religious instruction was in progress:

If this reform is granted, we are inclined to think that Church Primary Schools will disappear. At any rate new schools will not readily be formed. If it is not granted the Church Primary Schools will increase.<sup>956</sup>

There were two reasons for this support of the state education system. One was the intensely practical one, which had caused the breakdown of the Anglican school system in the 1860's. that members of the church did not contribute generously enough to make the building and maintenance of large numbers of schools possible; but there was also the conviction that a single educational system was preferable to one that must have divisive effects on the community.

In the face of an adequate state primary educational system, therefore, the Anglican Church made no real attempt to set up a rival chain of schools. There was frequently talk of doing so, as each successive wave of new clergy from England noticed the absence of those parochial schools that played such a big part in the educational scene at home but the realities of the Anglican situation in Australia in most cases led them to change their mind after a time. The result was that though a small number of church primary schools were established about the turn of the century, they neither grew very big nor endured very long. The first was St. John's Day School in Brisbane which Canon Montagu Stone-Wigg started in 1894 with the assistance of the Sisters of the Sacred Advent.<sup>957</sup>

This actually proved the most permanent of the church's primary schools: within a year it had seventy pupils, and by 1908 its numbers had reached two hundred, and it continued until 1942 when it succumbed as a war-time casualty. The few other primary day schools which were started as a rejoinder to the secular education of the state schools faded out after the introduction of religious instruction into the latter. Rockhampton, Ipswich and Woolloongabba parishes all had small schools for a time, with less than a hundred children, but none of these survived the first World War. In staff and equipment they were quite unable to compete with the state schools, and the fees ranging from sixpence to a shilling a week, would have needed to be greatly increased if they were to provide adequate facilities.<sup>958</sup> The only other significant move by the church in the field of primary education was the purchase of the Toowoomba Preparatory School in 1920: but this was a boarding school, a sphere in which there was no competition from the state.<sup>959</sup>

In the realm of secondary education, however, the situation was very different. There were no high schools under state control, and the only secondary education in Queensland was provided in the few grammar schools, Roman Catholic schools, or in small private institutions. Fees had to be charged in all these secondary schools, though the grammar schools received an indirect subsidy for some of their pupils in the form of state scholarship allowances, which after 1899 could be taken out at any approved secondary school of the student's choice. In this field, then there seemed an obvious opening for the Church of England to initiate educational work.

Tentative steps towards the establishment of church high schools had already been made in the 1880's, but the time was premature. As early as 1881 the subject was discussed by the diocesan council in North Queensland.<sup>960</sup> Then following a motion in the 1884 synod<sup>961</sup> a rather grandiose scheme was agreed upon at a meeting in Townsville in 1886 to form a "North Queensland Church Schools Company Limited": with a capital of £10,000 in £5 shares. The first project was to be a girls' school, but it was hoped that others for boys and girls would follow the initial example.<sup>962</sup> The scheme might well have proved workable in a more settled community, but North Queenslanders were not yet ready for this kind of investment, and

<sup>955</sup> See below, Chap. 17, iv.

<sup>956</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1899. The same policy was reaffirmed after the league's victory. Ibid., January 1912.

<sup>957</sup> Short History of the Society of the Sacred Advent.

<sup>958</sup> For details of these primary schools, see annual reports, Diocesan Council of Education, Brisbane Year Books; also Rockhampton Church Gazette, April 1901, October 1907, and December 1912.

<sup>959</sup> Details from Mss. of historical research carried out by Archdeacon W.P. Glover. The school was bought for £7,000.

<sup>960</sup> Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, p. 110.

<sup>961</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1884, p.24.

<sup>962</sup> N.Q. Diocesan Diary 1885-8. 7 January 1886; also N.Q. Monthly Record, January 1886.

the proposal died a natural death. In southern Queensland, too, similar practical financial difficulties stood in the way, and though Bishop Webber urged the wisdom of founding high schools in 1887, he had to admit that no immediate action could be taken.<sup>963</sup> Certainly the church itself had no finance for the purpose: the best Webber could do was to suggest that individual members of the church might found private schools on church principles.<sup>964</sup>

In fact, this was the way that the early church secondary and boarding schools did begin. In the early nineties the North Queensland diocesan council decided to found a girls' school, but were forced to change their mind by the economic depression, and when a Miss Macdiarmid came from England to found such a school, it was only on the condition that the diocese could promise her no financial support.<sup>965</sup> Under these discouraging conditions the school commenced in 1894, but it never grew to more than about fifty girls, and under three successive principals it was unable to meet operating expenses; it was hardly surprising that it was forced to close down in 1905.<sup>966</sup> The same fate befell several other independent church schools, both in north and south. A Collegiate School for Girls under the direction of Miss Frances Stretch lasted in Brisbane from 1897 to 1902, and at its height had more than sixty girls enrolled; but it too was crippled by the financial burden, aided by mismanagement. In the Diocese of Carpentaria two tiny schools had an even more fleeting existence.<sup>967</sup>

It was clear that something more than the optimism of isolated individuals was needed if strong church schools were to be put on their feet, particularly as the depressed conditions of the nineties made the obstacles to success even greater than they would otherwise have been. As circumstances were to demonstrate, the schools that survived were those which were established in one of three ways: those which were founded by a religious order, The Society of the Sacred Advent; those which commenced with official authorisation by the church, with the financial and moral support which that involved; and those whose individual founders were people of particularly outstanding ability.

The first group of schools, those under the direction of the society of the Sacred Advent, were to become an important part of the church's educational system in Queensland. Their first venture, the Eton High School, was founded in 1895, and after several changes of situation finally settled in 1910 at Albion where it became known as St. Margaret's School. "Not very efficient", Archdeacon David noted privately of this school in 1904, but "it might be developed".<sup>968</sup> By 1912 this school still had little more than sixty girls, but the saving in salaries through the fact that the sisters received no payment, made it possible for this school to carry on when other small institutions had failed. Unfortunately, however, the sisters were never sufficiently numerous to provide more than a small nucleus of the staffs of the schools under their direction; yet the continuity of administration provided by the life of the community, aided by their self-sacrifice in carrying on the work in the face of all kinds of difficulties, enabled their schools to survive and make progress. As the sisters' numbers increased, so they ventured upon more school undertakings. In 1909 they took over a struggling girls' school at Stanthorpe – it had only three boarders and seven day girls – and renamed it St. Catherine's. Not long afterwards, in 1911, a reform school for girls, which had been in existence since 1904 at Clayfield, was re-constituted as an industrial school and named St. Michael's, though it was chiefly concerned with younger girls.<sup>969</sup> Later, at the urgent request of Bishop Feetham, the S.S.A. also took charge of three new schools in the north, but it will be more convenient to consider the growth of church schools in that diocese together.

The second group of schools were those which began directly under diocesan auspices, or were saved from failure by being taken over from their private owners by the church. Increased diocesan interest in school projects was demonstrated in Brisbane from 1899, when a special Council for Education was set up by synod.<sup>970</sup> The chief venture carried through by the diocese itself was the Glennie School, Toowoomba. This project grew out of the £800 which Archdeacon Glennie had collected for school purposes, with which a fine site was procured in Toowoomba for boys' and girls' schools, but with the funds available a girls' school only could be established which opened in 1908 under the Misses Lawrence as joint principals.<sup>971</sup> Another small school at Southport, known as Miss Davenport's school, was taken over by the diocese in 1911 and became an official church school under the name of St. Hilda's<sup>972</sup> Later, in 1918, a group of Warwick churchmen under

<sup>963</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 20 December 1887.

<sup>964</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1889, Bishop's address, p.17.

<sup>965</sup> Minutes, N.Q. Diocesan Council, 18 November 1892, October 1893, and 18 March 1894.

<sup>966</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1900-01, p.92, and 1905-06, p.72. For further details, see Rowland, E.C., The Trp[lo]cs fpr Christ, pp 111-113.

<sup>967</sup> Carpentarian, April 1901 and October 1906.

<sup>968</sup> David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS)

<sup>969</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1911.

<sup>970</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1899, p.72

<sup>971</sup> Ibid., 1908, p.76. Part of the funds for this school had been collected in England by the Rector of St. Luke's

Toowoomba, the Rev. T. St. J. Pughe, See Pughe, to S.P.G., 31 July 1899, S.P.G. "F" Mss. Also letters from Pughe to Archbishop E.W. Benson, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace (1898).

<sup>972</sup> Minutes, Diocesan Council for Education, 1 November 1911. the price paid was £1,800.

the leadership of their rector, the Reverend W.P. Glover, made moves to establish schools for boys and girls in that district. Sites were purchased, and a girls' school actually established; but financially it proved too great an enterprise for one parish, and the diocese was forced to take over the girls' school. Later a boys' school was also started, but this story belongs to a later section of our work.<sup>973</sup> Another Church of England Girls' Grammar School at Bundaberg, founded during the war, never grew to more than a handful of students, and failed to survive.

In the third group were two other ventures, which though they started privately and were eventually taken over by the church, stood in a different category. For they were taken over out of strength, rather than weakness, and essentially they owed their early success to the remarkable personalities of their founders. In 1902 the Reverend H.H. Dixon, Rector of Southport, founded a school for boys in his parish as a private venture, though with the sanction of the diocesan authorities. It was planned that if it succeeded, it should become an official school of the church, and in 1913 the diocese purchased the school from its founder, but retained him in office as headmaster.<sup>974</sup> Very much in the tradition of an English public school, and set in a splendid position by the sea, the school quickly became recognised as one of the finest secondary schools in the state. No less remarkable was the enterprise of the Reverend, W.P.F. Morris, who in 1912 gathered a few boys to form a private school at Toowong, which grew until in a healthy condition, it became an official church school in 1914, with its founder also remaining on as headmaster.<sup>975</sup> In 1917 the growing school moved to a fine site in East Brisbane, where it too had room to develop into one of the great secondary schools in the state.<sup>976</sup>

Behind these enterprises lay the constant support and encouragement of Archbishop Donaldson. It was under Donaldson's guidance that the new educational policy of the church was developed. In essence this policy was to leave the work of primary day schools to the state, but to develop boarding schools, and in particular secondary schools, which would do work that the state was avoiding. In short, the design was to foster a system of church schools "to supplement the State system on their own free lines without State aid or State control".<sup>977</sup>

If Donaldson was a powerful influence in the south, Bishop Feetham was even more so in North Queensland. In the great areas of the north where population was thinly scattered, Feetham saw a double threat: there were not only the dangers of secularised state education – and religious instruction was still not permitted in the state high schools – but there was the other danger of large numbers of Anglican children being sent to Roman Catholic boarding schools, because these were the only ones available. Feetham grasped two facts: the whole weight of the diocese and its bishop must be squarely placed behind a church school system, and if costs were to be kept within practicable limits and the right religious atmosphere provided, the schools must be under the control of religious orders.

For a diocese that in the first decade of the new century had been on the verge of economic collapse, this was no small task. Bishop Frodsham had left a blueprint for a church college. It was to train teachers who could give religious instruction, and to prepare students for further theological training and also for the university. He had even arranged for a priest to come from England to take charge of the work, and some funds were in hand for this purpose.<sup>978</sup> A start was actually made with a boys' school at Herberton in 1913, but the chosen principal returned to England, and the warden of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, the Reverend R.C. Halse, had to take charge on a temporary basis. The shortage of clergy caused by the effects of the war soon created difficulties, however, and by 1916 the school – which had finally developed as a primary boarding school – was forced to close down.<sup>979</sup>

Bishop Feetham, however, was determined to press on. Having failed in his efforts to persuade an English community of nuns to commence school work in his diocese, he finally succeeded in convincing the over-committed Society of the Sacred Advent to extend their work to North Queensland. Then, having undertaken a vigorous campaign to raise money both inside and outside the diocese, the bishop founded three secondary boarding schools for girls in different parts of the diocese within a few years. In 1917 the S.S.A. opened St. Anne's School in the heart of Townsville. In 1918 a private school at Herberton which had been operating on the premises of the defunct boys' school, was taken over by two sisters, Misses Rosa and Amy Philpott, and became known as St. Mary's School, which, when the Philpott sisters were later professed into the S.S.A., became affiliated with that community. Finally in 1921 another school for girls, St. Gabriel's was

<sup>973</sup> Archdeacon W.G.P. Glover's Mss., and Church Chronicle, March 1918. The initial cost of the girls' school, under Miss Margaret Brown as principal, was £7,000.

<sup>974</sup> Minutes, Diocesan Council for Education, 4 August 1913.

<sup>975</sup> Ibid., 4 May 1915.

<sup>976</sup> The history of these schools may be traced in the school magazines, the Southportonian and the Viking. For the C.E.G.S., see also Morris, W.P.F., Sons of Magnus. Dixon continued as headmaster of the Southport School until 1929, and Morris as head of the Church of England Grammar School until 1946.

<sup>977</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1917, Archbishop's address, p.114.

<sup>978</sup> N.Q. Year Book 1910-11, p.73

<sup>979</sup> N.Q. Synod Proceedings, 1915, p.102. See also Halse, R.C. "Early History of Church Schools in North Queensland", in Historical Records Folder, N.Q. Diocesan Registry.

opened at Charters Towers.<sup>980</sup> Meanwhile, the boys' side had been catered for in 1920 when Reginald Halse, on behalf of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, founded All Souls' School at Charters Towers. Halse, with his gift of adapting 'the most improbable means to the most triumphantly useful ends'<sup>981</sup> used a homestead, a stable and part of a hotel as the basis of his school, and during five years refused several offers of bishoprics in order to put the school on a sound footing.

These new schools, founded so close together, placed a great strain on the financial resources of the church in North Queensland. By 1921 some £27,000 had been spent on their establishment: and it was a great tribute to the personal energy of Bishop Feetham that £20,000 of this had been subscribed.<sup>982</sup> The next decade was to show that the financial problems of the schools of the church, both in southern and northern Queensland were by no means settled with their foundation, and there were to be times when the wisdom of the venture was questioned. Yet almost without exception the schools that had survived by 1921 were to flourish, and to make a considerable contribution to the total picture of Queensland education.

What was the significance of these church schools that sprang up in the generation from 1890 to 1920? The principle lying behind them was summed up by their great champion, Bishop Feetham:

We have here religious education in the full meaning of the words – a system in which religion is not merely one subject among others, but in which the Christian faith is placed at the centre, and all other subjects are grouped around it and taught and learned in relation to it. This is the only form of education which entirely satisfies the Christian.<sup>983</sup>

This was the aim; and with it was the intention that the quality of the general education provided should be the equal of that given in secular schools, and that physical and recreational facilities be provided as fully as any in any other schools in the state.

While they had many elements in common, the church schools differed considerably from one another in atmosphere. In North Queensland they were much more directly under diocesan control than were the southern schools, and the strong personality of Bishop Feetham impressed itself on the staffs and pupils of the schools. In the Diocese of Brisbane semi-independent school Councils were responsible for administering the schools, and the individual principals greatly influenced the tone of their schools: especially were the Southport School and the Church of England Grammar School in Brisbane shaped by the long headmasterships of their respective founders.

These schools had an influence in the life of Queensland far greater than the numbers of their students might suggest. In the early years particularly, they were quite small, and in 1919 the ten church schools in the Diocese of Brisbane totalled fewer than 1100 scholars;<sup>984</sup> three years later the North Queensland schools had an additional 350.<sup>985</sup> These numbers were not large: but it has to be remembered that the numbers proceeding to secondary education in Queensland at that time were quite small, and the Church of England schools catered for a significant proportion of these. Fees were kept remarkably low in the early years, mainly because the salaries of staff were so low and equipment was simple at a time when greatest emphasis was placed on subjects in the tradition of classical education. This meant that it was possible for children of ability to attend these schools even though their families had limited means,<sup>986</sup> and the relatively small numbers included many of the ablest young people in Queensland, so that past pupils of these church schools have since played a very prominent part in many spheres of the life of the state. The fact that such a large proportion of the students were boarders also was significant, because it meant that large numbers of children who would otherwise have been unable to go to secondary school were enabled to do so. The boarding aspect of the church schools has continued to give them a distinctive flavour in contrast to the increasing number of day state high schools.

The need for boarding accommodation in a wholesome atmosphere for bush children raised the possibility of another type of venture by the church in the educational field, namely in the provision of hostels for outback children attending state schools. As early as 1912 land was bought for a hostel in Rockhampton,<sup>987</sup> and a motion approving the principle of such hostels was carried in the Brisbane synod two years later.<sup>988</sup> A hostel called St. Paul's was actually opened in

<sup>980</sup> A Short History of the Society of the Sacred Advent, passim. Also North Queensland Jubilee Book, pp 82-90. For further details of all the North Queensland schools, see Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, Chap 10.

<sup>981</sup> Comment by Bishop Feetham, North Queensland Jubilee Book, p. 32.

<sup>982</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1920-21, p.46.

<sup>983</sup> Ibid., 1916-19, Bishop's address to 1917 synod. P.95

<sup>984</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1919, p.155.

<sup>985</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1921-2, p.46.

<sup>986</sup> In 1907 fees for boarders ranged from 7 or 8 guineas per quarter at Eton High to £12.10.0 per quarter at Southport. For day scholars they were only 1½ to 2 guineas at Eton High and £3.10.0 at Southport. Figures taken from Church Chronicle, March 1907.

<sup>987</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1912, p.11.

<sup>988</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1914, p.35.

Rockhampton in 1914 with accommodation for a dozen girls, and was found very useful; when in 1922 a church school for girls was opened at Yeppoon, however, there was no further need for the hostel, which was closed down.<sup>989</sup> Meanwhile in 1921 the Sisters of the Sacred Advent opened a hostel for girls attending the state school in Charleville, and this institution grew steadily in the course of time.

Few sections of the community were more concerned to have a university established in Queensland than the Church of England. There were two reasons for this. One was that the bishops and a large proportion of the clergy, being graduates of British universities, appreciated the value of a university education to a much greater extent than many others in the community. In Brisbane diocese, 35% of the clergy were university graduates at the outbreak of the first World War; while in the northern dioceses the proportion was even higher – about 50% in North Queensland and 65% in Rockhampton. These men were anxious to secure for their own children and for their people the same benefits of tertiary education that they had enjoyed themselves, and they knew how important it would be for the future intellectual and cultural life of Queensland.

There was another reason for special Anglican interest in a university, of more immediate concern to the well-being of the church itself. It was recognised by responsible leaders that an educated indigenous ministry, which was a live issue after 1890, necessitated the high standards of education which a university would foster. It was not without significance that when he first raised the subject of the need of a university Bishop Webber did so in the context of comments about the need for training local men for the ministry.<sup>990</sup> The two subjects were never far apart in the thinking of leading churchmen.

When a Royal Commission was set up in 1891 to examine the university question, Bishop Webber was included among several leading churchmen who sat on the commission, and he demonstrated his lively interest by the absolute regularity of his attendance, in contrast with some of his ecclesiastical colleagues. One of the controversial issues that came up was whether there should be a chair of divinity at the proposed university. Dr. Dunne, the Roman Catholic bishop was utterly opposed to any such suggestion, but for the Church of England the Reverend A.E. David argued on the basis of his English experience for a theology degree as a sequel to the arts degree. The Commission's report proposed something of a compromise,

that the character of the University be secular as a State institution, but that chairs of comparative or Christian theology may be established by private donors.<sup>991</sup>

As the actual foundation of the university still lay almost twenty years in the future, this finding did not have much immediate significance; but it did reflect one of the specific church interests involved in the university question.<sup>992</sup>

When the University of Queensland was actually established, a direct link with the church was maintained by the tradition of appointing the Anglican archbishop (together with leaders of the Roman Catholic and Non-conformist churches) to the senate. A more important matter, however, was the establishment of St. John's College within the University, as an Anglican residential college formally affiliated with the university. Archbishop Donaldson was in large measure personally responsible for this enterprise. Having made a large personal contribution to help found the college, he gathered together a few wealthy churchmen to form a limited liability company to put the college on its feet.<sup>993</sup> The Reverend Edward Morgan Baker was brought from England to be the first warden, and with five students the college opened in 1912 in temporary premises rented at Kangaroo Point, across the river from the university. It was the second of the residential colleges to be established.

While the university was very small, the college only gradually increased in numbers of resident students. Nevertheless, under Baker's wise guidance, it grew to nineteen students within a year, for whom a warden, bursar, and two resident tutors were supplied, as well as half a dozen visiting tutors.<sup>994</sup> The war brought something of a crisis, with the enlistment of many of the members of the college; but it survived with the aid of money collected by the archbishop in England and the backing of the diocesan council, and after the war St. John's College settled down to make its distinct contribution to the life of the university.

In spite of the emergence of these varied fields of religious education after 1890, the Sunday school still remained the chief means of conveying the church's teaching to large numbers of children. How many children attended Sunday school, and

<sup>989</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1915 p.44, and 1922 p.37.

<sup>990</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1886, Bishop's address.

<sup>991</sup> Report of Royal Commission on the University, V.&P., Legislative Assembly of Queensland, 1891, Vol iii, p.xxi.

<sup>992</sup> In synod of 1900 Bishop Webber protested against the proposed 'deliberate exclusion of the science of Theology from the subjects in which a degree may be given'. Brisbane Year Book, 1900, p.44.

<sup>993</sup> According to Bishop J.O. Feetham, Donaldson gave £500 towards the college at its foundation, another £2,000 in 1931, and left £3,000 in his will. See N.Q. Year Book, 1935-6. p.31. A summary of the early history of the college is given in Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.173ff.

<sup>994</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1913.

with what regularity, is hard to assess accurately because of the notorious unreliability of the returns available. In 1900 there were more than 10,000 children on the rolls in the Sunday Schools of Brisbane diocese, with more than 800 teachers, of whom the great majority were female; the average weekly attendance, however, was only about 55% of the children.<sup>995</sup> The schools varied greatly in size and efficiency, and while some of the bigger parishes had Sunday schools totalling hundreds of children, others were quite small.

Although in the Sunday schools a large number of children were receiving teaching, there were signs of dissatisfaction among thinking churchmen with the Sunday school system as it stood. As early as 1892 a sub-committee of the synod of Brisbane expressed disquiet about the quality of instruction in many of the Sunday schools, and suggested there was need for more highly educated members of the church to be engaged in the work of teaching. Above all, this committee put its finger on the permanent difficulty about successful Sunday school work:

Little, comparatively, can be done in Sunday schools or classes for State school children, when the homes have a countering influence.<sup>996</sup>

This report, and other occasional acknowledgements of the defects of the existing system, did little, however, to arouse any concerted action.

From about 1907 there appeared to be a new tide of concern about the weaknesses of the traditional haphazard Sunday school system, in which devoted, but untrained teachers, sometimes very young and inexperienced, taught Bible stories and catechism without any particular plan of instruction. The Northern Churchman, for example, deplored what it termed "Sunday School Religion" which separated religious instruction from the ordinary services of the church.<sup>997</sup> The following year the Brisbane commission on religious knowledge and habits placed part of the blame for existing ignorance on the Sunday schools. In similar strain Bishop Halford lamented the contrast which the children must notice between their week-day and Sunday schools in efficiency, discipline and equipment.<sup>998</sup>

It was very worrying, but no one quite knew the solution. Few of the clergy were trained educationists, and specialised training for religious education was as yet unknown. Nevertheless, there were signs of at least the beginning of attempts to plan curricula and train teachers. By 1907 in Brisbane a four-year plan of lessons had been adopted, and almost all the Sunday schools had accepted it as their basis. Occasional conferences for Sunday school teachers, as well as opportunities for devotional training, were also being provided.<sup>999</sup> It was at least an augury of better things to come.

By 1920, as we have seen, the church was approaching the whole question of education much more energetically and positively than a generation previously. The dangers and failure of an education that was wholly secular had been demonstrated to the satisfaction of thinking churchmen, and they were now making genuine efforts to fill the gaps in what was provided by the state. There was still a long way to go, and the years that lay ahead were to provide new kinds of difficulties in certain respects. Nevertheless, it remains true that the generation we have been considering saw a genuine turning of the tide which had important implications for the future.

### **iii. The Religious Life**

The revival of religious orders had been one of the results of the Oxford movement in England, and by the end of the nineteenth century a number of these communities, both for men and women, were flourishing in the English church. In Australia the revival of the religious life – in the technical sense of that term – came much more slowly than in England. This was scarcely surprising, because in the nineteenth century the catholic revival did not have nearly the influence on the Australian church that it had in England, and in any case, the same factors as militated against the early development of an indigenous ministry, wrought a similar effect on any possible growth of religious orders.

There was another factor that had a significant effect on the attitude towards the religious life in Australia. Because of the fact that the whole of the nineteenth century was a time, particularly in Queensland, when the church was struggling barely to maintain essential ministrations, there was a tendency for bishops, clergy and laymen alike to feel that the church could not afford to allow numbers of men and women to be drained out of the pool of practical workers in the parishes for tasks that appeared less immediately urgent. For this reason little encouragement was given to the furthering of scholarship among the clergy: men could not be spared from the busy parishes for the seclusion of the scholar's study. The same atmosphere pervaded every aspect of 'non-essential' work, and the religious life unfortunately came under this category.

<sup>995</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1900. At this time the nominal Anglican population of the diocese was about 125,000.

<sup>996</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p.93f.

<sup>997</sup> Northern Churchman, January 1907.

<sup>998</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1910, Bishop's address, p.14.

<sup>999</sup> Report of Committee for Religious Education, Brisbane Year Book, 1907. p.77



This frame of mind could be discerned behind the foundation of the one religious order of the Anglican church which arose and became rooted in Queensland, the Society of the Sacred Advent. It was Canon M.J. Stone-Wigg, Sub-Dean of St. John's Pro-cathedral, who conceived the idea of an order of sisters to work in Brisbane. He mooted the idea of introducing some sisters from England at the parish's annual meeting in 1891,<sup>1000</sup> and went on to raise the subject in synod the same year. It is significant, however, that it was in a debate on the home mission work of the diocese that he introduced the topic; the implication was that the primary purpose of the sisters would be for their self-sacrificial social work rather than for their witness to, and practice of, prayer and the spiritual life.<sup>1001</sup> Perhaps Stone-Wigg himself did not regard the sisters primarily from the point of view of their immediate practical service: but at any rate it was necessary to explain the meaning of religious community to synod in these terms. This attitude affected the order itself because it was constantly being pressed to take on a multiplicity of activities that were too many for the number of sisters available. There was a constant threat that too many works would hinder the living of the religious life; but through wise leadership and the devotion of the members of the community, the S.S.A. was able keep the ideal of the religious life before it.

It was at the end of 1892 that Sister Caroline, who had been trained in the Community of St. John the Baptist, Clewer, arrived with a deaconess known as Sister Minnie, to commence the society of the Sacred Advent. That indefatigable worker for the diocese, Bernard Wilson, had been working in co-operation with Stone-Wigg to make this possible.<sup>1002</sup> The sisters had a difficult beginning: at first they had no permanent house, and then they were flooded out twice in the flood of 1893. Nevertheless they persevered, and by 1894 they had five novices and the first local profession of three sisters took place the following year.<sup>1003</sup> Already the small group of sisters was involved in three different kinds of activities: the training of orphaned girls for domestic service at the Home of the Good Shepherd; the care of unmarried mothers at St. Mary's Home; and teaching in a day school at St. John's Pro-cathedral.<sup>1004</sup> Then in 1895 the Eton High School was opened, and two years later the community became responsible for an orphanage at Ormiston, which was rebuilt in 1901 as the Tufnell Home.<sup>1005</sup>

These ventures would have taxed the resources of a much larger community, and the society badly needed more members as well as greater financial backing. To try to secure these, Mother Caroline, who remained Mother Superior until 1905, more than once visited England. Yet the growth of the community was slow, and by 1916 there were still only ten professed sisters. It was only by using secular workers to form the great majority of the staffs of their institutions that the society was able to continue them. In this way were founded the educational institutions mentioned in the last section, the Industrial School, the three North Queensland schools, and the Charleville Hostel. For a time the sisters also assisted in parochial work in the parishes of All Saints and Woolloongabba, and to cap it all, they took over the Pymont Private Hospital in 1916, which was at a later date to be transformed into St. Martin's Hospital. Through all these ventures, the wise leadership of Mother Emma, who succeeded as Mother Superior in 1905, and the guidance of successive wardens, Canon Stone-Wigg, Archdeacon David and Archdeacon (later Bishop) Le Fanu were invaluable in enabling the community to cope with such a variety of activities.<sup>1006</sup>

One of the greatest difficulties which the community had to face in the early years was distrust and suspicion from members of the Church of England itself. A religious order was such a new thing for Queensland, apart from the Roman Catholic church, that many were the doubts aroused. In official circles there was full approval;<sup>1007</sup> among ordinary church people, however, especially the irregular churchgoers, approval was not so complete. In 1912 the Northern Churchman, for example, was moved to deplore the hypocrisy of those Anglicans who objected to religious orders in the Church of England, yet sent their children to be educated at convents of the Roman Catholic church.<sup>1008</sup> This attitude, however, gradually softened, as more people came into contact with the sisters and came to respect both the quality of their lives and the work that they were accomplishing.

There was another ephemeral sisterhood with a somewhat chequered history in the first decade of the century. In 1905 two members of the 'Sisters of Mercy', Sister Mary Gloriana and Novice Monica, took up work in the parish of Charters Towers under the direction of Archdeacon Garland. Where they came from is not clear, but for a time they operated a high school for girls, and enrolled half-a-dozen women as associates. They did not, however, stay long, and by 1907 the sisters

<sup>1000</sup> Church Chronicle, May 1891.

<sup>1001</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p.72c.

<sup>1002</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1892 and January 1893.

<sup>1003</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1894, p.25; and Church Chronicle, May 1895.

<sup>1004</sup> Letter from Sister Caroline, Church Chronicle, September 1894.

<sup>1005</sup> £1,000 towards the cost of the latter was given by Mrs. Tufnell in memory of her husband, the first bishop.

<sup>1006</sup> For further details, see A Short History of the Society of the Sacred Advent, 1892-1942.

<sup>1007</sup> A motion praising the work of religious communities was passed in provincial synod in 1909. Proceedings of

Provincial Synod, 1909 p.19

<sup>1008</sup> January 1912.

had withdrawn from the parish.<sup>1009</sup> They next appeared in Rockhampton, where the sisters were given a formal constitution by Bishop Dawes under the name, Servants of the Cross, with Sister Mary Gloriana as mother superior. Here they took charge of St. Mary's Rescue Home, as well as the school of St. Paul's Cathedral.<sup>1010</sup> By 1911, however, the tiny community seems to have broken up.<sup>1011</sup> The fact appears to have been that this community was founded on the enthusiasm of a few women, but without the proper direction necessary for a stable religious order.

Despite the failure of this community the success of the Society of the Sacred Advent was sufficient to mark out this period as a constructive one for the church in yet another direction. The growth of the S.S.A. was slow; yet even so, it stood as a living witness to the quest for deeper spirituality and to the emergence of a sacrificial sense of vocation within the church.

#### iv. Evangelism in the Cities

Queensland was never characterised by the crowded industrial cities and slums that had become such a feature of the countries of the old world after the industrial revolution. Yet Brisbane, and to a much lesser extent the larger provincial cities, did present problems which needed to be faced by the church. There was poverty – especially in the bad years of the nineties – and it was a fact that the poor in Queensland were as much out of touch with the church as was the corresponding class in England. Something needed to be done to present the Gospel to these people in a way that would grapple with their situation. A related, but different, problem was posed by the constant growth of new suburbs around the city. Brisbane in particular was growing steadily, as immigration continued at a high level, and new outlying suburbs were springing up which were neither populous nor wealthy enough to support full parochial machinery, even if sufficient clergy had been available. At the same time the growth of the community posed ever more strikingly the need for the church to do something to help those in distress or moral difficulty – the orphans, unmarried mothers, prostitutes and the rest.

These matters exercised the mind of Canon Montagu Stone-Wigg, and as we have seen they were partly responsible for his desire to introduce a religious order to Brisbane. The pro-cathedral, being in the heart of the city, was particularly bound to take a lead in facing the urban problems we have mentioned; and Stone-Wigg, like his bishop, hoped to see St. John's as a mission centre from which evangelists would radiate to the outer suburbs. He longed to see the Church Army start work in this field. In England the Church Army, a team of lay evangelists organised in military fashion, had achieved good results among the poor and unchurched. Working within the church, using similar methods to the Salvation Army, with open-air meetings and brassy music, they had attracted considerable attention by the very unorthodoxy of their methods. "We must bring these to Brisbane", Stone-Wigg told his parish meeting in 1891.<sup>1012</sup>

The Church Army was unable to extend its work to Queensland at this time, but in 1895 an individual captain of the Church Army, Charles Kitchen, came to Australia and offered his services to Stone-Wigg, and was gladly accepted. At first Kitchen and the team of assistants that he built up from among the parishioners of the pro-cathedral worked under Stone-Wigg's direction as a cathedral organisation, living at the sub-deanery. With Stone-Wigg's departure for New Guinea, however, the Church Mission was reconstituted as a diocesan organisation, and took a house of their own as headquarters. Kitchen soon became known as "a real saint, if ever there was one",<sup>1013</sup> and the Church Mission soon became known for its open air meetings, services in scattered suburbs like Rosalie, East Brisbane, Holland Park, Mt. Gravatt and Enoggera, and work among the poor, such as the Brisbane newsboys, for whom a club was started in 1901. Among Kitchen's helpers was a young layman, W.P.B. Miles, who as a lad had lived with Stone-Wigg and came under Kitchen's powerful influence. Miles himself, after years as a lay worker, was ordained and became director of the Anglican Church Mission, a position which he held until the conclusion of the work of the Mission in 1960.<sup>1014</sup>

In 1903 the Church Mission ventured into a new field, with an effort to help restore women who drifted into vice or were in some sort of distress. A Women's Shelter was opened in 1903 in the city, and steady, if unspectacular, work under the direction of C.J. Downward was carried on among women around the streets of Brisbane. This presented certain administrative difficulties, however, as it meant that the various social institutions of the church were now under the direction of different agencies, so in 1906 it was decided to re-allocate responsibilities, by which the Church Mission confined itself to evangelistic work, while the various social institutions were placed under the Home Mission Fund. This new Home Missions organisation, which was to be responsible for the social work of the diocese, was the successor of the old Church Society which had for years been languishing, and had lost sight of its original purpose. The change suggested the new awareness of the church's social responsibilities which was one of the features of this period, and at the same time

<sup>1009</sup> Northern Churchman, June 1905, August 1905, June 1906. Also Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, pp.113-4.

<sup>1010</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1908, p.10.

<sup>1011</sup> Ibid., 1912, p.46. Also Church Gazette, July 1911.

<sup>1012</sup> Church Chronicle, May 1891.

<sup>1013</sup> David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane (MS).

<sup>1014</sup> For the early history of the Anglican Church Mission, see Church Chronicle, August, 1896, October 1897 and November 1934. Also Brisbane Year Book, 1960, pp.139-140.

centralised control made for more efficient management.<sup>1015</sup> Nevertheless the Home Mission Fund, which had other extensive responsibilities as well as social work – such as fostering church extension in new districts, helping augment stipends in poor districts, and assisting the Clergy Superannuation Fund – never found itself sufficiently affluent to enter as vigorously into social work as had been hoped.

By the first decade of this century the church was directly involved in social work among various classes. Orphans were catered for at the Tufnell Home, unmarried mothers at St. Mary's, vagrant women at the Women's Shelter, and attempts were being made to restore licensed prostitutes to normal society at a Rescue Home which had been opened at Wilston in 1905. In addition there were efforts to train delinquent girls for useful work at the Home of the Good Shepherd and the Industrial school at Clayfield. Apart from this, there was the Church Mission's work among the newsboys and other poor lads of the city.

Outside the capital population was too scattered to allow for much work of this kind, and Rockhampton was the only other city where similar social efforts were practicable. There in 1907 a rescue home named St. Mary's was opened, and for fifteen years did valuable work among unmarried mothers and destitute infants. Public support, however, was never sufficient, and it was not easy to keep the right kind of trained staff, and by 1922 it was found necessary to close the home.<sup>1016</sup> As it was, it was only the government subsidy and the income from the Walter and Eliza Hall Trust that had enabled it to survive, though the fact that at its height it had up to forty inmates, women and infants, showed the real need which it met.

The Anglican Church Mission undertook one other venture which deserves mention. In the years preceding the first World War the Church Mission sponsored the migration of English lads. These boys, who were sent out in batches of about twenty, were examined by a committee in England, and after a six months' farm training course at a Church Army school in England they came to Queensland, and were met by W.P.B. Miles, before being sent on to jobs throughout the state. The war put an end to the scheme, but not before it had achieved successful results with some hundreds of the boys.<sup>1017</sup>

Small though these enterprises were in their early years, and inadequate as were their premises and equipment, they at least indicated that the church felt itself ready to grapple at last with some of the social problems of the community. It was another sign that the church had come of age.

#### **v. Evangelism in the Bush: the Bush Brotherhoods.**

Quite early in the history of the church in Australia the fact emerged that several practical conditions had to be complied with if the church were to minister effectively to the people in the bush. The first was that the clergy had to be mobile: the successful bush priest was the one who was constantly on the move and who accustomed himself to the hardship of being frequently away from home. For a married man, especially if he had children, this constituted a very grievous hindrance to the life of his family. Secondly, there needed to be provision for companionship; because the mental and spiritual burden of loneliness, especially in an environment whose standards were frequently markedly different from those of the priest, was too heavy for any but the very stout-hearted to bear. Then, for the sake of the lay people, there had to be some means of ensuring a reasonable continuity of ministry. Scattered country parishes could be gruelling in the extreme for the priest, and there was a constant attraction to move on to more settled districts, especially if he had children whose education must be taken into account. Finally, the cost of providing these ministrations must be kept to a minimum, because the people were few in number and in the pioneering days had little spare cash to pay big stipends, while the church itself had no endowment with which to provide funds from central sources.

The combination of these conditions made the question of what to do about the bush a very perplexing one for bishops and their advisers. In the nineteenth century various expedients had been tried, and had failed. Bishop Tufnell had had the idea of sending his priests to work country districts in pairs, but problems of manpower and finance had disrupted the scheme. Then, single itinerant chaplains were employed, like F.J. Grosvenor in Tufnell's time or Frederick Richmond in Hale's episcopate; but the exhaustion of travel and the intense loneliness were such that these men were scarcely ever able to endure more than a few years. Married clergy were tried, but the strain on their home life was tremendous, and very rarely with insecure stipends and growing families were they able to stay for long periods. Perhaps the worst example of the consequences of this was in the north, where the Reverend Aneurin Vaughan Williams discovered on his appointment to Herberton in 1902 that he was the thirteenth incumbent of the parish in fourteen years! The effect of such changes on the spiritual life of the parish can easily be imagined.

<sup>1015</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1906, p.80.

<sup>1016</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1906, p.38; 1907 p.40; 1908 p.26; 1912 p.46; 1919 p.41; 1922 p.46.

<sup>1017</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1914.

It was this combination of circumstances that fostered the growth of what has perhaps been the one distinctive Australian contribution to the Anglican Communion – the bush brotherhood idea. Yet while the final form of the bush brotherhoods was peculiar to Australia, their origin was closely related to a late nineteenth century development within the English church. One of the manifestations of the Anglo-Catholic movement was missionary service along community lines, both at home and overseas. Some of the best known examples of this were connected with the universities, such as the Cambridge Mission to Delhi, the Oxford Mission to Calcutta, the Dublin University Mission to Chota Nagpur, and the university settlements in the London slums. At least one other venture was connected with a religious community, namely the Society of the Sacred Mission's Brotherhood in Korea. In one aspect they were the expression of a somewhat romantic phase of the catholic revival; from another point of view they represented a conscious effort to continue in the service of the church the close fellowship that the young men concerned had known in the English universities; but at the same time, there was a real desire to give sacrificial service for the church wherever it might be most needed. Their spirit was expressed in the words of the thirty young priests who placed themselves at the disposal of Bishop Westcott of Durham in the 1890's:

We note that it is not expected of the private soldier in an earthly army to select his own post and his own manoeuvres. We do not think it should always be left to private soldiers in the Divine army of aggression to do so.<sup>1018</sup>

The fact was, then, that there was available in the English church at this time a pool of young priests, mostly university graduates, who were prepared to offer themselves, at least for a limited time, for work on a community basis under a definite rule. For this period they were prepared to remain single, and to be content with the minimum stipend needed for maintenance.

In the missions and settlements that had grown up along these community lines in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, there was nothing that quite paralleled the circumstances of the Australian bush. They were closely knit communities, normally living together in a single house, and working in a relatively compact area. There seemed little connection between these conditions and the vastness of the Australian countryside.

Meanwhile in Queensland in the decade from 1885 to 1895 there were several experiments along the lines of groups of priests, with laymen sometimes associated, working together as a team. We have already noticed Bishop Webber's scheme for a team of mission chaplains radiating into the country from the pro-cathedral as headquarters, and we observed the failure of the plan.<sup>1019</sup> A more effective example of team work was demonstrated in Toowoomba about the same time, where the Reverend Thomas Jones was responsible, with the assistance of two other clergy and a lay catechist, for a large area on the Darling Downs and down to Gatton. The whole staff met regularly each week to compare notes and make plans, and though this was in no sense a brotherhood, it embraced some aspects of the life of the later bush brotherhoods.<sup>1020</sup>

A more precise precursor of the brotherhood system was tried out by Archdeacon Gilbert White in North Queensland in 1894. To the diocesan synod of that year White proposed the formation of a 'Brotherhood of St. James', to consist of clergy and lay readers who would be associated with the cathedral, under direct obedience to the bishop. The brotherhood would have no specific vows, and members would be free to withdraw on three months' notice; but it was to have three essential features, "common life, the maintenance of the devotional life, and pecuniary self-denial". White's plan seems to have been that groups of the brothers should be sent out from the centre for evangelistic work in areas where there was no parochial organisation, and then return after five months for a month's recreation, reading and devotional exercises at the central house.<sup>1021</sup> Although White's motion was accepted, there was considerable scepticism about the proposal, especially in regard to the archdeacon's claim that a man in such a brotherhood could live on a salary of £50 a year. White therefore determined to experiment: and though it was not possible to work from the cathedral, he did gather a few laymen together at Queenton near Charters Towers, and within a year was able to hand over the district in working order to a rector.<sup>1022</sup> No other priests joined the movement, however, and it failed to survive.

Hence it is clear that both in England and Australia there was an atmosphere favourable to the concept of brotherhood methods in church work. It was Bishop Nathaniel Dawes who fused together the community idea with the needs of the Australian bush. As Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane from 1889 to 1892 Dawes was particularly responsible for the oversight of the western areas, and it was at this time that the principle of working the bush by means of teams of priests radiating out

<sup>1018</sup> Quoted in Tomlin, J.W.S., The Story of the Bush Brotherhoods, p.33

<sup>1019</sup> G.M.L. Lester traced the origin of the Brotherhood idea in Australia to this plan of Webber's. See Australian Bush Leaves, September 1898.

<sup>1020</sup> Minutes, Wednesday Meeting of Clergy at St. James', Toowoomba 1885.

<sup>1021</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1895, pp 17 and 29.

<sup>1022</sup> Berwick, G.T., "the Birth of the Bush Brotherhood", in Theology, May 1947.

from strong centres made its appeal to Dawes, and by the time he became Bishop of Rockhampton in 1892 a definite plan was forming in his mind. In a report to Bishop Webber in that year, Dawes asked:

Why should there not be an Oxford or Cambridge Mission planted in the Australian bush as well as in East London, Africa, and India? A great opportunity now offers for starting such an enterprise. The Central Railway has recently been extended to Longreach, a township 425 miles west of Rockhampton...A University Mission started there would command a splendid field for aggressive Christianity.<sup>1023</sup>

The desperate plight of the new Diocese of Rockhampton in its task of tackling the great western areas soon made Dawes' theory an intensely practical matter, and the bishop set off for the Lambeth Conference of 1897 with plans for a bush brotherhood firmly in mind.<sup>1024</sup>

The results of Bishop Dawes' English tour of 1897 exceeded expectations. Not only did he receive encouragement for what came to be known as his bush brotherhood from leading churchmen like Bishop Westcott, Canon Charles Gore and the Reverend A.F. Winnington-Ingram, of Oxford House; but he returned to Australia with the first three bush brothers, and sufficient funds to launch the scheme. So in 1897 the bush Brotherhood of St. Andrew, comprising of the Reverends G.D. Halford (head), T.J. Chapman and A. Perry, commenced work in the diocese of Rockhampton, with Longreach as their headquarters.<sup>1025</sup> It was on Holy Cross Day, 14 September, 1897, that Halford took the simple brotherhood vows, and the Brotherhood of St. Andrew took over the great area of central western Queensland from the lone Archdeacon G.M.L. Lester, who had so courageously struggled on alone.

It was not an encouraging prospect that greeted the first bush brothers on their arrival. The ordinary transition from the compactness of England to the primeval vastness of the Australian bush was aggravated by the awful desolation that the long drought of the turn of the century was already bringing in the west. Living conditions were primitive compared with what they had been accustomed to, though a good central house was soon provided in Longreach. Above all, they found a distressing spiritual and moral environment in the western frontier regions:

In the large townships, more particularly those near the railway, the purer is public thought and life. The further out west, the more remote a township is from the railway and the hum of the world, the less religious life there is, and the more corrupt morals are. It is painful to mark how lightly the most sacred things are regarded, how easily they set marriage on one side.....<sup>1026</sup>

It was in such a setting that the need of courageous Christian witness to the scattered settlers in the bush was burnt into the soul of George Halford.

The Brotherhood of St. Andrew never became very numerous, and at its peak about 1910 had only five members. Yet its area was vast, for from Longreach as centre, the brothers ministered in the district to Barcardine in the east, to Aramac and Muttaborra in the north-east, beyond Winton to the north-west, and as far as the border of the Northern Territory to the west. Here they carried out what was to become the typical routine of Australian bush brotherhoods, of long country tours with services at little settlements and isolated station homesteads, alternating with periods in Longreach and the bigger towns. What made possible this exhausting programme was the regular provision for rest, spiritual and physical recreation, and the fellowship of the other brothers at the central house.<sup>1027</sup>

The Longreach brotherhood was significant because it pointed the way to a new approach to evangelism in the bush; but it was soon superseded in importance and size by brotherhoods in other dioceses. Both Brisbane and North Queensland developed small, informal brotherhoods which later were to grow into more formally organised bush brotherhoods. In Brisbane diocese Archdeacon A.R. Rivers, who since his appointment as archdeacon in 1896 had exercised a kind of lone roving ministry, began from 1901 to gather together a small group of clergy and laymen to bring the ministrations of the church to a great semi-circular area through the Burnett and Upper Dawson valleys, and then down between the parishes of Dalby and Roma through to the border of New South Wales. Gayndah was made the headquarters of this great territory, which included towns ranging from Biggenden, Kilkivan and Eidsvold in the north, through Taroom and Miles to St. George in the south. A service list of the time shows a total of 125 places where services were to be held over a period of three

<sup>1023</sup> Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 1 December, 1892. See also Dawes' sermon printed in Australian Bush Leaves, March 1898. It should also be noted that in 1891 Bishop Webber had spoken of Charleville and Longreach as possible centres for the development of this kind of work. See Brisbane Year Book, 1891, p.63.

<sup>1024</sup> It is perhaps not without significance that Bishop Dawes chose to sit on the committee of bishops at Lambeth who were considering the question of religious communities.

<sup>1025</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1897, p.161

<sup>1026</sup> Letter from Rev. T.J. Chapman, Australian Bush Leaves, September, 1898.

<sup>1027</sup> For details of their early work from Longreach, see Smith, L.P.G., Diamond Jubilee of St. Andrew's Church of England, Longreach.

months,<sup>1028</sup> and sometimes it was for long periods of riding in horse and buggy in the case of Rivers, or on horseback in the case of his fellow priests, that they were away from their centre at Gayndah. It was quite definitely a brotherhood type of work, but there was no formal constitution nor vows. These were not formulated until the centre was moved to Charleville in 1905 and the 'Charleville Bush Brotherhood' came into existence. The fact that the Reverend H.L. Puxley, Rivers' right-hand man at Gayndah, moved to Charleville as first head of the new brotherhood, ensured, however a definite continuity between the Gayndah and Charleville ventures.<sup>1029</sup>

Meanwhile in North Queensland another small experiment took its rise about this time that was to evolve into yet another bush brotherhood, but with a distinctive character of its own. In 1902 the new incumbent of Herberton, the Reverend Aneurin Vaughan Williams, being concerned at the lack of continuity of priestly ministrations in his district over recent years, approached Bishop Frodsham with a view to forming of a community. The Reverend J.B. Barton, who was stationed at Mareeba, agreed to join him, and in 1903 the Rectory at Herberton was turned into a community house, and on St. Barnabas' Day the new brothers took their vows as members of the Community of St. Barnabas.<sup>1030</sup> Two features made this venture different from the Longreach and Gayndah brotherhoods. One was the area covered, for though the Herberton brotherhood was responsible for some 11,000 square miles and a great number of small centres, this was not nearly so big as the great tracts of land covered by the other brotherhoods. The other was the difference implied by the term "community", for this was intended to be a society more closely approximating to a religious order than the other brotherhoods. Its vows were more definite, and its essential features were set out in its paper as "Community Life. Maintenance of the Devotional Life. Pecuniary Self-Denial".<sup>1031</sup> In short, it was seen not so much as a convenient way to meet the needs of bush evangelism, but as a kind of community life of value in itself for the members of the community. This characteristic left a permanent mark on the outlook of the later Bush Brotherhood of St. Barnabas. Though Vaughan Williams himself persevered and never relinquished the ideals of the community, he found it hard to find a group of fellow workers, and it was not until Bishop Frodsham's visit to England for the 1908 Lambeth Conference that the turning point came for the brotherhood.

By 1905, then there was one fully organised bush brotherhood in Queensland – the Brotherhood of St. Andrew – and two others in embryonic form; and already it was clear that the church had found a method of working the bush districts that possessed great advantages both for the clergy and their congregations. So far, however, the districts that most needed the brotherhoods – the far west of Brisbane and North Queensland dioceses – were still left without regular care, except what Archdeacon Trotter was able to provide from Charleville. This was one of Bishop Donaldson's first concerns on his arrival, and the matter had special urgency because an anonymous endowment, which would make available £200 a year of the £600 believed to be sufficient to maintain a brotherhood of three men, was shortly to be withdrawn if a start were not made.<sup>1032</sup> Donaldson failed in his hope of bringing men out from England to make a start, so resolving to convert the relatively closely settled district of Gayndah into a regular parish, he asked Puxley to move to Charleville and become first head of the new brotherhood.<sup>1033</sup> Puxley accepted the call, and being joined by an Australian priest, A.F. Eva, and an English priest who had been in the Gayndah brotherhood, A.E. Bevan, and two lay catechists A. McD. Hassell and J.D. Anderson (both of whom were eventually ordained) the Charleville Bush Brotherhood commenced in 1905.<sup>1034</sup>

The area worked by the new brotherhood was incredibly large, embracing the whole of south-western Queensland west of the parish of Dalby, with the exception of Roma and its environs, which formed a separate parish. Services still had to be quite infrequent in many of the smaller places, and in the early years only Charleville and, usually Cunnamulla could expect regular weekly services; but at least the smaller settlements knew that they would receive regular – if not frequent – ministrations. Church life slowly began to be built up, and buildings erected or improved. At least in one place, Thargomindah, the latter seemed quite necessary, because the church, owned by the Methodists but used by the bush brothers, had been constructed of thatch, and had been eaten by horses during the drought!<sup>1035</sup>

The great distances to be covered by the members of the Charleville brotherhood imposed from the start a condition which threatened the whole original idea of bush brotherhoods, namely that they should avoid the evils of isolation by working from one centre as headquarters. Charleville was far too distant from the easternmost parts of the brotherhood area for it

<sup>1028</sup> Service list is enclosed with Walker, B.P., Memories of the Church in the Upper Burnett Fifty Years Ago, (MS of lecture delivered at Pinalba clergy conference, 1956).

<sup>1029</sup> For further details of the Gayndah brotherhood, see reminiscences of Archdeacon A.R. Rivers and Rev. H.L. Puxley in Bush Notes, September 1926.

<sup>1030</sup> The Friend, January 1906.

<sup>1031</sup> Ibid., December 1906.

<sup>1032</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1902 p.29; also David, A.E., Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane, (MS).

<sup>1033</sup> Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul, Jubilee Book Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul, Jubilee Book, p.8.

<sup>1034</sup> This was its official title until it became known as the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul in 1932.

<sup>1035</sup> Bush Notes, May 1905.

to be convenient for the brothers actually to live there; so that for the greater part of the time, though bound together by obedience to their common rule, the brothers were still cut off from direct personal contact, except at their quarterly meetings.

Meanwhile in the north Bishop Frodsham faced the same problems in ministering to the north-west of the state as the Bishops of Brisbane faced in the south-west. In the early years of the century, heroic and self-denying work was done by the Reverend T. Hely Wilson of Cloncurry and the Reverend W.H.W. Williams as an itinerating mission priest. In 1904 the bishop himself went out as far as Camooweal – the first time this border centre had been visited by a priest.<sup>1036</sup> The need to do something for this great area was deeply impressed in Frodsham's consciousness as he went to England in 1908, and the sense of urgency must have brought an irresistible note of conviction when he put his call to a meeting of undergraduates in Oxford. He uttered a cry which he had borrowed from an American bishop of the previous century: "O for a band of men that will preach like Apostles, ride like cowboys, and having food and raiment, therewith be content."<sup>1037</sup> The response was immediate: by the following morning ten undergraduates had promised the bishop that after ordination and first curacy they would come to work in his bush brotherhood. There was a similar response at Cambridge. These were, however, rather promises for the future than immediate offers, but though not all were fulfilled, many of these men did in fact come later to North Queensland as bush brothers. Of more immediate significance were the acceptance by an Irish Priest, the Reverend E.T. Crozier, of the position of head of the Community of St. Barnabas, and the establishment of auxiliaries both in England and Ireland which promised to support the diocese, and especially the brotherhood, financially. It was with no little satisfaction that Frodsham told his synod in 1910:

The real brotherhood is on its way. The 'venture prompted by temporary enthusiasm' at Oxford and Cambridge is developing into a 'sense of vocation'. In the slums of London, among the Lancashire operatives and the Norfolk fishermen; and in many English villages the Brothers are already preparing. Please God, it will not be much longer before we can reach the uttermost bounds of the West.<sup>1038</sup>

Crozier on arrival made Cloncurry his headquarters, and so began the work of the Community of St. Barnabas in the far north-west. Although nominally part of the one community with Vaughan Williams who was still at Herberton, the great distance separating them virtually made impossible real community life. It was not long before Vaughan Williams, after nine years of intensive and exhausting work, had to give up, so that he never really became part of the re-formed brotherhood. Yet his had been a magnificent pioneering work, and on his foundations the fuller life of the brotherhood was to be built.

With the departure of Vaughan Williams, the Herberton area, like Cloncurry, was staffed with newly arrived priests from England. Williams' departure might have meant a change from the earlier stress on the community aspect of the brotherhood. However, a significant new development in 1912 ensured that this would not be so. In that year, Bishop Frodsham, on a further visit to England, offered the post of warden, which Crozier was vacating, to the Reverend Reginald Halse. Halse, who had been associated as a tutor with the house of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, was warden of an informal fraternity of young priests who had been awaiting an opportunity for some sort of community service abroad, and the work in North Queensland, with its tradition of definite rule of life where the community life they had known in England could be continued, appeared to be just what they had been seeking. The fraternity considered the matter, and agreed that Halse should go out first, and that others should follow.<sup>1039</sup> For his part, Frodsham was overjoyed. He wrote to Bishop H.H. Montgomery of the S.P.G.:

Reginald Halse of Poplar has accepted the Headship of the Brotherhood. He will be accompanied by some men (priests) from the Kelham Fraternity. I only heard yesterday, and I have felt like saying 'Thank God, Thank God' ever since. Don't you see, you dreamer of dreams, that it is the opening of a new era for Australia? We are going to have Community life as a fact in the Celtic fashion, and not spikes.<sup>1040</sup>

Reginald Halse who remained warden of the brotherhood for thirteen years, did in fact become one of the greatest of the heads of Australian bush brotherhoods, and helped develop the atmosphere for which the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas became famous. In the process he himself became the right-hand man of Bishop Feetham, who very soon afterwards succeeded to the see. Partly as a result of the source of supply made available by its Kelham connection, the Community of St. Barnabas soon became the largest of the Queensland brotherhoods, and by 1915 had thirteen priests.

<sup>1036</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1905-6, p.80.

<sup>1037</sup> Quoted in North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.14. That this was copied from the American Bishop Whipple is shown in Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 27 April, 1903, S.P.G."F" Mss.

<sup>1038</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1910-11, Bishop's address, p.55.

<sup>1039</sup> North Queensland Notes, July 1912.

<sup>1040</sup> Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 22 April 1912, S.P.G. "F" mss. 'Spike' is an ecclesiastical slang term denoting a person who is unduly concerned with the external ceremonies of religion.

By the first World War the three Queensland bush brotherhoods were firmly established, and for the first time the outlying bush districts were receiving regular attention from the church. Basically their methods were identical. The brothers accepted the rule of their brotherhood for a limited period of time, though this might be extended, or in case of necessity, be diminished. During this time, they were under obedience to their head and the brotherhood chapter, consisting of the full meeting of all the brothers. They were to remain single, and to be content with their keep and a small salary varying from £25 to £50 according to the particular brotherhood. Sometimes out of even this meagre salary, or out of private means, they contributed to the needs of their district when sufficient finance was not forthcoming from their people.<sup>1041</sup> Each brotherhood had one central house – or in the case of the Community of St. Barnabas, two, at Herberton and Cloncurry – where the regular chapter meetings, retreats and periods of rest were held; but for a great deal of the time the brothers were on the move, sleeping at station homesteads, in the vestries of churches, or sometimes camping out. As they settled into a regular routine, they were able to let people know their schedule of services in advance, so that even on isolated stations, they would be expected. Typically, they would plan to arrive in the evening, hold an evening service at the homestead or in the shearing sheds, and then have a celebration of Holy Communion early the next morning before leaving for the next place. Transport in the early years was almost entirely on horseback, often with the use of trains where convenient; but by 1910 the beginning of the revolution in transport began when one of the North Queensland brothers began using a motor-cycle in the Cloncurry area.<sup>1042</sup> The Charleville brother made a similar experiment two years later – “an experiment”, he wrote soon afterwards in disgust, “which will not be repeated”.<sup>1043</sup> Actually motor-cycles were used by a number of the brothers, and it must have required no little grit to tackle some of the bush roads on these primitive machines. In 1915 the purchase of the first brotherhood car revealed the transport revolution in full swing, and a very noticeable increase in the distances travelled, and number of services held, quickly followed.<sup>1044</sup> In fact it was fortunate that this should have happened in the war years, because the shortage of clergy in the war was partly able to be offset by the increased coverage now possible for each man. Weather and unforeseen circumstances were nevertheless always likely to upset plans: yet bush people had learned to be patient, and one bush brother who arrived a day late for a wedding still found the bride and bridegroom patiently waiting!<sup>1045</sup>

Each of the brotherhoods had its own rule of life to be strictly observed by the members. The Charleville Brotherhood, for example, provided that its members should say the midday office of Sext daily, besides the usual Matins and Evensong; they were to spend an hour a day in study when staying at any brotherhood centre; they were to use the diocesan intercession lists when at a centre; and to attend quarterly meetings for prayer, study and refreshment.<sup>1046</sup> The Brotherhood of St. Barnabas had similar provisions, but was in some respects more strict, in accordance with its stronger community emphasis. It was laid down in its first permanent constitution in 1911, for example, that members were to attend a quiet day every five weeks,<sup>1047</sup> and were to make no changes in ritual without the warden’s consent. These rules laid great stress on the maintenance of a high standard of devotional life by the brothers. This was very necessary, because the conditions of the bush made the continuance of regular prayer and study extremely difficult. Even so spiritual a man as G.D. Halford found it hard to make a practice of meditation while riding; but he found that he could use his two-hour midday break for study and reading.<sup>1048</sup> The bond of this common rule of life, besides the fellowship resulting from the common situation in the midst of difficult conditions, had the effect of creating a remarkable spirit of comradeship among the members of each of the brotherhoods.

How did the laity in the bush react to this new approach to the work of the church in the outback? At first there were certain suspicions. Archdeacon David found it advisable to assure the Brisbane synod that there was no intention of reviving “a strict system of monasticism” in the west.<sup>1049</sup> The element of doubt was to some extent fostered by the fact that a large number of the bush brothers, particularly in the north, were of very advanced churchmanship, and they sometimes endeavoured to make sudden changes in the forms of ceremonial to which people had been accustomed. On the other hand, there were among the members of the brotherhoods a great proportion of men of very high spiritual and intellectual gifts: they included some of the cream of the products of the English universities, and they had the kind of qualities that won them the respect of even those who were indisposed to accept their teaching and inclined to laugh at their ‘new chum’

<sup>1041</sup> E.g. Bush Notes, June and December 1905.

<sup>1042</sup> Northern Churchman, April 1910.

<sup>1043</sup> Bush Notes, April, 1912.

<sup>1044</sup> Ibid., November 1915 and January 1916.

<sup>1045</sup> Ibid August 1911.

<sup>1046</sup> Minutes of Committee of Management of the Brotherhood, 13 April 1905, in Minute Book, Various Committees (Church House, Brisbane).

<sup>1047</sup> Brotherhood of St. Barnabas Papers, Ravenshoe.

<sup>1048</sup> Australian Bush Leaves, June 1898.

<sup>1049</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1902, presidential address, p.29.



idiosyncrasies. The very fact of the proportion of bush brothers who became bishops in later years is sufficient indication of the recognition of their qualities by the church.<sup>1050</sup>

Because of these qualities the bush brothers on the whole became extremely popular, and brought a great fund of good-will towards the church in the bush. People learned to know and to appreciate the sacrifices they made and the difficulties they endured. Some of them became almost legendary, such as Frederick Hulton-Sams of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, whose loving spirit, bored with officialdom but full of Christian joy, brought a bond of sympathy with the informal laymen of the bush. "It is safe to say", Bishop Halford said after Sams' death in the first World War, "that no man's death has been more sorrowfully regretted throughout Australia."<sup>1051</sup> Yet even in this very popularity there was for the bush brothers of attractive personality the subtle danger that their ministry might be too fully based on personal attractiveness.<sup>1052</sup> Yet there was a positive side to this for in the minds of many bush people, long out of touch with the church, the image of the parson was that of the popular caricature of an absent-minded, effeminate creature. There was truth in the claim of one of the North Queensland bush brothers:

Speaking generally, I feel sure that the Brotherhood has firmly established itself in the respect and esteem of the best class of men, and that it has done much to reverse the 'Bulletin' conception of the parson as a black-coated, umbrella-armed, long-faced hypocrite, who is shocked at all that is joyous, and exists only on the superstitions of weak-minded teetotallers. We have not yet got to the stage where the class of men to whom I refer join normally with us in our worship; but we have made it possible for them to do so without any feeling of unmanliness, insincerity or disregard of the rational faculty.<sup>1053</sup>

Yet while the attitude to the clergy had changed, it was true, as the last sentence of this quotation suggests, that the actual response of the people to the ministry of the bush brothers remained disappointing, and particularly with the labouring class there was only very limited success. Services in the shearing sheds won a mixed response, and it was usually true that the university-educated English bush brother felt much more at home with the sometimes-cultured homestead family than he did with the rough labourers. This was not, however, simply a matter of class consciousness or cultural snobbery: in large part it was the result of the fact that the homestead people were permanent, whereas many of the labourers were a very transient population whom the itinerant bush brother had little chance to come to know well. In any case, there had grown up in the bush a very long tradition of expecting irregularity in church services: it was a tradition that was not easily broken.

While the bush brotherhoods had a great deal in common, there was, as we have hinted, a difference in ethos among them, and this reflected a different outlook on the subject of the ultimate purpose of a brotherhood. In Rockhampton diocese, the brotherhood was generally seen not so much as an end in itself, as a temporary expedient for meeting a particular situation in the bush while population was sparse and finances limited. The Reverend C.M.E. Hicks, then head of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, wrote in an article in 1912 that the brotherhood system should gradually be replaced by more normal parochial methods, and that the very nature of bush work prevented bush brotherhoods from being a religious community in any real sense. Both bush brotherhoods and religious orders, he argued, had a real place in the life of the church, but it was a mistake to attempt to combine them; the bush brotherhood should be allowed to die out once its original work was done.<sup>1054</sup> There were certain very practical considerations in this attitude, including the fact that many of the lay people preferred to belong to a settled parish with a resident priest rather than an itinerating member of a brotherhood, and the fact that there were possible long-term disadvantages in country people's getting a cheap religion, and not being trained in the need for increasing financial support for the church. It was significant that the commission on the state of the diocese which presented its report in 1910 already showed some disagreement on the wisdom of perpetuating the brotherhood system,<sup>1055</sup> and in synod two years later it was strongly urged by a lay member that the brotherhood area should be divided into four separate parishes.<sup>1056</sup>

The following year Bishop Halford – himself the first bush brother – announced as a definite policy that the brotherhood was aiming to build up church life in the townships to the level where they could become individual parishes, and that then the brotherhood would transfer its attention further west.<sup>1057</sup> In view of this express policy, it was not surprising that the

<sup>1050</sup> Among Queensland bush brothers who became bishops were: G.D. Halford (Rockhampton), S.H. Davies (Carpentaria), H. Otter-Barry (Mauritius), R.C. Halse (Riverina and Brisbane), R. Thomas (Willochra), B.P. Robin (Adelaide), R.W.H. Moline (Perth) and W.B. Belcher (North Queensland).

<sup>1051</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1916, Bishop's address, p.20. See also, Halford, G.D. and others Frederick Hulton-Sams, the Fighting Parson.

<sup>1052</sup> See, for example, the reply of the Rev. C.F.J. Holmes to the intended compliment that he had been a man first and a priest afterwards: Bush Notes, December 1911.

<sup>1053</sup> North Queensland Notes, July 1916.

<sup>1054</sup> Australasian Church Quarterly Review, September 1912.

<sup>1055</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1910, report of Bishop's Commission on the State of the Diocese.

<sup>1056</sup> Ibid., 1913 p.26.

<sup>1057</sup> Ibid., 1914, p.21.

Brotherhood of St. Andrew soon ceased to exist: by 1916 several parishes had been broken off, and the decline in the strength of the brotherhood due to the war forced its virtual suspension. Fifteen years later an attempt was made to revive it, but it never again recovered real stability.

At the other extreme from the Rockhampton brotherhood, which had never been given a formal constitution nor fixed rules except by mutual consent of the individual members, was the Community of St. Barnabas in the north. We have already noted that it aimed to embrace some aspects of the life of a religious order, as its very name suggested. Bishop Frodsham had encouraged this attitude, and strongly disagreed with Hicks argument that the brotherhoods should gradually die out. He claimed that so far as the different circumstances of bush work permitted, the Community of St. Barnabas did succeed in living a community-type of life, that was of permanent value in the church, quite apart from its expediency as a method of working the bush.<sup>1058</sup> Frodsham himself had some hopes of establishing a teaching order in relation to the brotherhood, and in 1910 was in contact with Ely Theological College on this subject;<sup>1059</sup> and though it was a long time before this hope was fulfilled, the foundation of All Souls' school kept the idea alive, and demonstrated that the Community of St. Barnabas aimed to be more than a self-extinguishing expedient. Certainly there were those within and outside this brotherhood who hoped to see a permanent Australian religious order develop from it.<sup>1060</sup> On the other hand, the argument that a real religious community could not exist properly in the scattered conditions of the bush carried weight, and it was significant that in 1925 the chapter of the Community of St. Barnabas decided to delete the word 'Community' from its title.<sup>1061</sup>

The Charleville Brotherhood stood somewhere between the other two in the question of the ultimate significance of the bush brotherhood method. From the beginning it had a definite constitution and rules, yet was less monastic in its outlook than the Community of St. Barnabas. Its tendency in the earlier years, was, however, further and further away from parochial organisation. In the beginning the head of the brotherhood was regarded as Rector of Charleville, and the other brothers as his assistant curates, while the individual districts had their churchwardens and representatives in synod.<sup>1062</sup> The trend over the years, however, was towards decreased lay control and to growing centralisation of authority in the chapter of the brotherhood itself, a trend that reached its culmination when lay representation in synod from the brotherhood area was abolished in 1935.<sup>1063</sup> Of this more must be said later: but for the earlier years, it may be said that the Charleville brotherhood represented the *via media* in its understanding of the final purpose of the brotherhood system.

The bush brotherhoods are perhaps the one distinctive contribution of the Australian church to the total thought of the Anglican communion, and they have been treated in some detail here because they had a significance in Queensland church life out of proportion to the numbers of clergy and lay people directly concerned in their work. Because of the quality of their membership and the unique kind of fellowship which they attained, the bush brotherhoods in Queensland left a powerful influence on the life of the church as a whole. Not only did their members frequently exercise a block vote in synods and conferences, but long after they had left the brotherhoods, and had risen, some of them, to positions of important leadership in the church, they carried something of the spirit of the bush brotherhoods with them. The spirit of romance and adventure which the brotherhoods symbolised attracted men from England who would probably never have come to Queensland other-wise, and they ensured that the Church of England was to the fore in the evangelisation of the Australian bush. In contrast to some of the other newer countries of the world, such as the United States, the Anglican church was able to adapt itself to the frontier environment and carry the Word and Sacraments to the farthest limits of settlement. For this achievement the bush brotherhoods were almost entirely responsible.

#### vi. The Church Societies.

Parish life for most of the nineteenth century was a fairly simple, uncomplicated business. People came to church on Sundays, and in addition the children came to Sunday school. To help in these activities there were likely to be two groups of lay people, the Sunday school teachers and the choir. Otherwise, apart from the vestry or parochial council which held its meetings monthly there was little week-day activity associated with the parish. Occasionally there were special meetings of *ad hoc* committees, but nothing resembling the round of week-day activities of all kinds of church organisations that plays such a large part in the typical twentieth century parish.

It was at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the present century that the traditional routine of quiet parish life began to be affected by the growth of a number of church societies designed to cater for different groups of people, and the change reflected a further adaptation by the church to the rapidly altering social conditions in the generation that began in 1890. In these years the realisation was sinking in, as we have seen, that the church was out of

<sup>1058</sup> Australasian Church Quarterly Review, December 1912.

<sup>1059</sup> Church Chronicle, September, 1910.

<sup>1060</sup> See, for example, Tomlin, J.W.S., Australia's Greatest Need, p.122.

<sup>1061</sup> Minutes, Chapter of Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, 18 September 1925.

<sup>1062</sup> E.g. see Bush Notes, June 1911.

<sup>1063</sup> Ibid., June 1935.

touch with large sections of the community – in particular the labouring classes and the menfolk – and that even many who came to church had sometimes little idea of what the church really stood for. There was an increasing recognition of the fact that the church must be concerned with the week-day lives of its people, and that only in this way might the gap between the church and the great majority be lessened. The result was the rise within a relatively short time of a host of organisations connected with the church. They were designed both to bring into the church's fellowship those who had become strangers to the life of the church, and also to strengthen the witness and fellowship of regular churchgoers.

As with so many of the innovations in church life in Queensland this move towards church societies in the parishes was essentially a reflection of what was happening in England. The last quarter of the nineteenth century saw the rise of a number of societies designed to cater for different age groups, and after the usual delay, the same kinds of organisations were either transplanted to, or copied in, Australia.

There were instances of the development of church clubs even earlier in the century. In 1865, for example, a young men's institute was founded in connection with St. John's Church, Brisbane, under the presidency of Colonel Maurice O'Connell.<sup>1064</sup> Early clubs of this kind were generally designed for educational and recreational purposes for young labourers who had had little opportunity to further their education and who could afford to spend little money on either education or recreation. At Toowoomba, for example, the Reverend John Vosper started in the eighties a Working Men's Society and a Fife and Drum Band for young men. Later, when he went to Mt. Morgan, Vosper established what he called the St. Andrew's Association to promote intellectual activity and manly physical exercise among working men.<sup>1065</sup> Also at this period at the close of the century, when the example of General Gordon of Khartoum was being upheld to young Christians, Gordon clubs became quite popular in many parishes, to encourage the Christian manliness with which the name of Gordon was associated.

These were all, however, single clubs which depended entirely on local leadership, with no overall organisation or rules. What was ultimately to be more important was the extension to Queensland of several organisations that had grown up in England and had been recognised as official societies of the church. The first of these, the Girls' Friendly Society had been founded in England in 1872, and a branch had been begun in Brisbane under the presidency of Mrs. Benjamin Glennie in 1882, and was formally approved by the Brisbane synod the following year.<sup>1066</sup> Although its sponsorship and leadership was Anglican the G.F.S. was broad in scope and permitted members of any denomination to be associated with it. Initially it aimed to assist girls of the working class, particularly those who were lonely and away from home, but in the course of time it broadened into a general organisation for girls. At first it was primarily educational, classes being held for subjects like needlework and reading; later physical activities came to have their place. Gradually the G.F.S. spread and branches were established throughout the state, and a provincial council was formed to supervise its operations. Meanwhile some parishes retained their own separate clubs for girls: the parish of Milton, for example reported a membership of two hundred girls at its club in 1907.<sup>1067</sup>

Much more specific in its rules was the Mothers' Union which had several branches in Queensland by 1904. This society, which always had a strong devotional basis, was particularly concerned with stressing the sanctity of the marriage bond and strengthening Christian family life, and was never intended to be simply a social or fund-raising organisation. Because of its very nature the Mothers' Union was not very numerous in membership, but it provided real spiritual strength to those parishes where it was strong. By the time of the first World War there were some 25 branches throughout the Province of Queensland.

Perhaps the most striking growth by any of the organisations in the first decade of the century was that of the Church of England Men's Society. There was a special sense of urgency about this society, because the weakness of the church in its men had become so very obvious. Just a few years after the society had been founded in England its first Australian branch was established in Toowong, Brisbane, under the leadership of a layman, Richard Ruegg in 1905. By 1908 there were already 20 branches throughout Queensland with more than four hundred members, and the report of the society that year saw this as part of "one of the greatest religious revivals in the history of the Anglican Church".<sup>1068</sup> This was no doubt being optimistic: yet the society did grow at an impressive rate, and by the Great War there were 63 branches with more than 1100 members.<sup>1069</sup> One help in this expansion was the visits of two leading English members of the society, the Reverend H.S. Woolcombe in 1909 and the Reverend J. Watts-Ditchfield in 1913,<sup>1070</sup> though the brevity of their visits limited their effectiveness.

<sup>1064</sup> Brisbane Courier, 22 May 1865.

<sup>1065</sup> Darling Downs Church News, January and April 1888.

<sup>1066</sup> Brisbane Courier, 25 December 1882 and 21 April 1883.

<sup>1067</sup> Milton Messenger, July 1907.

<sup>1068</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1908, p.82.

<sup>1069</sup> Ibid., 1914, p.159

<sup>1070</sup> See Woolcombe, H.S., Beneath the Southern Cross.

As with the Mothers' Union, it was not numbers that gave the C.E.M.S. its strength. It too had a definite rule for its members embracing a regular prayer and communicant life, and it sought to be unashamedly spiritual in its approach, rather than to achieve a large expansion of membership. Its members exercised a very considerable influence in the province, and in the individual parishes, and a few like Sir Littleton Groom, a national vice-president of the society, in wider spheres of public life.<sup>1071</sup> The first World War, however, dealt a grievous blow to the C.E.M.S.. Many of its members were young enough to go to the war, and others were busy with indirect war work, and the membership of the society declined badly. By 1919 there were only 38 branches in Queensland, with 450 active members. Yet it had fulfilled, and on a lesser scale continued to fulfil, an important part in the life of the church.

One of the positive effects of the war with its resulting decline in the strength of the men's society itself was to foster within that society the idea that it should perpetuate its own existence by providing a source of supply for the C.E.M.S. of the future. In this way, as an offshoot of the older society the Church of England Boys' Society came into existence. Aiming in the first instance to cater for boys from 14 to 20 the society began in the middle of the war, and slowly grew to half a dozen branches by 1919.<sup>1072</sup> It was a small beginning, but it was to grow in importance in the following generation.

By the end of the first World War there were consequently in existence official societies of the church for men and women, girls and boys. Not every parish had branches of all of them, and some parishes, especially in the country, had none of these organisations. The numbers of their members were still relatively small: but they were significant because they represented a core of keen inner members of the church who were trying to carry their religion into week-day activities, and they were also a means of evangelisation by which the outsider could be brought in. For the parish and the parish priest they represented a radical alteration of traditional programmes of activities, and in many parishes the clergy found that a great deal of their time was taken up in work with these organisations. This had real advantages, but as they became more numerous it was to pose new problems to an already over-busy clergy. Already the solutions to the problems of one age were threatening to become the new problems of the next.

---

<sup>1071</sup> Cranswick, G.H., "Sir Littleton Groom and the C.E.M.S.", in Groom, Jessie (Ed.), Nation Building in Australia.

<sup>1072</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1919, p.185.

### **CHAPTER 13: LOOKING OUTWARDS.**

The growth of maturity of the Australian church was marked by an increasing breadth of interest in the outlook of churchmen. In the early pioneering days an extreme degree of parochialism characterised the church in Queensland, finding its most notable expression in the opposition of some people to the appointment of the first bishop. Bishop Tufnell only partially succeeded in overcoming this parochial outlook, and in Brisbane at least there was if anything a drift backwards in the time of Bishop Hale. Then came the golden age of what might be called diocesanism, which reached its peak with the building up of strong diocesan life in the nineties. There was an anomaly here, because the strong diocesan bishops of this era were not on the whole men whose interests were limited to their own dioceses. Bishops, Webber, Dawes and White in particular had a strong sense of the wider church; but the power of parochialism was so strong on the one hand, and the possibility of really effective national organisation of the Anglican Church in Australia was still so remote on the other, that in practice they were forced to concentrate upon the diocese as the basic unit of church life.

The creation of the Province of Queensland in 1905 represented an important forward movement, because it provided a constitutional framework which encouraged parishes and dioceses to look outwards from themselves to the wider life of the church. It is not surprising, then, that this sign of wider vision in the church was accompanied by several manifestations of looking outwards. In this period the movement for a strong national constitution for the Australian church began in earnest. It was also the time when the Australian church began to look beyond itself to the call to missionary work among the Australian aborigines and the peoples of the south Pacific. Besides this, there was a new kind of interest in other Christian denominations and a seeking of paths that might lead to Christian unity. In these various manifestations of broader vision, the church in Queensland, because of the quality of its leadership, its geographical position and its prevailing doctrinal emphases played a distinctive role.

#### **i. The Province and the National Church.**

Bishop Donaldson arrived in Brisbane to find the establishment of the province all but complete, and within a year he became metropolitan of Queensland, with the title of archbishop. Though his predecessor was the architect of the province, Donaldson played a vital part in making it a reality, for it was his leadership and the weight of his personal authority that gave cohesiveness to what might otherwise have been a merely nominal federation of dioceses. The dioceses still remained the basic administrative units, but there was among them a wider unity which found expression not only in the triennial provincial synods, but in the confidence which the bishops and people placed in their metropolitan. In 1906 Donaldson paid a metropolitan visit to all the mainland dioceses of the province, and two years later he spent some time in New Guinea. Everywhere he went he showed not only real concern for all the details of church life, but gave inspiration by his addresses and wise personal guidance. "He has much enheartened us all", wrote Bishop Dawes after the archbishop's visit to Rockhampton, "and cannot but prove a wholesome centripetal force in the Province."<sup>1073</sup> After 1915, when Donaldson consecrated Henry Newton as Bishop of Carpentaria and Henry Le Fanu as Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, all the bishops of the province had received consecration at his hands, which strengthened the personal bond between them and their archbishop; and they all looked to him as a wise counsellor and father.

It was not only in the field of personal relationships that Donaldson set about making the province a reality. Although his own diocese was till not over-supplied with clergy or money, the archbishop took the attitude that as the strongest diocese Brisbane was bound to give support to the weaker ones in practical ways. With this in mind he initiated his plan by which the ordinands coming from St. Francis College were to place themselves in his hands to be sent anywhere in the province in the early years of their ministry. He also lent the weight of his influence to appeals by the northern dioceses for financial support from England, and this was a considerable help because Donaldson had many well-placed friends in the old country. In general synod, too, he not infrequently lent his powerful support to assist the claims of the weaker dioceses of the province, so that the Province of Queensland more often than not spoke with a united and powerful voice in the councils of the Australian church.

Nevertheless, Donaldson was not entirely sure as to the future of the provincial system. After a rather dull provincial synod in 1909, he wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

I am a little anxious as to the future of these intermediate Synods between the Diocesan and General. I think however that we shall learn how to use them as time goes on. Certainly there are no signs in Australia as yet that the States will merge their existence in a unified Commonwealth: & as long as State-patriotism is so strong, it is probably a right policy to have State-Synods of the Church.<sup>1074</sup>

<sup>1073</sup> Bishop Dawes to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 17 July 1906. S.P.G. 'F' MSS.

<sup>1074</sup> Donaldson to Abp. R.T. Davidson, 17 October 1909, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

He already recognised that the Anglican church in Australia would not be properly organised until it had an effective national outlook and organisation, and that the province ought to be a stepping stone rather than a final destination. In his seventeen-year Australian episcopate it was not the least of Donaldson's activities to be one of the great apostles of the movement for the creation of a strong national church as an autonomous member of the Anglican Communion.

Already before 1900 occasional criticisms had been made within the church of the ineffective national organisation of the Church of England in Australia, and it will be recalled that Bishop Tufnell had argued for the granting of real powers to general synod.<sup>1075</sup> Actually there was throughout the nineteenth century only a very confused idea as to what was the constitutional relationship of the Australian church with the mother church in England. Two things, however, were clear: that the general synod was an extremely ineffective body when positive action was required, and that the position of the primate was in many ways unsatisfactory. The latter question came to a head in 1890 with the election of the Reverend William Saumarez Smith as Bishop of Sydney and Primate of Australia. Up to this time it had been taken as axiomatic that the Bishop of Sydney should be primate, but the insistence of the Sydney diocesan electors on Smith's election against the wishes of most of the Australian bishops raised the question of whether the church should have to accept as primate a bishop in whose election the church as a whole had little voice.<sup>1076</sup> Among those most strongly opposed to Dr. Smith's election was Bishop Webber, who was far removed from the new primate both temperamentally and doctrinally. The personal clash of outlook between the two men gave particular sharpness to the distinctive attitude which the Diocese of Brisbane took up on the questions of the primacy and the general synod.

At the general synod of 1896 Webber opened the attack with a motion for the extension of the powers of general synod. Webber, with his high doctrine of the church and his temperamental leanings towards episcopal authoritarianism, regarded the existing constitution of general synod, which prevented it from speaking with any authority, as entirely unsatisfactory. The general synod could pass determinations, but these had no authority in any diocese until the synod of that diocese had accepted them. Webber therefore urged an extension of the authority of the general synod, but the primate sought to crush the suggestion in advance in his opening address:

Surely to press, unduly, the coercive, as distinguished from the consultative, position of the General Synod, would open out a risk of disintegration. Diocesan opposition to the legislation of the General Synod will only be manifested when there is some really strong local ground for it.<sup>1077</sup>

Bishop Webber's motion was finally amended to provide for a select committee to examine the matter, and no immediate result followed; but it demonstrated the continuing Queensland attitude that the central powers of the national church should be strengthened.

At the next general synod in 1900 Webber again led the campaign. His policy was twofold: that the powers of general synod should be increased, and that the primacy should be fixed in Sydney provided the whole church be given an effective voice in the election of the Archbishop of Sydney.<sup>1078</sup> Again he failed. General synod remained as before, and as Sydney refused to give way about having complete control in the election of its own bishop, it was resolved to have a movable primacy, by election from among the bishops of Sydney, Melbourne and Brisbane. The following year Webber expressed his annoyance by commenting that it was "at least questionable whether the time and expense involved in attending the General Synod are seriously justifiable",<sup>1079</sup> and the Brisbane synod carried motions supporting their bishop's view. Indeed, the general synod stood in low repute among Queensland churchmen at this time. It was not long afterwards that the prominent layman and lawyer, F.W.S. Cumbrae-Stewart, who had been prominent in the drafting of the constitution of the Province of Queensland, urged that general synod be allowed to fall into desuetude, and give place to provincial synods, and if necessary, a world-wide synod of the whole Anglican communion.<sup>1080</sup> About this time, too, Archdeacon David roundly attacked the existing constitution of general synod, and agreed with a former primate's description of it as an 'ecclesiastical abortion'.<sup>1081</sup>

It was soon realised that these criticisms of the constitution of general synod and of the primacy raised questions far deeper and more subtle than at first appeared, for any marked alterations to the existing clumsy machinery would require a searching examination of the whole relationship of the Australian church to the English church and the British parliament. For this reason the question of what should be done about general synod became merged in the wider question of

<sup>1075</sup> See above, p.126f.

<sup>1076</sup> Details of this election are discussed in a file of letters in Archiepiscopal Correspondence for 1890, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>1077</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1896, p.32.

<sup>1078</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1900, pp.32-3, Bishop's address

<sup>1079</sup> Ibid., 1901, p.32.

<sup>1080</sup> Official Report of Proceedings of the Adelaide Church Congress, 1902, p.78ff.

<sup>1081</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1904. For more detailed discussion of the powers of General Synod see Giles, R.A., The Constitutional History of the Australian Church, Chapter XIII.

autonomy for the Australian church, and those who sought for stronger authority in general synod were soon concentrating their attention on the more basic question of the constitutional position of the church as a whole.

In 1900 there was still a great deal of confusion, even among leading churchmen, as to the nature of the link between the English and Australian church. According to his chaplain, Dr. Donaldson came to Queensland looking forward to freedom from the parliamentary fetters that bound the Church of England.<sup>1082</sup> He was soon disillusioned; because it appeared that in certain respects the Australian church, by the provisions of the constitutions of its various dioceses, had tied itself even more rigidly than the English church. It was bound by the legislation of an English parliament in which it had no representation, and by the decisions of a judicial committee of the Privy Council before which it had no right of appeal except by leave of the Australian High Court. The issue of church-state relations was coming to a head in England about the same time. Decisions of the Privy Council on ritual cases had aroused considerable discontent; the report of a royal commission was shortly to find that the existing law was too narrow, for the modern needs of the church; and the 'Life and Liberty' movement, which sought to free the English church from some of its existing constitutional fetters, was making its first impact in England. Thus the movement for autonomy, while in some respect distinctively Australian, was closely related to developments in England; and it is noticeable that it was from English leaders of the Australian church that the impetus towards Australian church autonomy came.

In Queensland there were two notable leaders of the movement towards autonomy, Archbishop Donaldson and Bishop Frodsham. Of the two, Donaldson was perhaps rather more cautious, but he strongly favoured breaking the legal nexus with England, not only in order to remove constitutional anomalies, but in order that the Australian church might play its proper place in the life of the nation. He drew the parallel between the growth to autonomy of the church and of the state in Australia:

A precisely parallel development is taking place in our Australian Church. Here, too, the problem is that of the daughter growing up to years of discretion. In the early days, the various Dioceses were simply appendages of the Church of England in England, and, in spite of all our ecclesiastical development, our position may still be so described. But this condition of things cannot be permanent, and meanwhile much tact and wisdom is required lest, on the one hand, by undue attachment to English traditions, we hamper the natural growth of the Church, and, on the other – and this is perhaps the greater danger at present – lest we precipitate our development by headstrong acts of independence.<sup>1083</sup>

It was clear to Donaldson and many others that the first step was to clarify the existing confused legal situation, and it was an important decision when the general synod of 1905 appointed the three archbishops and the Bishop of Perth, with the aid of competent legal experts, to examine the legal connection between the Australian and the English church. It is not relevant here to go into details of the answers received. The burden of the legal advice, however, was contained in the words of the English counsel who were consulted:

The Anglican Churches in Australia and Tasmania are all organised upon the basis that they are not merely Churches 'in communion with' or 'in connection with' the Church of England, but are actual parts of that Church.<sup>1084</sup>

This meant that the Anglican Church in Australia had no real constitutional independence whatever, and the advocates of breaking the legal nexus now intensified their campaign, and from about 1910 the issue became a much more live one. The opposition to any change came chiefly from the big metropolitan dioceses, especially Sydney and Melbourne, while the laity of Brisbane were also rather doubtful. One reason for this opposition was the fear that a new constitution might allow the smaller dioceses, by their very numerical strength, to become far too influential in relation to their numbers of people. But never far from the surface were reasons of churchmanship. In Sydney, in particular, it was feared that the movement for autonomy was an Anglo-Catholic plot to make possible the radical revision of the Prayer Book and the alteration of the doctrinal formularies of the church. Dr. J.C. Wright, Archbishop of Sydney, wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the movement was the work of "the Young Guard, who are possessed by a wish for ritual liberty at any cost".<sup>1085</sup> The archbishop was no doubt earnest in this belief, but it scarcely squared with commonsense to put men like Donaldson and Frodsham into such company; and the sincerity of the plea in Frodsham's farewell sermon before the provincial synod in 1912, and the wisdom of Donaldson's call at the same synod for willingness to go slowly in order to "convince our fellow Churchmen of the rightness and necessity of the action we propose to take" had all the marks of deep concern to see that no hasty or ill-considered action was taken.<sup>1086</sup>

The apparent impossibility of securing constitutional change in the foreseeable future aroused considerable dissatisfaction among some of the clergy in Queensland. Timidity and conservatism in the south appeared to make the chances of a

<sup>1082</sup> Batty, F. de Witt, Constitutional Memories (pamphlet).

<sup>1083</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1906, pp. 35-6, Archbishop's address.

<sup>1084</sup> Quoted in Giles, R.A., op.cit. p.166. For full opinions of counsel see General Synod Proceedings, 1916, pp 73-86.

<sup>1085</sup> Wright to Apb. R.T. Davidson, 12 September 1911, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>1086</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1912, pp.8 and 15.

satisfactory national church constitution very slight. It was with this in mind that a significant action was taken by the provincial synod in 1909. A motion was moved by Bishop Frodsham and seconded by F.W.S. Cumbrae-Stewart:

That in order to remove all doubts as to the legal position of the Church of England in the Province of Queensland, the Standing Committee be requested to take the necessary steps to procure a Church of England Act for the whole of Queensland.<sup>1087</sup>

The primary intention of this motion was to give the same legal standing to the provincial constitution as the constitutions of Brisbane and Rockhampton dioceses already enjoyed by the Church of England Act of 1895. At the same time, however, it was proposed to delete the provision – as Rockhampton had already done – by which the church in Queensland was bound by decisions of the English civil courts.<sup>1088</sup> This change aroused the suspicions of the laymen in the Brisbane synod, and despite Donaldson's assurance that there was no intention of fostering provincial independence, synod referred the matter back for further consideration. The following year the archbishop agreed that it might be best for provincial synod to re-draft the proposed bill, and to submit it to general synod for approval of the whole church before asking the Queensland parliament to pass it.<sup>1089</sup>

The significance of this proposal for legislative sanction for the provincial constitution was that it represented the germ of an idea which was developing among some Queensland churchmen, that if the whole Australian church were not prepared to adopt a workable national constitution, then the Province of Queensland might need to go ahead independently. Frodsham took the attitude that though provincialism was little better as a solution to the needs of the Australian church than diocesanism, it was better to have some means by which a province could regulate such matters as revision of the Prayer Book than that each priest should do so individually, as was in fact occurring.<sup>1090</sup>

Here then was the tension within the church in Queensland – the desire on the one hand for a satisfactory constitution for the whole church in Australia, and in the face of the apparent remoteness of this goal, the urge on the part of some for independent provincial action, at least as a temporary expedient. This tension was not eased by the action of the general synod in 1916 in reducing the representation of the smaller dioceses. The action in itself was just enough, but Bishop Feetham, as one who was always the champion of the smaller dioceses against the larger ones, decided to make an issue of the unconstitutional way in which he believed it had been done.<sup>1091</sup> Finally, under the influence of Donaldson, Feetham agreed to give way,<sup>1092</sup> but the controversy had served to increase the difference of outlook between the Province of Queensland and some other parts of the Australian church.

Donaldson and Frodsham, the two Queensland champions of Australian ecclesiastical autonomy, both returned to England without seeing their hopes fulfilled. Yet their work was not ultimately in vain, because the movement which they had helped to initiate was too much in accordance with the needs of the church to be finally defeated, and the mantle of Donaldson appropriately fell on to the shoulders of his friend and chaplain Francis de Witt Batty who, later, as Bishop of Newcastle, was to lead the movement through until victory was almost achieved.

## **ii. The Missions of the Church**

Missionary work had never been forgotten among the ideals of the church in Queensland. The first attempt at evangelisation of the aborigines had been made by a C.M.S. mission at Moreton Bay in the 1830's; the first two Bishops of Brisbane both listed missionary work among their tasks when they first arrived in their diocese; there had been the unsuccessful attempt to work among the aborigines in the north at Somerset; and there had been some successful work among the kanakas and Chinese in various parts of the colony. Yet it must be admitted that up to 1890 the positive results of these hopes and endeavours were singularly small. Nor was this really surprising: because it has become clear that bishops and clergy were often at their wits' end simply to keep up the basic work of the church among the white Christian population, and they had no surplus resources such as would have been needed for missions to the heathen. It was another sign of the growing maturity of the church that the beginnings of a change in missionary attitudes and achievements could be noticed in the generation after 1890.

What little had been accomplished before 1890 was mostly through the work of individual clergy or catechists among non-European peoples living and working in their parishes. The Reverend Albert Maclaren, for example, had done excellent work among the two thousand kanakas in his parish at Mackay. Indeed from the point of view of some of his white

<sup>1087</sup> *Ibid.*, 1909, p.19

<sup>1088</sup> *Ibid.*, p.23.

<sup>1089</sup> Brisbane *Year Books*, 1911 p.17 and 1912 pp.19-22.

<sup>1090</sup> Frodsham, G.H., "Church Legislation in Australia", in *Australasian Church Quarterly Review*, January 1911. Also see N.Q. *Year Book*, 1911-13, Bishop's synod address, pp.29-31.

<sup>1091</sup> N.Q. *Synod Proceedings*, 1917.

<sup>1092</sup> N.Q. *Year Book*, 1921-2, p.33.



parishioners his work was too excellent, and they objected to his devoting so much time to the coloured people.<sup>1093</sup> At Maryborough and Bundaberg, too, a good deal of local mission work was carried on among the kanakas, and though partly supported by central funds, this depended mainly on local initiative. Actually the fact that so little mission work was accomplished in Bishop Hale's episcopate is testimony to the fact of the difficulties in the way, because no one could have been keener on missionary work than Hale.<sup>1094</sup>

The fact was that there was a widespread public attitude, even among many churchgoers, that was hostile to missionary work among the alien races. The Chinese were particularly unpopular, and although a Chinese catechist was supported by the Brisbane diocesan Board of Missions for ten years from 1890 to 1900 and did useful work among the Chinese in the Brisbane area, public support was always limited.<sup>1095</sup>

Although an Australasian Board of Missions had been established by the conference of the six bishops in 1850, it was late in the nineteenth century before this official missionary organisation of the church had the means to accomplish anything notable. By the end of the century, however, work had begun in two directions, which were eventually to become among the most important spheres of missionary work of the Australian church. In both ventures Queensland was to have a distinctive role.

The first was the New Guinea Mission, which for geographical reasons was always a particular concern of Queensland. The annexation of Papua by Sir Thomas Mcllwraith in 1883 made the question of the church's attitude an immediate one, and the two Queensland bishops, Hale and Stanton, wasted no time in discussing the matter. They decided on two immediate courses of action. One was to seek an official pledge from the government that the natives would be dealt with on Christian principles. The other was that as the Australian church was in no state to organise a mission itself, it should approach the English missionary societies to do so, with the promise of financial help from Australia.<sup>1096</sup> Being the closest bishop to New Guinea, Stanton agreed to accept the responsibility for exercising general oversight of the mission, and to try to rally support for it. The S.P.G. promised financial help, but could do no more, and Sydney, after early promises of support, began to grow lukewarm.<sup>1097</sup> Nevertheless the Reverend Albert Maclaren, who had been ordained in Brisbane and done such faithful work at Mackay, offered to found the mission, and counting on support from Brisbane and North Queensland, as well as five other dioceses, he set out to explore the situation.<sup>1098</sup> Maclaren did not survive long in the work: by the end of 1891 he had died of malaria, but not before he had planted the mission which was to become one of the finest ventures of the Australian church.

The church in Queensland, with its personal interest in Maclaren and its geographical proximity, continued to show interest in the New Guinea mission, though practical support was rather small. By 1894 there was real danger of collapse through lack of financial support, but Brisbane, despite its own financial crisis, gave £500 towards an A.B.M. appeal for £10,000 for New Guinea and aboriginal work.<sup>1099</sup> More important, it was from Brisbane in particular that the impetus came to establish a bishopric in New Guinea. In contrast to the hesitant caution of the primate, Bishop Webber set himself up as the leader of the campaign for a New Guinea bishopric, and even decided in his own mind who the first bishop should be. In a letter to the primate, which he circulated among all the Australian bishops, Webber put forward the alternatives as he saw them:

Either (1) at once to advise Sir William MacGregor – {administrator of New Guinea} that we feel ourselves too impotent a body to be entrusted with a work requiring so much missionary zeal, and suggesting that he should commit the same with delay to some more living and forceful agency or (2) to make up our minds at once to appoint the Church's natural leader – a Bishop – as head of the New Guinea Mission; and for this purpose to choose the best man that can be found.<sup>1100</sup>

The man Webber had in mind was his own sub-dean, Canon Montagu Stone-Wigg, a man "of singular self-devotion, spiritual power, and great missionary zeal" and "of no mean intellectual ability".<sup>1101</sup> In spite of the primate's annoyance at what he considered Webber's high-handed attitude, the stubborn Bishop of Brisbane secured the support of his own synod

<sup>1093</sup> Synge, F.M. Albert Maclaren p.12.

<sup>1094</sup> See above, p.164f.

<sup>1095</sup> This was well illustrated by Bishop Frodsham's request to the S.P.G. for assistance for work among the Chinese in North Queensland in 1902: "You know what the average Australian thinks about missionary work among the Chinese" Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 10 September 1902, S.P.G. "F" Mss.

<sup>1096</sup> Hale to Bishop Barry, 16 November 1883, copy included in S.P.G. "F" Mss.

<sup>1097</sup> Bishop Stanton to S.P.G., 19<sup>th</sup> July 1889, and Rev. A.A. Maclaren to S.P.G., 20 February 1890, S.P.G. 'F' Mss.

<sup>1098</sup> The dioceses whose support he expected were Tasmania, Adelaide, Bathurst, Riverina and Ballarat, besides Brisbane and North Queensland. See Maclaren to S.P.G., 1 May 1890, S.P.G. 'F' Mss.

<sup>1099</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1894, and Brisbane Year Book, 1895, p.27.

<sup>1100</sup> Webber to Bishop W. Samurez Smith, 7 April 1896, copy preserved in Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>1101</sup> Ibid.

for the project of the New Guinea bishopric,<sup>1102</sup> and he then went on to make a further suggestion – or ultimatum – to the primate

Should your Lordship still feel that you cannot reach the conclusion which to some of us has become almost axiomatic, let me say that I am not unprepared – having regard to the administrative relations between our Government and New Guinea and the moral considerations consequently arising therefrom – for the Board, should it see fit, to devolve the responsibility of the New Guinea Mission upon the shoulders of my Diocese.<sup>1103</sup>

The condition of the offer was that the choice of the bishop should be in Webber's hands, and that he should be free to seek the support of other dioceses of the Australian church. Webber showed his determination by taking the matter up with the S.P.G. and the Archbishop of Canterbury, but finally the primate and the A.B.M. decided to establish the bishopric, and in accordance with Webber's hopes, Stone-Wigg was appointed. He was consecrated first Bishop of New Guinea in St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, on 25 January 1898, and appropriately enough Bishop Webber as acting-primate was the consecrating bishop, and the sermon was preached by Stone-Wigg's close Brisbane friend Archdeacon David.<sup>1104</sup> Stone-Wigg was well known and deeply respected for his work in Brisbane, and as a result the link between the church in Queensland and the New Guinea mission was greatly strengthened.

It is not our purpose here to pursue the work of the church in New Guinea as such. Progress in the early years was very slow, and Stone-Wigg had good cause for bitter complaint about the lack of support from the Australian church. Yet the links between the New Guinea mission and Queensland were always strong. Two months after the Province of Queensland was inaugurated in 1905, New Guinea became the fifth diocese to join the province, and the special relationship thus established made the links closer. In 1908 Archbishop Donaldson paid his first metropolitanical visit to New Guinea; in 1915 it was he who urged that the conquest of German New Guinea by Australia must mean added spiritual responsibilities by the church;<sup>1105</sup> and personal links were strengthened when the second Bishop of New Guinea, Gerald Sharp, became Archbishop of Brisbane, and the Bishop of Carpentaria, Henry Newton, was translated to New Guinea as third bishop. In church, as in state, the history of New Guinea was vitally affected by the initiative of Queenslanders.

The other major sphere of missionary activity that was begun at the end of the nineteenth century was among the Australian aborigines. Despite many pious hopes and good intentions, and a few ill-fated experimental ventures, it was not until 1892 that the first permanent Anglican aboriginal mission was founded in Queensland. In reality it was even more of an individual effort in origin than the New Guinea mission had been, because although the Reverend J.B. Gribble obtained the approval of the Australian Board of Missions and the diocesan council of North Queensland, both bodies warned him that they could guarantee no financial support.<sup>1106</sup> Nevertheless, having selected a site on the advice of the famous botanist, Baron von Mueller, and having been granted the site by the government, Gribble set about raising financial support and interest for his lone venture. The site, though just a few miles south of Cairns, was effectively cut off by the nature of the terrain from overland contact with white settlement; but though attractive, it was not ideal from the agricultural point of view. In any case in June 1892 J.B. Gribble landed, accompanied by a white man, a south sea islander, and an aboriginal lad, and commenced the work of the Bellenden Ker mission, later known as Yarrabah.<sup>1107</sup> From the beginning there were many difficulties. The founder of the mission was soon seriously ill, and his white assistant left. Within five months J.B. Gribble was unable to carry on, and was forced to leave, without having actually made contact with the natives of the area at all. Fortunately, however, his son Ernest, who was preparing for ordination as a catechist in New South Wales, answered his father's call for help, and arrived to commence what was to be a lifetime of missionary service to the aborigines. When his father died, Ernest Gribble took complete charge of the mission, with the assistance of his widowed mother; and until 1908 he persevered at Yarrabah, and then left it for work among aborigines elsewhere. By this time Yarrabah had a population of some five hundred aborigines, living in fifteen villages, and served by five churches, a hospital and a fleet of small vessels. It was a remarkable achievement in the face of heavy odds, due first of all to the courage and perseverance of the Gribble family and their small band of helpers, then to the meagre but growing assistance of the church through A.B.M., aided after some years by increasing government subsidies.<sup>35A</sup>

These beginnings of two important missionary enterprises were only on a small scale before 1900. In the new century there was a noticeable quickening of interest in missionary work in Queensland. One reason for this was the formation of the province, which in composition was perhaps the most varied ecclesiastical province in the whole Anglican Communion, with its blend of European, aboriginal, Papuan, Torres Strait islander, kanaka and Asian populations. This meant that missionary

<sup>1102</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1896, p.65.

<sup>1103</sup> Webber to Bishop W. Samurez Smith, 25 June 1896, copy preserved in Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>1104</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1898.

<sup>1105</sup> Donaldson to Rev. C.F. Pascoe, 10 September 1915, S.P.G. 'F' Mss".

<sup>1106</sup> Gribble, E.R.B., A despised Race, p. 34. Also see Minutes, N.Q. Diocesan Council, 7 September 1891.

<sup>1107</sup> From the aboriginal name for the locality, 'Eyerraba' North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.53ff.

work was an integral part of the very existence of the province. It was not that public opinion always welcomed this missionary activity – indeed, Bishop Frodsham wrote to the S.P.G. in 1903 that his advocacy of missionary work among aliens in Queensland had stirred up “a hornet’s nest of opposition”<sup>1108</sup>. But welcome or not, it could not be ignored. The missionary-mindedness of some of the most influential leaders of the church was another important factor. Archbishop Donaldson was always keen on missions, and he constantly had before him a vision of the part Queensland might be destined to play:

We are so situated geographically as to seem marked out to be the evangelists of the Pacific Islands; and it is my dream that we shall one day be in a position fully to realise our responsibility. Just as the centre of Christian effort in the first days shifted from Jerusalem to Antioch, so it is my dream that one day Brisbane, which received its church organization originally from the south, shall, in its turn, become the Antioch of Australia.<sup>1109</sup>

While the archbishop dreamed this dream and strove to stir up missionary interest in the settled southern part of the state, the northern bishops were translating missionary talk into action. Carpentaria’s great missionary bishops, Gilbert White and Henry Newton, were expanding the work among the non-European races of their diocese, while at the same time seeking to arouse a favourable public opinion. In North Queensland, at the same time, Bishops Frodsham and Feetham took a real interest in the matter – Frodsham with his efforts to influence government policy towards the native races, and Feetham with his transparent practical and pastoral concern for the aborigines as a race.

The other great factor in the rising missionary concern was the changing climate of opinion that was accompanying the new status of the Australian nation. The country, like the church, was coming out of the pioneering stage, when all its attention had to be directed to the immediate internal problems of building up a nation. Federation symbolised the new status; now it became possible to look outwards, and at the same time to examine the white man’s responsibility to the aborigines. Governments as well as churches were awakening to the extent of their past failure to give a fair deal to the original inhabitants of the country, and as a large percentage of the aborigines (and Torres Strait islanders) live in Queensland, this was a particular concern for the Queensland government and people. Missionary work, then, became less of an oddity, and more of an enterprise which the government welcomed, and in certain circumstances was prepared to help by material means.

So far as the church was concerned, the rise of the new missionary outlook had several manifestations. One of the most important was that the church began to develop a definite policy on matters of administration of native races, and to urge this policy upon the government. Two races were particularly concerned in this matter – the aborigines and the kanakas – and as these races were above all concentrated in Queensland, churchmen from Queensland played a leading part in the formulating a policy for the church. The aboriginal policy being urged by the Anglican Church was most clearly set out in a pastoral letter issued by the bishops of Australia in 1910. The bishops summed up the existing situation succinctly:

They have a right to live, and we have destroyed the environment in which alone they could freely and naturally exist.<sup>1110</sup>

From this starting point the pastoral went on to enumerate four principles.

The first was the principle of segregation:

If they are to make a real advance upon the upward path of civilization the aborigines must in the earlier stages of their development be kept apart from the white man, and to this end the policy of inviolable reserves is undoubtedly the right one.<sup>1111</sup>

The second principle was that they should be encouraged towards self-support, as a start at least by means of agricultural or pastoral work. Thirdly, adequate arrangements should be made for definite moral and spiritual influences to be brought to bear upon them. Finally, lawless aborigines should be sent to special reformatory reserves, not to mission stations which had no means of dealing with criminals.

Some of these principles were very significant. The advocacy of segregation was in direct opposition to the expressed desires of certain commercial interests, especially those who were anxious to secure cheap aboriginal labour from the mission or government reserves. There had been a constant tension about this matter, and not infrequently these interests had criticised missions for holding back the natives from gainful employment.<sup>1112</sup> The missionaries replied that all too often this represented an exploitation of a race not yet equipped to stand on their own feet, and not yet ready to withstand harmful social and moral influences. The bishops took this latter stand: but it should be noticed that their advocacy of

<sup>35A</sup> For further details of the early history of Yarrabah, see Rowland, E.C., *The Tropics for Christ*, pp 91-98

36. Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 22 January, 1903, *S.P.G. ‘F’ Mss.*

37. *Church Chronicle*, June 1905.

<sup>1110</sup> Quoted in *ibid.*, January 1911.

<sup>1111</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>1112</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1911, p. 12 Archbishop’s synod address.

segregation was for “the early stages”, and was not necessarily to be an ultimate policy. Indeed, Bishop Gilbert White, one of the formulators of this policy, looked forward to the aborigines eventually living as full members of the country and in harmonious relations with the white population, helping to solve the problem of the de-populated north of Australia.<sup>1113</sup>

The third principle in this pastoral held certain implications for the question of relations between church and state. Behind it lay the belief that purely secular work among aborigines, as on government reserves, would not meet the real needs, because while enabling the aborigines to take up the outward forms of European civilization, it would leave a moral and spiritual vacuum. By this time it was becoming increasingly apparent that the church lacked the financial resources to make a thoroughly successful job by itself of bringing the aborigines up to the levels of white Australians in education, health and living standards. On this ground it was argued in some quarters that work for the aborigines was best done by the government on a purely secular level. The bishops in effect were hinting that this would not do; and that a reasonable solution would be for the state to provide more extensive financial support for the church in its aboriginal mission work.

The fourth principle was concerned with a practical problem that had faced the church in Queensland. In 1902 Yarrabah, together with the Presbyterian mission at Mapoon, had been proclaimed a reformatory, and since then a large number of convicted aborigines had been committed there by magistrates.<sup>1114</sup> The closing down of the Fraser Island Mission, which had been carried on unsuccessfully from 1900 to 1904, and the transfer of those people to Yarrabah, further increased the number of incorrigible aborigines, and it proved difficult to combine the free kind of atmosphere desirable on a Christian mission with the disciplinary measures needed for convicted criminals.

The formulation of a deliberate aboriginal policy by the Church of England – as by some other denominations – gradually began to make some impact on public opinion. There was a steadily increasing interest on the part of the government in aboriginal missions, and a gradual softening of the antipathetic public attitude towards the aborigines.

The other group about whom a definite church policy began to emerge at the beginning of the century was the kanakas. Mission work among the kanakas had gone on from an early period, and in the 1890's was particularly important on the Herbert River in North Queensland under Archdeacon Francis Pritt, and at the Selwyn Mission at Mackay. A very large proportion of the kanakas were consequently under Christian influence, and above all under that of the Anglican church. Soon after federation the federal government decided to deport the kanakas, on grounds of maintaining a white Australia. It was this that stirred up the northern bishops on humanitarian grounds. Some of the islanders had been in Australia so long that they had no other home, and it would be a great hardship to be deported to islands where they would be complete strangers. “No amount of popular sentiment can make wrong right”, thundered Bishop Gilbert White, “and it would be a thousand pities that the new Commonwealth should sully its fame by an act of oppression to a people who were too weak effectually to resist it.”<sup>1115</sup> For his part, Bishop Frodsham took more direct action: he wrote to Kidston, the state premier, and Watson the federal Labour leader, and attacked the inhumanity of the decision.<sup>1116</sup> Following these and other protests a royal commission recommended that those kanakas who so desired should be allowed to stay. A number of them settled on Moa Island in the Torres Strait, and Bishop White sent the saintly deaconess, Florence Buchanan, to be their spiritual guide. There she worked until her death in 1913, a courageous soul facing incredible suffering “in about as frail a body as any soul could dwell”.<sup>1117</sup>

If the growing interest in missions was illustrated by this more definite public policy on questions affecting native races, it was also revealed by the building up of the church's own missionary machinery. The Australian Board of Missions, as the official missionary board of the church, was beginning to emerge from its nineteenth century insignificance. The Queensland provincial synod in 1906 recommended that each diocese be set a target for its missionary subscriptions, and this was done. Brisbane for example, was allocated £550,<sup>1118</sup> and though for a time the diocese fell far short of its goal, the setting of a definite target helped to raise the sights of missionary giving.<sup>1119</sup> One trouble was mismanagement in the central office of A.B.M. in Sydney, which by 1909 resulted in a major crisis, with a deficit of £5,000 which threatened the continued existence of the New Guinea and aboriginal missions. Archbishop Donaldson, who throughout his life was keenly interested in missionary organisation in the home base, took a lead in meeting this crisis. He urged the appointment

<sup>1113</sup> White, G., “Some Problems of Northern Australia”, in Victorian Geographical Journal, Vol. xxv, 1907, p.65.

<sup>1114</sup> Queensland Parliamentary Papers, 1902, p.1138

<sup>1115</sup> Abstract of the Proceedings of the first Conference of the Diocese of Carpentaria, 1902, p.19.

<sup>1116</sup> Frodsham to W. Kidston, 8 March 1906 and 26 March 1906, copies preserved in S.P.G. 'F' Mss.; also see Frodsham to Bishop H.H. Montgomery, 28 November 1905.

<sup>1117</sup> Jones, E., Florence Buchanan. See also the poem, “Florence Buchanan, Deaconess” in The Poems of Gilbert White, p. 118-9.

<sup>1118</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1906, p.73.

<sup>1119</sup> In 1908, only 12 of the 50 parishes in Brisbane diocese reached their missionary goal – Brisbane Year Book, 1908, p.80.

of paid staff, and of provincial organising secretaries, as a means of increasing income and handling it more efficiently.<sup>1120</sup> The result was that this crisis marked a turning-point in the A.B.M., and with revitalised organisation, its income increased noticeably and it became a more efficient instrument of missionary expansion than it had ever been before.

In Queensland the appointment of the Reverend J.S. Needham as organising secretary of A.B.M. reinforced the efforts of the bishops to arouse a new missionary concern in the church at large. By the time of the Great War Rockhampton missionary giving was reaching record figures; <sup>1121</sup> in North Queensland Bishop Feetham was able to report by 1918 that his diocese had exceeded the target he had set of giving ten percent of income to missionary work;<sup>1122</sup> and in Brisbane above all there was a constant rise in missionary contributions. It was with some satisfaction that Archbishop Donaldson was able to announce that from 1906 to 1920 the annual missionary offerings of the province had grown from £500 to £4000.<sup>1123</sup>

These developments in policy and organisation naturally were reflected in the mission fields themselves, and so far as Queensland was concerned, this meant a steady expansion of what had been begun at Yarrabah and New Guinea, and above all the commencement of important new ventures in the Diocese of Carpentaria. Discussion of internal development in New Guinea is not relevant here. Yarrabah made general progress, but with those ups and downs that have characterised work among the Australian aborigines. In part this reflected the deeply rooted nomadic character of the aborigines themselves, with the consequent difficulty which that implied in attaining social and religious stability by the standards of European civilisation; but in part, too, it reflected the difficulty in finding the right kind of experienced and efficient staff for the station. Nor were the problems eased by the occasional destructive cyclones, and the unsuitability of the land for profitable agriculture. In 1911 a period of mismanagement at Yarrabah came to a head with the replacement of the superintendent, and the undertaking of the business direction of the mission by a group of prominent Brisbane business men.<sup>1124</sup> The result of these circumstances was that Yarrabah aroused a remarkable variety of conflicting comments. From commercial interests there was frequent criticism of over-protection of the natives; from business men there were questions as to why the mission was constantly in financial trouble; from humanitarian visitors there were many favourable comments on the progress being made in education, health and economic self-support, to say nothing of the marked religious change.<sup>1125</sup> The presence of two aborigines at the North Queensland synod in 1907 indicated that progress was being made; and one of these men, James Noble, after years as a lay reader and catechist, was made a deacon in West Australia in later years.<sup>1126</sup> Yet in general it could be said that the results achieved at Yarrabah were of mixed standard.

It was in the Diocese of Carpentaria that more of the aborigines lived, and it was there that most of the future work was to develop, though only one station was opened in the Queensland part of the diocese before 1902. This was at Mitchell River, on the eastern shore of the Gulf of Carpentaria. In 1902 the site for this mission was examined by two parties, an overland one led by Ernest Gribble from Yarrabah, and another one from the sea, including Bishop Gilbert White. The parties failed to make contact, but enough was seen to request the government for a grant of 700 square miles as a mission reserve.<sup>1127</sup> There were estimated to be some two thousand natives in the area, in a completely nomadic and wild state, and it was a risky enterprise starting the mission in 1904. As there was no priest available, a layman named Matthews was in charge, and within five years about 90 aborigines had come to reside at the mission station.<sup>1128</sup> Progress was slow, the firmly rooted habit of the walk-about making steady growth difficult, but gradually the numbers under the influence of the mission increased. Meanwhile, on the western shore of the gulf, at Roper River, another mission was opened by the Church Missionary Society in 1907.<sup>1129</sup>

The most unexpected piece of missionary work from the Anglican point of view came, however, as a result of an offer from the predominantly Congregationalist London Missionary Society. The L.M.S. had started work in the Torres Strait islands as early as 1871, a date celebrated by the islanders themselves as 'the coming of the light'. The primary purpose of the L.M.S. was to secure a base for the evangelisation of New Guinea, but in the ensuing years the eighteen hundred islanders, who were distinctly ethnically both from the New Guinea people and the Australian aborigines, had all become nominally Christian. By the time of the first World War the L.M.S. found itself over-committed, and administratively the

<sup>1120</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1909, p. 11, Archbishop's address; see also Donaldson to Abp. R. T. Davidson, 17 October 1909, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace.

<sup>1121</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1915, p. 42

<sup>1122</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1916-19, p.173

<sup>1123</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1921, p.5.

<sup>1124</sup> N.Q. Year Book, p. 1911-13, p.48; Church Chronicle, July 1911; and Northern Churchman, May 1912.

<sup>1125</sup> For examples of the last, see Church Chronicle, September 1910 and March 1920.

<sup>1126</sup> North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.45.

<sup>1127</sup> Account by Rev. E.R.B. Gribble, Ibid., p.58ff.

<sup>1128</sup> Carpentarian, October 1910.

<sup>1129</sup> Ibid., July 1907.

continuance of the mission in the islands presented difficulties, as New Guinea had now been handed over to the Commonwealth government, while the islands came under Queensland control, In 1914, therefore, the L.M.S. decided to offer to hand over the Torres Strait mission to the Bishop of Carpentaria.<sup>1130</sup>

It was a quite unusual situation. The native people were scattered over some twenty islands, some of them with very small populations, and about five hundred of them were full members of the Congregational Church. There was a reasonable degree of education, elementary day schools being provided free of cost by the government, though the native teachers were not very efficient. There were a number of churches, five solid ones of coral and lime having been built in the past few years.<sup>1131</sup> In other words, a completely organised mission, based on Congregationalist doctrine, worship and polity, was being handed over to the Church of England.

There were some ticklish details to be arranged in the transition, but the L.M.S. mission superintendent very helpfully conveyed Bishop White on a tour of the islands and helped explain the changes to the islanders. Deacons, Congregational style, were converted into churchwardens, Anglican style; the Book of Common Prayer began to make its appearance by degrees; and before long on the various islands candidates were being prepared for confirmation, so that they might become full communicant members of the Church of England. The L.M.S. had exercised a strict form of discipline for religious and moral offences, so the transition to discipline in the catholic tradition of the Church of England was not so great as might be supposed.<sup>1132</sup> There were, of course, individual problems. One man, for example, was personally worried about the changeover, as Bishop White recorded:

One man came to me to enquire anxiously whether I would continue him in his office, which he had held continuously for over 40 years. He was the official Church awakener, and had an ancient black rod with a silver top, with which he went round and prodded any member of the congregation who fell asleep under the sometimes very long-winded exhortations of the native Deacons.<sup>1133</sup>

The new responsibilities placed a considerable burden upon the Diocese of Carpentaria, but the A.B.M. promised its support, and the Reverend John Done soon arrived to become superintendent of the new scattered mission. The change-over had not long taken place when Bishop Henry Newton became Bishop of Carpentaria. Newton was concerned as to how the islands could be satisfactorily ministered to. Finally he decided that the only practicable method was to build up a native ministry, with a priest on each inhabited island, who would support himself with his own gardening and fishing, and provide the ministrations of the church as well, while over the whole would be an European priest-superintendent. Some of these islands had a population of not much more than fifty, so that it was quite necessary that the native priests should have something else to do besides their spiritual duties. With this plan in mind, a small theological college was opened on Moa in 1917, and the first four native students admitted to be trained for the sacred ministry, under the guidance of the Reverend Geoffrey Luscombe.<sup>1134</sup> Two years later, in 1919, Joseph Lui and Poey Passi were made deacons in All Souls; Cathedral, Thursday Island; in later years they were ordained to the priesthood.<sup>1135</sup> In this way one of the most interesting and distinctive parts of the church in Queensland was brought into the Anglican Communion. That the transition was so smooth was in no small measure due to the fatherly guidance of Bishop Henry Newton. Newton was not one of the more influential of the Queensland bishops, though his most important work lay in the Diocese of New Guinea, and consequently outside the scope of this work; but he was a truly

missionary-hearted man, and a real father-in-God to his people, both native and European. He was able to maintain and build up that episcopal tradition, which the Diocese of Carpentaria has always been able to preserve because of its small population, that its bishop is less an administrator than a true pastor of his flock. In this respect Bishop Newton had a fine example from his own half-brother, the Reverend W.M. Wilkinson, whose great self-denying pastoral work in the Gulf country became almost legendary in the north.<sup>1136</sup> Newton had a deep sense of the responsibility of church and state for these simple island people who only recently had emerged from cannibalism. He urged the appointment of a protector, with almost absolute power, but with deep understanding and sympathy, so that they might be carefully led through their period of transition. He himself with his gentle shepherding, and sometimes firm discipline, unofficially fulfilled such a role in no small measure.<sup>1137</sup>

<sup>1130</sup> Goodall, N., A History of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945, p.420. Also see Report of London Missionary Society, 1915, pp. 26 and 325.

<sup>1131</sup> Report of London Missionary Society, 1914, p. 340 ff.

<sup>1132</sup> For details of the transition, see MS entitled Torres Strait Island Mission, in Bishop Gilbert White's handwriting, Carpentarian Diocesan Registry.

<sup>1133</sup> Carpentarian, July 1915.

<sup>1134</sup> Ibid, April 1917.

<sup>1135</sup> Ibid., January 1920.

<sup>1136</sup> Smith, P. McD., The Strenuous Saint, describes a great pastoral tour of Wilkinson which lasted more than 2 ¼ years.

<sup>1137</sup> Carpentarian, October 1917.

By 1920 the missionary work of the church in Queensland was still on a small scale. The numbers of native peoples under direct Christian influence were still limited, the number of missionary volunteers was painfully few, and the contributions of church members were almost insignificant considering the size of the population. Yet in comparison with thirty years before there was a striking contrast. Then Queensland itself had been virtually a missionary area, and sums were still being poured in from England for expansion and maintenance of the church in Queensland. What missionary work was going forth from the colony was essentially the result of the initiative of a few individuals. By the end of our period the church had quite clearly seen its corporate responsibility: not only was the Queensland church for the most part maintaining itself, but it was looking outwards. It was a long time before Archbishop Donaldson's vision of Brisbane as the Antioch of the south Pacific could be in any sense realised; but the flourishing northern missions, based on Australian support, indicated that the vision was at least beginning to materialise.

### iii. Relations with other Christian Communions

Generally speaking, in Australia as in England, the nineteenth century was not characterised by particularly cordial relations among the various Christian denominations. Nor was it on doctrinal differences alone that this coolness was based. In England the Anglican Church had a privileged status as the established church, and this was apt to aggravate mutual antipathies. Anglicans tended to regard the other churches – whether Non-conformist or Roman Catholic – as having inferior status to the established church, while those bodies resented the privileges which the Anglican Church received. These feelings were not entirely left behind in England when Australia was settled, because though the Church of England received in Australia no privileged position in law, there was a heritage of English attitudes brought out by clergy and laymen alike. It was this spirit that was evidenced when in 1885 a Baptist minister remarked biting, though rather foolishly, of the newly arrived Anglican bishop that a Bishop of Brisbane was an anomaly, “an unscriptural being”.<sup>1138</sup>

In the first generation of the colony, relations between the Anglican Church and other denominations were quite restricted. There were occasional co-operative ventures, such as the joint tour of Bishops Tufnell and Quinn on the educational question, but these were rare occasions called forth by very special circumstances. The exclusive attitude of the Roman Catholic Church, and significant differences of outlook on various issues from the Non-conformists did not help to lessen the prevailing Anglican attitude of separateness. We have already noted that Bishop Hale, whose evangelical leanings led him to play down differences in doctrine and order between the Church of England and the protestant churches, ran into serious differences with his own clergy on this very issue. The prevailing outlook of the clergy was well illustrated when arrangements were being discussed to welcome Bishop Webber in 1885. A move to invite ministers of other denominations to the welcome was defeated: the Reverend John Sutton protested that he was a Catholic, not a protestant, and even Archdeacon Glennie remarked with some satisfaction that he had not fraternised with ministers of other churches in his 37 years in Queensland.<sup>1139</sup>

The laity were generally less concerned about maintaining separateness from the Non-conformist churches than were the clergy. It was not often that they went so far as did the people of Gladstone in 1882, when they passed one of the strangest motions to appear on any church minute book in Queensland:

The meeting being of opinion that it were impossible for the members of the Church to support a clergyman in this Parish were they to invite one, it was thought desirable to join with the Presbyterians and invite a minister (say a Wesleyan) to do duty in both churches and to visit all Protestants in the District.<sup>1140</sup>

This was not typical, but it was indicative of the degree of doctrinal vagueness that characterised a very large proportion of Anglican laymen. They very often showed little appreciation of the catholic heritage of the Church of England which marked it off from the doctrine and polity of the non-episcopal churches; and at the same time they were less influenced than the clergy by non-theological prejudices inherited from the traditions of the English establishment.

From about 1890 there was noticeable a subtle, but significant, change in the Anglican attitude. Previously the sense of separateness seemed to be more determined by inherited prejudice, than by the demands of the catholic view of the nature of the church. This now began to be reversed: the prejudice of ecclesiastical snobbery – if we might call it that – became less noticeable, while the reality of theological differences assumed greater significance. There were several reasons for this changing emphasis. In England itself Anglican privilege had been steadily broken down throughout the nineteenth century, and in Australia arguments based on the accident of English church establishment grew increasingly irrelevant. At the same time, on the practical level, inter-church co-operation in the Bible in State Schools campaign helped break down old prejudices. Meanwhile the attention to doctrinal issues that resulted from the catholic revival emphasised doctrinal

<sup>1138</sup> Brisbane Courier, 8 December 1885.

<sup>1139</sup> Ibid., 29 October 1885.

<sup>1140</sup> Minutes, Gladstone Church Committee, 31 January 1882.

differences between Anglicans and Non-conformists, and the Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888 focussed attention on the doctrinal questions involved in re-union.<sup>1141</sup>

No one in any responsible position questioned that unity among Christians was desirable; and already by 1889 Bishop Webber was expressing clearly where the Church of England stood on the matter:

No thinking man who is a believer, who has ever pondered the prayer of our Lord for the unity of His Church - as the standing witness to the world of His Divine Mission - can for one moment regard the present state of Christendom as in true keeping with that ideal...The Church of England occupies a unique position of opportunity and therefore of responsibility, for with the one hand she touches the other ancient Churches of Christendom, with the other the modern Protestant bodies.<sup>1142</sup>

This was the position consistently taken up by the Anglican church in Queensland as elsewhere – a new concern for unity, but also a strong conviction, on theological grounds, that the Church of England had a distinct contribution to make to that re-union, which could only be made if it held firm to its catholic principles. It would not be by compromise, nor by patched up agreements that unity would be achieved, but first of all by facing up honestly to the major differences separating Christians.<sup>1143</sup>

The desire for unity, qualified as it was by the conviction that it was essential to avoid precipitate action that failed to take basic differences into account, caused the Church of England to take up a position quite different from that of the typical protestant churches. Bishop Barlow, for example, was invited to join in a united missionary enterprise to the kanakas, but declined;<sup>1144</sup> Anglicans persistently refused to take part in united services of worship;<sup>1145</sup> and Bishop Gilbert White, with the backing of the other bishops of Australia, declined to accede to a Presbyterian request to hold services in his cathedral, though he did offer the Thursday Island parish hall for the purpose.<sup>1146</sup> These actions were bitterly resented by some of the Non-conformists, who regarded them as a token of the insincerity of Anglican pretensions towards Christian unity. The Anglican conviction was, however, that there was a shallowness about such combined enterprises. They were regarded as an attempt to gloss over real differences in a show of unity, which would not solve the basic problems, but simply avoid them temporarily.

With the arrival of Archbishop Donaldson, the quest for closer relations among the churches took on a new phase. It was not so much that Donaldson differed from his predecessor in doctrine; but Webber had been so deeply immersed in internal ecclesiastical concerns that his interest in closer relations with other Christian bodies rarely found opportunity of expression. Donaldson, however, was able to look outwards; and it was not without significance that at his first synod cordial greetings were interchanged between synod and the Presbyterian assembly which was meeting at the time. Yet while Donaldson and the churchmen of his era were more overtly concerned with strengthening relations among the Christian bodies, they were no more ready for hasty action than Webber and his contemporaries had been. Time and again the archbishop emphasised that there must be no hasty compromise nor corporate submission of one body to any other: for the present the course to be followed was one of prayer, of seeking to extricate principles from prejudices, of each body understanding more clearly its own positive convictions, and of each body of Christians drawing closer to one another by closer communion with God.<sup>1147</sup>

One of the distinctive features of the Anglican attitude which marked it off from that of the Non-conformist churches was the emphasis on the principle that the Roman Catholic Church must be included in the hopes for Christian reunion. Actual intercourse between the Anglican and Roman churches was very limited, and the papal denial of the validity of Anglican orders in 1896 had not improved relations. But the Anglican leaders were conscious of a common catholic heritage which the Church of England shared with the Church of Rome, and they believed that the Anglican role should be to bridge the gap between catholic and protestant, not to become part of a mere pan-protestant unity. In 1900, for example, the Church Chronicle criticised the tone of lectures that had been given in the Protestant Hall,<sup>1148</sup> and time and again Anglican

<sup>1141</sup> The Lambeth Quadrilateral, put out by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 on the model of the earlier Chicago Quadrilateral of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, set forth four basic prerequisites of any reunion scheme, viz. the acceptance of Holy Scripture, the Nicene Creed, the two Gospel Sacraments, and the Historic Episcopate. This became the basic of many subsequent reunion negotiations.

<sup>1142</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1889, Bishop's address, p.2.

<sup>1143</sup> See, for example, Bishop Dawes' comments, Church Chronicle, February 1891.

<sup>1144</sup> Diocesan Diary, 12 May 1893.

<sup>1145</sup> e.g. Brisbane Year Book, 1901, p.33; Church Chronicle, July 1902.

<sup>1146</sup> There was a protracted disagreement over this, beginning at the consecration of the church in 1893 by Bishop Barlow, See N.Q. Diocesan Diary, 12 November 1893, and Carpentarian, July 1903 and January 1904.

<sup>1147</sup> E.g. Address by Archbishop Donaldson to the Brisbane Ministers' Union quoted in Church Chronicle, September 1912.

<sup>1148</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1900.



spokesmen reminded enthusiastic protestants that no scheme of reunion would be complete without the Roman Catholic Church. Yet as Donaldson pointed out,

The reunited Church of Christ will not be Roman Catholic, or Anglican, or Presbyterian, or Methodist, but something more truly Catholic, more truly devoted to her Master, more fully enlightened by his Mind than any of these.<sup>1149</sup>

With one other communion, relations of a more intimate kind were sought by the Church of England. This was with the Greek Orthodox Church, from which the Church of England was separated by no major doctrinal issue, although there was a very great difference of ethos. The question here was of an immediately practical kind. The Greek Church had people scattered over the country, but had very few priests. In 1919 Archbishop Donaldson wrote to the Greek archimandrite in Melbourne pointing out that some Greek Orthodox people were accustomed to receive Holy Communion in Anglican churches in North Queensland at Easter. He asked whether the Greek church would like Anglican priests to encourage the Greek people to do this. The reply was friendly and encouraging: such invitations to Greeks to receive the sacrament at Anglican altars would be, as the archimandrite said, "with my freely and gladly given sanction".<sup>1150</sup> Not only was this custom fostered in the north, but Orthodox priests were offered the hospitality of Anglican churches when they visited North Queensland.

The generation from 1890 to 1920 saw a definite advance in the matter of inter-church relationships. It was not that there was any successful example of reunion, nor even serious proposals towards it. But for the first time in Queensland the issues were squarely faced, and faced on the basis of principle, not of prejudice. Attention was focussed for the first time, as it needed to be, on the fact that the basic problem was that of the differing catholic and protestant understandings of the nature of the church.<sup>1151</sup> The Church of England firmly argued that moves towards unity must be not by the path of 'undenominationalism', but of 'inter-denominationalism', as William Temple put it on his visit to Brisbane in 1910.<sup>1152</sup> This confrontation with the basic issues prepared the way for the next phase of the movement for unity which followed the Lambeth appeal of 1920. That story belongs, however, to another chapter.

---

<sup>1149</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1908, Archbishop's address, p.43.

<sup>1150</sup> Correspondence quoted in Northern Churchman, December 1919.

<sup>1151</sup> See, for example, the excellent editorial on this subject, presumably from the pen of the Rev. F. de Witt Batty, Church Chronicle, April 1913.

<sup>1152</sup> Church Chronicle, September 1910. Temple later became Archbishop of Canterbury.

## **CHAPTER 14: SOCIETY IN TRANSITION.**

When Queensland began its existence as a separate colony in 1859 England was at the height of the 'Victorian equilibrium'. It was a time of peace and prosperity; the social unrest that had occupied the stage from the French Revolution to the chartist agitations of the forties had calmed down; the scientific discoveries of the eighteenth century had been assimilated into forms of thought; and the diffused influence of evangelical religion had imposed generally accepted standards of moral and social behaviour.

Even at this time, however, there were portents of the breakdown of the Victorian equilibrium. In the very year of Queensland's foundation Charles Darwin published his Origin of Species, which on top of Lyell's earlier geological researches, portended a revolution in man's understanding of the origins of the world and of human life. At the same time Karl Marx was engaged in the researches in the British Museum which were to result in Das Kapital and thus set the seal on his revolutionary theory of class relationships. Nor were signs wanting of the declining influence of evangelicalism, and the consequent questioning of its accepted attitudes in morality and social convention. In the ensuing decades the extent of the breakdown of high Victorianism was demonstrated by the rise of militant anti-religious thought, of trade unions and socialist societies, of theological liberalism within the churches, and of the Edwardian approach to morality and convention.

As in other respects Australia reflected these English changes; but the image was far from exact, because the nature of Australian conditions was very different. There had been no period of high stability in Australian society in the middle of the nineteenth century. There was the instability of rapid expansion, magnified by the extraordinary conditions of gold-rush society; there was the egalitarianism and working class consciousness that made for a profoundly different social outlook in Australia from that of the old country; and the forces of religion were never as deeply rooted as in England. So in a real sense the nineteenth century was an era of continuous transition for Australian society and thought, and the church had to struggle against unfavourable circumstances in its environment throughout the history of the colony. Yet it remains true that the new forces at work in English life in the later part of the nineteenth century made their special mark in Australia too, and they presented new problems for the church to grapple with. We shall examine this new challenge under three headings – the intellectual threat posed by new scientific theories; the questions raised by the self-conscious class struggle between capital and labour; and the stresses on traditionally accepted forms of family life, morality and social custom.

### **i. The Intellectual Challenge.**

There ran through Australian life in the latter part of the nineteenth century a strong anti-religious current of thought. To a large extent this was a social phenomenon, as it was closely linked to the growing working class movement; but it drew strength and encouragement from some of the current trends of scientific thought. Frequently it took the form of a recognition of the human qualities of Jesus of Nazareth, while denying His divinity, and criticising the churches as being parasitical and obscurantist. The prevailing anti-religious sentiment was not, then, primarily an intellectual movement in late nineteenth century Australia, but it did have intellectual ramifications. As George Nadel has said, "scepticism, like the exercise of political rights, was passing from the hands of the upper classes into those of the people at large".<sup>1153</sup>

The result of this atmosphere was a breakdown of the sense of divine authority behind religious teaching. As the theories of geologists and biologists appeared to contradict the biblical account of creation, and the results of biblical criticism among scholars threw doubts on the infallibility of the Bible as traditionally accepted, the very basis of authority for Christian teaching appeared to have been lost. It was not that many people in Australia had clear knowledge either of Darwinian theories or biblical higher criticism: that was part of the trouble – the diffused ideas emanating from the scholars became in the popular mind simple statements, such as that man was descended from the ape and that the Bible was untrue. Observers of the time noted the effects of the spread of these ideas. J.A. Froude, for example, after a visit to Australia in the eighties, commented:

Religion has become a matter of opinion, a thing about which nothing certain can be known, and on which, therefore, it is idle and unbecoming to be dogmatic or violent. Individuals have their personal convictions, strong enough and sincere enough to make their lives holy and beautiful; but Church and Creed have ceased to be factors in the commonwealth.<sup>1154</sup>

It was about the same time that the Townsville Daily Bulletin remarked in an editorial that "there is no doubt that an assumption of something like unbelief has lately become rather fashionable among young and middle-aged men in the colonies".<sup>1155</sup>

<sup>1153</sup> Australia's Colonial Culture, p. 241.

<sup>1154</sup> From Oceania, or England and her Colonies, selection given in Clark, C.M.H. (Ed.), Select Documents in Australian History, 1851-1900, p.811.

<sup>1155</sup> Quoted in N.Q. Monthly Record, March 1884.

Before about 1890 there is very little evidence to suggest that church leaders in Queensland were doing anything very positive to meet this situation. Theological liberalism, which had made its appearance in England as early as 1860 with the publication of Essays and Reviews by a group of theologians, had no influential exponents in Queensland, and intellectually most churchmen were of the pre-Darwinian era; while the more extreme German biblical criticism hardly penetrated to Queensland at all. The fact was that there was no time nor opportunity for theological scholarship, and the clergy were so immersed in pressing problems of parochial life that purely intellectual questions seemed quite remote. The result was that the new scientific and biblical theories were neither bitterly attacked nor warmly espoused: they simply did not come into serious consideration, and church leaders were perhaps unaware of the extent to which they were influencing popular opinion.

After the arrival of Bishop Webber there was, as we have seen, a rapid influx of considerable numbers of new, highly educated English clergy. These were for the most part fairly young men, fresh from the universities and theological colleges, which by 1890 had begun to assimilate the new ideas, and to see that there was no necessary conflict between them and Christian truths. From this time, scholarly clerics frequently referred to the apparent intellectual problems of the age. Their approach was in no sense negative, and while sometimes they found cause to attack false religious conclusions drawn from supposedly scientific evidence, they generally welcomed the new light thrown by science upon certain aspects of Christian truth.

One of the first to deal seriously with this question was Archdeacon Gilbert White, who preached a sermon in Townsville in 1892 on "The Church and Modern Life". White saw modern knowledge as a thing of positive value to the Christian:

The Church has nothing to fear from knowledge as knowledge; on the contrary, it is her joy and privilege to welcome every fresh discovery, every established law, as a further manifestation of the all-pervading wisdom of her Head, by whom all things were made.<sup>1156</sup>

He went on, however, to point out two possible dangers. One was that a scholar "so concentrated on his particular study as to lose the true proportion of human life"<sup>1157</sup> - the danger of over-specialisation that has become much more apparent since White preached this sermon. The other danger was that the scholar might become so caught up by the complexity and beauty of the physical phenomena which he was studying that he might be inclined to ignore the higher principles of which they were part. The archdeacon went on to see the progress of knowledge, and the perplexities which it involved, as a sign of the continuing work of the Holy Spirit:

Christ never promised to give the Church complete and finished truth. He promised that His Spirit should 'guide her into all truth'. We believe that the truth she has is absolute truth, but she has not yet all truth. She is being guided into it. Let us then welcome knowledge, not partial knowledge or circumscribed knowledge, but all knowledge, the higher as including the lower.<sup>1158</sup>

In this sermon was expressed the typical positive Anglican approach to the acceptance of scientific truth. It was an attitude, which, unlike that of some Christian bodies, welcomed and encouraged genuine scientific research, on the ground that all truth is part of God's truth, and need not be feared by the Christian. At the same time there was an acceptance of perplexity: it was not always easy to see immediately the relation between revealed religious truth and new scientific discoveries, and there must be a degree of reverent agnosticism while the conclusions of revelation and reason were related to one another. The prevailing attitude in Anglican thought in Queensland was neither one of modernism on the one hand - a readiness to overthrow revelation on the basis of the latest scientific hypothesis - nor blind conservatism on the other - a refusal to reconsider past interpretations of divine revelation.

This question of the relationship between reason and revelation was at the heart of the matter, and Archbishop Donaldson chose to speak about it in a sermon on the occasion of the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Science in 1909. Reason and revelation, the archbishop pointed out, belonged to different dimensions, and trouble only arose "when the seeker in one domain trespasses upon the territory of the other". Christians, he admitted, had been guilty of such trespassing on their part:

Revelation is not given to save man trouble. He has the gift of reason whereby he can, through long labour and costly sacrifice, find out the truths of the material world... Yet once and again the Church has erred in this matter, and has sought to turn the Bible into a scientific text-book.<sup>1159</sup>

It was a moderately liberal attitude that typified the outlook, of the Church of England in Queensland in the early years of the twentieth century. Among those who were particularly influential in setting the tone was Archdeacon David, who as

<sup>1156</sup> White, G., The Church and Modern Life, p.11.

<sup>1157</sup> Ibid., p.12.

<sup>1158</sup> Ibid., p.14.

<sup>1159</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1909.

examining chaplain and principal of the Brisbane Theological College, epitomised this positive approach to new scientific knowledge. In a paper before the Church Congress in Hobart in 1894 David made it quite clear that he accepted the results of biblical criticism, but that this did not destroy belief in the inspiration of the Bible.<sup>1160</sup> One of David's primary aims in the theological training for which he was responsible was to raise the intellectual standard of the clergy so that they might be equipped to use the opportunities presented by the intellectual developments of the age.<sup>1161</sup> This positive approach to modern knowledge was carried on into the new St. Francis' College, and thus influenced many of the younger clergy. Consequently, the literal understanding of all parts of the Bible, known as fundamentalism, came to be very generally discounted among the clergy in Queensland. In the first decade of the century articles began to appear in church papers expressing a more liberal interpretation of the Bible.<sup>1162</sup>

While the assured results of modern scholarship were welcomed in this way, no encouragement was given by responsible church leaders in Queensland to the more extreme attacks on basic Christian truths in the name of modern thought. In 1905 the subject of higher criticism was so much before the public eye that Archbishop Donaldson decided to give a special address to synod on the subject; and both he and Bishop Frodsham in North Queensland warned the clergy against signing a statement circulated from England, which implied among other things the historical inaccuracy of the New Testament.<sup>1163</sup> Several years later the archbishop expressed his concern at those who "deny the truth of Christianity as we know it, and yet would indignantly repudiate the suggestion that they are not Christians".<sup>1164</sup> At this time the archbishop had particularly in mind the "New Theology" that was being preached in the London City Temple, by R.J. Campbell, which denied both the personality of God and the divinity of Christ. Such denials of the basic ingredients of Christian belief were abhorrent to Donaldson, and he significantly put part of the blame for the spread of such ideas on the failure of the clergy to teach:

I believe the Church is herself in part to blame through her widespread neglect of the teaching office with which she has been entrusted. She has acquiesced in the popular cry against dogma and allowed the Clergy to neglect the Catholic Faith while they preach upon the 'topics of the day'.<sup>1165</sup>

Although modernism hardly existed among the clergy in Queensland there was one case where action had to be taken because of a priest's teaching. The Reverend Douglas Price was a minor canon of the cathedral, assisted Archdeacon David with the theological college, and was in charge of All Saints', Brisbane. He was a man of deeply sensitive and artistic character whose life was marked by a real spirit of reverence. Indeed it was he who instituted a daily Eucharist in his parish, and fostered a tradition of reverent worship. Price, however, increasingly grew less orthodox in his views. Influenced by the pantheism of German theology, he gave series of public lectures on such topics as "The Mind of Nature" and "Mysticism in Ancient and Modern Times", and evidently was moving away from certain basic Christian doctrines. Finally Archbishop Donaldson requested Price to show him his sermons for examination, and on finding them heretical, the archbishop reluctantly asked Price for his resignation.<sup>1166</sup> A big public meeting of All Saints' parishioners petitioned the archbishop to reconsider; but Price agreed to resign, and with great dignity on both sides the matter was concluded without more ado.<sup>1167</sup> The end was tragic: Price after his resignation drifted further from orthodox Christian belief, and endeavoured to found a society of like-minded people; but finally in 1916 he perished at his own hand. His end was deeply regretted by all in the church who knew his many fine qualities.<sup>1168</sup>

By 1920 the attitude of the Anglican Church was fairly settled along the lines of welcoming modern knowledge, while yet adhering firmly to the great truths of the Catholic faith. Yet in the popular mind the conflict between science and religion was by no means dead, and there were many misconceptions about what the church really did believe, and as to whether it was irreconcilable with modern knowledge. The following generation had still to face the task of diffusing the understanding of the relationship between the truths of reason and revelation which the scholars of the church had been clarifying for themselves.

## ii. Capital and Labour

There was no more significant development in Australian life in the generation we are considering than the rise of organised labour as a force in society: political alignments were radically altered, new social attitudes appeared, and a series of bitter

<sup>1160</sup> David, A.E., "The Church and the Bible as Affected by Modern Criticism", Official Report of the Church Congress Held at Hobart, 1894, pp.36-42.

<sup>1161</sup> See, for example, his sermon at the consecration of Bishop Frodsham, quoted in Church Chronicle, September 1902.

<sup>1162</sup> See, for example, articles on "Genesis", Church Chronicle, March and April 1907.

<sup>1163</sup> Ibid., June 1905; Northern Churchman, May 1905.

<sup>1164</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1907. Archbishop's address, p.35.

<sup>1165</sup> Ibid., p.38

<sup>1166</sup> Daily Mail, 9 January 1911.

<sup>1167</sup> Minutes, All Saints' Annual Meetings, 12 January 1911.

<sup>1168</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1917.

struggles erupted between capital and labour. The industrial strife of the early nineties, which was most bitterly manifested in Queensland, dramatically ushered in a period when the sense of class conflict was never far beneath the surface.

For the church this new social atmosphere posed perplexing questions. Indeed the social challenge was not unlike the intellectual challenge which we have just considered. As in that sphere, the church had to adjust itself to a new set of conditions, and to face the fact that the old ordering of society was not necessarily of divine institution. Just as the faith of the church had been expressed in old modes of thought, and in some respects had to be expressed anew in line with new intellectual ideas, so the church had taken for granted a social order which was now changing; and in the maelstrom of new ideas being propagated, it was necessary to sort out what was positively un-Christian, and what was not necessarily opposed to the basic Christian understanding of man and society.

Before 1890 there is little evidence of consistent concern by churchmen with questions of capital and labour. The existing order was simply taken for granted, and all the church's energy was being expended on getting the ecclesiastical machinery into order. Bishop Hale, it is true, had supported the movement for the early closing of shops in 1883, but he entered the lists only on the clear understanding that no question of class struggle was involved. "Nothing will at any time", he wrote, "induce me to join in any movement which is a class struggle".<sup>1169</sup> Keeping out of class struggles was a relatively simple matter when those struggles were only very minor. In the nineties, however, it was not to be so easy.

The first reaction of church leaders in Queensland to the great strikes of 1890 was a negative one: very little reference to them appears to have been made at all. From labour circles this very silence provoked bitter comment. The official report of the New South Wales Labor Defence Committee in 1890 referred to the Queensland strikes in no uncertain terms.

If the press fought well for its Master no one can say the same of the church. The newspaper editors did lead 'public opinion'. The clergy left it to grope amidst the gloom of sacerdotal clap-trap. The fact is – and it is a matter for deep regret – that the clergy were afraid to speak out. Their office-bearers, the men upon whom they chiefly rely for pecuniary support, the men who, lending an air of worldly respectability to their churches, are thrust into positions of solemn dignity, were arrayed against us, often our bitterest opponents. To give offence to them was to quarrel with the means of grace. So the clergy in their weakness took a middle course and failed to win from the working-classes even the respect accorded to honest opposition. We recognise the stamp of a man in the Queensland Bishop, who worked on the wharves with the blacklegs, but it is to be feared that the clergy as a body, through their want of straightforwardness during the strike, have done much to lose their opportunities of well-doing among the workers of Australia.<sup>1170</sup>

This very antagonistic labour attitude towards the church – for the Church of England was undoubtedly included in the sweeping criticism – was not mollified by the quite strong words of Bishop Webber to his synod the following year. The bishop, it is true, deliberately attacked certain features of capitalism as it existed in Queensland, in particular the evils of non-resident proprietorship of stations and the lack of concern of management for the moral well-being of the labour which it employed. He also expressed sympathy with the ideals of Christian socialism. Yet at a time when emotions were running high the labour leaders saw his implicit criticisms of the new unionism, and his explicit opposition to the socialist theory that environment can shape character, as an attack on the immediate policies being pursued by the Queensland labour forces. The Worker was accordingly not slow to make some sarcastic comments about the bishop's "harmless platitudes about the industrial problem", and went on to ask:

And since Bishop Webber needs a fine house and a carriage, fine churches and a cathedral, and since the average parson would as soon dream of cutting his throat as of swagging it among the poor in apostolic fashion, what can one expect?<sup>1171</sup>

Synod was depicted as essentially a gathering of capitalists, and the clergy were represented as being fearful of offending those upon whom their living depended.<sup>1172</sup>

How much truth was there in this labour picture of the attitude of the church? A fair analysis suggests that there were enough half-truths to give credence to the picture, but that it was nevertheless an unfair statement of the position of the church. It was true that many of the clergy by their birth, training and social position had natural affinities with the views of the employing class; and this was even more true of the majority of the lay members who comprised the synods of the church. Their whole mode of thought – even of those who were sympathetic to the unionists' ideals – was very different from that of members of the trade unions; and the difference was greater because so many of the influential clergy were

<sup>1169</sup> Brisbane Courier, 12 February 1883.

<sup>1170</sup> Quoted in Clark, C.M.H. (Ed.), Select Documents in Australian History, 1851-1900, p. 775. The bishop referred to was Bishop G.H. Stanton, who worked for two hours to help load a ship in which he was travelling to Townsville. There is no reason to believe, however, that this action had any particular political significance. The bishop was simply anxious to complete his journey.

<sup>1171</sup> Worker, 13 June 1891.

<sup>1172</sup> Ibid., 7 March 1891.

recently arrived Englishmen, while most of the unionists were moved by a strong sense of Australian nationalism. Yet against this it must be remembered that many of these same newly arrived clergy of the nineties were strongly imbued with the ideals of the social movement within the English church that was typified by men like Charles Gore and Henry Scott Holland. They were the successors of the Christian socialists like F.D. Maurice, and they sympathised strongly with the aspirations of the working class; and a study of the statements of responsible clerical leaders of the nineties reveals a remarkable degree of recognition of the virtues and faults of both sides of the current struggle. With many of the ideals of the labour movement a good deal of sympathy was expressed; of the methods used to attain those ideals, there was considerably less approval.

Apart from the use of force, which generally aroused ecclesiastical disapproval, there was another aspect of the labour movement that not unnaturally caused misgivings within the church. This was its attitude to religion. One French observer in Australia at the very end of the century remarked on the strongly religious tone of labour leaders in this country;<sup>1173</sup> and it is true that there were reflections in Australia of that link between Non-conformity and the working class movement that had typified mid-century England. On the other hand, there was also in the labour movement a militant anti-Christian, or at least anti-ecclesiastical, strain of thought. Marxian socialism, with its strongly anti-religious tone, was not yet an accepted labour philosophy; but the kind of thinking that linked the overthrow of the old economic order with the overthrow of the old religion was already present. The church could scarcely be expected to welcome this, nor to see it otherwise than as a threat to be opposed. Nor in the last resort was the tendency of trade unionism itself to grow into a new kind of religion any less of a potential threat. It was a perceptive comment in the Worker about unionism that "it is a Religion in itself if we but understand it rightly, and we are understanding it more and more every day."<sup>1174</sup> Nor was it coincidental when the class struggle was referred to in the labour press in apocalyptic language as leading up to the final Armageddon.<sup>1175</sup> This substitution of man-made religion for divine, of an anticipated earthly paradise for the Kingdom of God, could only be regarded by the church as a dangerous heresy which must lead to disaster if it were left uncorrected.

In view of this it is perhaps surprising that there was as much sympathy among leaders of the church for the labour movement and its aspirations as there was. Bishop Webber, as we have seen, placed much of the blame for the great strikes of 1890 on the capitalist system; the following year Archdeacon Gilbert White spoke of the inspiration of Christ being behind the great social movement of the age;<sup>1176</sup> and about the same time Bishop Dawes urged the role of the church as mediator between the conflicting classes.<sup>1177</sup> By 1894 there were signs of a thaw in the relationship between church and labour leaders. A visiting clergyman from Melbourne, apparently an Anglican, was invited to speak at the Trades Hall on the subject of strikes, and his sympathetic lecture, which commended the gains of recent strikes, but urged conciliation and arbitration boards as a better approach, was loudly applauded.<sup>1178</sup> Not long afterwards a writer in the Worker welcomed the church's altered attitude to social questions,<sup>1179</sup> and the Brisbane Clerical Society, after hearing a paper from Canon James Matthews on industrial disputes, invited the editor of the Worker to a later meeting to discuss those questions. The Church Chronicle later reported that the discussion was not conclusive, but it was hoped it would assist "in promoting a better mutual understanding between the Clergy and the leaders of 'Labour'".<sup>1180</sup>

While there were these indications of sympathetic discussion between the church and organised labour on the best methods of improving social relationships and the conditions of the working people, there was also apparent during the rest of the nineties an increasing attempt by churchmen to grapple with the philosophical implications of socialism, which was being increasingly accepted as labour doctrine. Generally speaking, there was a surprising degree of sympathy with the ideals and aspirations of socialism as a theory; but from some of the clergy came criticisms – and as events were to prove, justifiable criticisms – of some implications of socialist theory. One of the basic disagreements was with the common socialist assumption that the re-shaping of the economic and class structure of society would effect a change in human nature and morality. Such a purely materialist philosophy was regarded by churchmen as contrary to religious belief.<sup>1181</sup> Those who spoke this was not infrequently commended the principle of socialism as such, provided it were freed from purely materialist shackles. Another fear expressed by some thinking churchmen was of the rise of a socialist bureaucracy in which a new kind of graded aristocracy might appear – a prophetic fear which the next generation was to

<sup>1173</sup> Metin, A., Le Socialism sans Doctrines, quoted in Clark, C.M.H. (Ed) op cit., p.676

<sup>1174</sup> Worker, 13 June 1891.

<sup>1175</sup> Ibid., 27 December 1890.

<sup>1176</sup> White, G., The Church and Modern Life, p.8.

<sup>1177</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1892, p.57.

<sup>1178</sup> Brisbane Courier, 11 July 1894.

<sup>1179</sup> Worker, 3 November 1894.

<sup>1180</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1895.

<sup>1181</sup> See, for example, report of sermon by Rev. C.G. Robinson, Brisbane Courier, 14 May 1894; also see Church Chronicle editorial, November 1900.

show to be well founded.<sup>1182</sup> Another fear, expressed by Bishop Webber, was one that was to be re-echoed by many Australians in later generations, that state socialism threatened to encourage undue dependence on the state, and to discourage “individual effort, individual enterprise, and individual liberality in public schemes.”<sup>1183</sup> These various opinions were clearly summed up in the pastoral letter issued by the Australian bishops in 1905. On socialism, it said:

In its proper sense we believe it to be in no way hostile to, but rather consonant with, the altruism – to use a modern term – which is taught by our Lord as an element of the Christian character....The political danger of the future lies, in our view, not in this or that theory of government, but in the class prejudice and mistrust which divide the community and confuse the real questions at issue. We are members one of another: our ultimate object is not a party victory, or the triumph of a class, but the promotion of the Common Good.<sup>1184</sup>

By the beginning of the present century, then, there seemed to have emerged a general attitude in the Church of England of sympathy with the aspirations of the labour movement, but of disagreement with some aspects of its methods and philosophy. The general strike in Brisbane in 1912 provided a very tense situation in which this church attitude was thoroughly tested. Amid such bitter feeling as existed at the time, the church might well have been forced into one camp or the other.

Such, however, did not occur. With that statesmanship which was one of his greatest qualities, Archbishop Donaldson sought to direct attention to the genuine issues that lay behind the industrial disputes of which this strike was one example, and he refused to condemn industrial unrest root and branch. He looked beyond the immediate circumstances to the underlying significance of the rise of the labour movement:

This strike in Brisbane is no isolated affair. It is part of a vast movement, throbbing strongly throughout the civilised world. Its phenomena are varied, and often seem blameworthy to the dispassionate onlooker, but I have no hesitation in saying, that our duty as Christians in this matter is to get below the actual phenomena, which repel us, and to discern and welcome the spiritual motive, which in spite of inconsistencies, does often lie at the back of it all, the passionate hunger for better human conditions, the glowing ideal of the Apocalypse, the vision of a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. It is not the whole gospel, but it is part of the gospel, and Labour people are to be found all over the world, who cling to it and work for it and suffer for it with enthusiasm, which may well put us to shame.<sup>1185</sup>

Donaldson believed that a degree of industrial strife was virtually inevitable at this stage of social development, and that the hunger for better conditions was not necessarily sordid nor materialistic. On the other hand, Donaldson refused to seek popularity by condoning less worthy motives that were mixed up with the existing situation – “avarice and self-seeking, hatred and prejudice, pride and self-will: it is these things which cause the real misery.”<sup>1186</sup>

Donaldson’s position, then, was that it was an over-simplification to speak of the evil of strikes: they were in fact the symptom of more deep-rooted evils in society. He did not personally believe that the strike was the best way of overcoming these evils. He urged arbitration, and indeed with the leading Methodist minister of Brisbane, Dr. G.E. Rowe, he agreed to act as mediator in the early stages of the dispute. The effort failed, but it demonstrated the deep concern of the church to achieve a fair settlement.

By this time the attitude of the church to the labour movement and its philosophy may be said to have been fairly settled. This new phenomenon was neither condemned in theory, nor totally approved in practice. If it implied – as with some of its adherents it did – pure materialism, atheism, and violent class war, then to that extent it was resisted by the church; but insofar as it implied high idealism, the just quest for a fairer ordering of society and the fulfilment of part of the Christian vision, then it was welcomed, and by some churchmen strongly supported. On this latter question of positive support to the organised labour movement, there was no official attitude in the church, any more than there was official support of any other political party. There were times when certain policies adopted by the Labour Party were openly opposed by church leaders for specific reasons. The Labour desire to deport the kanakas in fulfilment of a doctrinaire White Australia policy was one such instance; the Labour opposition to the introduction of the Bible into state schools was another; Labour attitudes to recruiting during the first World War caused another difference of opinion.<sup>1187</sup> Sometimes some of the clergy, and frequently prominent members of the laity, were known to be strongly opposed to the ideas of the labour movement.

<sup>1182</sup> See article on Socialism by Archdeacon G.M.L. Lester, of the Diocese of Rockhampton, Church Chronicle, November, 1894.

<sup>1183</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1899, Bishop’s address.

<sup>1184</sup> Pastoral Letter of the Australian Bishops, 1905.

<sup>1185</sup> Church Chronicle, March 1912: report of a sermon preached before the Mayor and Corporation of Brisbane

<sup>1186</sup> Archbishop’s pastoral letter, Church Chronicle, March 1912.

<sup>1187</sup> Ibid., January 1916.

On the other hand, others in high places, including men like Bishop Feetham in North Queensland and Bishop Halford in Rockhampton expressed strong labour sympathies.<sup>1188</sup>

It might seem that we have devoted excessive attention to the rise of the labour movement in this history of the Church of England. But the fact was that this phenomenon was far more than the growth of a new political party. It was something that altered the whole alignments of social, political and economic forces in Australian life, and had a marked effect on the way of life of the new Australian Commonwealth. A class that had previously been numerous, but only relatively little influential in the life of the country now took on radically new significance; and this was just the class with which the Anglican Church in England and Australia in the nineteenth century had had least effective contact. If it had been possible to ignore labour before, it was no longer possible, and the 'sins of the fathers' in the nineteenth century church were now being visited on their early twentieth century children.

Because of wise leadership the church in Queensland did in fact grapple with this situation more realistically than might have been expected. The early bitter hostility towards the church that typified the labour movement in the eighties and early nineties gradually softened, as they saw churchmen earnestly endeavouring to understand their point of view, even if they could not fully accept it. Yet naturally enough, the old tensions did not easily fade away, and in 1918 Bishop Halford could admit:

It is said that the Church has opposed progress and generally been on the side of the rich and against the poor; that it is the Church of one social class. I have been accustomed to deny this, perhaps because all my ministerial life at home was lived among the so-called working class. But I confess now that I am convinced that there is justice in the criticism; on the whole the Church's outlook has been more to the side of the employer, and the wage-earner has been too little represented in the councils of the Church. The result is that the whole Labour Movement is suspicious and antagonistic to the Church.<sup>1189</sup>

There was truth in this: but in the final judgement another side of the truth should not be forgotten – that not a few of the clergy shared with the workers the insecurity of small and uncertain salaries, and that the very bishop who so criticised his church renounced all wealth that he might give all in the service of the poorer classes.

### iii. The Moral Order

The generation from 1890 to 1920 saw the birth of the Australian nation, for not only was federation formally achieved in 1901, but the national effort in the first World War sealed the sense of unity within Australia and gave the country a recognised place in international affairs. From the church there was whole-hearted support for national unity.<sup>1190</sup> One result, however, of the wider outlook associated with nationhood and of the disturbed conditions of the war was that certain moral questions, which were not in themselves new, were brought to the fore. They were magnified, too, by the changing social conventions of the Edwardian era as against those of the Victorian age.

With federation the problem of the emptiness of the Australian continent in contrast to the density of population in countries to the north became a pressing matter of national concern. With this was closely linked the question of the White Australia policy, which, while far from new, took on new urgency as a commonwealth policy had to be developed to replace the policies of the separate colonies, and as it began to be realised that the improvement of world transport meant a relative shortening of distances from Asia to Australia. Moral considerations were closely associated with these questions, and it was not surprising that the northern bishops – particularly White, Frodsham, and Feetham – were those who were most concerned to put these issues before the Australian people. They were the ones who were most acutely conscious both of racial problems within Australia – because it was in their dioceses that the greatest concentrations of kanakas, Chinese and Japanese were gathered – and also of the sparsity of white population within their areas.

The northern bishops knew well from experience the problems raised by the presence of large numbers of Asians within Australia. They saw the shockingly low standards of living that were accepted by these people, with the consequent threat to the standards of European workers; they recognised the racial animosities that could ensue; and they knew, too, the religious problems when large numbers of heathens threatened to swamp a Christian community. They were consequently not at all disposed to make a wholesale criticism of immigration restrictions. "I myself would infinitely prefer a white

<sup>1188</sup> According to Norman, J. John Oliver North Queensland, p. 189, Bishop Feetham voted Labour early in his career, but later believed that the Labour Party had degenerated, and lost its early ideals. Feetham's comments on the labour movement to the N.Q. synod in 1919 suggest such a disillusionment with the labour movement. See N.Q. Year Book, 1916-19, p.221.

<sup>1189</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1918, Bishop's address, p.10.

<sup>1190</sup> In 1899 for example, Bishop Webber called upon Queensland Anglicans to vote for federation in the referendum. Brisbane Year Book, 1899, Bishop's address, p.42.



Australia were it possible,” wrote Bishop Gilbert White in 1907:<sup>1191</sup> and Bishop Frodsham argued that the old kanakas should be allowed to remain, not because the principle of white Australia was wrong, but on the grounds that “the principle of a White Australia would not be affected by leaving in our midst a handful of Islanders...”<sup>1192</sup>

Basically, then, the church’s spokesmen supported the principles of the Australian immigration policy, but with certain important reservations. One was that already mentioned, that the policy should not be so rigidly enforced as to make no provision for hard cases such as that of the old-established islanders living in Queensland. Another proviso was that the criterion of immigration restriction should not be merely one of colour. The general synod of 1905, for example, carried a motion at the instigation of Bishop White and Archbishop Donaldson approving of restricted immigration, but recording the conviction “that it is unreasonable to assume that the white man is, necessarily and inherently, superior to every race of another colour”.<sup>1193</sup> The other reservation of the bishops was that they were not at all sure that the policy was a practicable one in view of the inevitable population pressure from crowded Asia to empty Australia.

Behind these reservations held by the church in connection with white Australia, there was a blend of Christian idealism with practical realism, and each was regarded as reinforcing the other. The belief in the basic equality of human beings in the sight of God was accompanied by a consciousness of the nearness of Asia and of the future destiny that Asian countries would likely to fulfil. On the night of his consecration in 1900 Bishop White took occasion at a public meeting in Sydney to point out on a map the nearness of Asia,<sup>1194</sup> and just before the outbreak of the Great War Bishop Feetham spoke to his synod about the future of Asia:

The next 50 years will see developments around the Pacific Ocean which will throw into the shade the earlier activities of the nations around the Atlantic. Asiatic labour, advancing in skill and quality by leaps and bounds, must have its effect upon the world’s industries; its products cannot be permanently excluded from the world’s markets. Is the white man to regard the Asiatic as a dangerous rival and competitor, in fact as an enemy? And if so, are we not approaching a conflict more terrible than any the world has yet seen? Has the religion of Jesus Christ and the common Father of mankind an answer to these questions? Have Christians the courage to face them? While we exclude the coloured man from our white countries, have we the right to go where we please in his? Are we going to treat him as a younger brother in the family of God, to be led forward and encouraged to find in life all the higher interests and delights we ourselves find in it? Or are we going to try and make his position permanently inferior? There are instances in which he is already our equal in intellect and applied science, in military organisation. If we are going to insist upon an unalterable superiority and an absolutely prior claim to the best things the world can give, there will be collision before very long.<sup>1195</sup>

This was the authentic voice of prophecy; and it was with these thoughts of the future role of Asia in mind that the bishops urged that while Australia was right to have a policy of restricted immigration, it should not be such that it would intensify the possibility of future conflict.

The northern bishops saw that the key to the problem for Australia was population. Bishop White spoke of the unpeopled north as “a standing temptation to anxious foreign countries who do not know what to do with their surplus population”,<sup>1196</sup> and as he anxiously watched his own diocese losing its white population year by year, he called for a national policy on populating the north. Bishop Frodsham, along the same lines, urged the prime minister to give preferential treatment to settlers in the tropics by subsidising northern railways, and foodstuffs, and by providing for higher wages,<sup>1197</sup> and his part in the foundation of the Institute of Tropical Medicine in Townsville in 1913 was with the object of improving conditions of life in the north. Bishop John Feetham, his successor, was a life-long advocate of government policies to encourage settlers to move to the north and away from the cities.

There was a moral question closely related to this shortage of population. Bishop Feetham pointed out to his synod in 1925 the marked decline of the birthrate in Queensland.<sup>1198</sup> This decline he attributed in large part to the drift to the cities, but he and others among church leaders saw at the root of this decline a selfish attitude on the part of married couples, a desire for more luxury, and the use of contraception and abortion. As early as the first decade of the present century church

<sup>1191</sup> White, G., “Some problems of Northern Australia”, Victorian Geographical Journal, Vol xxv, 1907, p.62.

<sup>1192</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1905-06, Bishop’s address, p.43.

<sup>1193</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1905, p.73.

<sup>1194</sup> Wand, J.W.C., White of Carpentaria, p.28.

<sup>1195</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1914-5, Bishop’s address, p.23.

<sup>1196</sup> G. White, “Some Problems of Northern Australia”, Loc.cit., p.64.

<sup>1197</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1909.

<sup>1198</sup> The figures he gave were:

1860	48 per thousand
1890	40 per thousand
1900	30 per thousand
1920	27 per thousand.

leaders were launching bitter attacks on these practices. Bishop White wrote to Robert Philp, then premier, on the subject in 1901;<sup>1199</sup> the Carpentarian spoke of birth control as “this degrading and unnatural practice”;<sup>1200</sup> and Bishop Frodsham told the North Queensland synod that if he could rightly act alone he would willingly excommunicate those who sold and used contraceptives.<sup>1201</sup> To Gilbert White, in particular, placed as he was in the midst of the empty north, the problem was oppressive. He expressed something of what he felt in a poem, Australia 1913:

O men of a race too small  
To handle your father's spade,  
To shoulder the ringing axe  
And level the forest glade.

Ye crowd to the reeking town,  
And swarm in the stifling street,  
But shrink from the calling land,  
Too rough for your dainty feet.

Ye measure and dole your work,  
Give least for the greatest pay,  
Work not for the honour of work  
But only for means to play

Your wives have a barren womb,  
Your stock fill the empty wild,  
Your paddocks are filled with lambs.  
Your homes with a single child.<sup>1202</sup>

Closely linked with this question was the whole matter of family life, and the stresses upon it in this era. It was significant that one of the matters of special concern which the Brisbane synod asked to have raised at the Pan-Anglican Congress of 1908 was the need to strengthen the sanctity of the marriage tie; and indeed there were many pressures beating against the stable kind of family life that had typified the Victorian era. Among some socialist thinkers there were attacks on the family as a bourgeois institution; the different status for women implied in the feminist movement was altering old ideas of the role of the mother; there was a trend to easier divorce, and a different climate of opinion as to the shame of divorce. Against these pressures the church took a very deliberate stand. The family was seen as a divinely ordained unit, and as Archbishop Donaldson said in a sermon before the general synod, “with the purity of the family stands or falls the national life”.<sup>1203</sup> One slight difference of opinion there was within the church, as to whether it was permissible to remarry the innocent party in a divorce obtained on grounds of adultery. The 1908 Lambeth Conference decided only by a very narrow majority against such re-marriage, but in Queensland, unlike some parts of the south, the bishops generally took this stricter line.

The church's attitude was very clearly displayed when Senator Dobson introduced a divorce bill in the federal parliament soon after federation. The bill provided for a number of new grounds of divorce, including drunkenness, imprisonment, assaults and desertion for three years. Anglican leaders immediately protested, and Bishop Gilbert White wrote to Philp, the premier, who forwarded the bishop's protest, together with one of his own, to the prime minister.<sup>1204</sup> As a result of such protests the bill was finally withdrawn.<sup>1205</sup> To many, the church's attitude seemed narrow and harsh; but the clergy argued that not only were they obeying the clear teaching of Christ, but that in seeking to prevent the easy dissolution of marriage, they were helping preserve a more careful entry into marriage, and maintaining the stability of that family life upon which the stability of the nation in the last resort depended.

Not far removed from this subject was the whole matter of sexual morality. Until the turn of the century very little was said on this matter, in accordance with the conventions of the Victorian era. Bishop Hale, as we have seen, made some references in a veiled way to prostitution in the eighties, and general references were made in the nineties to the number of irregular unions in the west. In the new century, however, and especially during the war, when moral failures became much more obvious, church leaders spoke more openly about the laxity in sexual morality. In 1907 Archbishop Donaldson spoke

<sup>1199</sup> Church Chronicle, November, 1901.

<sup>1200</sup> Carpentarian, July 1904.

<sup>1201</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1904-5, p.28.

<sup>1202</sup> The Poems of Gilbert White.

<sup>1203</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1905, p.xxii

<sup>1204</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1901.

<sup>1205</sup> Ibid., January 1904.

plainly to the Brisbane synod about the moral situation, and ten years later made even more explicit reference to the situation revealed by the statistics of illegitimate births and venereal disease.<sup>1206</sup>

The situation so revealed stirred the church to take action to try to improve the moral standards in the community. Certain kinds of literature were condemned as encouraging poor moral standards.<sup>1207</sup>

Suggestions were made of the need for instruction, not simply in the physical facts of sex, but in the moral and spiritual aspects of the subject;<sup>1208</sup> and the bishops of Australia authorised the publication of a special pamphlet setting out in clear language the Christian understanding of sex.<sup>1209</sup> Church leaders also gave strong support to the so-called Strength of Empire Movement which was set up towards the end of the war to encourage moral purity among the young men of Australia.<sup>1210</sup> How effective these measures were is impossible to say; certainly, however, they reveal an attempt to grapple with what had been revealed as a serious moral situation.

The use of liquor and gambling were two other questions to which considerable discussion was devoted during our period. They were regarded as being closely related to the pressures on family life, and liquor was frequently considered in connection with sexual immorality.

The Church of England never found the liquor issue as clear cut as did most of the Non-conformist churches, and the church as a whole never taught that drinking as such was inherently sinful. Intemperance was always regarded as a sin, but the church's official position was that moderate drinking was not wrong in itself, though there might well be times when it was inexpedient for the individual or for society. On the other hand there were many churchmen who believed that total abstinence from liquor was the right thing for themselves, and a few who argued that it should be the goal for everybody. These always remained in the minority, however, though as we shall see, there was a period when the policy of prohibition seemed likely to win the official support of the church.

As with so many other things, the matter was brought to the fore in Queensland by Bishop Webber. In his first press interview on arrival in Brisbane the bishop was reported as saying "with no uncertain ring in his voice, that the total abstinence section was the only platform from which any real practical good could be effected."<sup>1211</sup> He quickly put a diocesan branch of the Church of England Temperance Society on its feet, and in the eighties and nineties this society spread fairly rapidly and had branches in many parishes in city and country.<sup>1212</sup> It had a twofold platform, which enabled membership on the basis either of total abstinence or of temperance in the true sense of the word. Generally speaking, however, under Webber's presidency, the society aimed to encourage total abstinence, and particular attention was devoted to encouraging children to think along these lines.

Until the first World War it was clear that the common attitude of the Church of England was one of opposition to abuses in the liquor trade, but not of fanatical opposition to liquor as such. At the 1901 royal commission on the liquor trade, for example, only three Anglican priests saw fit to give evidence, as against some twenty-two Methodist ministers.<sup>1213</sup> The Brisbane synod passed a motion that the "Anti-Shouting League" should be formed in the diocese; but this did not imply total abstinence, as was emphasised in the North Queensland synod about the same time.<sup>1214</sup> Most clearly of all the church's attitude was revealed in the rather embarrassing situation that arose when the lease of a Brisbane property owned by the church, on which a licensed hotel had been built, expired. There was considerable discussion as to what should be done with this highly profitable hotel. Finally it was decided that the license should be cancelled, and the building was converted into office premises.

What was specially significant, however, was the archbishop's emphatic statement that this did not imply that liquor trade was in itself wrong, but it was felt that it was inexpedient that the church should be involved in it.<sup>1215</sup>

The war, however, saw a noticeable change in the attitude of many of the leaders of the church. A decade before the war Bishop Gilbert White, who was certainly no fanatic on the subject,<sup>1216</sup> expressed his growing concern at the effects of liquor on young men in the tropical north:

<sup>1206</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1907, p.39; also 1917, p.118

<sup>1207</sup> Church Chronicle, May 1905; N.Q. Year Book, 1907-8, p.41.

<sup>1208</sup> E.g. Bishop Feetham's synod address, 1918, in N.Q. Year Book, 1916-19, p.163

<sup>1209</sup> Quoted in Northern Churchman, September 1918.

<sup>1210</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1918, March 1919, etc.

<sup>1211</sup> Brisbane Courier, 17 November, 1885.

<sup>1212</sup> See St. John's Parish Chronicle November 1886, for its foundation.

<sup>1213</sup> V. & P., Queensland Parliament, 1901, Vol.III, pp.4-6.

<sup>1214</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1908, p.65; N.Q. Year Book, 1907-8, p.55.

<sup>1215</sup> Brisbane Year Book, p.43f, Archbishop's address.

<sup>1216</sup> He had argued in favour of brief Sunday opening of hotels at the 1901 royal commission.

I have seen relay after relay of young men come up from the South with a profound contempt for drunkenness, and sink into drunkards; I have seen steady, well-intentioned middle-aged men gradually become more and more habituated to the use of spirits until they become steady soakers; I have seen so many homes desolated and so many lives end in disaster and death, so many broken-hearted wives and neglected children, that I cannot but record my belief that in this tropical climate all men are better without any stimulants at all, and that for the majority of men it is a matter of life and death.<sup>1217</sup>

The bishop was speaking of the peculiar circumstances of the north, with its fewer restraints, that led more easily to excess. In another way the war, with the disappearance for large numbers of men of the normal restraints of family and community environment, led to a similar set of circumstances on a much larger scale. It was this that led to the hardening attitude among many Anglican leaders on the subject of liquor. Archbishop Donaldson, who enjoyed drinking in moderation, made a personal rule to abstain from liquor as an act of mortification and self-discipline during the war, and this was just a symptom of the concern which grew up in the church at this time to foster a more disciplined use of drink. The various diocesan synods spent considerable time in discussing the liquor question, especially from 1916 on. The Brisbane synod, for example, endorsed a campaign to encourage the signing of the pledge, referenda for state option and local option, anti-shouting and early closing programmes.<sup>1218</sup> The Rockhampton synod, which also supported early closing, added its approval for the abolition of barmaids!<sup>1219</sup> The North Queensland synod was non-committal about the wisdom of six o'clock closing, but did urge a referendum on the subject.<sup>1220</sup>

As the war came to a climax these partial measures did not seem, however, to be having any significant effect, and it was under these circumstances that some Anglican leaders went further than they have gone on this subject before or since. Talk of prohibition was in the air at the time, and gradually, and rather reluctantly, some leading churchmen arrayed themselves behind the prohibition cause. Archbishop Donaldson expressed his own perplexity of mind on the subject at the provincial synod in 1918. He was becoming more favourable to the idea, at least as a temporary measure in the immediate unsettled post-war period, though he frankly admitted that he was not convinced that it would be a success.<sup>1221</sup> Information was sought from Canada to throw light on the effects of prohibition, and Donaldson became more favourable to the prohibition cause. Yet his opinion never captured the church, and the report of the temperance committee to the synod of 1919 admitted that "we do not yet feel that any corporate or whole-hearted desire for this inevitable reform has permeated the rank and file of the Church".<sup>1222</sup> The following year Bishop LeFanu, presiding in Donaldson's absence, somewhat unhappily called for a vote for prohibition in the coming referendum, and synod voted in favour of this; but the proceedings lacked real conviction. At best it was felt that it might be tried as an experiment, but a strong undercurrent of opinion that prohibition was not the real solution continued in the church despite official resolutions to the contrary. This opinion was rendered explicit in 1922 when the North Queensland synod rejected a motion supporting prohibition.<sup>1223</sup> It was probably with a sense of relief that Queensland Anglicans – including the majority of clergy and laymen alike – found that prohibition did not become the official policy of the state.

On the issue of gambling the church's attitude was not unlike that on liquor. There was unwillingness to say that every instance of gambling represented a definite sin; but there was a strong conviction that immoderate gambling became a threat to the nation and to the security of family life, and that it was quite unworthy for the church to raise its own funds by methods of gambling. Probably the most notorious instance of the use of gambling by the church had been the lotteries in aid of St. James', Townsville, in the late eighties;<sup>1224</sup> but this had been an exceptional case, and most of the bishops and clergy set their face against such methods, and by some at least, gambling was strongly condemned.<sup>1225</sup> Unlike some of the Non-conformist churches, however, the Church of England never made the condemnation of gambling one of the major planks of its social policy.

One last matter may be referred to – the breakdown of the Victorian Sunday. One of the features of nineteenth century evangelicalism was the sabbatarianism which regarded Sunday as a day to be kept entirely free of all worldly activities. This kind of Sunday was not so strictly observed in the freer life of Australia as in England, and it was less observed in nineteenth century Queensland than in the more settled southern colonies. The twentieth century saw an increase of

<sup>1217</sup> Carpentarian, October 1904.

<sup>1218</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1917, p.130ff.

<sup>1219</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1918, p.52.

<sup>1220</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1916—19, p.51.

<sup>1221</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1917-18, Archbishop's address.

<sup>1222</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1919, p.188.

<sup>1223</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1921-2, p.52.

<sup>1224</sup> See above, p.187.

<sup>1225</sup> See for example, Bishop Webber's comments, Brisbane Year Book, 1896, p.48; the motion recorded in Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1902, p.28; and Bishop Feetham's remarks on the "native ugliness", of gambling, N.Q. Year Book, 1916-19, p.165.

pressures on the old kind of Sunday, especially in the cities, and the clergy generally deplored this trend. However, the Anglo-Catholics, of whom Queensland had a higher proportion than the south, were less disturbed by this than the evangelicals. As early as 1905, Bishop Frodsham, while expressing regret at the changing character of Sunday, warned that it would be unwise to try to force a rigid Sunday on people generally by civil ordinances, and himself favoured a more lenient view of Sunday observance.<sup>1226</sup> The same view was taken by many others – that provided worship came first, it was quite permissible to enjoy the rest of the day with recreation of mind and body.

In these years which we have been considering the church appeared to be faced by many and grave moral problems. It was not so much that new forms of immorality appeared: but the breakdown of the Victorian code brought to the surface many moral issues that had at least been hidden beneath the surface in the generations before. This situation was aggravated by the fact that in the frontier conditions of a young colony like Queensland morality and social convention had never been entirely settled, and this created a disturbed moral climate. On top of this came the war with its consequent shattering of some of the ordinary forms of restraint. Indeed, the war brought to a head many issues that had been developing in Australian life, and it will be best to consider these by examining the war and its relationship to the life of the church, in a separate section.

#### iv. Christian Patriotism: The Church in War.

The outbreak of the first World War came as a terrible shock to a world that had known no major international conflict for a century. In Australia the time since federation had been a period of economic prosperity and growing national confidence. The promise of steady growth for the county, aided by new scientific achievements that were opening up new possibilities in all kinds of ways, gave promise of uninterrupted development for the future. Religious leaders claimed, as we have noted, that spiritual complacency was one of the characteristic failings of the age. Then came the war, and the calm was shattered – not to the same extent, it is true, as in Europe, yet few Australian homes went through the war without experiencing personal uprootings, and frequently, tragedies. On the life of the nation the war made a real mark.

Particularly in the early phase there was among Australians a good deal of the atmosphere of idealism and romance about the war, in noticeable contrast to the more realistic and almost cynical spirit of 1939 that resulted from a whole generation of wars and rumours of wars. In 1914 war was new and fresh, and the issues seemed very clear-cut. It was, in fact, St. George against the dragon. Among some people, at least, there was a light-hearted patriotism not far removed from jingoism.

For the Australian church, as for the nation, major war was a new experience. There had, of course, been the Boer War in which Australians were involved, but it was trivial in comparison, and had scarcely caused any heart-searchings. There was not even any preliminary period when war was becoming obviously inevitable, when questions of the Christian attitude to war could have been sorted out. Sermons, synod addresses, and church papers before August 1914 reveal no hint of any expectation of the conflict that was about to begin. As a result there was no serious consideration – if such were needed – of the church's attitude to war. Before the matter could be considered, it was a present fact to be faced.

The leaders of the Church of England were immediate and whole-hearted in their support for the allied cause. Yet among the more thoughtful and perceptive churchmen there was nothing of the attitude of "my country right or wrong". At the end of 1914, for example Archbishop Donaldson issued a pastoral letter on the war. He did not doubt the rightness of the British action in fulfilling her obligations to France, yet, he said, "I do not find that any passionate appeal to the justice of our cause rises easily to my lips."<sup>1227</sup> His ground for saying this was that he recognised the possibility of having judgment blinded by prejudice at such a time. He based his support for the cause rather on the conviction, which he held long before the war, of the long-term rightness of the imperial vocation which the British nation was fulfilling. The archbishop went on:

We have sinned, it is true: God forbid that I should be silent on that point. The history of our Empire's expansion is stained with avarice and selfishness. Our enemies say that it is stained with hypocrisy and they may be right. Our coloured fellow-citizens accuse us of colour prejudice. And can we deny the charge? In our strength we have grown luxurious and self-indulgent and proud. All this we must not forget; but in spite of it all we can claim and who will deny it, that the extension of our Empire has, on the whole, been for the good of humanity.<sup>1228</sup>

In this light Donaldson portrayed the essential justice of the British cause, mixed though it was with grounds for shame. The call was to support this just cause, but in a spirit of penitence: prayer should be not only for victory, but also for forgiveness for our part in the conflict. To this end the archbishop called his people to a day of prayer and penitence, and

<sup>1226</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1905-6, p.39ff.

<sup>1227</sup> Church Chronicle., December 1914.

<sup>1228</sup> Ibid.,

the following year a joint appeal from the leaders of all the major churches – Anglican, Roman Catholic and Non-conformist – called their people to a similar day of prayer.<sup>1229</sup>

The following year in a series of Lenten sermons in St. John's Cathedral, entitled "Christian Patriotism", Archbishop Donaldson amplified some of his points about the Christian attitude to the war. In these sermons he criticised what passed for patriotism among many people, as being nothing more than an "exhilarating emotion". Christian patriotism, he said, demanded sacrifice, and included striving to see that one's country walked worthily of its vocation. Sometimes for the Christian patriot this might involve facing opposition and obloquy. As for prayer, the "deeper-souled Christians" should pray "less for victory, and more that God's will may be done whatever it be."<sup>1230</sup> Having thus spoken about the British vocation, Donaldson went on to speak about the enemy:

Germany too has her rights, and supposing the day were ever to come when the future integrity of Germany depended, however indirectly, upon British policy, we are bound by our past history and by our present convictions to respect her national integrity as a sacred duty. Her present insolent pretensions must not blind us to the truth of her Divine vocation. What we are fighting is not the true German spirit, but a monstrous perversion of it.<sup>1231</sup>

Such a doctrine was not very popular in the wartime atmosphere, and it diverged widely from the popular attitude; but if it had been heeded at the end of the war it might have altered the events of the generation after 1919. In Rockhampton, too, Bishop Halford was driving similar teaching home. Even in war, he insisted, love ought to continue. "We have got to live in Europe with Germany, and we want to avoid leaving the Germans bitter and revengeful. We want to win as Christians...."<sup>1232</sup>

These reservations about some of the commonly held attitudes to the war did not affect the church's full support for the war effort. Diocesan and parish papers were filled with patriotic articles; the clergy in sermons called for a greater spirit of self-sacrifice in the national effort; and some church leaders played a prominent part in recruiting drives. In fact Archbishop Donaldson specifically called upon his clergy to help in the recruiting campaign,<sup>1233</sup> and with Canon D.J. Garland and Canon P.A. Micklem, set the example himself shortly afterwards.<sup>1234</sup> The archbishop went further: he made it known that he would refuse to accept men as ordination candidates if they were eligible for enlistment in the services.<sup>1235</sup> When the conscription issue came to the fore later in the war the Church of England lent its official support to the affirmative case in the conscription referendum. "It is not possible to see how a Christian can have any but one answer to give at the Referendum", wrote Bishop Feetham,<sup>1236</sup> and with only one dissentient vote the Brisbane synod approved of conscription under the description of "the nationalisation of the manhood of Australia".<sup>1237</sup> The church papers took up the same cry.

This call from the church to the men of the state to offer themselves for service in the national effort placed the younger clergy in a very invidious position. Some of them were called to serve as chaplains to the forces, and they gladly went. Indeed, when war broke out, the privilege of sending the first chaplain from the Diocese of North Queensland was given to the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, and every member of the brotherhood voted for himself to go.<sup>1238</sup> Only a proportion of the clergy were required, however, for chaplaincy purposes; and for the others, expected as they were to support the recruiting campaign, and yet easily open to the charge of sheltering behind their clerical collars, the mental tension was tremendous. Some of them were bursting to enlist, if not in the combatant forces, at least as stretcher-bearers; and one or two of them, like Frederick Hulton-Sams, who was on leave from the Brotherhood of St. Andrew at the outbreak of the war, actually enlisted in the combatant forces.

The bishops, too, were placed in an invidious position. They resolved, however, that they must ease the pressure from their priests by definitely forbidding them to enlist; and so in 1915 the bishops of the province set out their attitude and their reasons for taking it. They gave two reasons for their decision against allowing priests to enlist. One was set out in a letter by Bishop Feetham:

For a priest to become a combatant in war is a breach of Canon Law, and the priest who does so is in danger of incurring irregularity, since the killing of men is not compatible with the priestly calling.<sup>1239</sup>

<sup>1229</sup> Northern Churchman, December, 1915.

<sup>1230</sup> Donaldson, St. D. Christian Patriotism, p.23.

<sup>1231</sup> Ibid., p.51.

<sup>1232</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1915, Bishop's address, p.14.

<sup>1233</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1915, p.16.

<sup>1234</sup> Church Chronicle, September, 1915.

<sup>1235</sup> Ibid., March 1916.

<sup>1236</sup> Northern Churchman, December 1917.

<sup>1237</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1916.

<sup>1238</sup> North Queensland Jubilee Book, p.131.

<sup>1239</sup> Norman, J. John Oliver North Queensland, p.76.

The other reason was explained by Archbishop Donaldson to his synod:

As certain men, whose training and aptitudes lie in the arsenals and dockyards rather than in the trenches, must be kept at home lest the country fall short in the munitions of war, so we whose aptitudes and training lie on the spiritual side of life must stay at our posts to witness more earnestly than ever for the things unseen.<sup>1240</sup>

In short, the bishops recognised that it would be a fearfully short-sighted policy for the spiritual and moral life of the nation to be neglected in the total national effort, and this practical consideration reinforced the basic argument from the nature of the priestly office. From certain quarters there were sneers at this attitude, but the bishops stood firm, and personally accepted full responsibility for preventing the enlistment of their clergy.<sup>1241</sup>

Having encouraged young men to enlist, the church was bound to provide a ministry to their spiritual and physical needs. Despite grievous shortages of clergy at home, the bishops placed no hindrances on the enlistment of as many priests as chaplains as the forces required. By 1917 the Diocese of Brisbane alone had eight chaplains on full-time duty, while others acted as part-time chaplains or went away for periods on troopships or other special assignments. Frequently chaplains could only be supplied as a result of special sacrifice on the part of the parishes. The Bishop of Carpentaria, for example, wrote to his people explaining that they must accept periods without the ministrations of a priest in order that he could send some of his very sparse staff for troopship service. In some cases this meant that even marriages had to be solemnised by a civil registrar, and later blessed by the priest on his return, and the parishes were to pay the stipend of their priest while he was away on these temporary chaplaincy duties.<sup>1242</sup> Yet these sacrifices were accepted cheerfully by the laity.

To secure the support of church people for the work of ministering to the needs of the troops, Canon D.J. Garland applied his great organising ability to the foundation and development of a Soldiers' Church of England Help Society, which commenced in the middle of 1915. Garland, who was bursting with patriotic enthusiasm, took the motto that "Nothing is too good for our soldiers", and in the stirring atmosphere of the time, had no difficulty in whipping up great enthusiasm. Within a year 47 branches of the society had been formed: funds were being raised for the work of the church in army camps and of chaplains at the front, and social and recreational facilities were provided wherever groups of troops congregated.<sup>1243</sup> Garland himself was untiring in his efforts to bring the ministry of the church to the souls and bodies of men in the forces.

As the war lengthened, the difficulties which it created for the church's work grew immensely. It soon became obvious that it was not producing a return to religion, and by the end of 1915 there were indications of a positive decline in church attendance. In part this may have been the result of doubts which the horrors of war threw on to the mind of a generation so unprepared for it, but for the most part it seems to have been rather the result of the atmosphere of unsettlement which the war produced.<sup>1244</sup> To meet this unfavourable environment there was a much reduced staff of clergy. By 1917 this was being very seriously felt: not only were many of the parish priests serving as chaplains to the forces, but the normal supply of replacements, both from St. Francis' College, and from England, had almost dried up. The northern dioceses, with their larger proportion of young priests, suffered more than did Brisbane. North Queensland, which at the outbreak of the war had 32 clergy, was down to 21 by 1918. In Rockhampton diocese the Brotherhood of St. Andrew went entirely out of existence, and a great strain was placed on the remaining clergy. Of Carpentaria's eight priests at the beginning of the war, three were absent on military duty by 1917. The same year, Brisbane had four parishes vacant, and another five big parishes without assistant curates. Nor did the end of the war see an immediate improvement. The Charleville Bush Brotherhood was down to three members in 1919, to minister to the vast area of south-west Queensland. The Bishop of North Queensland expressed what all the bishops must have felt when he told his synod: "I cannot pretend that I see my way through these increasing difficulties".<sup>1245</sup>

The dilemma of finding staff to maintain the essential work of the church was not the only effect of the war. The heightened emotional atmosphere created by the war brought to a head those tensions between the church and certain forces of the age which have discussed earlier in this chapter. There was a new outburst of scornful rationalism encouraged by the apparently senseless carnage of war; some sections of the labour movement condemned the church's wholehearted support of the allied cause in what they regarded as a capitalist war; and the removal of normal restraints showed up various kinds of moral laxity in a strong light.<sup>1246</sup> Yet Archbishop Donaldson saw in this apparent extremity of spiritual crisis the raw material of a great opportunity if only the church would seize it. He believed that in the very starkness of conflict

<sup>1240</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1915, Archbishop's address, p.17.

<sup>1241</sup> E.g. Church Chronicle, January 1917.

<sup>1242</sup> Carpentarian, July 1916.

<sup>1243</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1916, p.198.

<sup>1244</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1915.

<sup>1245</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1916-19, Bishop's address for 1916, p.33.

<sup>1246</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1915, p.249.

men would come to see that only the depth of the Catholic faith could provide a satisfactory basis for life.<sup>1247</sup> The Australian bishops as a whole, in a pastoral, had expressed a similar belief:

We believe that these are days of great spiritual opportunity; the shattering of so much that seemed established reveals the vanity of human affairs, and anxiety, separation and loss have made many hearts sensible of the approach of Christ to the soul; if only we can seize the opportunity and enforce the teaching of the moment, our people may emerge from the ordeal a stronger, because a more God-fearing race.<sup>1248</sup>

It was with this situation in mind that Donaldson envisaged and organised the General Mission to Queensland in 1917. Actually this mission did not arise solely out of the exigencies of war, because as early as 1908 Donaldson had outlined a plan for a national mission to last some eighteen months, led by ten or a dozen missionaries from England.<sup>1249</sup> It was the wartime situation, however, that seemed to present the opportune moment, and the example of the National Mission of Repentance and Hope, which was conducted in England in 1916, spurred the archbishop on with the final preparations. The purpose of the mission was to bring to as many parishes as possible in a comprehensive but concentrated form the great truths of the Gospel as related to the existing human situation. There were to be four stages: first, an inner core of communicants was to be prepared for their part in the mission by instruction, prayer and penitence; then, beginning in January 1917, these people were to visit every house in their parishes, bringing details of the mission; the mission itself was to consist of ten days' concentrated evangelistic and teaching services; and finally there was to be a follow-up programme designed to consolidate the progress that had been made. The main period of the mission was to be from Easter to October 1917.<sup>1250</sup>

About a year in advance, preparations began to be made in the parishes, and small groups of keen church people received their initial instruction. Two priests came from England in 1916 – George Perry-Gore and Arthur Langford Brown – to lead the advance preparations, and others came from England and South Africa to take part in the mission proper. At the same time, a large number of Australian clergy, including the Bishops of Armidale, Goulburn and Bathurst, and many from within the Province of Queensland were preparing. In May 1917 some forty missionaries were commissioned by Archbishop Donaldson in St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane.<sup>1251</sup> Into parish after parish all over the state the message of the mission was brought in the ensuing months, one of the missionaries, the Reverend Reginald Halse, conducting no fewer than five missions of ten days each in a period of sixty days in different parts of Queensland.

It is never easy to assess the final result of such a campaign as this, and there were varying estimates after the event of its real achievements. Perhaps the truest statement about the mission was that of the rector of one of the northern parishes, who referred to the general mission as "a great success and a great failure".<sup>1252</sup> 'There was a fairly widespread opinion that the numbers who came to the mission services were not as great as had been hoped and expected; but those who did come – for the most part, people who were already church people to some extent – were encouraged and helped by the mission. The general consensus of opinion was that it did not result in very markedly increased church attendance, but it did bring greater stability and regularity to the life of the parochial congregations. Many parishes reported large numbers of people renewing their baptismal vows, making their confessions and seeking personal counsel from the missionaries. Twelve months after the mission, the archbishop expressed his conviction that "the stability and progress of our Church life in these days of trial is due at least in part to the moving of God's Spirit in our General Mission".<sup>1253</sup>

There were various factors operating against greater success in the mission. There were some last-minute dislocations of the programme due to the inability of some of the proposed missionaries to come; there was the problem of any general mission, that not all parishes were equally ready for this kind of enterprise to yield the most fruitful results; but above all, the mission was hindered by the shortage of clergy. Some parishes were without priests at all, in others the clergy were desperately short-handed; and this meant that in parish after parish neither the full-scale preparatory programme, nor the follow-up plan were really effectively carried out. At the same time, many of the laymen at the height of the war were more than ordinarily busy with patriotic commitments and did not have the time to give concentrated attention to their part in the whole mission programme. More important than this, the spiritual climate of the war years was unfavourable from the point of view of dramatic and obvious results. Yet this has another side: but for the general mission the church might well have lost ground in this period to a much greater extent than it did. As it was, parochial life was stabilised in those parishes where the mission actually took place.

<sup>1247</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1916: sermon by Archbishop Donaldson.

<sup>1248</sup> Quoted in ibid., January 1915.

<sup>1249</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1908, Archbishop's address, p.40.

<sup>1250</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1916.

<sup>1251</sup> Northern Churchman, July 1917.

<sup>1252</sup> Ayr notes, ibid., December 1917.

<sup>1253</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1918, Archbishop's address, p.247.



One thing that the general mission did was to give to the Anglican church in Queensland a new sense of confidence with which to approach the future, a confidence that was blended, as we have seen, with a spirit of self criticism. It was generally felt that the end of the war would mark the beginning of a new era. In popular thought, this war would end all war. Not all churchmen shared this confidence, especially in view of the lack of evidence of widespread spiritual and moral renewal. Nevertheless, a spirit of confidence and of new beginnings marked the immediate post-war years. There were clearly many unanswered questions for the church, and many unsolved problems, but the 1920's seemed to promise a more stable future. It was soon to become obvious, however, that there could be no easy return to the pre-war atmosphere: for a long time ahead the church was going to find itself in a very unsettled world.

**PART V: AN UNSETTLED WORLD**

## CHAPTER 15: NEW HOPES AND OLD DOUBTS.

### i. The Post-War Environment and the Church's Leaders.

The end of the first World War was generally anticipated with great optimism, particularly in the early phase of the conflict. In secular affairs it was expected to usher in a period of international co-operation, peace and prosperity; while many churchmen for their part anticipated an unprecedented opportunity for the effective proclamation of the Christian message.<sup>1254</sup> When the war actually ended, however, it began to be realised that the political, economic and religious environment was not nearly as straightforward and favourable as had been hoped. Indeed, the post-war problems assumed such complexity as to make them appear practically insoluble. Archbishop Donaldson summed up in 1919 what many people were thinking about the situation:

Both in Australia and in the world at large it is difficult to forecast the future. Financially the world is shaking like a quagmire: politically and socially the fog of bewilderment is blinding all parties alike, and while we are all conscious that mighty changes are afoot, none of us know whither they are leading us or what the final upshot will be.<sup>1255</sup>

In Australia there was less conscious perplexity and despair than in Europe. In the old world the war had disrupted normal life far more thoroughly than in Australia; and the post-war ferment resulting from the Marxist revolution in Russia and its repercussions in other European countries cast a much darker shadow on formerly accepted systems of government, social order and religion. The immediate effect of the war on Australia was one of exhilaration rather than of disintegration; for the war had given Australia a national self-consciousness and sense of achievement, as well as a new status in the empire and the world. Nevertheless in a shrinking world some at least of the perplexities being experienced in Europe made their impact in Australia.

Archbishop Donaldson commented on the changed atmosphere in Europe when he came back to Brisbane from the Lambeth Conference of 1920. The old simplicity, he said, was gone, and he noted "a resurgence of pessimism and its brood of pagan theories" which was reflected in the neo-paganism of modern literature and thought.<sup>1256</sup> It was a perceptive comment, because it was to be more than a decade before these neo-pagan themes were to find their full expression in German Nazism. Donaldson came to this conclusion: "the whole fabric of Christian civilisation is in danger".<sup>1257</sup>

Yet if the potential dangers to Christianity seemed great, so too did the opportunities. In his presidential address to the last provincial synod before he returned to England, Donaldson emphasised his conviction that the age was not irreligious:

It may be bewildered, it may be rebellious, it may be lethargic through physical exhaustion, it may be sinful; but it is not irreligious.<sup>1258</sup>

The key to whether the world would choose the path of Christianity or the path of neo-paganism lay in whether the church could manifest in its own life real spiritual power. This involved bridging the gap between churchmen and the great mass of men outside the church; it required a vigorous campaign of witness by the laity to definite standards of Christian worship and morality; and it called for a higher level of devotion among the clergy.<sup>1259</sup> Which way the world would turn in its post-war bewilderment would depend, Donaldson declared, on how the church itself responded to its challenging situation. The war left in its wake peculiar difficulties for the Christian cause. The atrocities and carnage of four years of war had made a deep imprint on the minds of many returned servicemen and their families. The atmosphere which had been stirred up of bitterness and hatred, so contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, was not easily effaced; and the moral laxity associated with unsettled wartime conditions left an environment prejudicial to the practice of Christian morality. No less significant was the fact that the war had accelerated the breakdown of many of the remnants of Victorian social custom, with which religious life had been intimately bound up. The home was becoming less the focal point of life, and there were increasing pressures on the family as the basic unit of society. Religious practices common in the middle class family of the nineteenth century suffered as a result, and family prayers, grace before meals and family worship in church declined noticeably.

With these changes was associated the breakdown of Sunday as a day which should be kept free from either work or amusement and be devoted only to worship and rest. Sunday had never, as we have seen, been kept as rigidly in Queensland as in the old country, or even in some of the more settled parts of southern Australia; but there was after the war an increase in the range of activities that became possible and respectable on Sundays, and these provided a strong counter-attraction to regular Sunday worship. The new degree of mobility resulting from the popularisation of the motor car

<sup>1254</sup> See, for example, Canon P.A. Macklem's sermon, Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1915, p.7.

<sup>1255</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1919, Archbishop's synod address, p.15.

<sup>1256</sup> Donaldson's speech at the welcome back from Lambeth, Church Chronicle, March 1921.

<sup>1257</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1258</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1921, Archbishop's address, p.12.

<sup>1259</sup> Ibid., pp.12-13.

only served to reinforce these pressures. The week-end was taking on a new significance, especially in the big cities near the coast, and this reflected a changing attitude to the right form of Sunday observance. The increased reference by church leaders to this matter and the trend to earlier church services both reflect the changing pattern of social life in this respect.

In its own internal organisation also the church had suffered as a result of the war. The closure of St. Francis' College, and the virtual cessation of the supply of clergy from England had led to a worrying shortage of clergy; and the lay organisations, especially those for men and boys, had been seriously weakened by the war. Many of the leaders of the boys' and young mens' clubs had enlisted, as had a large proportion of the members of the C.E.M.S.; and during the war many other laymen had been preoccupied with war work of some kind. The result was that the C.E.M.S., which before the war had promised to be a strong agency for lay evangelism, had lost much of its numerical strength and vigour, and never again became the powerful force that it had been before 1914. In 1920 its membership had declined to five hundred men, in thirty-two branches.<sup>1260</sup> These figures were only half those of 1914, and they pointed to a serious weakness in the life of the church, which was notoriously weak in active male membership.

Nevertheless, despite these manifest problems there was a spirit of optimism in the church in the early twenties, which reflected the contemporary post-war exhilaration in Australian life. Progress was confidently expected in the life of the church, and a series of changes in the episcopal leadership of the province, though causing temporary dismay, helped foster an atmosphere of fresh activity. The unexpected resignation by Bishop Halford from the see of Rockhampton was followed the next year by the translation of Archbishop Donaldson to the English see of Salisbury which in turn set off a chain of new appointments. Bishop Gerald Sharp, of New Guinea, was translated to Brisbane, and Bishop Henry Newton was called from Carpentaria to New Guinea, so that by 1922 every diocese in the province except North Queensland had a new bishop. New things seemed to be in the air.

The loss of St. Clair Donaldson to Salisbury was the most significant of the changes, and there was genuine and widespread regret at his departure from Queensland. For the first time the vacancy in the see was filled by vote of the Archbishop Election Committee, and their choice fell upon the Right Reverend Gerald Sharp who since 1910 had been Bishop of New Guinea.

The new archbishop presented a sharp contrast to his predecessor. He had no particular eminence as a scholar, nor had he a reputation as an administrator or statesman: indeed his experience as vicar of an English provincial parish and bishop of a missionary diocese had provided him with little training in the art of ecclesiastical and national statesmanship. Gerald Sharp, was, however, a deeply spiritual man, saintly, gentle and full of the zeal for the souls of men. It was his desire to serve wherever he might be needed that had moved him originally to accept the offer of the bishopric of New Guinea, the burden of which he knew only too well had crushed the health out of his predecessor, Montagu Stone-Wigg. He wrote a very simple reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury in accepting that difficult missionary diocese, and the very simplicity of his letter reveals something of the character of the man:

I accept the call to the Bishopric of New Guinea which you have made to me. Not only do I feel that I dare not refuse, but I truly think that there has now been born in me a longing to go.<sup>1261</sup>

A spirit of Christian charity was the chief mark of Gerald Sharp. On his death his coadjutor bishop said of him, "He was a man who loved abundantly, and was abundantly loved in return";<sup>1262</sup> while the Roman Catholic archbishop, Dr. James Duhig, described him as "the most lovable man I knew".<sup>1263</sup> Nor were these merely conventional obituary utterances. Even those who differed strongly with him – and on matters of churchmanship there were many – could not personally dislike the archbishop. Indeed, one of his weaknesses was that his own motives were so pure that he could not readily discern unworthy motives in others.<sup>1264</sup> He was never a strong disciplinarian, and the paradox was that under the rule of this most peaceable of bishops the Diocese of Brisbane had one of its worst periods of bitterness and disunity.

Doctrinally the election of Dr. Sharp to the see of Brisbane was significant. Sharp was too much a man of charity and peace to be himself a party man in any narrow sense: but the fact remained that he was the first occupant of the bishopric who could quite unequivocally be described as an Anglo-Catholic. The catholic tradition of the Diocese of Brisbane had,

---

<sup>1260</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1920, p.192

<sup>1261</sup> Sharp to Abp. R.T. Davidson, 3 December 1909, Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Lambeth Palace. The recommendation to the English primate that Sharp should be appointed to New Guinea had in itself a strong Queensland background, as it was Donaldson and A.E. David who suggested his name. See Bp. H.H. Montgomery to .... (no name on letter) 13<sup>th</sup> November, 1909, in ibid.

<sup>1262</sup> Bp. H.H. Dixon, Church Chronicle, October 1933.

<sup>1263</sup> Ibid., November 1933

<sup>1264</sup> See, for example, the comment of Archdeacon W.H.W. Stevenson, ibid., October 1933.

as we have seen, been strong from the beginning, and the last two bishops, Webber and Donaldson, had been deeply conscious of the catholic heritage of the Church of England. But Archbishop Sharp was the first of the bishops who was quite at home in the details of Anglo-Catholic ceremonial. Though never desiring to force such practices on others, he personally delighted in the use of rich ceremonial, with vestments and incense, and all the trappings of Anglo-Catholic devotion. Whenever contention arose on these issues he strove for compromise and peace: but if this failed, he could never bring himself to inhibit those who encouraged and practised such ceremonies. The ramifications of this policy we must follow out in a later section.

Sharp, then, was not a strong leader; and his failure to speak out on behalf of the church on matters of public concern was in strong contrast to his predecessor. His synod addresses aimed at being mildly persuasive rather than dogmatically clear; on contentious issues, like the question of a church constitution for Australia, he put his own views gently and humbly, and only as a last resort would he make a strong personal pronouncement. Nor was he much at home in the worldly details of diocesan administration; and the result was that the government of the diocese and the planning of its policies fell more and more to his deputy, the coadjutor bishop, H.F. Le Fanu, until the latter's translation to the archbishopric of Perth in 1929. The firm hand of Bishop Le Fanu was very clearly impressed upon the life of the diocese.

Le Fanu had been Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane since 1915, and had always been highly influential in the councils of the diocese; but while Donaldson's strong personality was at the top, his role was that of a subordinate. However, he knew and understood the diocesan machinery much more thoroughly than the new archbishop, fresh from the wilds of New Guinea, and much of the day-to-day administration now fell – quite willingly on the archbishop's part – into his hands. Le Fanu was a man of very considerable ability and great force of character.<sup>1265</sup> Unlike the coadjutor bishops of Bishop Webber's episcopate, whose sphere of work mostly kept them far from the metropolis, Le Fanu was in close touch with the heart of the diocese. Apart from the duties inherent in his office as coadjutor bishop, he was warden of the Society of the Sacred Advent, and by 1926, at the archbishop's request, he was acting as secretary of both home and foreign missions. But apart from this, he had a great influence in the financial policies of the diocese. He prided himself on having an intimate understanding of high finance, and under his direction the church became involved in a number of projects, the outcome of which will need further discussion later. By nature adventurous and optimistic, Le Fanu had the forcefulness to carry others with him. In many ways he typified, and in some respects moulded the optimistic spirit in the church in the early twenties.<sup>1266</sup>

It was also in 1921 that Philip Charles Thurlow Crick was consecrated third Bishop of Rockhampton. A Cambridge don, Crick was an able scholar, but he had scarcely had the kind of experience to equip him for the peculiar problems of an Australian country diocese. At the end of his Rockhampton episcopate he readily admitted his early inadequacy:

I came out as a 'new chum' and it is just the bare truth to say that few newly appointed Bishops can have come to their high office with less experience and knowledge of the workings of a Parish and a Diocese.<sup>1267</sup>

The result was that early optimism, which resulted in some rather rash ventures soon gave way to disappointment and anxiety on the part of the bishop. After his first synod he was buoyant, and he wrote in his monthly diocesan letter:

There was really wonderful enthusiasm and hope for the future, and complete unanimity among all members of the Synod in the feeling that the times are fully ripe for an extension of our work.<sup>1268</sup>

Yet after three years he found it necessary to make a trip to England, partly to recover from what he himself described as "a period of almost continuous mental and physical stress for myself".<sup>1269</sup> Perhaps because he lacked confidence in his new and strange environment, Bishop Crick was diffident about giving a strong lead to his diocese on major ecclesiastical or public issues, and his synod charges and sermons lacked the strength and character of those of his notable predecessor.

In the far north, too, the translation of Bishop Newton to replace Dr. Sharp in New Guinea necessitated the appointment of a new bishop for the Diocese of Carpentaria. As this diocese still possessed no properly constituted synod which could elect its own bishop the right of nomination to the see lay with the bishops of the province. In the circumstances of this difficult diocese the choice of the Reverend Stephen Harris Davies was a happy one. His Australian experience as a member and head of the Charleville Bush Brotherhood fitted him well for the work of such a scattered country diocese, and in his long and distinguished episcopate lasting twenty-seven years the bishop became known and loved as a father-in-God by Europeans and native peoples alike. Like the first bishop of that vast diocese Davies was a tireless traveller, and often

<sup>1265</sup> For Archbishop Donaldson's opinion of his ability see Brisbane Year Book, 1921, p.15.

<sup>1266</sup> For an impression of the character of Bishop Le Fanu, see Alexander, F. (Ed.), Four Bishops and their See, pp.210-212)

<sup>1267</sup> Rockhampton Church Gazette, July 1927.

<sup>1268</sup> Ibid, May 1921.

<sup>1269</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1924, Bishop's address, p.24.

journeyed ten thousand miles a year around his diocese, of which several thousand miles were covered in the small mission ketches in the Torres Strait.<sup>1270</sup>

Davies was not, like Bishop Gilbert White, a great prophetic figure prominent in the councils of the church at large; but within his own diocese he earned a just reputation as a wise and fair administrator, and as a faithful and loving pastor. To the native peoples he was always a friend, as he showed not only in his personal dealings with them, but in his efforts to influence government policy in what he considered to be their interests. Davies recognised that the time had come to place the constitutional machinery of the diocese on a sound footing, and it was under his presidency that the first synod of the diocese met in May 1931.<sup>1271</sup> Although the synod was small – there were only twelve clerical and five lay representatives at the first session – exorbitant travelling costs for members who had to go great distances to Thursday Island restricted meetings of synod to every second year. In March 1932 Bishop Davies completed the legal machinery by having the Diocese of Carpentaria incorporated under the Church of England Act of 1895.<sup>1272</sup>

It was only in the diocese of North Queensland that there was a continuity of episcopal leadership in the post-war years. Here John Oliver Feetham was in the prime of life, and was fast becoming the strongest and best-known church leader in the state. Feetham's influence was, of course, limited by the geographical location of his see: naturally the bishop of a northern diocese was not in the same position to influence public affairs as was the archbishop of the metropolitan see. Yet by his visits to the south, his strong letters to leaders in church and state, and his carefully prepared synod charges which he had printed and widely circulated, he made his views heard throughout the state. Feetham was nothing if not definite in his opinions, and by the twenties he was, unlike some of his fellow bishops in the province, thoroughly acquainted with Queensland conditions, so that he was unlikely to engage in rash schemes in the post-war boom situation. It was partly because of this, and partly because of different economic conditions operating in the north, that the Diocese of North Queensland rode more smoothly through the fluctuations of the twenties and thirties than did the southern dioceses of the province.

The early 1920's, then, found the church in an environment marked by the peculiar instability of a post-war society. It was a decade that seemed likely to provide great opportunities for religious growth, and yet offered a multiplicity of problems as well. Unfortunately to meet this situation the Church of England found itself less adequately equipped with leaders than in the previous decade. Archbishop Sharp was saintly and lovable, but was not a strong leader or administrator; his deputy, Bishop Le Fanu, was a vigorous administrator, but was prone to flights of adventure that were not always soundly based; Bishop Crick in Rockhampton was an able scholar, but was uncertain in the conditions of an Australian country diocese; Bishop Davies was admirably suited to his task in Carpentaria, but by the very nature of that diocese, his influence must be limited in the church at large. Only in North Queensland was there complete continuity with the previous decade. The new leaders brought their various gifts to the service of the church, and their early optimism appeared at first to be justified; but the unsettled decade of the twenties was to bring doubts and difficulties that were to be a sore trial to the church.

## ii. Years of Expansion

The 1920's saw a considerable expansion of the machinery of church organisation. In part, this was a recovery of ground that had been lost during the war, with its attendant shortage of clergy, breakdown of church societies, and concentration of energy upon patriotic affairs; but it went beyond this, and the prevailing spirit of optimism in Australian life was reflected in ecclesiastical thought and plans for the future. Yet it must be admitted that with all the talk and hopes, there was little that was essentially new.

The chief limiting factor – as it has always been – was lack of manpower; and this became especially acute because it was not clear that except under certain conditions the supply of English clergy for Queensland was drying up. It was still common for priests to come from England for important and specialised appointments; and the bush brotherhoods, especially in the north, still looked largely to England for their recruits. But the days of the five-year plan were over so far as ordinary parish work was concerned, and the increasing shortage of parochial clergy in England ensured that those days would not return. Nor did the more thoughtful leaders of the church in Queensland, themselves Englishmen, regret this situation. Archbishop Donaldson, preaching at Bishop Crick's enthronement in 1921, commented that,

There is no hope any longer of staffing Australia with English clergy, and I thank God for it, because it is time Australia supplied her own ministry.<sup>1273</sup>

<sup>1270</sup> Carpentarian, January 1939.

<sup>1271</sup> Ibid., July 1931.

<sup>1272</sup> Ibid., April 1932.

<sup>1273</sup> Church Chronicle., April 1921.

A few years later Archbishop Sharp went further and said that, even for the chief appointments in the church in Australia, it was wrong to pass over Australian-born men or men with long experience here unless the men imported were so outstanding that there was no one to equal them in this country.<sup>1274</sup>

Nevertheless, while recognising this in theory the bishops found it hard to resist the inclination to import men from England when they found gaping holes in the staffs of their own dioceses. The war-time closure of St. Francis' College meant an inevitable period of hardship pending the graduation of the first post-war students, and even then the number of local ordination candidates continued to be relatively disappointing. The archbishop told the Brisbane synod in 1924 that "the scarcity of ordination candidates will be calamitous if it continues, still more calamitous if it increases".<sup>1275</sup> The situation was aggravated by the fact that many of those who offered as candidates for the ministry did not actually proceed to ordination, either because of academic inadequacy or because of a change of heart regarding their vocations. In Rockhampton diocese, for example, only five of the twenty candidates who offered between 1918 and 1930 were actually ordained, and considering some £2,200 had been spent on their training by this relatively poor diocese, the wastage was very serious both in human and financial terms.<sup>1276</sup>

In this situation the bishops were sorely tempted to lower the academic requirements for ordination candidates.<sup>1277</sup> In the main this temptation was resisted, but the shortage of clergy continued to prevent the realisation of the long-held ideal that the standards of clerical education should be perceptibly raised. It is true that Dean Batty pushed a motion through the Brisbane synod in 1925 that the normal period of training for the ministry should be five years, including three years at a university, but in the nature of the case it was inevitable that the motion should remain a dead letter, and there was in fact a tendency towards a steady decline in the proportion of university graduates among the clergy.<sup>1278</sup>

Although university education did not in fact become the norm for theological students in Queensland efforts were made to maintain a good standard of theological training. It was to this end that a proposal was made in 1924 for the amalgamation of the tiny St. Francis' College – which had only nine students at the time – with St. John's College, Armidale, so that better academic standards could be attained in the larger environment.<sup>1279</sup> The Old Franciscans, however, strongly resisted this suggestion, which was easily defeated in synod. This was followed by another proposal to combine St. Francis' College with St. John's University College;<sup>1280</sup> but a select committee, after seeking advice from experts in theological training in various parts of the world, also recommended against this scheme.<sup>1281</sup> They wisely reasoned that the kind of environment provided by a university college was not best adapted to the spiritual training and discipline required for candidates for the ministry. So St. Francis' College continued on its way; but under its first post-war principal, Canon W.C. Campling, standards of discipline and study were tightened, and students were discouraged from undertaking extensive outside parochial commitments during their period of training for the ministry.

One suggestion for overcoming the shortage of clergy was made in the Brisbane synod in 1925, namely that men might be ordained who would still continue their secular occupations, and exercise their ministry on a part-time basis. The archbishop was requested to obtain the opinion of the other Australian bishops, as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop Donaldson on the subject. On the whole the opinions returned were strongly unfavourable, at least to the idea of such ordinations to the priesthood, though there was more willingness to permit a part-time diaconate. The bishops expressed the opinion that no one province should act alone on such a far-reaching change of policy, and the Archbishop of Canterbury suggested that the matter be ventilated at the next Lambeth Conference. From time to time since then the suggestion has been raised again; but in view of the strong opposition from the other bishops, no action was taken in Queensland to implement the proposal.<sup>1282</sup>

The outcome of all this was that the anticipated expansion of the ranks of the clergy did not occur. In Brisbane diocese, it is true, there were 118 clergymen in 1929 as against 100 in 1914; but in both North Queensland and Rockhampton the number of priests during most of the twenties was considerably lower than the pre-war figure, and though Carpentaria by 1928 had ten European and four native clergymen, only three of these were engaged in work among the Europeans, the others being involved in the expanded missionary work. The bishops found it particularly hard to fill the gaps in the bush, at any rate with Australian-born priests. The Brotherhood of St. Barnabas remained overwhelmingly English in

<sup>1274</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1929, Archbishop's address, p.9.

<sup>1275</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1924, Archbishop's address, p.25.

<sup>1276</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1930, p.35.

<sup>1277</sup> See, for example, Archbishop Sharp's comments, Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.22.

<sup>1278</sup> Ibid., 1925, p.38. At the outbreak of the first World War 35 out of 100 clergymen in the Diocese of Brisbane (i.e. 35%) were university graduates; fifteen years later in 1929, only 29 out of 118 (24.5%) were graduates.

<sup>1279</sup> Ibid., 1924, pp. 24 and 37.

<sup>1280</sup> Ibid., p.43.

<sup>1281</sup> Ibid., 1925, p.168.

<sup>1282</sup> Ibid., 1927, p.27.

composition,<sup>1283</sup> and the Charleville Brotherhood<sup>1284</sup> which was trying not to depend unduly on England for its membership found that its numbers dropped to a very low level during the twenties. By 1925 it had only four members, and successive heads of the brotherhood found themselves bitterly criticising the younger Australian clergy for their unwillingness to postpone marriage and make the sacrifice of serving some years in the bush.<sup>1285</sup> The fact was that few young Australian priests – who were themselves almost entirely the products of city parishes, for country districts were producing very few ordination candidates – found in the Australian bush that quality of romance that helped attract Englishmen; nor did they have the *esprit de corps*, nourished in the corporate life of the English universities, that led groups of young English priest-graduates to go out to a common sphere of work on the other side of the world. The bush brotherhoods in Queensland had not become truly indigenous products.

Despite the limitations imposed by clerical shortages there was plenty of evidence of an optimistic spirit in the church. For the first time in their history the various diocesan synods seriously took in hand the provision of reasonable minimum stipends for all the clergy. In Brisbane, a laymen's commission set up by the synod of 1920 recommended a rate of £300 for each married rector or vicar, plus a house and a ten pound allowance for each child from 3 to 14 years, with corresponding rates for unmarried rectors and curates.<sup>1286</sup> The scheme was put forward with the best intentions; the recommendations were just and earned the praise of the clergy. The synods of Rockhampton in 1921, and North Queensland in 1925, also set £300 as a basic stipend rate.<sup>1287</sup> The trouble was, however, that despite synod resolutions many parishes were unable, without greatly increasing their income, to meet the increased stipend payments, which in the Diocese of Brisbane would have required a total of £3,000 extra each year.

In order to save the clergymen in smaller parishes from suffering it was decided to carry out the proposal which had been under discussion for a generation past of paying stipends from a central fund. Parishes were required to pay their stipend funds to the diocesan office, which then paid the clergy, making up what was lacking in the parish contributions from the Clergy Central Sustentation Fund. There were great hopes that the scheme would ease the lot of the clergy, some of whom were struggling to make ends meet. The result, however, was disastrous: the poorer parishes, knowing that the central fund would make good any deficiency in their contributions, lacked the incentive to increase the income of their stipend funds, and the Central Sustentation Fund rapidly, and increasingly, found itself in debt. Already by 1921, when the central fund had to subsidise parish stipend contributions by some £1,400, the drift of events was all too obvious.<sup>1288</sup> By 1924 the central fund had an overdraft of almost £4,000.<sup>1289</sup> Even so, it was not until the depression brought financial collapse and shattered the early post-war optimism that the central payment of stipends of the clergy was abolished. In the northern dioceses the method of paying stipends through central funds was never comprehensively employed, though it was adopted on occasions. The breakdown there was of a different kind: sometimes the clergy did not receive the nominal stipend in full at all.

Another illustration of optimistic desires to improve the lot of the clergy was given in a motion of the Reverend L.J. Hobbs in the Brisbane synod of 1925. The proposal was for six months' long service leave for the clergy after fifteen years' continuous service, a locum tenens being provided by the diocese from a special fund.<sup>1290</sup> The suggestion was enthusiastically received, and a select committee worked out the details of the scheme, which was finally put before synod in 1927.<sup>1291</sup> There was one small, but important, proviso: the scheme should not be put into operation until there was sufficient money in the central fund to be set up for the purpose. Needless to say, with the financial crisis looming around the corner, the proposal found its way to the pigeon-hole.

It was in building operations that the post-war expansive spirit was most clearly demonstrated. By the mid-twenties a mild boom of church construction was in progress, involving both temporary wooden buildings to meet the needs of new areas of settlement and permanent brick churches to replace older wooden structures in the more settled districts. In North Queensland Bishop Feetham pointed out that the old timber churches, which had been the best buildings in the town in the days when ordinary houses were rough bush humpies were now only 'an interesting survival of an austere and simple past'.<sup>1292</sup> In the north the building of brick in place of wooden churches was a matter of more than aesthetic concern,

<sup>1283</sup> As late as 1935 only two of the thirteen members of this brotherhood were Australians: N.Q. *Year Book*, 1934-5, p.15.

<sup>1284</sup> It was not known as the Brotherhood of St. Paul until 1932: *Bush Notes*, September 1932.

<sup>1285</sup> See, for example, the comments of the Rev. W.F.H.N. Eldershaw, *Bush Notes*, July 1925 and of the Rev. C.H Edwards, *Ibid.*, June 1929.

<sup>1286</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1920, p.34.

<sup>1287</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1921, p.20; N.Q. *Year Book*, 1924-5, p.32.

<sup>1288</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1921, p.17.

<sup>1289</sup> *Ibid.*, 1924, p.27

<sup>1290</sup> *Ibid.*, 1925, p.47.

<sup>1291</sup> *Ibid.*, 1927, p.153; also "Minutes of Long Leave Committee", in *Minute Book, Various Committees*, The Church House, Brisbane.

<sup>1292</sup> N.Q. *Year Book*, 1925-6, Bishop's address, p.28.



however, for the perennial cyclonic threat made stronger brick or concrete buildings essential. Two of the fourteen wooden churches built in North Queensland in the first twelve years of Bishop Feetham's episcopate had already been destroyed in cyclones by 1925.<sup>1293</sup>

In Brisbane diocese, particularly, there was a building boom in churches. 1924 saw eleven new churches, including three permanent brick buildings; in 1927 there were fourteen, including two permanent buildings. The style of the new brick churches typified something of the spirit of the age. For the most part they were relatively small, compared with some of the nineteenth century churches, and even if planned ultimately to be reasonably large, were in many cases not completed in that generation. The new church at Dalby, for example, was quite small, while Auchenflower, Lutwyche and Sherwood all remained uncompleted for many years. Some of the later buildings like the churches at Bundaberg, Cairns, and particularly Mackay, were on a larger scale, but even so, were not relatively as big as some of the churches of the previous century. This reflects the decline of church-going, and it suggests that there was little confidence that this decline would be rapidly reversed.

The design of the buildings was typically unpretentious, retaining some of the features of ecclesiastical gothic while at the same time endeavouring to grapple more realistically with the conditions of a hot climate by increasing the area of window space. There was also a trend towards less steeply pitched roofs. Later in the twenties there was some experimentation with Moorish architecture, as seen in Holy Trinity, Mackay, and later more consistently in Holy Trinity, Woolloongabba.<sup>1294</sup> It was in short a time when it was being realised that nineteenth century English styles of architecture were not well adapted to Queensland needs; but no style had yet been devised that was naturally expressive of Queensland conditions.

The building boom did not only involve new churches. A big expansion was taking place in the church schools, whose temporary initial buildings were proving inadequate for increasing numbers of students. By the mid-twenties, large scale building projects were under way. At the synod of 1925, for example, it was reported that The Southport School was to spend £35,000 on increased accommodation; at the same time the Church of England Grammar School, Brisbane, was making an appeal for £15,000 for additional classrooms, and the Sisters of the Sacred Advent wanted another £15,000 for improvements to their institutions.<sup>1295</sup> The pressure of increasing numbers rendered these expenditures necessary, but they would have been less confidently undertaken if the impending financial crisis had been divined. In Warwick where, as we have seen, a girls' school was founded under the inspiration of the Reverend W.P. Glover just after the war, a site worth £7,000 was also bought for a boys' school. Lack of money, the departure of Archbishop Donaldson, and delay in the arrival of the intended first headmaster, caused long postponement of the beginning of this school, but in 1926 the Slade School actually commenced, with A.S. Douglas as its headmaster. It remained very small, with thirteen boys at first, and as liabilities increased, the diocese was forced to take over the school by 1929 in order to save it. This all involved a considerable increase in the diocesan outlay on education.<sup>1296</sup>

In North Queensland the network of four schools which was already completed by 1921, underwent steady growth in student numbers and buildings in the 1920's. To reduce the heavy debt on the schools, which he had largely met out of his own pocket, Bishop Feetham established the Church Schools League, which steadily raised money throughout the twenties. By 1925 the bishop estimated that £52,000 had been spent on the church schools in North Queensland in the past nine years, on which there remained in that year a debt of some £17,000.<sup>1297</sup> However, the steady efforts of the League gradually reduced the debt in successive years.

In the Diocese of Rockhampton under Bishop Crick there was also great optimism about the possible development of church schools. The difference in Rockhampton was that there were no Anglican schools already in existence, so that the relative expenditure required was much greater than in either Brisbane or North Queensland. Being fresh from England, however, Crick was enthusiastic about setting up church schools immediately on the English pattern and in 1921 he sent the Reverend J.W.A. Mackenzie to England to raise funds for school endowments. Mackenzie had previously been successful in increasing the see endowment of the diocese, and he set about his new task with undiminished energy and considerable success. Consequently land was bought for a boys' school at Barcaldine and for a girls' school at Yeppoon. The former site was chosen against the advice of some of the experienced clergy and laity who believed that a little inland town would be an unfavourable location for his kind of venture. The outcome well justified their doubts.

---

<sup>1293</sup> *Ibid.*, 1924-5, p.14.

<sup>1294</sup> Sometimes irreverently known as Massey's Mosque. The Reverend R.B. Massey was Rector of Woolloongabba at the time.

<sup>1295</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1925, p.19.

<sup>1296</sup> For details of the early years of the Slade School, see *Slade School Magazine*, Special Jubilee Issue, November 1950, article by Archdeacon W.P. Glover.

<sup>1297</sup> N.Q. *Year Book*, 1924-5, p.13.

Nevertheless within the year 1922-23 the two schools were opened, under the names of St. Peter's, Barcaldine, and St. Faith's Yeppoon, involving a total commitment of just under £20,000, less than half of which had been received.<sup>1298</sup> Early prospects were encouraging, and within a year St. Peter's had sixty pupils and St. Faith's twenty-two; but the financial burden was heavy, and inadequate staffing and early changes of school principals did not make for stability of management. The bishop himself refused to see the difficulties. Despite the overdraft of £10,000 and continuing losses, he told his synod in 1926 that "in this situation I see no grounds for apprehension".<sup>1299</sup> St. Faith's managed to hold out with difficulty until it was taken under wing of the Society of the Sacred Advent in 1932.<sup>1300</sup> St. Peter's, however, after a period under the control of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd, which was a group of priests and laymen living under vows, was forced to close down. It reopened temporarily as a preparatory school for boys and girls in 1928, but staggered to a final halt in the depression in 1933. It was a pity, because with more cautious planning and wiser guidance it might possibly have achieved the same stability as the Church schools in the other dioceses.

There were several types of social work in addition to education that the church took up with new vigour in the post-war decade. During the war the church had bought "Pymont" on a site adjoining St. John's Cathedral, for use as a private hospital under the direction of the Society of the Sacred Advent,<sup>1301</sup> and after the war it was decided that a new hospital should be erected on this site as the chief diocesan war memorial. This was a new kind of venture, and one involving considerable expenditure. However, it was a popular one and its nature as a work of mercy and as a war memorial enlisted a great measure of public support. Under the energetic leadership of Bishop Le Fanu funds were steadily collected towards the total cost of more than £85,000. As part of the scheme a number of beds were set aside for the treatment of ex-servicemen.

The concern of the church for work among the sick was greatly stimulated by the Hickson Mission,<sup>1302</sup> and the need for the appointment of full-time hospital chaplains in the bigger hospitals now became apparent. As usual, however, the lack of both clergy and funds to pay them caused delay, and it was not until 1931 that the Reverend D. Morgan-Jones could be appointed the first full-time chaplain at the Brisbane General Hospital. This appointment was the first of those appointments to specialised chaplaincies that were to become increasingly common in later years.<sup>1303</sup>

It was in Rockhampton that the chief extension of the church's social work took place during this decade. The closure of St. Mary's Home in that city in 1922 was a reverse,<sup>1304</sup> but the opening of the first of the new St. George's Homes for children at Parkhurst the same year made possible the continuation and expansion of the orphanage aspect of the work of St. Mary's. St. George's aimed to create a more personal, and less institutional, atmosphere, by accommodating the children in a number of moderately small homes instead of building up a large central institution. A second home at Parkhurst was opened in 1925, and by 1930 there were three homes containing ninety-nine boys and girls.<sup>1305</sup> In Brisbane the institutions that had been founded before the war continued to grow slowly; but in Townsville the church was so committed to paying off the schools that virtually no attention could be devoted to the needs of the underprivileged.

One kind of specialised ministry that the church began to take more seriously after the war was that among seamen. Up to this time chaplaincy work among sailors was done only sporadically in Queensland, and again it was Bishop Le Fanu who made it a personal objective to have a seamen's institute established in Brisbane with a full-time chaplain. By 1925 this project was well advanced: the first chaplain of the Missions to Seamen, the Reverend H. Glyn Lewis, was appointed and the foundation stone of the new institute at Petrie Bight was laid.<sup>1306</sup> It was not long afterwards, in 1927, that a smaller similar institute was opened in Townsville with a part-time chaplain: the volume of shipping at this port did not justify a full-time appointment.<sup>1307</sup> These ventures opened up in Queensland a kind of work that had long been done by the Anglican Church in other parts of the world, and that was to grow increasingly significant in Queensland as the volume of shipping increased.

One other development in the post-war years was the re-entry of the church, under the dynamic leadership of Canon D.J. Garland, into the immigration field, on a rather larger scale than before the war. In 1925 Archbishop Sharp called for steps to encourage British immigration in his synod charge,<sup>1308</sup> and the same year a large and influential committee was

<sup>1298</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1923 p.47.

<sup>1299</sup> Ibid., 1926, p.15.

<sup>1300</sup> Ibid., 1932, p.33.

<sup>1301</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1917.

<sup>1302</sup> See below, Chap.15, iii.

<sup>1303</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1931, p.18.

<sup>1304</sup> See above, Chap. 12, iv.

<sup>1305</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1923, p.46.; 1926, p.47 and 1930, p.29.

<sup>1306</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.205.

<sup>1307</sup> N.Q. Year Book 1927-8, p.61

<sup>1308</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.40.

established in Brisbane to be the local branch of the Council of Overseas Settlement, an English body which handled migration on behalf of the church. The object of the committee, according to its report to synod, was “to utilise all the moral and material forces of the Church in support of immigration”.<sup>1309</sup> The scheme was not to be limited to members of the Church of England, but parishes, especially in the country, were to be asked to find employment for the migrants introduced under its auspices. In the first three years of its operation the committee introduced almost 1,100 migrants to Queensland, and although the onset of the depression reduced the numbers considerably, Garland’s energetic leadership made the project highly effective during the favourable years.<sup>1310</sup>

The maintenance of these various aspects of post-war expansion of the church’s work required a considerable increase of expenditure. Was the church’s income keeping pace with the rising tide of spending?

The early post-war years saw a fairly healthy growth of parochial incomes, largely stimulated by inflationary conditions in the national economy. The total income of the parishes of Brisbane diocese, for example, rose from £38,259 in 1913-14 to £45,120 in 1918-19, and then to £65,415 in 1923-24; but thereafter the figures began to decline slightly again as prosperity began to give way to tighter economic conditions. With higher costs and expanded work, however, the parishes were apt to lag in contributing the amounts required for the wider work of the church at the diocesan or overseas level. In 1924 for example, the amount contributed by the parishes by way of voluntary assessments, on which the entire home and foreign mission work of the diocese depended, fell some £2,000 short of the budget requirements.<sup>1311</sup> Thus while the parishes were paying their way reasonably well, the diocesan organisation was only barely being maintained, and the extra strain imposed by the decision in 1925 to purchase the Wharf Street Congregational Church and surrounding properties, as a means of protecting the environs of the cathedral and as an investment for the future, only added to the strain on central funds. The diocese was becoming financially overcommitted, a situation that was to be made all too apparent with a change in the trend of world economy later in the 1920’s.

In the northern dioceses the situation was not dissimilar. In North Queensland Bishop Feetham’s personal contributions and loans helped tide his diocese over hard times, and in Rockhampton Bishop Crick’s optimism covered up the grim realities of the situation. Drought only increased the financial stringency in this diocese, but even so, the bishop declared not long before his departure in 1927 that the financial situation under the circumstances was fairly satisfactory.<sup>1312</sup> It was not until Bishop Fortescue Ash took over the reins that the perilous financial plight of the diocese was fully grasped.

The church did not branch out in many radically new directions in the 1920’s: the general pattern of its work had already been set before the war. There was, however, considerable development of old work, and in the early twenties a spirit of marked optimism about the future. As the decade wore on and as progress slowed down and economic anxieties emerged there was a gradual waning of earlier optimism. Yet on the directly spiritual side of the work of the church there was ground for hope: the losses in church attendance which had resulted from the war were cut and there was an increasing annual number of confirmation candidates. It was in fact a period of mixed achievements; and in that respect the life of the church reflected the general tenor of the twenties.

### iii. Teaching the Faith

One of the results of the searching self-criticism within the church which we observed about the time of the first World War was a profound sense of dissatisfaction with existing methods of propagating the faith. There was a strong feeling, especially among the Anglo-Catholics, that the Church of England had failed miserably in dogmatic religious teaching and that to this cause was to be attributed much of the weakness of the church. One aspect of the post-war optimistic spirit was the confidence that by more systematic and aggressive educational policies members of the church could be made more aware of what the Church of England stood for, and could be brought to a higher degree of conviction in their church membership. The result was not only a new searching consideration of the methods of Christian education, but also a more vigorous emphasis on what Anglo-Catholics called “the Catholic Faith”. Before long this was to have noticeable repercussions on the life of the church.

One of the most significant moves in the educational sphere was the institution in 1924 of a series of lectures on Christian Evidence intended for intelligent adults who were disturbed by some of the prevailing intellectual arguments against Christianity. The instigator of these lectures was the Reverend Farnham Maynard, Rector of All Saints, Wickham Terrace. Maynard had been the chief figure in the investigation into the state of religious knowledge in the Diocese of Rockhampton in the previous decade, and as a man with scientific training himself, was deeply impressed with the need to demonstrate to thinking people that there was no conflict between religion and modern scientific thought. Enlisting the services of the

<sup>1309</sup> *Ibid.*, 1926, p.212.

<sup>1310</sup> *Ibid.*, 1928, p.198.

<sup>1311</sup> *Ibid.*, 1924, p.144.

<sup>1312</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1927, p.37.

ablest intellects of the diocese – men like Canon F. de Witt Batty and Canon W.C. Campling, as well as himself – Maynard provided a series of thoughtful and helpful lectures.<sup>1313</sup> Similar lectures were given in later years, and they revealed the growing awareness that the church's educational task was not simply the indoctrination of the young, but the reasoned guidance of the thinking of more mature members of the church. So far, however, such programmes of adult education depended on the initiative of individuals, and were not yet planned on a diocesan scale. The northern dioceses, with their more scattered population, and smaller resources of scholarly clergy in any one centre, were scarcely able to do anything along these lines above the parochial level.

Meanwhile, in the twenties, important developments were also taking place in the methods of religious education in the Sunday schools, which still remained the chief agency of religious instruction of the young. In the parishes there were already signs of a change of meeting times of Sunday schools from afternoons to mornings, a change which was partly dictated by altered social conditions, but also was partly methodological in its significance. The changing pattern of Sunday observance, associated in part with the emergence of the motor car as a popular means of transport, rendered Sunday afternoon a less successful time than formerly; but there was also growing up, especially among the more catholic-minded clergy and laity, the conviction that Sunday school programmes should be closely related to the morning worship of the church, and that one cause of the relative failure of the traditional Sunday school system was that it trained a race of children who had virtually no contact with the normal worshipping life of the church until after confirmation.<sup>1314</sup> These changes marked the beginning of that practical reappraisal of the place of the Sunday school in the life of the parish that was to continue for the next generation.

It was, however, on the diocesan level that the chief steps forward in religious education were taken during these years. More conferences of Sunday school teachers were being held to improve their techniques, not only in Brisbane itself, but in the larger provincial centres. This training was badly needed: the Sunday schools were largely staffed by untrained women (and a few men) who were pressed into service by desperate parish priests, and many of the teachers were young adolescents barely out of the senior Sunday school class. In the diocese of Brisbane by 1925 some sixty-nine parishes were using the lessons provided by the diocesan committee for Sunday schools. But there, as in the other dioceses, the lack of a fulltime organiser of the work delayed further progress.<sup>1315</sup> The appointment of the Reverend M. de Burgh Griffith as first Director of Religious Instruction for the diocese of Brisbane in 1927 helped meet this important need. The northern dioceses did not have the resources to make a similar appointment but they naturally learned from developments in the metropolitan diocese.

Griffith had had considerable experience in Sunday school work in England, and came with high recommendations. He did not prove altogether successful in translating his theories into practice, but he did succeed in laying foundations for future sound development of religious education in Queensland. Under his direction, for example, the postal Sunday school which had been founded by the Charleville Bush Brotherhood was taken over and expanded as the Church Mail Bag School, which eventually developed into an Australia-wide system of religious education by correspondence.<sup>1316</sup> By 1932 the Mail Bag School already had more than a thousand pupils on its rolls and was filling a great need in the religious education of bush children. Under Griffith's direction a new teachers' manual, The Trowel, was introduced into the diocese from Sydney, and while its syllabus proved inadequate in certain respects, it did encourage more up-to-date methods of teaching, particularly in fostering interesting and educational forms of expression work for the children. The training of teachers was also undertaken more systematically, and in 1932 Griffith instituted the first of what was to become an annual series of summer schools for Sunday school teachers, which steadily grew in influence in later years.

An important result of the appointment of a full-time director of religious education was that Griffith had time to try to co-ordinate the various aspects of the youth work of the church, and to see the different youth organisations as part of the total educational machinery of the church. A Diocesan Advisory Council for Youth was established under his chairmanship, and a so-called Children's Crusade was launched in 1930 to try to bring children who were out of touch with the church into the Sunday schools and youth organisations.<sup>1317</sup> Shortly afterwards a similar crusade was launched in the Diocese of North Queensland on the Brisbane pattern, under the direction of Canon J.A. Cue.<sup>1318</sup> The crusades were rather disappointing in their direct results, and indeed the co-ordination of youth work did not proceed very far; but there were indications of a

<sup>1313</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1924 and November 1925.

<sup>1314</sup> See, for example, the comments of Sister Una Mary, S.S.A., Church Chronicle, December 1923. the diocesan Religious Instruction Committee formally commenced the changed policy some years later; Brisbane Year Book, 1927, p.184.

<sup>1315</sup> Report of Diocesan Committee for Religious Instruction, Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.193.

<sup>1316</sup> For early history of the Church Mail Bag School, see Bush Notes, January 1924, and November 1928, and Brisbane Year Book, 1929, p.186

<sup>1317</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1929, p.186.

<sup>1318</sup> Northern Churchman, August 1930.

more coherent approach to the whole problem of relating young people to the life of the church and of teaching them the Christian faith. So far, it was hopeful for the future, rather than obviously successful for the present.

In the 1920's much more use was made of corporate gatherings for spiritual or intellectual refreshment or instruction. It had long been realised that a profound impact could be made on people by taking them away from their normal environment for camps, summer schools and retreats, but it was only during this decade that the practice was widely developed in Queensland. The Anglican Church Mission had employed this method before the war with their camps for newsboys, and after the war the Charleville Bush Brotherhood took up the idea with the first of their annual summer camps for bush children in 1924 under the control of the Reverends Christopher Leeke and H.C. Cohen.<sup>1319</sup> During the twenties quiet afternoons at Bishopsbourne became a regular Lenten fixture for large numbers of altar servers, and retreats for women were also being held under the sponsorship of the Society of the Sacred Advent.<sup>1320</sup> About the same time the first annual Clergy Summer School was held in 1926, under the chairmanship of Dean Batty, and with the Reverend J.T. Perry as secretary. Under the guidance of the latter this annual summer school was to become an important regular occasion for the stimulation of the intellectual life of the clergy.<sup>1321</sup> By this period the annual clergy retreats were also being better attended, and at least in North Queensland under Bishop Feetham attendance was regarded as virtually obligatory upon every priest.

The value of these corporate gatherings of clergy and laity went far beyond the impact of the addresses that were delivered or discussions that took place. They helped broaden the sense of fellowship among members of the church, and often led to a deeper spirit of commitment to God and His church among those who attended. Thus there was nourished a core of more committed and educated church people than had existed in earlier generations of the church in Queensland.

One other aspect of this corporate spirituality was the foundation of a new religious order for women. Father Robert Bates, rector of the avowedly Anglo-Catholic parish of All Saints', Wickham Terrace, visited England in 1929, and having made a study of the Society of St. Francis resolved to found an order for women along Franciscan lines. The new community, known as the Daughters of S. Clare, came into existence in Brisbane on 29 April 1930, with a membership of three sisters and one novice, all of whom were Englishwomen and who, with one exception, were quite new to Australia. The order never really flourished, however, and apart from the initial members only two sisters were professed (in 1935), and the community never consisted of more than three professed sisters at any one time. Prayer was to be its chief concern, but the smallness of its membership and the extent of its active works in caring for the aged, assisting in parish work and making altar bread created constant pressures upon the successful maintenance of the community's ideal. The order was too dependent on the forceful personality and guidance of its founder, and this was an insufficient basis for the growth of a really stable community.<sup>1322</sup>

One particular occasion when the teaching of the faith received a practical stimulus was the visit of the Hickson Spiritual Healing Mission in June 1923. Few incidents have made so profound an immediate impact upon the spirit of church life in Queensland as the brief mission of this layman, J.M. Hickson. "A big, square-built man, with a strong, rather emotionless face,"<sup>1323</sup> Hickson was no mere faith-healing showman. His work in England, accompanied by prayer and the laying-on of hands, had been carried out in close conjunction with the regular ministry of the church, and he came to Australia under the authorisation of the bishops of those dioceses which he visited. Indeed, the mission was viewed not as an end in itself, but as a means of restoring the practice of spiritual healing to its rightful place in the life of the church.<sup>1324</sup> For some months prior to Hickson's arrival a programme of preparation was undertaken in Brisbane. The archbishop called for weekly services of intercession for the sick and for the mission itself; he requested the clergy to give instruction upon the subject in the state schools; and he pleaded for the deepening of faith in preparation for the mission.<sup>1325</sup> As the mission approached excitement grew, and even before Hickson's arrival some of the clergy reported remarkable results of healing after services of prayer with the laying-on of hands.<sup>1326</sup>

Hickson first conducted healing services in both Townsville and Rockhampton, and then the mission in Brisbane lasted five days, during which time he ministered to more than four thousand patients from all parts of the diocese. The whole

---

<sup>1319</sup> Bush Notes, July 1923.

<sup>1320</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1926.

<sup>1321</sup> Ibid., February 1926.

<sup>1322</sup> For more details of the social work of the Daughter of S. Clare, see below, Chap. 16,i. The three remaining sisters of the community were absorbed, at their own request, into the Society of the Sacred Advent on 20 January 1949 and the community then ceased to exist. Remaining documents of the community are in possession of Sister Clare Elizabeth, S.S.A., who was one of those received into the S.S.A. from the Daughters of S. Clare.

<sup>1323</sup> Brisbane Courier, 19 June 1923.

<sup>1324</sup> See, for example, Archbishop Sharp's anticipations of the Hickson mission, Brisbane Year Book, 1923, p.23.

<sup>1325</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1923.

<sup>1326</sup> Ibid., June 1923.

operation was carefully planned, tickets for admission being provided for the sick, nurses being on hand to help them forward, and bands of intercessors keeping up a chain of prayer in St. John's Cathedral and the nearby All Saints' Church. Other denominations also co-operated in prayer, and many who were not Anglicans were included among the sick who received the laying-on of hands. The archbishop himself participated in all the services, and regarded the whole mission as a very great spiritual experience. After Hickson had laid his hands on the sick, the archbishop and others of the clergy did the same, to give the blessing of the church. After these morning services the missionary, accompanied by the archbishop, spent the afternoons visiting the homes of those who were unable to attend the public services.<sup>1327</sup>

Those who took part in the mission regarded it as a profound spiritual experience. "We have been living for a few days in New Testament times", wrote one correspondent. "Physical results of the Mission may be few or many, but this is certain, nothing but good has been done."<sup>1328</sup> On the purely physical side there were numerous testimonies of cures received as a result of the mission, and others gave witness to great spiritual blessings received through it. Certainly one permanent result was a great quickening of interest in the whole notion of spiritual healing, in Queensland as in other parts of the world, and there was a considerable revival of the New Testament practices of the laying-on of hands and of anointing the sick. The bishops of the Australian church issued a pastoral letter on the subject the following year:

We desire to see increasingly closer co-operation between the spiritual ministry of the Church and the medical profession which is consciously or unconsciously doing part of the healing work of God...

The Christian Healing Mission is passing now into the ministry of healing which it was the aim of the mission to revive. The mission broke through the crust of traditional churchmanship and conventional Christianity, and opened the eyes of the Church at large, and in part of the world also, to something more of the Gospel and the mind of Christ. Now the time has come for the more normal method of healing ministrations to individuals and to little groups in the ordinary course of parochial life.<sup>1329</sup>

The bishops went on further to sanction the laying on of hands and anointing with oil, and urged the need of careful preparation by the stirring up of penitence and faith through prayer.

The Hickson Mission had no particular affiliations so far as churchmanship was concerned, but its outcome undoubtedly gave encouragement to a growing emphasis on sacramentalism in the Anglican Church. The revival, with episcopal encouragement, of the sacrament of Holy Unction, which had largely fallen out of use in the church of England (and had come to be regarded in the Roman Catholic Church as a preparation for death rather than as a sacrament of healing) fostered sacramental thinking; while the emphasis on repentance as a necessary part of preparation for this sacrament helped encouragement the use of sacramental confession in the Church of England.

The 1920's undoubtedly saw a strong upsurge of Anglo-Catholic teaching within the Anglican Church in Queensland. There were various reasons for this. One was that many of the catholic-minded priests who had come out as young bush brothers in the previous two decades had now risen to positions of seniority among the clergy, and their influence was no longer confined to the scattered settlements of the bush. Indeed, two of them were now bishops in Queensland, namely John Feetham in North Queensland and Stephen Davies in Carpentaria. In fact, it was true that all the bishops of the province were personally of Anglo-Catholic outlook, and while for the most part they honestly sought to be fair to all schools of thought in their diocese, they could not in conscience inhibit teaching and modes of worship of which they themselves approved.

In the northern dioceses the incipient Anglo-Catholicism of the previous decade became quite apparent by the twenties. We have already discussed Bishop Feetham's strong catholicism in North Queensland. He always endeavoured to be fair to evangelicals, though he frankly had great difficulty in understanding their point of view: sacramentalism was at the heart of his own approach to religion, and emphasis not only on the Eucharist, but on sacramental confession, became a feature of the teaching of the church in that diocese. By the mid-twenties, the term "Father" was already being used of priests in the North Queensland synod, and before long it appeared in printed documents, such as the diocesan Year Book, as well. Reference to the Eucharist as the Mass was also becoming increasingly common. Yet on the other hand Feetham was adamant against certain practices which he regarded as having no authority in the Church of England, and in 1925 he spoke strongly to his synod of this subject:

It is quite clear that our Church cannot allow a small but self-assertive group of her members to introduce into her system of worship, novelties – such as the extra-liturgical cultus of the Blessed Sacrament – which can claim no authority in our Communion, on the grounds that they are authorised in the Roman Church.<sup>1330</sup>

<sup>1327</sup> Brisbane Courier, 16<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup> June, 1923.

<sup>1328</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1923.

<sup>1329</sup> Ibid., April 1924.

<sup>1330</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1924-5, Bishop's synod address, p.26.

Nevertheless the general tenor of the diocese was, and was generally recognised to be, Anglo-Catholic. Indeed the official organ of the diocese rejoiced in this reputation in 1925, and expressed the hope that the diocese “always will enjoy that reputation and be worthy of a name that most fully expresses what the Church of England stands for.”<sup>1331</sup>

A similar tone of churchmanship generally prevailed in the Diocese of Carpentaria, and the absence of large conservative centres of European population made this a relatively easy development. The native peoples generally took readily to the clear-cut sacramental teaching of the Anglo-Catholics. In Rockhampton diocese the main outline of catholic doctrine had long been emphasised by Bishop Halford and his contemporaries, but the influx of the priest and lay members of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd in 1925 led to a period of more aggressive catholic teaching. The O.G.S. was a society of members living under a rule of life, who were introduced into the diocese by Bishop Crick. They took charge of the cathedral parish, and later of St. Peter’s school and of some other parishes; and the same changes in terminology began to appear as in the north. There were undoubtedly misgivings of the part of many of the laity about these changes, and there were charges that the practices of the members of the oratory were driving people from the church.<sup>1332</sup> The oratory, however, soon ceased to exist as a corporate society in the diocese, and the outcry died down without ever coming to a head.

It was, however, in the larger and more complex Diocese of Brisbane that the tensions resulting from dogmatic Anglo-Catholic teaching became apparent. Archbishop Sharp dearly wanted to avoid party strife, so he chose the path of comprehensiveness, in the hope of reconciling the two schools of thought. After some rumblings around the diocese on doctrinal issues, the gentle archbishop spoke on the subject in his synod charge in 1924:

The truth is that, as I said at my welcome, I do not want this diocese to be labelled either a High Church diocese or a Low Church diocese. It is neither. It is a Church diocese. And if there be some, as I know there are, who reflect sadly that services are in several churches different from what they were thirty or forty years ago, I would ask them to remember that certain changes such as have occurred rather generally in England were bound to come here....Room must be found in our Church and in this diocese of our Church for those who are Anglo-Catholics and for those who would not like to call themselves so. There must be in essentials unity, in non-essentials diversity, in all things charity.<sup>1333</sup>

The archbishop’s conciliatory words could not, however, assuage the mounting tension. Part of the trouble was that Queensland churchmen were being disturbed by press reports of ecclesiastical troubles in England, associated with the Kensitite riots and the bitter controversies about Prayer Book reform, and some of the low churchmen had genuine, if misplaced, fears about a plot radically to change the character of the Church of England. The anxiety found expression in a motion in the 1924 synod moved by the Reverend Samuel Atherton, who became the leading spokesman of the protestant section of the synod. He deplored the spread of Anglo-Catholic practices, and took as the particular point of attack the erection of a large crucifix in the grounds of St. Francis College at Nundah. Behind the motion lay the fear that it was the provincial theological college that was largely responsible for these trends of churchmanship.

At this synod a compromise motion prevented the issue from coming to a head, but the matter was only submerged, not really disposed of; and throughout the decade party strife was to recur in one form or another in a more bitter and prolonged form than the church had previously known in Queensland. The points of attack varied, but the underlying purpose was the same. The parish of All Saints, Brisbane and the new parish of St. Alban’s, Auchanflower, were the centres of the most bitter complaints.<sup>1334</sup> The formation, under Atherton’s leadership, of a Church of England Defence Association, which set about collecting information about supposedly illegal practices, and endeavoured to stir up feeling throughout the diocese, brought the bitter spirit to a head by 1928, a time when overseas tension was at its height over the rejection by the British parliament of the revised Prayer Book.

The threat thus presented to the unity and effectiveness of the church greatly disturbed senior churchmen in Brisbane, and in 1928 a pamphlet was issued over the signatures of Dean Batty, Archdeacon Glover, the rural deans and several leading laymen of the diocese, calling for a new spirit of tolerance among both parties.<sup>1335</sup> While clearly appreciating the catholic heritage of the Church of England, the writers of the pamphlet emphasised the value of both the catholic and evangelical traditions and urged both parties to avoid such language and extreme opinions as would foster and embitter the present controversy. They expressed the hope that the anticipated constitution for the Australian church would make possible a clear basis for lawful authority which was at present lacking. Such a hope, however, could scarcely placate the low churchmen, who, as we shall see, were inclined to regard the constitutional proposals themselves as evidence of Anglo-

<sup>1331</sup> Northern Churchman, June 1925.

<sup>1332</sup> See for example, the cathedral notes in Church Gazette, August 1927.

<sup>1333</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1924, Archbishop’s address, p.23.

<sup>1334</sup> See, for example, Archbishop Sharp’s answers to the Reverend Samuel Atherton’s questions, Brisbane Year Book, 1925, p.43.

<sup>1335</sup> Entitled, Notes of the Present Controversy in the Church.

Catholic designs to seize control of the whole church. It was a well-meaning pamphlet, but it failed to satisfy the extremists on either side, and the Church of England Defence Association continued to extend its activities.

Finally even the archbishop, who had striven to avoid condemning either party, found himself moved to speak strongly against the activities of the C.E.D.A. Objecting to its policy that members go to church services to collect information and that meetings be held in parishes without the consent of the parish priests, the archbishop went on openly to defend the loyalty of the Anglo-Catholics:

I repudiate the insinuation that they are guilty of illegal practices; and those who seemed to be aimed at by these statements, far from being intruders, are loyal, faithful, hard-working Clergymen of the Church, who work with excellent results as regards Churches well filled with reverent congregations and large numbers of communicants. I entirely repudiate the suggestion that they are a disloyal set of men who ought to be driven out of the Church. As they cannot well stand up for themselves, I stand up for them whole-heartedly.<sup>1336</sup>

In this fashion the archbishop clearly aligned himself against those who sought to eliminate the Anglo-Catholics, and the diocesan council shortly afterwards supported the archbishop by refusing permission to the C.E.D.A. to use the title "Church of England" under the provisions of the Church Institutions Canon.<sup>1337</sup> With this firm stand, and the turning of attention to other matters with the onset of the depression, the doctrinal issue began to fade into the background. It was not yet settled, however, and was to rise again in later years.

Why did these differences arise in the 1920's? They were a new and obvious manifestation of the tensions that had existed in the Church of England since the Oxford movement had begun to make its revolutionary impact upon the church. The influence of that movement had grown unevenly and sporadically and always in the face of opposition. Sometimes it was the opposition of blind conservatism, sometimes it was the result of a genuine fear that the Church of England was being romanised.

The fact was that there was a large section of the laity whom the more advanced clergy had not succeeded in carrying with them in their effort to foster an appreciation of the catholic heritage of the Anglican Church. Often changes had been made in the external forms of worship without the rank and file of church membership genuinely understanding or accepting the changes, and there were sometimes drastic alterations in ceremonial matters within individual parishes which left many of the laity confused and disturbed. The catholic revival had gained much ground, but not as much as some of the clergy imagined; and with some of the members of the church protestant prejudices die hard. It only needed a bishop who was not a strong disciplinarian for the underlying differences to come to the fore. The Queensland dioceses for the most part had had strong leadership since the nineteenth century, and North Queensland under Bishop Feetham and Carpentaria under Bishop Davies still had it. But the milder leadership in the south allowed the old tensions to come again to the surface. Again, new hopes for the spread of the faith were being beset by doubts and prejudices inherited from the past.

#### **iv. The Legal Nexus**

The post-war years saw a revival of interest in the question of autonomy for the Australian church. This was natural enough. The war effort and Australia's newly won status as a member of the League of Nations had fostered the consciousness of Australian nationalism; the complex legal situation revealed by the opinions of the lawyers in the previous decade clearly had to be considered once the war was over,<sup>1338</sup> and the troubles over proposed Prayer Book revision in England showed up the existing church-state connection in its worst light. With the departure of Archbishop Donaldson the leaders of the movement for autonomy were no longer to be found in Queensland, and the Right Reverend G.M. Long, Bishop of Bathurst, assumed Donaldson's mantle. Nevertheless, the attitude of the dioceses of the Province of Queensland continued to be influential, particularly in view of their unusual unanimity of approach; men like Canon (later Dean and Bishop) F. de Witt Batty and Sir Lytton Groom were well to the fore in the search for a new constitutional status for the Australian church. This is not the place to discuss the movement as a whole; but it is relevant to consider the line taken by the dioceses of Queensland.

The constitutional question was revived on an optimistic note. At the general synod of 1921, not only did Archbishop Donaldson make a powerful last plea for autonomy before leaving Australia, but the primate, Archbishop J.C. Wright, gave support to the principle of an Australian church constitution.<sup>1339</sup> This was a significant advance. It was the first time that an Archbishop of Sydney had officially approved the idea, and as the Diocese of Sydney was traditionally the chief stumbling block, his change of heart was naturally regarded as a major turning point. The primate, however, significantly reserved his right to disagree with certain details of the proposals that were being made. These proposals were embodied in a report by

<sup>1336</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1928.

<sup>1337</sup> Ibid., January 1929.

<sup>1338</sup> See above, Chap. 13,i.

<sup>1339</sup> Proceedings of General Synod, 1921, p.44.



a committee that had been set up by the general synod of 1916.<sup>1340</sup> The majority of the committee recommended that the legal status of the Australian church being unsatisfactory, steps should be taken to do away with the existing anomalies. To achieve this end alternative methods were possible: either to construct an entirely new constitution with revised standards and formularies of faith and order, or to amend the existing diocesan constitutions by parliamentary legislation in the commonwealth and state parliaments so as to re-adopt the existing standards while at the same time making provision under careful safeguard for future alterations. It was the latter piecemeal method that the committee inclined to recommend.

The proposals were cumbersome and conservative, but they aroused little opposition in the synods of the northern dioceses of Queensland. The same was not true in Brisbane. A committee set up by synod in 1922 to consider the question of autonomy was sharply divided in opinion, and in 1923 Canon Batty's motion for the adoption of the 1921 proposals was followed by a sharp and lengthy debate resulting in eventual defeat on a vote by orders. The archbishop supported the proposals for autonomy; the clergy gave their assent by the relatively close vote of 52 to 40; but there was overwhelming lay opposition to the tune of 91 to 35.<sup>1341</sup> While voting was not simply along partisan lines, there was undoubtedly a strong fear among the opponents of the autonomy proposals that the established standards of faith and worship of the church were in danger, and the opposition was closely related to the bitterness over doctrinal issues which characterised the diocese during this decade. There was, however, also a notable blindness on the part of the opponents of autonomy to the reality of developing Australian nationhood. One of their arguments was that the church in Australia was not a national church in the sense of Article 34 in the Thirty-nine Articles, because Australia was not a separate nation.<sup>1342</sup> In this argument the lay majority showed themselves far less alert than the clergy to the trend of Australian history. The rejection of the 1921 proposals by the synods of Sydney and Tasmania, as well as Brisbane, put an end to the plan for the present, and it was resolved that an entirely new approach would need to be made at a constitutional convention which was summoned to meet before the general synod of 1926.

A new draft constitution was adopted by the general synod of 1926 as recommended by this constitutional convention, and the draft came before the various diocesan synods for approval the following year. Feelings still ran high, and the same old fears continued to dog the debate. Again the approval of the northern dioceses was fairly certain, but doctrinal tensions in Brisbane continued to make the issue doubtful in that diocese. Brisbane's affirmative decision was vital if progress were to be made, because the opposition of one of the metropolitan sees must inevitably kill the constitution. It was wisely decided to commit the motion for acceptance of the constitution to Sir Lyttleton Groom, whose patriotic sentiments and moderate churchmanship were unquestioned, and who, as an elder statesman of the nation, was highly regarded by the laity. Groom dealt with the question of Australian nationality:

Since the movement was first started the cry was 'How can we have a national Church in Australia when we are not a nation?' But Australia is now a nation, a member of the Commonwealth of Nations, recognized as a nation by the League of Nations. The Church as a rule has not led the nation; now we are asking that it shall go side by side with the nation.<sup>1343</sup>

Bishop Le Fanu in seconding the motion dealt with the other major issue: "The Constitution is in no sense a party affair, a sort of High Church conspiracy".<sup>1344</sup> Through these powerful speeches the doubts of the laity were dissolved, and with only five dissenting votes the approval of synod was given to the draft constitution. It was a notable triumph, for it marked the conversion of the lay members of the Brisbane synod to the view which their clerical colleagues had been urging for twenty years past. In a short time twenty of the Australian dioceses had accepted the draft, and it seemed that at last the constitutional question had been settled.

Such anticipations, however, were premature. The synod of the Diocese of Sydney, with its strong protestant susceptibilities, refused to accept the draft as it stood, and inserted a number of qualifying clauses to protect the Sydney viewpoint. The most significant of these rejected the right of appeal from the Sydney diocesan tribunal to the supreme tribunal which was contemplated by the draft constitution.<sup>1345</sup> There was an angry reaction from other dioceses, not least those of Queensland. The synod of North Queensland went so far as to accept a motion of the Reverend G.G. O'Keefe, protesting that Sydney's action implied a threat to the unity of the Australian church.<sup>1346</sup> Nevertheless the Queensland dioceses – except Carpentaria whose bishop was away at the time – grudgingly agreed to accept the Sydney demands

<sup>1340</sup> See Document X, Giles, R.A., The Constitutional History of the Australian Church, pp.301-307.

<sup>1341</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1923, p.38.

<sup>1342</sup> Ibid., p.65.

<sup>1343</sup> Quoted in F. de Witt Batty's essay, "The Church Constitutional Question" in Groom, Jessie (Ed.) Nation Building in Australia, p.220

<sup>1344</sup> Proceedings of Special Session of Brisbane Synod, 1927, p.27.

<sup>1345</sup> Giles, R.A., Op.Cit., p. 193.

<sup>1346</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1927-8, p.33.

because they recognised that unless they did so the whole constitutional movement must collapse. It was, however, with grave misgivings that they did so, and without unanimity.

A further setback followed almost immediately. Bishop Long, the leader of the autonomy movement, now discovered a flaw in the draft constitution: it appeared that the only way of dealing with any protests about future revisions of the Prayer Book would be by means of litigation in the civil courts, a course which was exactly what the constitution was intended to avoid. The bishops agreed on a way out of this impasse, but Sydney was reluctant to consent. By 1929 it was clear that negotiations had broken down. Speaking of the special clauses demanded by Sydney, Archbishop Sharp told the Brisbane synod, "I for one would not attempt again to press them upon you, and I do not think I should succeed if I did",<sup>1347</sup> while in the north Bishop Feetham spoke more outspokenly about "the reactionary character of the Sydney Synod".<sup>1348</sup> The result was that the Queensland dioceses which had accepted the Sydney conditions the previous year now withdrew their acceptance, and returned to the earlier position of accepting only the 1926 draft constitution itself. Deadlock had been reached; and the death of Bishop Long in 1930 appeared to mark the end of any hopes of settlement.

Although the fears of Sydney for the maintenance of their own quite distinctive position as an extreme evangelical diocese may be understood and appreciated, there can be no doubt that the stand adopted by the Queensland dioceses was entirely justified. From the time of Bishop Webber Queensland church leaders had consistently taken the position that if a constitution for the Australian church were to be workable it must give a real measure of power to the general synod and that individual dioceses must be prepared to deny themselves a measure of autonomy. Otherwise decisive action would never be possible, and the general synod would continue to be the same ineffectual forum for idle talk that it had been since its foundation. The leaders of the church in Queensland dearly wanted a constitution: but not at the price that Sydney was asking. Fresh proposals were soon to be made; but by the end of the twenties the constitution question, which had opened so hopefully in 1921, seemed to be despairing of solution. In this sphere, too, the aspirations of the early post-war years were being submerged in old doubts.

#### v. Christian Unity.

In the generation before the Great War there had been a marked increase of interest in the theological issues involved in Christian unity. This was a necessary preliminary to any concrete movement towards re-union, but the settled and somewhat complacent spirit of the pre-war years had hardly been conducive to anything further than academic discussion. After the war there was a noticeable change of mood. The war itself had helped break down the old acceptance of a hard-and-fast ordering of society. It was a period of re-appraisal in many directions, and not least, in the matter of Christian disunity which so clearly contravened the intention of Christ and weakened the Christian witness in the world. Particularly in the face of rising neo-pagan forces whose birth in Europe had been noted by Archbishop Donaldson and others, the practical urgency of Christian unity became very apparent.

In the light of this situation it was not surprising that one of the main topics for discussion at the Lambeth Conference of 1920 was that of Christian unity. The crux of the problem now seemed to lie in the question of the nature of the church, as crystallised in the specific question of how a valid ministry of the church was rightly commissioned. This was a crucial issue between the Anglican and Roman churches on the one hand, and the Anglican and Protestant churches on the other; for the Church of Rome had declared Anglican ordinations invalid, while the Anglican attitude to the non-episcopal churches was that, lacking bishops, they could not possess a fully valid ministry of the Catholic Church. This was a dilemma which seemed insoluble apart from the method of mass re-ordinations, which would be submitted to neither by the Church of England in relation to Rome nor by the non-episcopal churches in relation to the Church of England. Such re-ordination would inevitably imply that the ministrations of the respective churches thus far had been invalid.

It was to break this impasse that the Lambeth Conference of 1920 made a radical proposal:

... if the authorities of other Communions should so desire, we are persuaded that, terms of union having been otherwise satisfactorily adjusted, Bishops and clergy of our Communion would willingly accept from these authorities a form of commission or recognition which would commend our ministry to their congregations, as having its place in the one family life. It is not in our power to know how far this suggestion may be acceptable to those to whom we offer it. We can only say that we offer it in all sincerity as a token of our longing that all ministries of grace, theirs and ours, shall be available for the service of Our Lord in a united Church.

It is our hope that the same motive would lead ministers who have not received it to accept a commission though Episcopal ordination, as obtaining for them a ministry throughout the whole fellowship.<sup>1349</sup>

<sup>1347</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1929, Archbishop's address, p.18.

<sup>1348</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1928-9, Bishop's address, p.7.

<sup>1349</sup> Quoted in Bell, G.K.A. Randall Davidson, II p.1256.

The purpose of this proposal was to secure the unification of the ministries of the various churches without passing judgment on their former validity. It was made chiefly as a possible means of rapprochement between the Church of England and the non-episcopal churches, but in principle there was no reason why the same method could not be used in relation to the Roman Catholic Church, and it was this possibility that provided the opening for the abortive Malines conversations in Belgium in the 1920's.<sup>1350</sup> Nevertheless it was clearly in the protestant direction that the initial hopes of reunion lay.

In Queensland, as elsewhere, the Lambeth Appeal led to a brief period of optimistic discussions between Anglican and Protestant representatives. Within a year of the Lambeth Conference, informal conversations had taken place in Brisbane, Rockhampton and Townsville, and Archbishop Donaldson urged more formal discussions at the national level.<sup>1351</sup> In the meantime the archbishop advocated the interchange of pulpits, and increased co-operation among the churches in social work. The latter suggestion aroused little opposition, because no theological issues were involved, but little was done about the former; and indeed the next archbishop, Dr. Sharp, openly opposed the interchange of pulpits, which he regarded as an unwise attempt to reach reunion by a short-cut.<sup>1352</sup> A local branch of the Faith and Order movement was established to discuss the theological issues involved in reunion, and there were occasional joint activities on the parish level such as a simultaneous mission by the various churches in the Lutwyche district in 1922.<sup>1353</sup> It was not long, however, before the discussions were bogged down in disagreement. The failure of a national conference at Cronulla in May 1923, when the Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists took a stand against the Lambeth proposal for mutual commissioning, marked the end of the early optimistic hope that at last a way to reunion had been found.<sup>1354</sup>

It was significant that this period of revival of interest in practical measures towards Christian unity coincided with the advance of Anglo-Catholicism within the Anglican Church in Queensland. Some among the Anglo-Catholics were very suspicious of any reunion proposals which might tend to ally the Church of England more nearly with the protestant world and widen the rift with the Church of Rome. On the other hand, well known, catholic-minded leaders like Archbishop Sharp, Bishop Feetham and Farnham Maynard showed definite sympathy with the ecumenical trend. Bishop Feetham, for example envisioned a future pattern of Christendom in which the various Christian bodies would retain their own forms of organisation and worship but would be in full communion with each other, and would be unified around a bishop and a regional or provincial synod.<sup>1355</sup> Later he was to view with approval the "large-hearted and courageous" scheme for reunion in South India, the wisdom of which was doubted by many of his Anglo-Catholic colleagues.<sup>1356</sup>

What was important in all this was that in Queensland the Anglican leaders of the movement for unity were of strong catholic convictions, and while earnestly desiring unity they insisted that it must not be at the cost of catholic principles. This was in contrast to the situation common in the southern states where the Anglican supporters of reunion were frequently more "liberal" in outlook and were consequently rather more ready to take expedient short-cuts towards unity. The prevailing attitude in Queensland was that such methods would provide a unity that would be superficial and impermanent, and that the Church of England would only make its true contribution to the cause of unity by bringing the fullness of its catholic heritage into the unified church. The church in Queensland thus provided something of a distinctive flavour in the ecumenical movement in Australia.

As reunion discussions broke down on the stumbling block of episcopacy, so interest in the question waned and by the mid-twenties the early optimism had largely faded. Nevertheless, though no decisive immediate result was achieved, there remained a heritage of friendly personal relationships among the leaders of the various Christian communions in Queensland. This was fostered in no small measure by Archbishop Sharp's personal charity and humility. It was he, for example, in the industrial turmoil of 1928, who invited the Roman Catholic archbishop, Dr. James Duhig, and the leaders of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist and Baptist Churches to confer with him at Bishopsbourne; and as a result a joint manifesto was issued on the question of industrial peace.<sup>1357</sup>

The personal friendly relationship between the Anglican and Roman Catholic archbishops was in itself one of the distinctive marks of church life in Queensland, and this was in contrast to the situation in the southern states. Largely it was a personal matter, but it was not without doctrinal overtones. Among the catholic-minded Anglican Archbishops of Brisbane from Sharp onwards, there was an appreciation of some aspects of Roman Catholicism that was not shared by their more

<sup>1350</sup> For detailed discussion, see Rayner, K., "Rome and Canterbury: Two Attempts at Rapprochement", *Australian Church Quarterly*, January 1960, pp.3-24.

<sup>1351</sup> *Provincial Synod Proceedings*, 1921, p.8.

<sup>1352</sup> *Brisbane Year Book*, 1922, Archbishop's synod address, p.21.

<sup>1353</sup> *Church Chronicle*, November 1922.

<sup>1354</sup> *Brisbane Year Book*, 1923, Archbishop's synod address, p.21.

<sup>1355</sup> *N.Q. Year Book*, 1920-1, p.37.

<sup>1356</sup> *Ibid.*, 1929-31, p.10.

<sup>1357</sup> *Church Chronicle*, April 1928.

evangelical episcopal brethren in the south. At the same time there was a large-heartedness about Dr. Duhig which made it possible for him to enter into friendly relations even with those from whom doctrinally he was separated. While this did not mean that there were real prospects of unity with the Church of Rome, it did at least help allay sectarian bitterness and make possible a degree of co-operation with the Roman Catholic Church on practical social questions.

On the parochial level there were on the other hand pin-pricks which had a disturbing effect on relations between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. The chief of these was the vexed issue of mixed marriages, in which the exclusive and unbending Roman Catholic attitude formed a constant source of annoyance even to sympathetically disposed Anglicans. After many years of silence Bishop Feetham was at last moved to speak publicly on this subject in 1934. After advising against mixed marriages, he went on to argue that if they took place and only one of the parties actively practised his or her religion the children should be brought up in that faith. In the more difficult case where both parties practised their religion, he urged that they take refuge in the Church of England, because of the impossible conditions imposed by the Church of Rome on a conscientious Anglican. His deep feelings on the whole subject were revealed in his words to synod.

I have said nothing else, and shall say nothing else, in criticism of the Roman form of Christianity. It is accomplishing a very noble work in the world. I have the deepest respect for good Romans and I do not want to hurt their feelings, but in this matter where the happiness of some of the homes of my own people is so seriously concerned I am obliged to speak plainly.<sup>1358</sup>

Unfortunately in this kind of practical matter much of the good done by friendly relationships on a higher level was undone.

By the end of the twenties it was impossible to point to any very definite headway in Christian reunion, despite the hopes of the early years of the decade. In this respect, too, the hopeful efforts of the early post-war years appeared to have proved abortive. Yet even so, there was a foundation laid of a real concern for unity and of closer personal relationships among Christian leaders that could pave the way for later progress. This was itself a definite advance on the scarcely veiled antipathies and sectarianism of the previous century.

#### **vi. The Aboriginal Missions**

The post-war years saw an increased concern among Anglicans for missionary work in general, and in particular there was an extension of the aboriginal missions that had commenced before the war. There was, however, little that was fundamentally new in policies or methods. Aboriginal missions still presented something of the aspect of nineteenth century philanthropy to a backward race, and there was relatively little evidence of clear and positive thinking about the future of the aborigines. During the 1920's the bishops laid considerable stress on missionary giving as an index to the reality of the spiritual life of their dioceses. Time and again Bishop Feetham's monthly letters in the Northern Churchman developed this theme, and when on one occasion North Queensland's contribution fell far short of the diocesan quota for the Australian Board of Missions the bishop strongly rebuked his synod and commented that "our sincerity is gravely open to question".<sup>1359</sup> Actually in the early twenties a crisis occurred in missionary administration in Australia due to the combined pressures of increased commitments to missionary work and the effect of inflation in the Australian economy. By 1922 the A.B.M. was some £15,000 in debt, and although the debt had been halved by 1925 the archbishops were forced to issue an urgent call to the church to step up contributions if serious retrenchments were to be avoided.<sup>1360</sup> Gradually, however, the pleas of the bishops, combined with the missionary campaign known as the World Call to the Church,<sup>1361</sup> aroused a more satisfactory response. By 1929 missionary giving had reached record figures in Queensland, and further missionary expansion seemed assured.<sup>1362</sup> Unfortunately, however, this encouraging improvement was no sooner achieved than the great depression began to exert its strangulating influence upon missionary work as on all other aspects of the national economy.

It was in the Diocese of Carpentaria, under the firm but fatherly leadership of Bishop Stephen Davies, that the chief missionary expansion within Queensland itself was occurring. At Mitchell River the work that had been begun long before the war continued, and in 1917 a more favourable site for this mission was established by the lay superintendent, J.W. Chapman. Chapman was a remarkable figure, who devoted the major part of his life to the aborigines of the Gulf country. An intensely practical man, of simple and unpretentious Christian faith, he had gone to Mitchell River in 1914 at a time when the aborigines were still entirely primitive, without any form of agricultural pursuits, and no dwelling places except the

<sup>1358</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1933-4, p.31.

<sup>1359</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1925-6, p.29

<sup>1360</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1925.

<sup>1361</sup> The World Call to the Church was a manifesto in the form of six reports published in England, setting out the urgency of the missionary task facing the Anglican Communion. In Queensland the A.B.M., and the C.M.S. co-operated to put this call before church people.

<sup>1362</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1929, p.22; N.Q. Year Book, 1928-9, p.18

crudest gunyahs. Progress was inevitably gradual, and the stated policy of introducing the aborigines to agricultural and pastoral pursuits was only slow of attainment.<sup>1363</sup> A beginning was made, however, with a small cattle industry which it was hoped would eventually make the mission self-supporting and provide useful work for the aborigines; but the inability to secure an experienced and adequately trained staff was a constant difficulty.

In view of the practical difficulties in the way of developing industries through which the aborigines could learn to support themselves there was a constant temptation to make “hand-outs” so easy that any sense of independence and initiative among the native people would be stifled. As early as 1922 Bishop Davies warned his staff against this danger.<sup>1364</sup> Some years later, reviewing the unsatisfactory position at Mitchell River Mission, the bishop reverted to this criticism of earlier policy:

It is probable that this is mostly due to the policy originally adopted whereby many adults and youths were entirely maintained by the Mission, thereby destroying in these persons all initiative and independence of character...One fears it will take many years to develop the spirit of self-help.<sup>1365</sup>

With improved administrative policies, better medial attention, and Chapman’s dogged leadership, however, Mitchell River made gradual progress, and by 1928 there were some six hundred aborigines on the reserve, of whom about a third were living a settled life.<sup>1366</sup>

Meanwhile other aboriginal missions were being commenced. The C.M.S. missions in Carpentaria, at Groote Eylandt and Oenpelli, being in the Northern Territory part of the diocese, do not concern us here. But on the Queensland side of the gulf there was a new venture at Lockhart River, and the church was also involved in the new government settlement at Cowal Creek. Lockhart River was approved by the Queensland government as an aboriginal reserve in 1924,<sup>1367</sup> and the Reverend H.R. Rowan was appointed first superintendent. It was a difficult enterprise, because the aborigines concerned were in a particularly degraded state and belonged to five distinct tribes which had a tradition of strong inter-tribal rivalries. They were riddled with diseases, notably tuberculosis and venereal diseases, and the nomadic adults proved very difficult to influence. As a result it was found best to concentrate on the children.<sup>1368</sup> By 1932, however, there were some three hundred people on the mission, and forty-five candidates were confirmed at the first confirmation held that year.<sup>1369</sup>

The government mission at Cowal Creek was situated much further north, towards the tip of Cape York Peninsula, and it embraced only about 150 aborigines. Although it was a government station the Church of England was responsible for the religious life of the settlement, and the hard-pressed Diocese of Carpentaria had to try to provide from its own resources some spiritual ministrations.

Owing to the shortage of white staff and the smallness of the population at Cowal Creek it was impossible to send a European priest, but in 1929 a Torres Strait Island deacon, the Reverend Francis Bowie, was sent there. By 1931 a third of the population were confirmed.<sup>1370</sup>

Meanwhile in the Diocese of North Queensland, Yarrabah, the oldest of the aboriginal missions continued on its way, with periods of optimism interspersed with occasional crises. The problems at Yarrabah were somewhat different from those of the Gulf missions: the native people were considerably more advanced, and their close proximity to Cairns meant that they were much more constantly in touch with European civilisation. The nature of the country made productive industries problematical and the church never had enough finance available to undertake capital works on the scale necessary for real material advancement. Besides, there was the perpetual problem of staffing: there was a constant flux in the staff of the mission, and all too often enthusiastic amateurs, who were often subject to ready disillusionment, were forced to do the kind of work that demanded long and rigorous training.<sup>1371</sup> Nevertheless credit must be given where it is due: and the fact is that if these Christian volunteers had not done this work among the aborigines – often at considerable personal sacrifice – no one else would have bothered.

There were, of course, aborigines in the northern part of the state particularly who were not embraced by either the church or government mission stations. The North Queensland synod set up a committee which reported in 1926 on the spiritual and material condition of these people. They found that there were some 3,500 aborigines in northern Queensland altogether, and that those working on the cattle stations were fairly well cared for, but that those living on the outskirts of

<sup>1363</sup> Carpentarian, July 1921.

<sup>1364</sup> Carpentaria Diocesan Diary., 12 May 1922.

<sup>1365</sup> Bishop’s synod address, Carpentarian, July 1931.

<sup>1366</sup> Ibid., July 1928 and May 1930.

<sup>1367</sup> Carpentaria Diocesan Diary, 4 June 1924.

<sup>1368</sup> Tennant, K., Speak You So Gently, p.26ff.

<sup>1369</sup> Carpentarian, October 1932.

<sup>1370</sup> Ibid., October, 1931.

<sup>1371</sup> See Bishop Feetham’s comments on Yarrabah’s “ups and downs”, N.Q. Year Book Year Book., 1934-5, p.30.

towns were frequently in deplorable conditions, in poor housing, with little education, either secular or religious, and frequently an easy prey to cheap drink.<sup>1372</sup> This committee advocated the extension of the system of reserves, and urged that the whole of Cape York Peninsula be made into an aboriginal reserve. Attention was also drawn to the need for the church to make more effective provision for the spiritual well-being of the increasing number of aborigines on the government station at Palm Island.<sup>1373</sup> There was concern in the church about aboriginal conditions; but neither in the church nor in the community at large was there much evidence of a thoroughgoing attempt to tackle the aboriginal problem with the full-scale planning and resources that alone could meet the need.

While aboriginal missions were slowly growing it was still the work among the islanders in the Torres Strait that was the most attractive and fruitful part of missionary work in the north. Under the superintendency successively of the Reverend J.J. Done and the Reverend W.H. MacFarlane, the slowly increasing group of native priests and deacons, who were stationed on the larger islands, brought a more regular ministry of the church to the islanders.<sup>1374</sup> On these islands there was friendly co-operation between church and state. The government provided for the costs of education and supplied the salaries of teachers, but these worked in close contact with the mission authorities. In 1920 two islands – Boigu and Dauan – were too small for government schools, so the church opened schools there under the charge of native deacons assisted by native teachers. As these became firmly rooted, they were handed over by the Church to the government, to be operated along the same lines as the schools on the other islands.<sup>1375</sup> The growth of a more mature church life was demonstrated by the rise of such organisations as the Mothers' Union, of which by 1928 there were six native branches, the biggest on Badu having more than fifty members.<sup>1376</sup>

If not spectacular, missionary progress in the twenties was at least steady, and promised well for the future. Unfortunately like everything else, it was to fall under the shadow of the financial crisis that lay ahead. We must now turn to consider how the high hopes and the achievements of the 1920's were to be placed in jeopardy by the depression and its aftermath.

---

<sup>1372</sup> *Ibid*, 1925-6, p.48.

<sup>1373</sup> In 1930 the Reverend Ernest Gribble, the Yarrabah pioneer, returned to North Queensland to work at Palm Island, where he continued as chaplain until 1957, in which year he was awarded the O.B.E. for his work. The last few months of his life he spent at Yarrabah, where he died in 1957. See Rowland, E.C., *The Tropics for Christ*, pp.102-104.

<sup>1374</sup> For reminiscences, see *Anglican*, 18 October 1957.

<sup>1375</sup> *Carpentarian*, July 1920 and October 1930.

<sup>1376</sup> *Carpentaria Year Book*, 1927-8.

## **CHAPTER 16: THE YEARS OF CRISIS**

### **i. Depression and its Consequences.**

If the early hopes of the post-war years grew less rosy as the twenties progressed, their total eclipse appeared to come in the financial crisis that shook the economy of Australia and the world a decade after the end of the war. Throughout our history the effect of economics upon the church has been apparent: never was it more so than in the early 1930's, when the organised life of the church appeared to be in danger of strangulation from the economic collapse. Nor was this to be the only crisis of this period, for recovery from depression was rapidly followed by immersion in total war which for the first time in the history of the nation came to the very shores of Australia. The years from 1930 to 1945 might well be termed years of crisis.

It was in the diocese of Rockhampton that financial stringency was first felt. This diocese was already in serious straits before the state of the national economy became critical, for financial over-commitment caused by the injudicious educational ventures of Bishop Crick was aggravated in the late twenties by one of the worst droughts that Central Queensland had ever experienced. The degree of indebtedness of the church continued to increase and was dangerously high in relation to the small resources of the diocese; but to the end of his episcopate Bishop Crick failed to recognise the seriousness of the situation. Indeed, if a normal recovery had followed the drought the position need not have been regarded as desperate; but instead, drought was succeeded by depression, and the church's financial plight grew grim.

The choice of the new bishop to succeed Dr. Crick on his translation to Ballarat in 1927 showed how the laity viewed the situation. The choice fell – mainly on the weight of the lay vote in synod – upon the Reverend Fortescue Leo Ash, at that time Rector of Warwick. Ash was known as a faithful and devoted parish priest and pastor, but above all as a builder and money-raiser. His most notable work had been done at Mackay, where with the support of the great team of laymen whom he built up around him he had made the parish strong and vigorous and had built what was recognised as one of the finest parish churches in the state.<sup>1377</sup> The clergy were not as enthusiastic about his election as the laity, for he had no special reputation as scholar or theologian, as statesman or preacher; but the laity believed he was the right man for the emergency, and in the very contrast to his scholarly predecessor they found those qualities of administrative ability that Bishop Crick had lacked.

It was typical of Bishop Ash that when he finally gave up the reins of his diocese after eighteen years of hard grind to restore its economic stability, it was only to take up another post which involved fund-raising in an even more exacting fashion. For five years he served as commissioner for the A.B.M. centenary appeal, which sought (successfully) to find fifty missionaries and £100,000 for new mission work. Even the years of his retirement were taken up with a succession of various money-gathering enterprises which earned for Ash the reputation of being the most capable fund-raiser in the Australian church. He did not himself hesitate to recognise that this had been his chief contribution to the church. At the end of his episcopate at Rockhampton he told his synod:

If I have been of any value in this Diocese I am inclined to think that it is mainly in the direction of my trying to get it out of debt and so put it in the position where it can make spiritual progress. Debt impedes spiritual progress for to remain in debt without making a good effort to get out of it is just plain dishonesty, and dishonesty is sin. If therefore my successor is in the position as soon as he takes over from me, to enter upon a programme of definite spiritual work, I shall be happy.<sup>1378</sup>

It is only fair to emphasise that with all his concern for money, financial recovery was only for Bishop Ash a means to a higher end, and never an end in itself. Behind this concern lay what his successor called an "intense pastoral zeal and a very personal interest in the lives of the priests and people in the diocese."<sup>1379</sup>

At his first synod in 1928 Bishop Ash squarely faced the diocesan financial situation for the first time. He revealed that the total debt was some £24,500, of which more than £20,000 was debited to the schools.<sup>1380</sup> Seeing this situation as a personal challenge, the bishop took on his own shoulders the bulk of the work of recovery. Within the year following he visited virtually every centre of population in the diocese, as well as a hundred stations. Everywhere he went he appealed persuasively for money. To ensure efficiency in diocesan administration in his own long absences from Rockhampton, he appointed S.T.M. Pierce as diocesan secretary.<sup>1381</sup> The following year, calling Bishop Halford back to administer the diocese in his absence, he set off for the Lambeth Conference; but financial considerations were still uppermost in his mind.

<sup>1377</sup> For a character study of Bishop Ash by Bishop John Feetham, see Feetham, J.O. & Rymer, W.V. (Eds.), North Queensland Jubilee Book, pp.34-5.

<sup>1378</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1946, Bishop's address, p.20.

<sup>1379</sup> Ibid., 1948, Bishop Housden's address, p.11

<sup>1380</sup> Ibid., 1928, p.33.

<sup>1381</sup> Ibid., 1929, p.12.

“The evident extreme financial distress of the diocese makes it quite impossible for me to concentrate upon the deep things of Lambeth”, he wrote back from London, and he spent most of his time in England pursuing funds for the diocese.<sup>1382</sup> It speaks volumes for Ash’s work that in 1929, when the depression was already beginning to make its presence felt, the income of the diocese as a whole was £22,850, compared with only £15,641 in 1926. Yet not even Bishop Ash could turn the tide against the depression, and 1930 saw a drop of some £4,500 in the income of the diocese.<sup>1383</sup> As the depression reached its height, so the financial position of the diocese worsened, and the fall in the price of wool and meat, upon which the economy of central Queensland so largely depended, had a marked effect on the income of the parishes. By 1932 the position was at its worst, and the following year the boys’ school at Barcardine, which continued to lose heavily, was forced to close. However, the economies thus effected, combined with the easing of the depression and the unceasing efforts of the bishop, turned the tide, and although throughout the thirties the pressure of debts at high interest continued to harass the diocese, there was a trend towards slow improvement in diocesan finances.

In the Diocese of Brisbane the crisis did not loom quite so early, but it was all the more disastrous when it came. Until 1930 there was little awareness in church circles of the impending depression, and in a spirit of somewhat rash optimism large amounts were borrowed for building purposes, particularly by the cathedral chapter. As late as 1929-30 the vast sum of £95,000 was invested chiefly in constructing new buildings on the Adelaide Street frontage of the cathedral property in the expectation of receiving a steady income from rents.<sup>1384</sup> Originally this scheme had been expected to cost only about £40,000, but costs mounted frighteningly and the chapter found it necessary to mortgage the whole cathedral property, and every building upon it, with the exception of the cathedral itself.<sup>1385</sup> The result was disastrous. A vast interest bill was incurred, and even apart from the depression it is doubtful if the investment would have yielded a worthwhile income; but the onset of the depression completely crippled the scheme. Rents never came within sight of meeting the interest bill, and the cathedral chapter found itself burdened with a great debt of thousands of pounds a year.

This crisis for the chapter made the outlook critical for the whole diocese. Though it was independent of the control of the diocesan council, the cathedral chapter was responsible for a large segment of diocesan property, and if it became insolvent the economic stability of the diocese as a whole must be threatened. Besides, the chapter was responsible for certain general diocesan expenses, such as the part payment of the archbishop’s stipend and the support of the principal of St. Francis’ College, who was a residentiary canon of the cathedral. At the same time pressure came to bear upon diocesan finances from other directions. In 1929, for example, the diocese was forced to take over the administration of Slade School, Warwick, with its heavy liabilities, because it was falling steadily into heavier debt.<sup>1386</sup> By 1930 it had also become clear that the Clergy Superannuation and Widows’ and Orphans’ Fund was heavily over-committed, and the report of a Sydney actuary showed that its capital assets would need to be augmented by £35,000 if it were to be able to meet the payments liable to be claimed from it.<sup>1387</sup> The same year saw a disturbing decline in the voluntary assessments paid by the parishes for the support of home and foreign missions and theological training, and this portended future difficulties in maintaining these essential activities.<sup>1388</sup>

In the next two years the trickle of financial pressure on the church became a flood. While income from investments and from the general offerings of members of the church declined markedly as a result of unemployment and deflation, interest bills on outstanding debts still had to be met. The pressure was heavy from two directions.

On the one hand the colleges, schools and institutions of the diocese were losing heavily. By 1931 the debt on St. John’s College had reached almost £9,000, and additional income was desperately needed if the college were not to close.<sup>1389</sup> There was an apparently insoluble dilemma: if the college stayed open its debt would increase for some time to come; if it were closed down and disposed of the profits of sale would be insufficient to extinguish the debt, and interest payments would still have to be made on the remaining debt.<sup>1390</sup> To relieve the hard pressed cathedral chapter responsibility for the support of St. Francis’ college was taken from it, but this simply meant that the college debts were charged to another account. By 1933 the principal despairingly reported to synod: “The debt increases year by year, and the breaking-point must be near at hand.”<sup>1391</sup> The plight of some of the schools was just as serious. Financial conditions led to lower

<sup>1382</sup> Rockhampton Church Gazette, November 1930.

<sup>1383</sup> Figures quoted from Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1931, p.13.

<sup>1384</sup> The property itself had been acquired at considerable cost in 1924.

<sup>1385</sup> Minutes, St. John’s Cathedral Chapter, 5 June 1928 and 25 July 1930.

<sup>1386</sup> Slade School Magazine, Special Jubilee Issue, November 1950.

<sup>1387</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1930, Bishop Batty’s synod charge, P.20ff. Batty was now Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane as well as Dean, and presided at synod in the absence of the archbishop at the Lambeth Conference.

<sup>1388</sup> Ibid., 1930, p.158.

<sup>1389</sup> Ibid., 1931, p.38.

<sup>1390</sup> Ibid., 1931, p.189.

<sup>1391</sup> Brisbane Synod Proceedings, 1933, p.55. (Because of the financial situation a Year Book was not published that year).



enrolments, a trend which was accentuated by the reduction in the number of state scholarships available. The situation was further worsened by the effects of an epidemic of poliomyelitis in 1932. The older established church schools were able to hold their heads above water, but the newer and smaller schools appeared to be in a desperate position.

The other major source of financial pressure on the church was the continually mounting indebtedness of the cathedral chapter. By 1931 it was reported that the annual losses on the cathedral properties had reached the staggering figure of £4,676,<sup>1392</sup> and by July of that year the chapter was unable to meet a bill of £3,200 for rates.<sup>1393</sup> Earlier the same year it had been suggested that the diocesan council take over all the liabilities of the chapter, but a joint committee of chapter and council rejected the proposal on the ground that synod was unable to meet its own debts anyway.<sup>1394</sup> The Diocesan synod that year found itself unable to do anything more effective than pass a motion of sympathy with the chapter in its financial crisis and appoint a committee of laymen to help the chapter raise additional funds.

The pressure created by these two sources of increasing indebtedness was aggravated by the decline of general parochial and diocesan income. The situation in the parishes is indicated by the fact that in 1931 eighteen parish priests were in arrears by at least one month in the receipt of their stipends.<sup>1395</sup> The appeal that had been launched in 1930 to raise £50,000 under the title of the Million Shilling Fund had only brought in the miserable amount of £451.<sup>1396</sup> At the same time the sum of almost £10,000 asked for from the parishes by way of voluntary assessments had fallen short by some £3,000.<sup>1397</sup> In the face of this situation there was a manifest atmosphere of gloom at synod, and morale was very low indeed. Even the measures designed to improve the situation were proposed and carried out with only half-hearted determination.

In this serious economic crisis the diocese was sorely hampered by lack of strong and capable financial leaders. Bishop Le Fanu, who had for years past been the reputed financial genius, but whose over-optimistic policies had in part created the present crisis, had gone to Perth as archbishop. Bishop Batty, who had succeeded him as coadjutor bishop, had been translated to Newcastle. The archbishop himself never at home in financial matters, and in any case was ageing and ailing. The diocesan registrar, Gordon E. Gall, a faithful and amiable servant of the diocese, lacked the initiative to meet a situation of such overwhelming complexity.<sup>1398</sup> Nevertheless by the time synod met in 1931 it was beginning to be recognised that ruthless measures would have to be employed if the economy of the diocese were to be salvaged.

One sign of the new awareness was the appointment of a small board to deal with "all matters relating to the purchase, sale, leasing, mortgage, transfer and dealing with real property and interests therein" of the diocese.<sup>1399</sup> This board was the germ of what was to become the extremely influential Property and Finance Board, which introduced a new standard of business-like efficiency in handling the church's financial affairs. In the same year a sub-committee of the diocesan council made a searching examination of the use made of some forty-five trust funds, totalling over £68,000. It appeared that many of these, instead of being safely invested, had been pooled and lent out for a variety of church purposes at varying rates of interest.<sup>1400</sup> This policy had been undertaken in good faith, to save the payment of interest to external lending institutions, but it had enabled some unwise ventures, and threatened in time of depression to cause the collapse of the economy of the church. Another sub-committee was appointed to consider the debts of the diocese. It found that "no serious efforts are made to check the drift...Money has been too freely advanced by the [Diocesan] Council without proper provision being required for a reasonable rate of redemption".<sup>1401</sup> A number of recommendations followed, to assist in the balancing of the budget. No further loans were to be made to parishes, unless regular reductions could be guaranteed; office economies were to be effected at the diocesan registry; certain posts, such as that of Director of Religious Instruction, were to be combined with others so as to effect a saving in salaries; land was to be sold on the Bishopsbourne and St. Francis' College properties; the payment of clerical stipends through the diocesan office was to be reconsidered. Already savings had been effected through the radical measures of not appointing a new coadjutor bishop, and combining the offices of Archdeacon and Dean of Brisbane.

<sup>1392</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1931, p.172.

<sup>1393</sup> Minutes, Cathedral Chapter, 17 July 1931.

<sup>1394</sup> Ibid., 24 March 1931.

<sup>1395</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1931, p.84.

<sup>1396</sup> Ibid., p.175.

<sup>1397</sup> Ibid., p.102.

<sup>1398</sup> Cf. a comment on him after his death by Dean W.E.C. Barrett: "He was of a naturally retiring disposition and this caused him sometimes to be overawed by stronger characters". Church Chronicle, April 1947.

<sup>1399</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1931, p.39.

<sup>1400</sup> Ibid., p.182.

<sup>1401</sup> Ibid., p.183.

All in all, the synod of 1931 was a depressing one. As F.T. Cross wrote about it shortly afterwards: "The Synod of 1931 reflected the conditions of the world without. Plainly financial embarrassment was written across its face."<sup>1402</sup>

The strain on the leaders of the diocese under these conditions was very great, the effects of the financial anxiety being aggravated by the fact that some of them were combining jobs in order to save extra expense. The history of the Reverend H.H. Dixon, who had retired in 1929 after a notable career as founder-headmaster of The Southport School, illustrates the way in which offices had to be combined in order to make the best use of the men and resources available. In 1930 Dixon came out of his retirement to become Archdeacon of Brisbane, while the newly consecrated Bishop Batty remained Dean of the cathedral. With Batty's translation to Newcastle in 1931, Dixon added the deanery to his responsibilities as archdeacon, and in the absence of any assistant bishop performed some of the administrative duties that might normally be attached to that office. Then the archbishop asked Dixon to become his coadjutor bishop, and he was consecrated in March 1932. Although he was already 62 at his consecration, and had ostensibly retired, the new bishop was still extremely vigorous, and in the increasing ill-health of Dr. Sharp his appointment was a source of strength to the diocese. He retained his archdeaconry, but to the position of dean came the much loved W.E.C. Barrett, who quickly demonstrated the spirit of service which he brought to his office by offering to have his stipend reduced to the meagre sum of £350 a year, in order to relieve the cathedral chapter of some of its burden.<sup>1403</sup>

By 1932, however, it was clear that no makeshift measures could get to the root of the church's economic difficulties. A Sydney actuary, H.J. Davys, offered his services free of charge to the diocese to examine the whole position, and at a tense session of the 1932 synod, held in camera, read his long 29-page report to a crowded house. There were some synodsmen who wanted to adopt his drastic recommendations immediately, but wiser counsels prevailed: the matter was referred back to the diocesan council for further consideration and the final decision was deferred for a special session of synod three months later.<sup>1404</sup> The delay was providential: for synod might easily have been stampeded into accepting a remedy so drastic that it might have crippled the diocese for years to come. In brief, Davys' suggestion involved tying up all available securities in the diocese for ninety-nine years at an interest rate of 5 1/4%. This would provide an income sufficient to pay the debts of the diocese, and in addition a sum of £39,000 above immediate requirements, which he proposed should be used to improve the properties controlled by the cathedral chapter, with a view to increasing the income from rents on these buildings in years to come. This, however, would be a long-term benefit, and no immediate improvement could be anticipated.<sup>1405</sup>

As part of his plan, Davys insisted that the cathedral chapter should pass over the control of its properties to the diocesan authorities, in order to avoid the dangers of divided and inefficient management. His memorandum to the cathedral chapter on this subject has the air of an ultimatum:

Doubtless you are aware that you are facing today a grave crisis from which no amount of debating can extricate you. Only in immediate action can a remedy be found.

1. The chapter cannot carry on by reason of its inability to meet its liabilities.
2. The only possible way out for you is to amalgamate your assets with those of the Diocese and have your financial difficulties straightened out by the proposed Diocesan Reconstruction Management Board which I have recommended Synod to carry into effect forthwith.
3. It is the duty of the Chapter to co-operate with the Diocese in straightening out the present difficulties and by so doing avert the danger threatening, as the collapse of the Chapter would involve the Diocese in a similar collapse.
4. Nothing in my Report and Plan of Reconstruction for Diocese and Chapter is detrimental to the Chapter or Diocese but in the contrary is only helpful.
5. If the Chapter refuses its co-operation with the Diocese such an act can only increase the difficulties of the Chapter. Synod must put into immediate execution the plan of reconstruction to save the Diocese, and as Guarantor of the Chapter's overdraft and loans is compelled to protect the Diocese as a whole, regardless of such non-cooperation of the Chapter. Close co-operation by the Chapter with Synod in getting the Plan of Reconstruction carried out only can save both itself and the Diocese.

As in past days the Diocese has stood by the Chapter, so today when the Diocese as a whole is in grave danger, the Chapter should stand shoulder to shoulder with Synod regardless of personal matters and clear the way for renewed

<sup>1402</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1931.

<sup>1403</sup> Minutes, Cathedral Chapter, 6 May 1932.

<sup>1404</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1932.

<sup>1405</sup> For full details of Davys' plan, see Proceedings of Special synod, 27<sup>th</sup> September, 1932. this report was never published.

prosperity. Chapter should remember that to the outside world both Chapter and Diocese are regarded as one: the Creditors look, not to the Chapter, but to the Diocese for their just payments and security.<sup>1406</sup>

This memorandum has been given in full, not only because of the intrinsic interest of its proposal, but because it does reflect the spirit of emergency – almost of impending disaster – which hung over the diocese at the time, and which affected in a marked fashion every aspect of the church's work.

When the special session of synod met in camera in September, 1932, the members agreed with the diocesan council in rejecting the Davys plan. Having the whole assets of the diocese irrevocably mortgaged for ninety-nine years was rightly seen to be too drastic a remedy, even in the existing emergency. Yet Davys' work was by no means wasted, because while his specific solution was rejected, his report so aroused the responsible leaders of the diocese to a realistic assessment of the situation that they were prepared to take thorough-going measures to meet the emergency. As it happened, although they did not realise it at the time, the tide of depression was already turning, and the future held out better prospects than they foresaw. This fact, combined with the new spirit of ruthless application to the crisis, enabled the corner to be turned.

A committee of the diocesan council put forward alternative proposals to Davys' scheme. Their report showed that the combined external debts of the synod, chapter and schools of the diocese amounted to £278,518, to which an additional £43,002 of internal debts of synod had to be added. The annual loss at the time was £4,624 by synod and chapter, and approximately another £2,500 by the schools. The committee set out a number of principles for the immediate financial policy of the diocese: a sinking fund was to be established, for the ultimate extinction of loan indebtedness; loans were to be consolidated as far as possible, with long terms at favourable rates of interest; and trust funds were no longer to be used to finance schools. A number of specific economies were then proposed. The first set of proposals concerned the schools of the diocese. It was suggested that the stronger schools, notable The Southport School and the Church of England Grammar School should lend money to the Toowoomba Preparatory School and the Warwick schools, while Glennie should assist the Glennie Preparatory School. In this was it was hoped to reduce the school losses by £1,800 a year. Each school was to have a school council, over which the archbishop should preside, and of which the registrar of the diocese should be a member.

Economies of staff were also suggested. The office of Director of Religious Instruction was to be combined with that of Warden of St. John's College. The Archdeacon of Toowoomba, the Venerable W.P. Glover, was to move to Brisbane and take charge of a central diocesan fund, including the Home Mission Fund. To save the appointment of additional archdeacons, their work was to be done by the bishop coadjutor and the rural deans (on an honorary basis). The archbishop's stipend was to be reduced by £300 to £1,000, and other reductions were made in the salaries of the bishop coadjutor and office staff. The allowance to the clergy for their children was to be discontinued, as was the payment of clerical stipends through the diocesan office. These suggestions were designed to reduce the annual deficit of the synod and chapter to £1,300, which amount was to be sought in the form of 1,300 subscriptions of one pound each from members of the church.

Meanwhile the cathedral chapter had agreed to vest all its real estate in the Corporation of Synod, and to hand over the financial side of its affairs to a new Property and Finance Board.<sup>1407</sup> This board, henceforth to be the overall economic executive body of the diocese, was set up by a canon of the special synod in September 1932, and consisted of the archbishop, treasurer of synod and four lay members.

The new measures by no means automatically solved the financial problems of the diocese. Indeed, some of the economies proved very difficult to effect, and in some of the funds losses continued to mount. Yet by and large the drift was greatly diminished. Archdeacon W.P. Glover, in his new role as Finance Commissioner, made some headway – though less than was anticipated – in appealing for funds. The new diocesan treasurer, M.S. Herring, who took up the position on the death of J. Allen at the end of 1932, helped bring a greater efficiency to the management of diocesan funds. Most important of all, the gradual improvement in the economy of the country was naturally reflected in an easier outlook for the church. It was a long time before the financial handicaps of the depression were to be eliminated from diocesan affairs, and even longer before its effects on morale were to pass away: but by 1933 there were glimmerings of a more hopeful future lightening the sheer blackness of the year or two before.

In the far north of Queensland the effects of the depression on the church varied. North Queensland was less directly hit by the financial crisis than any other diocese. In part this was due to the different type of economy in the north, which minimised its suffering, but mainly it was due to the fact that the northern diocese had experienced its wave of expansion

<sup>1406</sup> Minutes, Cathedral Chapter, 13 June 1932.

<sup>1407</sup> Minutes, Cathedral Chapter, 24 August 1932 and 23 September 1932. This latter proposal was not in fact carried out owing to the legal costs that would have been involved in the transfer: but in any case the cathedral chapter became a docile servant of the Property and Finance Board.

rather earlier than the southern dioceses, and had not undertaken the big new projects in the late twenties which had become such a source of embarrassment in Brisbane and Rockhampton when the depression struck.

It is noticeable that in North Queensland building continued at quite a steady rate even during the worst depression years. In 1931 it was reported that five new churches had been dedicated in the past two years, including permanent structures at Malanda, Innisfail and Macknade.<sup>1408</sup> In the next two years another five churches were completed, though in this case they were all wooden buildings.<sup>1409</sup> In 1934 the building which housed the diocesan offices was reconstructed as Stanton House at a cost of £2,000.<sup>1410</sup> This steady progress in building occurred when the southern dioceses of the province were struggling to hold their heads above water, and could not contemplate new building projects. Nevertheless the diocese was by no means free of debt, and Bishop Feetham recalled later in the decade that in order to pay the costs of diocesan administration he had had to give out of his own private means never less than £100 a year throughout the thirties.<sup>1411</sup> The fact was that it was only the bishop's personal resources that kept the diocese from slipping into further debt.

If the Diocese of North Queensland came through the depression relatively well, its neighbour to the far north was not so fortunate. We have seen that the economic foundation of the Diocese of Carpentaria had been extremely precarious from the beginning. The relative prosperity of the goldrush days before the turn of the century had gradually been superseded by economic stagnation and decline of white population, and the depression dealt an additional blow to an already reeling economy. "All the townships are feeling the depression very severely", wrote Bishop Stephen Davies in 1932.<sup>1412</sup> Croydon, the headquarters of the priest who served the Gulf country, was reduced to a population of 150 people; yet the few remaining folk struggled manfully to continue their support of the church.

It was on the mission stations, however, that the effects of the depression were particularly felt. The amounts given to missionary work seriously declined through the Australian church. As parishes and dioceses struggled to meet their urgent internal commitments, it generally happened that contributions to missions were the first to suffer. We have noted, for example, that in the Diocese of Brisbane the voluntary assessments, which included contributions to missions, were seriously falling short of the target set. The result was inevitable: both A.B.M. and C.M.S. had to reduce by considerable amounts their grants to the missionary dioceses, including Carpentaria.<sup>1413</sup>

By 1929 there was already an indication of possible future difficulties when the bank refused the Lockhart River Mission permission to overdraw its account.<sup>1414</sup> By 1931 the pressure was on. The Australian Board of Missions was forced to reduce its grants to Carpentaria by twenty per cent, and the already slender salaries paid to lay workers had to be reduced by one-tenth. The cutter Banzai, which served Moa, had to be laid up, and the mission boat Herald seemed likely to be the next to go.<sup>1415</sup> These economies pressed hard on a diocese which was already leading a hand-to-mouth existence, and with A.B.M. going further into debt the following year, Bishop Davies had no alternative but to retrench staff. Three women missionaries had to be dispensed with, and it was decided to suspend the admission of native ordination candidates into St. Paul's College, Moa.<sup>1416</sup> The anxiety became very great: not a meeting of the diocesan council passed without having to face the possibility that the salaries of the mission staff might not be paid in the ensuing month.<sup>1417</sup>

Under these conditions a great spirit of loyalty and self-sacrifice was demanded from the missionaries, and it was only their willingness to accept even less than the miserable salary that had been provided hitherto that enabled the work to continue at all. Nevertheless the increasing indebtedness inevitably took its toll, and by the end of 1936 Mitchell River and Lockhart River Missions were in debt to the extent of £600 each.<sup>1418</sup> The same year the staff position was quite desperate: neither

<sup>1408</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1929-31, p.14.

<sup>1409</sup> Ibid., 1931-33, p.15.

<sup>1410</sup> Ibid., 1933-34, p.14.

<sup>1411</sup> Ibid., 1938-39, p.21.

<sup>1412</sup> Carpentarian, July 1932.

<sup>1413</sup> The decline in missionary giving is illustrated from figures for combined contributions to A.B.M. and C.M.S., quoted in Carpentarian, January 1937.

1929	£68,723
1930	63,244
1931	52,601
1932	50,632
1933	47,621
1934	51,758
1935	51,478

<sup>1414</sup> Diocese of Carpentaria Diary, 28 February 1929.

<sup>1415</sup> Carpentarian, January 1931.

<sup>1416</sup> Ibid., January 1932.

<sup>1417</sup> Bishop Davies; address to synod, quoted in ibid., July 1933.

<sup>1418</sup> Ibid., April 1937.

Mitchell nor Lockhart had a resident chaplain, and there was no mission worker at all stationed at the newer mission of Edward River. At Mitchell, the superintendent, J.W. Chapman, bore a great burden. Inevitably the result was that the work of the mission stations was badly frustrated.<sup>1419</sup> The bigger dioceses were beginning to recover from the depression by the mid-thirties, but naturally enough their missionary giving was the slowest part of their work to recover, so that a missionary diocese like Carpentaria was forced to labour on under greatly reduced grants for long after the worst of the depression had passed.

From this gloomy account it is clear that, with the possible exception of the Diocese of North Queensland, the financial crisis of the early thirties had an immediate and drastic effect on the organised life of the church in Queensland. Nor was this effect limited to the economic sphere. There was a noticeable atmosphere of discouragement abroad in the church. In almost every direction, any thought of positive advance was abandoned, and even to maintain existing work required a great straining of the nerve. The mark made on the morale of the church took years to be effaced.

There was, for example, a disturbing effect on the number of ordination candidates. Young men who were conscious of a vocation to the sacred ministry were unable to pay their way through three years of theological training, and the Ordination Candidates' Funds of the various dioceses were in no condition to provide adequate subsidies to impoverished students.<sup>1420</sup>

The lack of vocations was noticeable in various kinds of work where particularly sacrificial service was required. The Charleville Bush Brotherhood, for example, was for a time in 1931 reduced to three members, and Brother C.H. Edwards was left to minister alone to the great areas around Mitchell, Morven, Augathella, Charleville, Wyandra, Cunnamulla, Eulo, Thargomindah, Eromanga and Quilpie.<sup>1421</sup> There was a slight improvement before long, but Edwards was right in referring to it as "the most desperate period, from the point of view of man-power, in the history of the Brotherhood".<sup>1422</sup> In Rockhampton, too, the revived Brotherhood of St. Andrew was recommenced with only two members, under the headship of the Reverend A.T. Robinson; its fortunes improved, however, and by 1936 with seven members it had reached the highest membership in its history.<sup>1423</sup>

In Carpentaria, at the same time, there was a serious decline in missionary vocations. Indeed, Bishop Davies regarded this period as one of those times in the history of the church when zeal and devotion were at their lowest ebb:

We can see from this Northern part that in Australia there is at the present time a lessening of zeal and devotion. Depleted staffs are not being filled up; our country appears to be approaching a period of deadness in her spiritual life such as that of just over 100 years ago in England, out of which the Church was aroused by the movement known as the Oxford Movement.<sup>1424</sup>

The bishop was perhaps being unduly gloomy: the fact probably was that as the missionary societies were unable to support more missionaries, they were not making their usual drive for candidates. Yet whether his judgment of the causes of the lack of candidates is right or not, the fact remains that the depression had the effect of creating conditions where many people were not willing nor able to offer for the more sacrificial spheres of service in the church.

Whether there was a real decline in spiritual life at this time is more doubtful. Indeed Bishop Ash produced figures in 1932 suggesting that in the Diocese of Rockhampton those parishes which had received regular ministrations over recent years had shown an increase in the number of communicants of some thirty-five percent over a three year period in comparison with the previous three years.<sup>1425</sup> Archbishop Sharp also reported indications of increased church attendances in Brisbane despite the financial difficulties.<sup>1426</sup> It would be a serious mistake to imagine that there was a necessary correlation between economic weakness in the church and spiritual strength.

There was one direction in which the depression aroused the church to a new form of Christian service, at least so far as Queensland was concerned. From the end of 1929 the Church of England Men's Society in Brisbane resolved to take up social service work by providing one meal a day for the unemployed. Starting with St. Luke's Hall, Charlotte Street, as their headquarters, and later moving to the Valley, the C.E.M.S. built up their work until they were providing some two thousand free meals a week. Later, as more effective government provision was made for such meals, the C.E.M.S. changed the direction of their work by opening St. Oswald's Hostel in a rented building in the Valley, where up to 140 men, who had

---

<sup>1419</sup> Ibid., October 1936.

<sup>1420</sup> For example Bishop Ash lamented the fact in 1933 that he had lost a student at St. Francis' College to the diocese, because no parish in Rockhampton diocese was able to afford to pay an assistant curate. Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1933, p.22

<sup>1421</sup> Bush Notes, March 1931.

<sup>1422</sup> Ibid., June 1932.

<sup>1423</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1936, p.16.

<sup>1424</sup> Carpentarian, July 1933.

<sup>1425</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1932, p.10

<sup>1426</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1931, p.24.

previously been sleeping in the parks, were provided with shelter. These men paid part of their relief money, received from the government, as board, and so helped support the hostel. In later years a hostel was built under the same name at North Quay, with the intention of turning it into an old men's home when the immediate economic crisis had passed. As late as 1935 the hostel provided just under 50,000 beds for the night in the course of the year, and some 150,000 meals, while work was found for 177 men. It was a notable example of Christian social service, at a time when the church was struggling to maintain its own internal solvency.<sup>1427</sup>

Apart from this practical aid to the unemployed, did the Church of England give any lead to public opinion about the causes and remedies for the depression? It cannot be said that she did. The fact was that churchmen were just as confused about the reasons for the collapse as were most other people, and few attempts were made to suggest practicable solutions to the impasse. It is true that a few comments on the depression were made from time to time, but these were usually in quite general terms, and did not suggest specific remedies.

On the eve of the main crisis, in 1929, the Rockhampton synod in a motion by the Reverend F. Harty, seconded by Bishop Halford, urged that the solution to the industrial problem should be along the lines of "partnership involving the admission of the worker, as such, to a share in the control and in the profits of industry proportionate to the quality of his service".<sup>1428</sup> Bishop Stephen Davies struck a similar note two years later when he called for a change of heart which would set human values above profits. He went on:

Our own special witness will be in our efforts to drive covetousness and avarice away for these spiritual causes seem to me to be largely responsible for our present ills.<sup>1429</sup>

Yet while in general terms it was suggested by various churchmen that it was spiritual ills in the life of society that caused such economic crises, little attempt was made to put forward specific solutions. This was, after all, the work of the economist, not of the theologian; the church's concern was more with the fundamental ills in human nature. Nevertheless occasionally thoughtful churchmen went on to draw specific conclusions from the existing economic turmoil. Bishop Halford, for example, in a speech on Communism in Townsville, saw the success of Bolshevism as a judgment on the church for its failure to make self-sacrifices and see that justice was done in the community, and he urged the positive value of planning in economic life. It was not that Halford was enamoured of Communism: indeed he strongly criticised its restriction on liberty, its attack on the institution of the family and its atheism.<sup>1430</sup> Yet he did approve of its principle of planning the economy as a means of tackling the periodic crises that beset capitalist societies. Halford was scarcely typical in his views, however, and he himself was very critical of the church for its inclination to bypass serious consideration of the great social questions of the day.<sup>1431</sup> On the whole his criticism was just: church leaders were apt to accept rather uncritically the status quo in social organisation.

The great depression brought a sharp jolt to the easy optimism of the immediate post-war years. For the church in Queensland it was a veritable slough of despair. The shock of near-bankruptcy which the depression had brought, with the consequent setback to many hopes and aspirations, made a deep mark on the morale of the church. But perhaps even this loss of confidence was a needed reminder that the real strength of the church lay not in the things of this world.

## **ii. The Renewal of Self-Confidence: the Brisbane Episcopate of John William Charles Wand.**

On 30 August 1933, Archbishop Gerald Sharp died after a long and painful illness. Behind him he left rich memories of a beautiful and saintly life; but he left also a heritage of financial instability, dispiritedness and uncertain vision of what the future might hold. It was obvious that a decisive leader was required for the church in Queensland; but looking around the Australian church the Archbishop Election Committee could find no one with the requisite gifts.

Attention was consequently turned to England. The see was first offered to Canon J.C.H. How, of Liverpool, but he declined it.<sup>1432</sup> The reason was partly financial, for the archbishop's reduced stipend made the prospect unattractive for anyone without private means. Besides, the state of the diocese demanded unusual financial and administrative abilities in the new archbishop and a willingness to grapple energetically with the grim situation that existed. How felt unequal to such a mission. The task of seeking out a new archbishop was now entrusted to Bishop Batty, who was visiting England at the time. He not unnaturally sought the advice of his old leader, Dr. Donaldson, and it was almost certainly Donaldson who recommended the Reverend John William Charles Wand, Dean of Oriel College, Oxford, for election as archbishop. The

<sup>1427</sup> For details, see Brisbane Year Book, 1930 p.194; 1931 p.210; 1933 p.61; 1935 p.86; and Church Chronicle, February 1942.

<sup>1428</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1929, p.34.

<sup>1429</sup> Carpentarian, July 1931.

<sup>1430</sup> Northern Churchman, September 1932.

<sup>1431</sup> See, for example, his letter in Church Chronicle, August 1937.

<sup>1432</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1933.

choice was agreed upon, and Wand was consecrated in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, on the feast of Ss. Philip and James, 1 May 1934. He was enthroned in St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, on 5 September of the same year.

It was no easy decision for Wand to come to Brisbane. It involved a kind of work quite different from what he had been accustomed to, and he knew the immensity of the problems that would face him, for it was only after he had been thoroughly acquainted with the condition of the diocese that he accepted. As an Oxford don Wand was winning a reputation as a scholar of unusual ability. He had written a number of small but excellent books in the historical and biblical fields, and he was known as an incisive and stimulating lecturer. Far from being the absent-minded academic of caricature, he had had practical pastoral experience in a variety of spheres, both in parishes and as an army chaplain in the first World War; and although he had had little scope to demonstrate administrative ability he had the qualities of decisiveness and efficiency that were required. He was very conscious of the spiritual authority inherent in episcopacy, yet his own comparatively humble origins gave him a contact with the common man that his predecessor, St. Clair Donaldson, for example, had not had. Those who knew him at Oxford took it for granted that Wand would go a long way in the church, and it would have been easy for him to wait for preferment in England; but he took up the challenge which Brisbane offered, and it gave an excellent opportunity for the exercise of those powers of leadership which had been relatively hidden under the quiet scholarship of his Oxford days.

The transition from the cloisters of Oxford to the pressures of administration of a run-down and dispirited metropolitan diocese was not easy. What made it possible was the spirit of intense self-discipline that was a mark of Wand's life. His routine was always ordered and planned, so that even amidst what he himself described as "the exaggerated demands that Australia makes on its public men"<sup>1433</sup> he kept to a programme that allowed for the maintenance of his spiritual and intellectual activities of prayer, reading, study and writing. This meant that he was less accessible than his predecessor had been, but it was the secret of his ability to accomplish an immense amount of work, and still retain an intellectual freshness. The moral strength provided by this inner discipline was early called into play when, almost immediately after his arrival in Australia, news came from Europe of the death of his only son in a mountain accident. The archbishop's first monthly letter to his new diocese in the Church Chronicle was deeply moving:

I spoke in my first public address of the sacrifices that might be demanded of us if we were prepared to be true to the religion of the Crucified. I did not then know – it was mercifully hidden from us – how soon my own family was to bear the burden of a grievous personal loss. I cannot yet see why this should have happened. But we are the followers of One who was made perfect through suffering, and it may be that we had to go through this ordeal before we were worthy to offer you our humble service of friendship in the name of Christ. But for the present you must realise that your leader has been sorely wounded at the very moment of taking charge, and you must bear with me if my grasp is not as strong as it should be.<sup>1434</sup>

Yet though this blow was very great, such was the self-discipline of the archbishop that his grip on the situation did not noticeably falter.

The same self-discipline was the basis for Wand's clear and decisive leadership. He planned his policy carefully and coherently, and having determined on a pattern of action he was forceful and strong-willed in its execution. He never sought popularity – and in many quarters never received it. He was impatient with inefficiency, and at times was perhaps too unwilling to take advice from those who were more familiar with the local scene than he. Yet behind this unwillingness lay the conviction that the diocese needed his policy and that spiritless inertia must at no costs be allowed to destroy the pattern of his campaign to build up afresh the organised life and morale of the church. Unpopularity and the possibility of mistakes were part of the costs of doing this necessary work.

There was an atmosphere of optimism and enthusiasm about the welcome to the new archbishop. He was personally unknown in Australia, but favourable reports had preceded his arrival, and the Church Chronicle reflected popular hopes when it remarked, "We look forward with zest to a fresh era for this diocese under our new leadership."<sup>1435</sup> Everyone was waiting for a strong lead and it was soon clear that the church had a leader of a kind that it had not possessed since the days of St. Clair Donaldson.

We may see parallels between Wand and his predecessor of half a century earlier, Bishop Webber. It was not that the two men had much in common personally. But they came to situations roughly similar, in which order had to be shaped out of confusion, hope out of gloom. Archbishop Wand found that he must do again in the circumstances of twentieth century Queensland what Dr. Webber had had to initiate in the cruder conditions of half a century before. Of the two, Wand was far the greater in depth of scholarship and breadth of vision, but through the accident of historical circumstances the significance of Webber was much the greater for Queensland church history.

<sup>1433</sup> In a sermon on the death of St. Clair Donaldson, Church Chronicle, January 1936.

<sup>1434</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1934.

<sup>1435</sup> Ibid.

As his first synod Archbishop Wand put forward a three year plan in which his policy was set out under the headings of Self-Realisation, Co-ordination and Expansion. The entire work of his episcopate might be considered under these headings.

By Self-Realisation Wand meant essentially the restoration of self-confidence, which he rightly saw to be so badly lacking on his arrival. He spoke directly on this subject to the synod:

I did not feel when I first came among you that there was much of that élan which is the characteristic spirit of a victorious army. No doubt this could be explained by the difficult times through which you had been passing. Yet there was surely no warrant for any spirit of defeatism.<sup>1436</sup>

He noted that even the restoration of comparative financial stability had been achieved too exclusively by the rigid exercise of economies – with a consequent diminution of positive forward work by the church – and too little by increased giving on the part of church people.

There is no doubt that Wand had put his finger upon a great cause of weakness in the church in 1935 when he criticised the defeatist spirit that was abroad. Perhaps he failed to grasp fully the gravity of the depression and consequently to appreciate the shattering effect it had had on morale. But the archbishop was right in his conviction that until the prevailing attitude of mind was changed real headway would be impossible. Wand made this his major initial task. He gauged lack of leadership to be one of the chief reasons for failure in self-confidence, and in his own person he set about remedying this defect with conspicuous success. Everone, from the other bishops of the province to the ordinary man in the pew soon recognised that they had a leader, and though there was in some quarters opposition and resentment to what was regarded as a new authoritarianism in the diocese, there was a strength and wisdom in Wand's leadership that made it generally respected. Dean Barrett expressed a widely held opinion when, less than a year after Wand's arrival, he spoke of the archbishop as the first asset of the church in Queensland.<sup>1437</sup> Whether they agreed with Wand or not, people both inside and outside the church began to sit up and take notice, and there was a new sense that the Anglican Church was making its presence felt in the life of the state.

Wand realised, however, that the self-confidence of the church must not rest on his abilities alone, and he embarked upon a campaign that lasted throughout his episcopate to raise the intellectual quality of the clergy generally. He was distressed to find that only 35 out of 136 clergymen in the Diocese of Brisbane had a university training. His ideal was that the clergy should be the best educated section of the community, who should be able to influence not only the religious but also the intellectual and cultural tone of the country. He spoke on this theme also at his first synod:

Thus the clergy occupy an important position, not only in respect of their specific religious duties, but also in respect of the whole life of the mind and of the spirit. Therefore it is specially important that they should bring into the life of the people the breath of a larger world, that they should be able to advise them on many public questions, and that they should set before them in an attractive manner many cultural ideals for which they might otherwise be disinclined.<sup>1438</sup>

Having adumbrated this ideal, the archbishop took positive steps to translate it into practice. He appointed new commissaries in England, to whom he gave two instructions: to encourage priests of ability to come out from England, and to take steps to obtain books for a first-rate clerical library for the diocese.<sup>1439</sup> In his monthly letters he constantly urged upon the clergy and laity alike the duty of serious reading and study. He encouraged the clergy to make full use of such opportunities for intellectual refreshment as were provided by the annual summer schools.<sup>1440</sup> He encouraged promising young clergymen and ordinands to undertake courses of study at the university. He took a keen interest in the work of the church schools, and regarded them as seed-beds for a more intellectually equipped clergy and laity in the future. At the same time he encouraged men of first-rate intellect to come out from England to the church in Queensland. His own academic contacts placed him in an ideal position for this, and it was not long before scholastic priests were being introduced. Such were the Reverend Verney Johnstone, a don of Keble College, Oxford, who came to be headmaster of The Southport School (where his scholastic attainments were unfortunately shown to be not matched by corresponding administrative ability); the Reverend Harry Thomas, an old student of Wand's and latterly vice-principal of Ely Theological College, whom the archbishop introduced to be principal of St. Francis' College; and the Reverend Felix Arnott, who was brought out to become warden of St. John's College within the University of Queensland.

The crucial feature of the archbishop's design to raise the standard of the clergy, however, was his plan for improved theological training. He was himself experienced in this kind of work and was anxious to have a direct share in the training of his future clergy. He therefore seized the opportunity presented by the financial difficulties of St. Francis' College, where

<sup>1436</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1935, Archbishop's synod address, p.20.

<sup>1437</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1935.

<sup>1438</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1935, Archbishop's synod address, p.23

<sup>1439</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1935.

<sup>1440</sup> E.g. Ibid, November 1934.



most of the ordination candidates for the province were trained. He initiated a radical scheme to sell the existing property at Nundah and to reconstruct the college on the Bishopsbourne estate. The archbishop made no secret of the fact that one of his chief motives was to place the college close to his own residence in order that he could both lecture and generally maintain personal contact with the students. The proposal stirred up a hornet's nest of opposition, especially from the Old Franciscans, but the archbishop persisted, and in the face of considerable controversy he went ahead with the project. The Reverend R.E. Sutton, who had just succeeded Canon W.H.W. Stevenson as principal, resigned, and it was to replace him that Wand imported Thomas as principal.<sup>1441</sup> An appeal was launched for funds, and in 1937 the foundation stone of the new college was laid by the governor, Sir Leslie Wilson, with most of the funds required for rebuilding in hand. The wisdom of the move has often been questioned since that time, and the issue still remains unresolved; nevertheless, the immediate result was that Wand brought his own powerful influence to bear upon the training of the clergy, both directly and through his protégé Thomas, and this had a marked effect on the calibre of the training being given.<sup>1442</sup>

Wand's concern for high intellectual standards and his long experience at Oxford made him an active and valued member of the senate of the University of Queensland.<sup>1443</sup> He was particularly concerned at the complete absence of theological subjects among the courses provided by the university, and he spoke forcefully on the dangers inherent in this exclusion of theology from Australian universities in his sermon before the general synod in 1937.<sup>1444</sup> Wand strongly pressed this matter in the senate and finally with the support of the Reverend H.M. Wheller (a leading Methodist minister) and at last of Archbishop Duhig, he succeeded in persuading the senate to introduce courses on biblical literature in the Faculty of Arts. This was the germ from which the degree course in Divinity was later to develop.<sup>1445</sup>

To the second aspect of his three year plan Archbishop Wand gave the title "Co-ordination". By this term was implied the need for coherent planning of the various departments of the work of the church, both within the diocese and on the provincial and national levels. Wand was concerned at the apparent wastage of effort that resulted from diffused and unregulated enthusiasm. As in the case of self-realisation, he realised that co-ordination within the diocese must in the first instance stem from himself and from the firm exercise of his episcopal authority.

By theological conviction – for he was a strong Anglo-Catholic - Wand believed in the authority inherent in episcopacy. At his enthronement Bishop Feetham had expressed in the enthronement sermon the extent of this authority in the strongest possible terms:

The influence and authority of the Bishop do, in fact, extend to every department of the life and work of the Church, as does that of the father to all the concerns of the family. There is, for example, no place at which you can draw a line or should attempt to draw one between the spiritual and material aspects of the Bishop's responsibility. They cannot be separated. The one is the expression of the other.....We do not set bounds to the authority of the Bishop or Archbishop. He takes counsel, it is true, in many respects with his priests and with his learned laymen, but the responsibilities for his decision rest with himself alone, in the weightiest matters, and in the last resort, it is he who must decide and for his decisions he is responsible to God alone.<sup>1446</sup>

This was a typical Feetham utterance, and perhaps went further than Wand himself would be prepared to go; but by and large it expressed much of the spirit of Wand's approach to his Brisbane episcopate.

In contrast with the lax discipline that had characterised Dr. Sharp's episcopate, a new order of strict rule was ushered in. Clergymen who stepped out of line were likely to receive a firm rebuke from the archbishop. Definite instructions were given about the conduct of church services, and the clergy were reminded that faculties were to be obtained from the archbishop before alterations were made to their churches.<sup>1447</sup> Principles to be observed in the design of new churches were set out, and typical plans were prepared as a guide. The clergy were urged to give courses of instruction to their people on special topics at such seasons as Lent. Parochial nominators were instructed to come to their meeting with the diocesan nominators without being fettered by instructions from their parishes, so that a diocesan outlook could be

<sup>1441</sup> The controversy is reflected in Church Chronicle, November and December 1935.

<sup>1442</sup> The purchase of a new residence for the archbishop at Hamilton, with the likelihood that Bishopsbourne will be absorbed into St. Francis' College, has ironically brought the wheel round a full circle, and would appear to vindicate those who maintained that it was in principle undesirable for the theological college to be on the archbishop's doorstep. Brisbane Year Book, 1962, p.105.

<sup>1443</sup> It had become standard practice of the government to nominate the Anglican and Roman Catholic archbishops and a leader of the Protestant churches to the senate of the university.

<sup>1444</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1937, p.20

<sup>1445</sup> Wand himself regarded this as one of his major long-term achievements. This view he expressed in an interview with the writer in London in 1959. Dr. Duhig was moved to support his proposal by a fierce attack on the principle of admitting theology as a university subject which was made by an anti-religious member of the senate.

<sup>1446</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1934.

<sup>1447</sup> Ibid., May 1936.

maintained in filling vacancies in parishes.<sup>1448</sup> These were but a few examples of an exercise of authority which while not universally welcomed among the clergy and laity, was nevertheless fairly generally heeded.

One of the principles behind Wand's policy of co-ordination was that the time had come when the method of makeshift in diocesan administration could no longer suffice:

It seems to me that we are still living too much in the pioneering stage and are to content with the makeshifts which were no doubt necessary in that period, but which should now be transcended.<sup>1449</sup>

Wand was right; though the policy of 'making-do' had come not so much from a false sense of being pioneers still, as from the particular exigencies of the depression. Offices of quite different character had been combined in order to save expense, and the result was overwork for many of the senior men in the diocese, with its consequent inefficiency and dullness of mental outlook. A reorganisation of diocesan machinery was badly needed. Wand began by dividing the diocese again into three archdeaconries, with archdeacons who were free of parochial duties. The Venerable W.P. Glover continued as Archdeacon of Toowoomba, Bishop Dixon became Archdeacon of Wide Bay, and Canon W.H.W. Stevenson was transferred from St. Francis' College to the lighter duties of Warden of St. John's College, and became Archdeacon of Brisbane. At the same time the Reverend M. de Burgh Griffith resumed the post of Director of Religious Education in a full-time capacity.<sup>1450</sup> These changes resulted in a closer supervision over the parishes of the widespread diocese and a more effective co-ordination of their work, and they left the archbishop free to concern himself with broader matters of policy. Later, when Stevenson was elected Bishop of Grafton in 1938, he was succeeded by Canon H. Thomas as Archdeacon of Brisbane, while the bush brotherhood territory became a separate archdeaconry under Archdeacon A.E. Morris.<sup>1451</sup> Yet even so, Wand was not altogether consistent in his policy of avoiding makeshifts. He was inclined to combine a number of offices in the person of Archdeacon Thomas, in whom he had great confidence, and who served not only as principal of the theological college (a full-time job in itself, particularly as he had no resident vice-principal) and Archdeacon of Brisbane, but also as archbishop's commissary when Wand was absent from the diocese, and as acting-registrar.<sup>1452</sup>

By this administrative reorganisation the archbishop was able to ensure a much greater measure of co-ordination, and was able to delegate a measure of responsibility to his subordinates. Yet it was his own voice that was supreme. His sermons and public statement were always carefully prepared, and he rigorously avoided the temptation to preach to excess, which he knew resulted in a diminution in the quality and weight of his utterances. At the same time he sought to increase the circulation of the diocesan paper, the Church Chronicle, which already had a reputation as one of the best church papers in Australia, and which improved further under the able editorship of the Reverend A.E. Saxon. The Chronicle, whose circulation reached seven thousand by the later thirties, was a valuable organ through which Wand could express his views on ecclesiastical or public issues.

It was not, however, only within the diocese that Dr. Wand's policy of co-ordination had application. His intellectual brilliance soon made him a national figure in the Australian church. He was frequently invited to preach and lecture in other parts of the Commonwealth; in 1938 he visited New Zealand to give lectures to the clergy;<sup>1453</sup> and in 1940 he undertook an extensive preaching and lecturing tour in America. The breadth of Wand's interests reached far beyond diocesan boundaries, and he sought to apply the same principle of co-ordination to the wider work of the church.

Already within the Province of Queensland there was a tradition of co-ordination quite surpassing that of the other provinces of the Australian church. A unity of spirit had grown up, dating back to the days of Bishop Webber before the province was formed, and the tradition was reinforced by the common outlook of the Queensland dioceses on social and doctrinal issues. Though he was by date of consecration the junior bishop in the province (with the exception of Bishop Strong of New Guinea) Wand quickly became the recognised leader, not only by virtue of office but also by innate ability. The other bishops were glad to consult him and heed his advice, and his metropolitanical visits, such as that to New Guinea in 1939, helped considerably to knit the province together.<sup>1454</sup>

The greatest need of the Australian church, however, was that wider unity that had been so long sought by means of a national constitution, and Wand gladly added his weight to the constitutional movement. After the apparent collapse of the movement at the end of the 1920's<sup>1455</sup> another draft of the constitution was produced by a convention in 1932. Wand

<sup>1448</sup> Ibid., September 1935.

<sup>1449</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1935, Archbishop's synod address, p.27.

<sup>1450</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1935.

<sup>1451</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1938, p.21.

<sup>1452</sup> Church Chronicle, March 1939, February 1940, etc.

<sup>1453</sup> Ibid., May 1938.

<sup>1454</sup> Ibid., December 1939.

<sup>1455</sup> See above, chap. 15, iv.

found this document “on the whole a very careful and statesmanlike production”,<sup>1456</sup> yet like many other Queensland churchmen he judged it to be seriously deficient in several respects. The chief criticism was that the appellate tribunal – the final court of appeal for the church – would comprise more lawyers than bishops, while the order of priests was not to be represented at all. The bishops of Queensland were adamant on this point: they argued that it removed final authority in matters of doctrine from the episcopate to a body of lawyers. They also objected to the excessive rigidity of the draft – for the provisions for the alteration of the constitution were impossibly difficult – and the placing of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion on the same level of immutability as the oecumenical creeds.

The Brisbane synod finally accepted the new draft constitution in 1935, but only on condition that the bishops were given the final authority in matters of doctrine, that the method of altering the constitution be made less rigid, and that members of general synod be elected by their respective orders in the diocesan synods, i.e. clergy by clergy and laity by laity. These desired amendments were, however, so drastic as virtually to mean the rejection of the received draft. Most of the other dioceses of the province took a similar stand: they were keen to have a national constitution,<sup>1457</sup> but they were not prepared to accept it as it stood.<sup>1458</sup> Similar objections were expressed in other provinces, too, and by 1937 it was clear that there was insufficient unanimity to make it worth while proceeding.

After a quarter of a century of negotiation for an Australian church constitution the impasse was highly frustrating, and there were various signs of impatience at this turn of events. Sydney’s impatience was manifested by a withdrawal of its acceptance of the draft altogether. From Queensland a different kind of reaction began to emerge, namely that provincial action must be taken independently if it were impossible to proceed on a national level. This was in fact not so much a new proposition as the revival of an old one, for in the early stages of the constitutional movement Bishop Frodsham had urged provincial action as the first step to autonomy, in the hope that the rest of the Australian church would follow.<sup>1459</sup> In his sermon before the general synod of 1937 Archbishop Wand issued a warning of the possible consequences if a satisfactory national constitutional was not agreed upon:

If we have no such Constitution it is almost inevitable that we shall develop along Provincial lines, and it is quite possible that such development would serve to emphasise the differences that already exist between us.<sup>1460</sup>

The dangers of such a move were apparent, and the general synod appointed yet another committee to try to revise the draft so as to make it more acceptable. Yet after so many failures, there was little optimism as to success.

While work was proceeding on this new draft there was renewed support from some of the Queensland clergy for independent provincial action. It was argued that this would lead more speedily to a national constitution, inasmuch as successful action by one province would demonstrate the practicability of breaking the legal nexus, and stir the other provinces to action. On the other hand there were real dangers. The Province of Queensland was traditionally more homogeneous in doctrine and outlook than the southern provinces, and while its Anglo-Catholicism was not as extreme as some southerners imagined, the tone of churchmanship was different from that of the south. Independent provincial action consequently carried with it the danger that the church in Queensland would grow apart from the rest of the Anglican Church in Australia. Dr. Wand recognised this possibility. Speaking to the Brisbane synod in 1938 he emphasised that if by independent provincial action were meant the acceptance by the province of the draft constitution that had already been proposed for the whole Australian church, it could be a lead to other provinces in the direction of national church unity; but if the proposed constitution were to be amended as they saw fit, national agreement would be all the more distant.<sup>1461</sup> Under the restraint of this wise admonition, no further steps were taken towards independent provincial action pending the appearance of the new draft of the constitution.

From this standpoint of the traditional Queensland desire for strong central authority and reasonable flexibility in the national church constitution, the new draft was still seriously deficient. To quieten the fears of Sydney, it was still made extremely difficult to alter the constitution, and each diocese was virtually to be permitted liberty to determine whose authority it was going to accept as final in matters of doctrine. At the meeting of the drafting committee Wand opposed these features of the draft, but he was the only Queenslanders present, and he was unable to carry the day.<sup>1462</sup> With some misgivings, however, he supported this draft when a vote was taken in the Brisbane synod in 1940, and a great majority of the laity voted for a motion authorising the acceptance of this constitution. The clergy, however, were not convinced, and a

<sup>1456</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1935, p.27.

<sup>1457</sup> Indeed,. The synod of Carpentaria formally accepted it: Carpentarian, October 1937.

<sup>1458</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1933, p.29, and 1936, p.24 N.Q. Year Book, 1931-33, pp 29 and 34; Carpentarian, October 1935.

<sup>1459</sup> Norman, J.R., John Oliver North Queensland, p.164ff.

<sup>1460</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1937, p.23.

<sup>1461</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1938, Archbishop’s synod address, p.26.

<sup>1462</sup> Church Chronicle, August 1939.

dead heat in the clerical vote when the vote was taken by orders meant the rejection of the measure.<sup>1463</sup> There was little doubt that the other Queensland dioceses would follow the Brisbane lead in rejecting the constitution, and independent provincial action again became a possibility in the face of renewed deadlock at the national level.

The first formal move came from North Queensland at the diocesan synod in Townsville in 1941. Archdeacon J.R. Norman, who had long taken an interest in constitutional questions, moved the following motion, which the Reverend H.G. Robinson<sup>1464</sup> seconded:

That this Synod is of the opinion that the time has come when the Province of Queensland should take steps to secure autonomy for the Church of Australia so far as this State is concerned, and recommends to the Provincial Synod that the Parliament of Queensland be asked to extend the powers of the Diocesan Synods in the following respects: (1) That, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in their constitutions the Diocesan Synods shall have power to formulate and declare the doctrines held by the Church and to amend the existing forms of worship as they may think fit, provided that no such declaration of amendment shall be valid until it receives the assent of all the bishops of Queensland and a prescribed proportion of the Bishops of Australia. (2) That the Diocesan Synods be given power to delegate to Provincial and to General Synod such of their powers as they think fit. (3) That the Diocesan Synods in conjunction with other Synods of the Province and of Australia, be empowered to establish Tribunals for hearing appeals from the Diocesan Courts, and such other cases as may be prescribed.<sup>1465</sup>

In the Brisbane synod, meeting at the same time, a less specific motion over the names of F.T. Cross and the Right Reverend H.H. Dixon was carried urging steps to strengthen the powers of provincial synod.<sup>1466</sup> These proposals were manifestations of the impatience being felt in Queensland at the continued failure to provide a satisfactory national constitution. It should be noted that the more radical North Queensland proposal did not provide for completely unilateral action by the Province of Queensland, inasmuch as the consent of a proportion of the other bishops of Australia was to be sought for changes in doctrinal formulae or standards of worship; yet the very fact that such changes were envisaged for Queensland, which, however much they might be approved in other parts of Australia, would not be lawful there, implied the threat of schism in the Australian church.

When the provincial synod met the same year Archbishop Wand in his presidential address gave support to the move for independent action by Queensland on the ground that the natural way to proceed was from diocese to province to national church. He left no doubt that his ultimate objective was still a national constitution.<sup>1467</sup> Provincial synod appointed a committee to look into the whole question,<sup>1468</sup> but the outbreak of war with Japan intervened almost immediately afterwards, and in the pressure of wartime emergency it is doubtful if the committee ever met. In any case no concrete result issued, and perhaps fortunately the matter was temporarily shelved and the whole constitutional question gave place to more urgent considerations. So Wand's episcopate ended without anything concrete to show in the way of constitutional co-ordination either at the national or provincial levels.

There was about the same time another example of a promising plan for co-ordinated action by the Australian church being frustrated by inter-diocesan suspicions. This concerned the proposal first mooted by Archbishop Donaldson that the Australian church as a whole should carry the burden of ministering to the people in the bush districts. Donaldson had regarded it as quite unreasonable that the poorer country dioceses should carry the whole weight of this essential part of the church's mission. Doctrinal differences had again

obscured the issue, for the two agencies engaged in this work were the Bush Church Aid Society, which was largely supported from Sydney and had a pronounced evangelical flavour, and the various bush brotherhoods, which for the most part were of Anglo-Catholic persuasion. The general synod of 1937 finally approved the principle of regarding the outback as a national responsibility, and the bishops issued a joint letter appealing for support to the tune of a capital fund of £100,000, and an annual income of £10,000.<sup>1469</sup> As the Queensland dioceses, with their extensive bush areas, were largely involved, the primate, Archbishop Le Fanu, invited Bishop Feetham to make a tour of the southern states to appeal for the fund. But party and diocesan divisiveness,<sup>1470</sup> together with the diversion of attention caused by the outbreak of war, made

<sup>1463</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1940, p.45.

<sup>1464</sup> Later Archdeacon of Mackay, and from 1951 Bishop of Riverina.

<sup>1465</sup> Townsville Daily Bulletin, 28 June 1941.

<sup>1466</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1941. p.44.

<sup>1467</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1941, p.9.

<sup>1468</sup> Ibid., p.17.

<sup>1469</sup> The letter is printed in Church Chronicle, November 1938.

<sup>1470</sup> This was exemplified in a fierce private letter from Bishop Feetham to Archbishop Wand, denouncing the attitude of Sydney ecclesiastical officialdom. See Feetham to Wand, 25 March 1938, in N.Q. Historical Records Folder.

the appeal almost entirely ineffectual.<sup>1471</sup> In this urgent practical matter it was once more demonstrated how lack of unity was seriously weakening the life and work of the Australian church.

Inter-church relations were another matter that came under Wand's broad heading of co-ordination. The 1930's were not years of notable visible advance in Christian co-operation, yet on the personal level of contacts among the leaders of the various Christian communions, there was a continuation of the happy tradition that had been built up in the previous decade. Between Dr. Wand and his Roman Catholic contemporary, Dr. Duhig, there was a mutual respect and friendliness that was unique in the Australian ecclesiastical scene: each appreciated the strong Christian lead given by the other in the face of the anti-Christian forces of the age. As with his predecessor, Wand's catholic beliefs made him more appreciative of many aspects of Roman Catholicism than were many Anglicans of other brands of churchmanship.

At the same time Archbishop Wand was friendly disposed towards, and highly regarded by, the leaders of the various Protestant churches. Though he disapproved of indiscriminate inter-communion and the interchange of pulpits as unwise short-cuts to reunion, Wand was always ready to seek the co-operation of Christians of other allegiances in matters of common concern, and at the same time to foster the study and understanding of the causes of disunity. His action on the two hundredth anniversary of the conversion of John Wesley, in inviting the Methodists to participate in a service of thanksgiving in St. John's Cathedral was deeply appreciated, and the Methodist Times commented:

It is pertinent to ask whether, in the whole history of Queensland Anglicanism, there is any precedent for a gesture of such wholehearted brotherhood towards Non-conformity.<sup>1472</sup>

The very sincere appreciation of Wand expressed by the Reverend H.M. Wheeler, the best-known Methodist minister in Brisbane, on the archbishop's departure from Queensland, typified the regard in which he was held in the other churches. It was natural that in the years after the second World War, Wand, as Bishop of London, gave weighty support to the ecumenical movement as it expressed itself in the World Council of Churches, and this was done without any wavering in his belief in the vocation of the Church of England. He was one of those who believed that the Anglican Communion had a peculiar contribution to make towards Christian unity:

There is, I believe, no other section of the Christian Church so favourably placed as we are. Almost alone among the many churches of Christendom we have refused to believe that there is any essential contradiction between the essential theology of the early and the post-Reformation periods. At the Reformation we declared our historical continuity with the past and yet opened our doors wide to the flood of new light and learning that burst upon the world.<sup>1473</sup>

This was not an original nor unique statement as to the Anglican role in reunion. But coming from one of Wand's historical and theological scholarship and his undoubted catholicity of faith it carried very considerable weight.

The third of the headings which Wand gave to his first three year plan, and under which the history of this period may be considered, was "Expansion". The depression had been a time of retrenchment. Except in North Queensland building had almost ceased, some parishes had had to be amalgamated, expenditure on missions had been considerably reduced, and generally the church had been barely holding its own. A new spirit of expansion – or what was increasingly being called evangelism – was sorely needed.

The very fact of the formulation of a three year plan was itself indicative of the spirit of planned expansion that characterised the church in the post-depression years. Planning was, of course, one of the features of life, especially since the financial collapse. In varying forms, and with varying degrees of ruthlessness, it was manifested in Communism, Fascism, and Socialism, and the need for some kind of planning was becoming recognised in church life also. The three year plan which commenced Wand's Brisbane episcopate, was not the only one of its kind during this decade. In 1939, for example, Canon R.B. Massey put before synod another three year plan for spiritual deepening, including one year's intensive visitation, a year of conventions and conferences, and then a year in which there should be a mission in every parish. This plan was approved by synod with applause, but as it happened the outbreak of war interfered with its execution.<sup>1474</sup>

In the same year, in the light of schemes that were being advocated for the rationalisation of industry, the Reverend W.A. Hardie<sup>1475</sup> proposed radical measures for the rationalisation of the church. His proposals included provision for Holy Communion before Confirmation, more individual instruction before Confirmation, a planned syllabus for religious instruction in the schools, and reorganisation of the parishes, including provision for removal of a clergyman after a period

<sup>1471</sup> N.Q. > Year Book, 1939-40, Bishop's synod address, p.21ff.

<sup>1472</sup> Quoted in Church Chronicle, July 1938.

<sup>1473</sup> Sermon before general synod, 1937, quoted in Church Chronicle, November 1937.

<sup>1474</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1939, pp 17 and 42.

<sup>1475</sup> Later Archdeacon of Moreton, Dean of Newcastle, and Bishop of Ballarat in turn.

in one parish.<sup>1476</sup> The Reverend H.J. Richards<sup>1477</sup> supported Hardie's proposals, and urged a new scheme of classification of parishes and clergy.<sup>1478</sup> None of these plans came to fruition: some of their proposals were impracticable, and in any case the wartime emergency caused their pigeon-holing. Their significance, however, is that they demonstrated an awakening consciousness of the need to overhaul ecclesiastical machinery and to plan afresh for the future in the light of the changing social pattern.

Of more practical significance was the expansionist aspect of Wand's original three year plan, which did have concrete results, even though to a lesser extent than the archbishop hoped.

Wand saw that the first need was for more buildings. Population had been growing, but the church's building programme had been stagnant. At his first synod the archbishop urged the need for new churches and church halls, and by 1937, when he had collated the reports of his archdeacons, he had come to the conclusion that 110 new buildings were required in the Diocese of Brisbane. He spoke frankly to synod about the situation:

This constitutes something of a crisis. It is not a question of course of the Church going back, but a question whether we are to go forward. Here we have at our hands 110 fresh openings, each one vouched for by the local parish priest. The question is whether we are to take the opportunity or to let it slip...At the moment we have roughly 220,000 Anglicans in this diocese. We have 250 churches, and the total accommodation in them is 45,000. This means that if our churches were full three times each Sunday we should still have ministered to only about half our people.<sup>1479</sup>

The plan was that a central fund be raised, from which loans or grants might be made to subsidise building funds raised locally within the parishes. The central fund was, however, very slow of growth, and the scheme did not proceed nearly as fast as the archbishop hoped. Indeed, only one church – at Caloundra – was erected predominantly with money from the archbishop's fund; nevertheless by 1939 Wand reported that twenty-one churches and halls had been built, and another nineteen building schemes were in various stages of progress.<sup>1480</sup> Most of these projects received little direct help from the central fund, but the attention which was focussed by Wand's drive upon the need for more buildings sparked off efforts in the parishes to build new churches.

For the most part, the buildings erected in the thirties were small wooden structures, frequently church-halls which would become parish halls when permanent churches could be erected. The archbishop urged that thought be given to the construction of stone and brick churches, that would compare favourably with the better class of public buildings being erected in the state. However, his own episcopate saw little result in this direction, and the war put an end to whatever prospects there might have been for permanent buildings. Perhaps this was a blessing in disguise, because ecclesiastical architecture in these years was particularly dull, and there might have been regrets in later years if the church had been saddled with a large number of permanent buildings of mediocre architecture.

Dr. Wand was concerned about the standards of ecclesiastical architecture and insisted that plans be approved by himself before building projects were undertaken. He took the trouble to remind the clergy of factors that should be kept in mind in planning churches, and he urged the desirability of moving away from the old Gothic styles. His primary motive for this, however, was to avoid obscuring the view of the altar with pillars, and he showed relatively little concern for climatic considerations. The result was that despite his comments on Gothic, the approved standard plans that were produced for church halls in the diocese were in essentially pseudo-Gothic style, with steep roof, high lancet windows, and with three such windows at the east end through which the strong sub-tropical sun could all too easily stream into the eyes of morning worshippers.<sup>1481</sup> A similar lack of regard for climate was manifested in the semi-Tudor design of the new St. Francis' College buildings. The intentions behind these plans were sound, but the results did not match the intention, either climatically or aesthetically.

In the northern dioceses, too, the later thirties saw something of an expansion of building on a limited scale. Bishop Ash referred to half-a-dozen building schemes in the Diocese of Rockhampton in 1937,<sup>1482</sup> while in the islands of the Torres Strait a number of permanent concrete churches, some of them quite imposing, were built during these years. Great impetus was given to this building programme by the offer of a builder, A.G. Harris, to give his services for at least twelve months free of charge to direct this work.<sup>1483</sup> Some of the churches erected later in the decade were extremely large; for

<sup>1476</sup> Church Chronicle, January 1939.

<sup>1477</sup> Later Archdeacon of Wide Bay and Burnett.

<sup>1478</sup> Church Chronicle, February 1939.

<sup>1479</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1937, Archbishop's address, p.33.

<sup>1480</sup> Ibid., 1939, p.18.

<sup>1481</sup> For Wand's comments, and samples of the proposed designs, see Church Chronicle, September 1937.

<sup>1482</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1937, p.23.

<sup>1483</sup> Carpentarian, January 1935.

example the one on Saibai Island, just off the coast of New Guinea, could accommodate five hundred, and the new church on Moa, dedicated in 1940, was regarded as the finest in the diocese.<sup>1484</sup>

These building projects naturally required considerable finance, and money was also required in great quantities for the necessary, but far less attractive, work of reducing the post-depression debts. In Rockhampton, as we have seen, Bishop Ash made himself personally responsible for placing the finances of the diocese on a sound basis. By 1936 the diocesan debt was still of the nature of £25,000, so the bishop made a tour of England, reminiscent of the old nineteenth century episcopal fund-raising trips. He spoke more than 160 times in thirty dioceses, and not only collected money in cash and promises to the tune of £5,000, but left behind him 111 branches of the Rockhampton Auxiliary to provide a permanent source of revenue.<sup>1485</sup> The, two years later, he followed the example of some other dioceses by establishing a Million Shilling Fund, and though (as usually happened in such cases) receipts fell far short of the target, they went a long way towards eliminating the debt. At the same time St. Faith's School, which had been such a major cause of diocesan indebtedness, began to show a profit, and by 1944, with the aid of wartime inflation, Bishop Ash was able to record the remarkable achievement of having cleared the diocese entirely of debt.<sup>1486</sup> Ash had set himself a narrow task by concentrating on finance in a way that no bishop should need to do; but he had done his work well, and had ensured that his successor would be able to do a bishop's task in proper fashion. It must be said to Bishop Ash's credit that even in the diocese's great need, he never became parochial in outlook, and in his episcopate the amounts given by Rockhampton to missions reached record figures.

The other dioceses of the province were not able to record such spectacular financial achievements during these years. In Brisbane Archbishop Wand rightly declined to make finance his primary concern, and emergence from the economic quagmire of the early thirties was a painfully slow process. The sale of a few properties had reduced the capital debts by a small amount, but losses on one or two of the schools, as well as the synod and cathedral chapter accounts, meant that even in the late thirties the deficiency account was still mounting, though certainly at a slower rate than a few years before.<sup>1487</sup> Slade School alone cost the diocese £8,000 over a few years.<sup>1488</sup> It was not until 1943 that the amount asked for from the parishes by way of voluntary assessment – for the support of home and foreign missions and other diocesan needs – was actually achieved.

In this situation the expansion which Archbishop Wand hoped for was inevitably held back. While such crippling debts hung over the diocese major forward moves were inhibited, and even the appeal for a central fund to help provide new churches met with only a moderate response.

It was not, however, only in the realm of material plant and finance that a policy of expansion was undertaken during these years. There was a deliberate drive to extend the scope of the church's influence by building up strong church societies for various groups of people. We have seen that societies such as the G.F.S. and C.E.M.S. had long been established, and had exercised an influence out of proportion to their numerical membership. The thirties were to see a renewed vitality in these organisations.

It was the depression that helped to bring a new sense of purpose – which it seemed to have lacked since the war – to the Church of England Men's Society. The entry of the society into the social service field by its work amongst the unemployed gave to its leaders and members a sense of mission. Dr. Wand himself took a keen interest in the work of the C.E.M.S.,<sup>1489</sup> and he encouraged it to maintain the policy of aiming at a relatively small committed membership instead of seeking to become a popular social organisation. The C.E.M.S. took a lead in various ways in church life in those years. It pioneered the use of religious films in the Anglican Church at a time when the possibilities of this new medium had hardly been exploited by the church. It built up the annual Good Friday Procession of Witness, which in the twenties had been a march of a small number of members of the C.E.M.S., but by the thirties had become an impressive act of witness in which thousands of Anglicans participated. The society tried the experiment, without great success, of services on the beaches in hope of reaching many of the unchurched. Wand himself commended the C.E.M.S. on its work just before he returned to England: "The C.E.M.S. here had attained to standards not reached by the Society elsewhere in the Anglican

<sup>1484</sup> *Ibid.*, January 1939 and October 1940.

<sup>1485</sup> Rockhampton *Synod Proceedings*, 1936.

<sup>1486</sup> *Ibid.*, 1944, p.10.

<sup>1487</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1937 p.77; 1938 p.48ff.

<sup>1488</sup> *Ibid.*, 1938 p.54. It was this situation that prompted the archbishop to press the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul to take charge of Slade School in 1936. He always hoped that this might lead to the establishment of a teaching order which would solve the financial problem by providing a dedicated staff at minimum cost. This hope, however, was not realised. See *Slade School Magazine*, Jubilee Issue, November 1950; also *Bush Notes*, November 1935.

<sup>1489</sup> When he returned to England Wand became national president of the C.E.M.S. in that country.

Communion".<sup>1490</sup>In the more scattered northern dioceses the society did not gain such a hold as in Brisbane, but by 1940 Rockhampton had five branches, and they were showing considerable evangelistic zeal.<sup>1491</sup>

At the other end of the age scale for male members of the church stood the Church of England Boys' Society which grew slowly during this period. By its nature, however, it was more susceptible to fluctuations in strength due to the changing quality of local leadership in the parishes. Between this society and the C.E.M.S., however, was a gap, and it was to bridge this that an important step was taken in 1936, largely at the instigation of Canon F.B.C. Birch, to form a Church of England Young Men's Society to cater for young men from 16 to 30 years. Particularly in the metropolitan area, but also in a number of the larger country centres, the C.E.Y.M.S. speedily grew in numbers and enthusiasm, and embraced some hundreds of young men, and some parishes which for years had grown accustomed to congregations of the middle-aged and elderly found an increasingly large proportion of youth coming to church. Naturally enough, however, the C.E.Y.M.S. was particularly badly hit by the second World War, and by 1942 it was carrying on only at skeleton strength, with a large proportion of its members in the forces.

The growth of women's organisations was less spectacular, mainly because they had begun to develop at an earlier period. In many parishes the women's groups formed the backbone of corporate life, both spiritually and financially. Many parishes only managed to pay their way through the money-raising efforts of their women's guilds, though these were organised entirely on a local level, without central organisation. This was not true, however, of the Mothers' Union and the Girls' Friendly Society, whose aims were more directly spiritual and social, and which were part of a world-wide organisation. They both increased in strength in the thirties, and by 1941 the Mothers' Union had 31 branches with more than 800 members in Brisbane diocese alone.<sup>1492</sup> The G.F.S. at this time had 70 branches throughout Queensland.<sup>1493</sup>

At no time hitherto in the history of the church in Queensland had the church societies been stronger or more influential than in the years preceding the second World War. It was an age of organisations, especially for young people. What was noticeable, too, was the greater emphasis upon the spiritual responsibilities of members, in contrast with the stress on physical activities in the Gordon clubs and similar church youth clubs of the generation before. Most of these societies had their quite strict "rule of life" for members, which set the ideal of daily prayer, regular Bible reading and church attendance. Efforts were made to provide a balanced "four square" programme consisting of spiritual, intellectual, social and physical activities, and increasing place was given to camps and conferences for the fostering of a stronger corporate spirit and for the training of leaders. These societies were the means by which many who would otherwise have drifted from the church or never have been drawn into its life at all, were brought into active membership. The societies had their problems – failure to maintain balanced programmes, irresponsibility among some members, and above all lack of leaders of the required calibre – and they never attracted more than a small minority of the youth of the community to their ranks. Yet they undoubtedly helped in the extension and deepening of the influence of the Christian Gospel in the lives of many.

Generally speaking, this was an era of segregated societies, with the male and female groups meeting separately and only joining together for occasional social activities; and the members themselves seemed to contented that it should be so. Nevertheless more attention began to be devoted to co-ordinating the activities of the various young people's organisations. In Brisbane another Youth Crusade was held in 1937, with special emphasis on attracting those from fourteen to eighteen years, and while the response was disappointing, particularly in the Sunday school field, increased numbers were reported in many of the youth organisations.<sup>1494</sup> This was followed by the establishment of a Council of Youth under the chairmanship of the archbishop himself, to co-ordinate and develop the youth work of the church.<sup>1495</sup> The same trend towards co-ordinating youth work was operative in North Queensland, and a Council of Youth was also set up in that diocese.<sup>1496</sup> Throughout Queensland the church still had a long way to go before its youth work would be thoroughly organised, but by the outbreak of war this was one of the brightest spots on the church's horizon. It augured well for the future.

Archbishop Wand saw that not the least important means of propagating the Gospel was the effective use of modern methods of mass communication. In his general synod sermon of 1937 he deplored the slowness of the Australian church to make full use of radio, cinema and newspapers for the proclamation of the faith. Within his own diocese he tried to remedy this defect. Wand encouraged the C.E.M.S. in its venture of purchasing a film projector for the showing of religious films; he was alert to the need for cultivating good relations with the press and not infrequently wrote articles himself for the newspapers, on subjects that were not necessarily narrowly religious. He had such facility with pen and speech that his

<sup>1490</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1943.

<sup>1491</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1940, p.13.

<sup>1492</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1941, p.221.

<sup>1493</sup> Ibid., 1940, p.223.

<sup>1494</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1937, p.218; 1938 p.221; and Church Chronicle, February 1938.

<sup>1495</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1938, p.43. This council was re-constituted in a different form the following year.

<sup>1496</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1939-40, p.47.



work was always welcomed, both by newspapers and radio, and his Sunday evening broadcasts from his chapel at Bishopsbourne attracted a wide listening audience. Yet by and large it remained true that the Anglican Church, like most of the other religious bodies applied itself only falteringly to the use of the new media.<sup>1497</sup>

One other direction in which Dr. Wand sought to extend the church's influence should be mentioned. This was in the field of politics and government. Wand, like other leaders of the Church of England before him, took the view that the church must be prepared to speak on political questions when moral issues were involved. He was far from asserting that the church should either form a political party, or should associate itself with any existing party: indeed, in his synod charge of 1938 he deliberately disassociated the Anglican Church from the sectarianism that had been apparent in the recent election.<sup>1498</sup> But he went on to emphasise that the good churchman must be a good citizen, and should therefore be interested in politics:

If it is true that the Church should never identify itself with a political party, it is also true that if its members fail to take their proper share in politics that Church will end by becoming a mere other-worldly pietistic sect.<sup>1499</sup>

Wand was less inclined to make thundering pronouncements on questions of the day than some other bishops. This did not necessarily imply that he did not feel strongly about them; but he recognised the fact that it is frequently possible to exercise influence more effectively by unobtrusive direct contacts than by condemnatory sermons or vehement letters in the press. He therefore cultivated friendly personal relationships with leading civic and political figures and won their confidence. He was on particularly intimate terms with the governor, Sir Leslie Wilson, and knew personally the leaders of the various political parties. He was fortunate in having one or two priests, particularly Canon D.J. Garland, who had considerable influence with leading members of the government.<sup>1500</sup> It was, for example, through Garland that Bishop Feetham approached the government for a grant for Yarrabah Mission when the control of that station was taken over by the Diocese of North Queensland in 1935,<sup>1501</sup> and the helpfulness of government officials undoubtedly resulted in large part from Garland's good offices.<sup>1502</sup>

It is always difficult to estimate the nature and extent of this kind of political influence that works quietly, but it is clear that during Wand's episcopate there was a cordial spirit between the leaders of the Anglican Church and the state. This was particularly notable inasmuch as very few of the members of the cabinet during these years of unbroken Labour administration were practising Anglicans.<sup>1503</sup>

In 1943 Archbishop Wand was offered, and accepted, the bishopric of Bath and Wells. It was clear that he had been brought back to England for some important task, and in 1945 he was translated to the Diocese of London, probably the most difficult see to administer of any in the Anglican Communion. It was here that the greatest work of his life was done, and on his retirement in 1955 it was widely agreed that Wand had been the most effective Bishop of London in recent times.

Yet it must be admitted that his episcopate in Brisbane was not characterised by such immediate and tangible results as might be expected from his undoubted ability. He left the diocese without having become a popular archbishop, with the great majority either of the clergy or the laity. It is true that he was respected, admired, and almost held in awe; but in his diocese he was regarded more as an administrator and a scholar than as a pastor, and Australians have always been inclined to judge a bishop by his pastoral work.

It there was any fault here it was not all on Wand's side. It was true that he gave to some the impression of coming as a cultured Englishman looking with some condescension on colonial society and intellect. Yet those who knew him well knew that there was nothing of the snob in him. What could be mistaken for aloofness was a natural English reserve, and what might be criticised as autocracy was an honest endeavour to restore proper authority in a diocese that had grown lax under his gentle and amiable predecessor. Among those of the clergy who were junior in Wand's episcopate there remained a noticeable affection for him; it was more particularly some of those who had grown up under the old regime who resented his methods. It was the story of Bishop Webber repeated: such a good man as Thomas Jones had come to bitter

---

<sup>1497</sup> Church Chronicle, June 1938 contains comments by the editor agreeing with criticisms by Charles Moses, general manager of the A.B.C. on the quality of broadcast sermons.

<sup>1498</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1938, p.17.

<sup>1499</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1500</sup> When Garland died, Wand remarked in his panegyric that "Cabinet Ministers have stated in the Press that they regarded him as a guide, philosopher and friend". Among the pall-bearers at his funeral were the premier, W. Forgan Smith, and the subsequent premier, E.M. Hanlon, neither of whom were Anglicans. Church Chronicle, November 1939.

<sup>1501</sup> Norman, J.R. John Oliver North Queensland, p.163

<sup>1502</sup> Bishop Feetham spoke with appreciation of the co-operation of the government. N.Q. Year Book, 1934-5, p.30.

<sup>1503</sup> The one notable exception was F.A. Cooper, who succeeded Forgan Smith as premier for a short time before becoming lieutenant-governor, and was a devout churchman.

disagreement with the bishop who did more to shape the diocese than any other, because they belonged to different generations and environments. Wand was faced with that Australian inferiority complex which has always been inclined to resent great ability when it has come from outside. If he had had some experience of Australian life before he became archbishop Wand might have been able to avoid some of this reaction. But his Australian episcopate, including its mistakes, was a preparation for the greater work that was to follow; and it was not without significance that he who was sometimes regarded in Queensland as snobbish and dictatorial was later regarded in his London days as one of the more down-to-earth English bishops.

Wand's churchmanship was another stumbling block to some of the Brisbane people. At Oxford he had been president of the English Church Union, a strongly Anglo-Catholic society, and he made no secret of his convictions in coming to Queensland. Strangely, there were none of the open party disputes that had erupted during Dr. Sharp's episcopate, but this was due to the strength of his rule and discipline rather than to universal acceptance of his policy. No sooner had he left that the suppressed opinions of some of the clergy about his methods came to the surface. One prominent low-church clergyman, in a paper read to the Brisbane Clerical Society, set out the qualities required in the next archbishop. No mention was made of Wand, but the implications were clear. He should preach at least three times each Sunday, so as to reach as many as possible of his flock; he should devote more attention to his clergy, and less to theological students; he should be predominantly a pastor, not an administrator and chairman of committees.<sup>1504</sup> Another leader of protestant thought within the diocese wrote in a letter of the "things which cause so much heartache" in the diocese, "the removal of which will go so far toward restoring that happiness of worship and security, which is so much lacking today".<sup>1505</sup> These were minority views, but they did reveal that with all its achievements Wand's episcopate had left unsettled problems behind.

The chief reason, however, why comparatively little positive advance occurred in Wand's term of office was the nature of the age. There are times when the tide flows in favour of the church: such has been the period since the second World War when various forms of progress in the church's work seemed to come comparatively easily. There are other times when simply to hold on against an adverse current is a notable achievement. This was the case in the thirties. By 1932 the church was in a mood of serious defeatism: morale was low and positive material progress was out of the question. To hold on, and fight back, and slowly begin to make progress once more was no small achievement, and it was largely the quality of Wand's leadership that enabled it to be done. It was not only the economic tide that was adverse: there was a strong anti-Christian intellectual current abroad in the world, and the restlessness of international politics created a spirit of unsettlement in society. In the face of these powerful forces Wand proved a vigorous leader. A situation was shaped where those who followed were able to achieve results that statistically were far more tangible; but this was possible because a foundation was laid on which they could build. Wand's own judgment just before the outbreak of war fairly sums up his achievement:

I think we may justifiably claim that the defeatist spirit of which I had reason to complain in former years, has now passed away. We have attempted a good deal. We have accomplished something, and we are aware that we can do still more if we are only prepared to stand together and make the effort.<sup>1506</sup>

### iii. Total War.

By 1939 the church was beginning to look forward to renewed progress and prosperity after the setbacks of the thirties; instead it was faced with a new crisis in the form of the second World War. In some ways it was a repetition of 1914, but there were contrasts – for Australia, none greater than that the second war came to its very shores, with a consequent disruption to the life of the country such as had never occurred in the previous conflict.

War did not come in 1939 with quite the dramatic suddenness of 1914; but it must be admitted that church leaders had done relatively little in the years of mounting international tension in the later thirties to define Christian attitudes to the impending conflict. Public statements on international affairs were rare, in part at least because of preoccupation with internal recovery from the depression. At the time of the Munich crisis Dr. Wand publicly supported Neville Chamberlain's policy of appeasement, on the practical ground that Britain was not yet in a position to oppose by force the extension of Hitler's power, however regrettable that might be. Wand went on to urge that people should take more interest in international affairs, so that the formulation of policy might be left neither to the "idealists who have not been prepared to face practical realities" (and so had permitted Britain's military weakness), nor to the 'realists who only too often have failed to recognize any ideals beyond those of immediate expediency'.<sup>1507</sup> Implicit in the archbishop's comment was the

<sup>1504</sup> The Reverend L.J. Hobbs, Church Chronicle, September 1943.

<sup>1505</sup> The Reverend S. Atherton, ibid.

<sup>1506</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1938, Archbishop's synod charge, p.15.

<sup>1507</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1938.

recognition that when Britain was stronger war might become necessary to stop Hitler. Generally, however, the prospects of war were not much discussed in public by church leaders.

In the immediate pre-war years there was, however, reference to some of the issues that lay beneath international tensions. Preaching at the general synod in 1937 Wand depicted the age as a time of crisis, through which the world was emerging into a new historical era:

It is certain that today we have come to the end of the modern period of history, just as surely as in the 15<sup>th</sup> Century man came to the end of the mediaeval period.<sup>1508</sup>

About the same time Bishop John Feetham declared that the basic issue in world affairs was that of the freedom of the human personality, which, he said, was being suppressed in certain modern forms of political and social organisation:

Any theory that undervalues or obliterates personality is profane. To deny a man the right to call his soul his own is blasphemy against the Creator and a dishonour to His image. Each man has got to be himself and not an imitation of someone else. Each man is obliged to think for himself, and not to adopt his ideas ready made. Each man should have the opportunity of making his own choices in life and should not be used as an element in the formation of mass opinion, or coerced to shout with the crowd, or be subjected to the whim of dictators.<sup>1509</sup>

This was a theological analysis of Fascism and Communism from a typically Anglican understanding of the nature of man. But while impelled to draw attention to what he regarded as the basic errors of these foreign ideologies, Feetham recognised the spiritual and moral danger for Christian democrats in complacently sitting in judgment upon others. He therefore frequently reminded his people that the democracies were not without responsibility for the existing explosive world situation. As one instance of this, he pointed to the injustice of an overcrowded Europe while Australia held "empty, vast and fertile spaces of the earth's surface", a situation that could only lead to resentment among the land-hungry peoples of the world.<sup>1510</sup> He went on to ask the frank question what would future German youth, disillusioned with Hitler's ambitions, find when they looked to the democratic nations for better ideals?

Imagine a great body of German youth when the truth at last comes home to them and the lies they have been fed upon are exposed: imagine them disillusioned and revolting utterly from the false theories of religion and morals by which they have been deceived. Imagine them asking desperately for sound guidance by which to rebuild their national life. Should we, if invited, be in a position to give it to them? Are we now in the worship of God and the pursuit of Christian ideals exhibiting a tithe of the energy and enthusiasm with which they carry out the diabolical teachings of their leaders, and worship a state which boasts of might and pours contempt on morals?<sup>1511</sup>

This was a healthy self-criticism; and it in no sense weakened the conviction of the essential righteousness of the democratic cause against the totalitarian ideologies. However much Britain and her allies had failed to attain the ideal of Christian civilisation, Feetham and others argued that they did stand for a Christian way of life, with standards of individual liberty and justice, which were threatened by a vicious form of paganism. Christian attitudes towards the second World War had little of the romantic idealism that had typified them in the previous war, for the continued international crisis of a generation had bred a hard realism that bordered on cynicism. Yet there was a more evident certainty among Christian leaders about the basic righteousness of the cause than there had been in 1914. The very title of an article by Archbishop Wand, Christianity at Bay, expressed this belief in the ideological nature of the conflict.<sup>1512</sup> "To me at least it is clear", declared the archbishop on another occasion, "that we are fighting, if not for Christianity in the abstract, then at least for Christian civilisation".<sup>1513</sup> There was no pacifism in Anglican attitudes to the war.

Until the entry of Japan into the war, the ordinary life of the church was not unduly affected. A number of the clergy, chiefly from the Diocese of Brisbane, were drawn off from normal work to serve as chaplains to the forces. By the end of 1941 sixteen priests had gone from the province for full-time chaplaincy work, of whom twelve came from Brisbane diocese, and there were another eighteen part-time chaplains.<sup>1514</sup> Nevertheless, the Diocese of Brisbane did not feel the strain unduly, as its roll of priests just before the war had been at the highest level in its history, and the number had been swollen by the influx of a number of clergymen from other dioceses in the early part of the war. It was in fact the smaller dioceses like Rockhampton that first felt the strain. It was not that they lost many priests directly to chaplaincy work, but there was always a considerable wastage in these country dioceses through normal movements of clergy, and in wartime conditions

<sup>1508</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1937, p.16.

<sup>1509</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1935-36, Bishop's synod address, p.26.

<sup>1510</sup> Ibid., 1938-9, p.32.

<sup>1511</sup> Ibid., p.33.

<sup>1512</sup> Printed in Church Chronicle, February, 1940.

<sup>1513</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1941, Archbishop's synod address, p.18.

<sup>1514</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1941.

losses were not being replaced, either from England or from the Australian theological colleges.<sup>1515</sup> Nevertheless, in general, the dislocation in the first two years of war was not serious.

During this time the church quietly adapted itself to wartime conditions. The Sailors' and Soldiers' Church of England Help Society was set into operation again, with the Reverend Roy St. George and the Reverend William Hoog as assistant directors (the archbishop himself being honorary director); services of intercession were instituted in connection with the war, and great numbers of people attended services on the special days of prayer called for by the king; and a number of parishes went ahead with evangelistic campaigns culminating in parish missions, in the hope of strengthening the spiritual life of the home base.<sup>1516</sup>

The clergy were spared in the second war some of the more invidious tasks that had fallen to them in the first. They were not given the duty of notifying relatives of casualties, a task which had sometimes turned routine parochial visiting into occasions of grim foreboding for relatives of servicemen in the 1914-18 war. Nor was it necessary for them to take part in recruiting campaigns. Conscription, too, never became the issue that it had been in the previous war, and a pastoral letter from the bishops of the Australian church, which somewhat ambiguously supported the principle of conscription if it should become necessary, aroused little comment.<sup>1517</sup>

The Japanese attack changed the situation dramatically for Australia. By the early months of 1942 the Province of Queensland was in the front line of the Pacific war. Archbishop Wand immediately called upon church people to resist the temptation to panic: "Any suggestion of hysteria would be unworthy both of our race and of our religion", he wrote in a letter to the diocese.<sup>1518</sup> The authorities of the various dioceses, however, made preparations to meet the emergency situation that now presented itself.

It was New Guinea that had to bear the immediate brunt of the Japanese attack; but the story of the church in that diocese, under the courageous leadership of Bishop Philip Strong, lies outside the scope of this history. It need only be said that the Australian church was inspired and thrilled by the devotion to duty of the missionaries, many of them Queenslanders, who stayed at their posts with the native peoples whom they had been nurturing in the faith in the face of impending Japanese invasion.<sup>1519</sup> Eleven members of the staff of the New Guinea mission met their death at the hands of the Japanese in a manner that bore all the marks of martyrdom. It was appropriate that the provincial synod of Queensland at its first post-war session in 1946 remembered with gratitude to God the lives and martyrdom of these heroes of the faith, and that later a day was set aside for the annual commemoration through the province of the New Guinea Martyrs.<sup>1520</sup>

Of the dioceses within Queensland proper, it was those in the north that were most affected by the war. Not only was there the threat of invasion, but the evacuation of civilian population from some areas and the encampment of large numbers of Australian and American servicemen, caused complete dislocation to normal life. This was truest of the Diocese of Carpentaria, where civilians were completely withdrawn from the Torres Strait islands by order of the military authorities, and even the sub-dean of the cathedral, the Reverend W.J. Daniels, had to leave. Bishop Davies decided to move his diocesan registry to Townsville, from which centre it was more easily possible to maintain communication with the whole diocese. In the Torres Strait only the native clergymen – three priests and one deacon – were left to minister to their own people. The theological college and school at Moa had to be closed down; the diocesan newspaper, the Carpentarian, was suspended, and European missionary work in the straits virtually came to a standstill. The native clergy, left largely to their own initiative, were severely tested, but they remained faithfully at their posts. On the aboriginal missions, too, the shortage of staff caused by the war was extremely serious. At Lockhart River Mission, for example, there was only one white lay worker for a time, because concentration on the war effort had dried up the normal sources of recruitment of mission staff.<sup>1521</sup>

In the mainland dioceses it was the church schools that suffered the most apparent dislocation in the turmoil of 1942. In the case of some of the coastal schools, the children had to be evacuated because of the threat of attack. For this reason, St. Hilda's moved from Southport to Pikedale Station near Stanthorpe, while St. Faith's School, Yeppoon, was transferred to the site of the former boys' school at Barcaldine. Some other schools had to move because their buildings were

<sup>1515</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1941, p.14.

<sup>1516</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1941.

<sup>1517</sup> Ibid., December 1941.

<sup>1518</sup> Ibid., January 1942.

<sup>1519</sup> Ibid., February and June 1942.

<sup>1520</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1946, p.13. The names of the martyrs were: Henry Matthews, Vivian Redlich, Henry Holland, John Barge (all priests); John Duffill, Margery Brenchley, Lilla Lashmar, Mavis Parkinson, May Hayman (all lay missionaries); and Lucian Tapiedi and Leslie Gariadi (Papuan). The date set aside for the annual commemoration was September 2<sup>nd</sup>.

<sup>1521</sup> For details on Carpentaria diocese in early 1942, see printed letter from the Bishop of Carpentaria, issued in Townsville, 18 May 1942.

confiscated by the military authorities, and a few of these lost the use of their properties for quite a long period. Among the schools affected in this way were The Southport School, the Glennie Preparatory and the Boys' Preparatory Schools in Toowoomba,<sup>1522</sup> St. John's day school in Brisbane, St. Anne's in Townsville and All Souls' School, Charters Towers. It was perhaps the last of these that suffered most, for there was no satisfactory alternative accommodation to be found at all. With remarkable resourcefulness the headmaster, R.L. Mills, decided to transfer the whole school to a camp site at Dalrymple, some thirty miles from Charters Towers, where the boys lived in primitive conditions under canvass for a whole school year. Under threat of possible flooding there, the school moved the next year to a scarcely more suitable site at the Charters Towers racecourse!<sup>1523</sup>

The loss of so many of the school buildings to the armed forces was taken with good grace by the church authorities, though indeed they had little choice in the matter. As the emergency passed, however, the continued occupation of some of the schools became a matter of concern. In 1944 Bishop Feetham castigated the government on the tardy return of school properties, and was bitterly critical of "tangled red tape and bad administration".<sup>1524</sup> Certain the exigencies of occupation had created considerable inconvenience, and sometimes expense, for many of the schools. Yet on the credit side there were some unexpected advantages. Some of the weaker inland schools like Slade School at Warwick, found that their numbers increased rapidly as children were evacuated from the coast, and Slade began to pay its way for the first time since its foundation. Also one or two of the occupied schools, notably All Souls', found themselves far richer in buildings after the war, as they were able to purchase quite cheaply from the government the extensive wartime buildings which had been erected on their properties. Naturally all the schools suffered from grave staff problems during the war, and many of the boys' secondary schools were forced to make extensive use of women teachers. In this difficult situation one of the most notable personal achievements was that of Canon W.P.F. Morris, founder-headmaster of the Church of England Grammar School, Brisbane. Though crippled in 1942 with chronic arthritis, he refused to leave his post, and throughout the years of war continued to supervise his school, first from his bed, and then by moving about painfully on crutches. Morris was perhaps the most notable example in Queensland of the dying race of Great Public School clergyman-headmasters.

There were other respects in which the church had to adapt itself to wartime conditions. Archbishop Wand instructed the clergy to see that church property was adequately covered by war risk insurance; many priests enrolled as padre wardens in the civil defence organisation, so as to be able to carry on their work in the event of air raids; in some cases times of service had to be altered to circumvent the problems created by the "brown-out". Many of the normal events, like the procession of witness on Good Friday, and even, in 1942, the clergy retreat, had to be cancelled; and Dr. Wand took the remarkable course of summoning the clergy and laity to synod in 1942, at the same time sending a letter expressing the hope that country synodsmen would not attend! By canon, synod had to be summoned every year, but it was decided to transact only necessary formal business.<sup>1525</sup> Later the state government under the authority given by the national security regulations, made provision for synod to be cancelled legally.<sup>1526</sup> Synod finally met again in Brisbane in 1944.

The stationing of great numbers of Allied troops in Queensland during the war with Japan placed an additional burden upon the social work of the church. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Church of England Help Society greatly expanded its efforts, in an attempt to provide social and spiritual amenities for servicemen in the camps and on leave in the cities. St. George's Club in Brisbane, maintained primarily by the voluntary work of some 1,400 women from the parishes, cost more than £35,000 to maintain during the years of war as a recreational centre for servicemen. Hostels for men on leave were also opened in Brisbane and Ipswich, while the society undertook other kinds of work in more than a dozen centres throughout the state where numbers of servicemen were gathered. Some £13,000 was spent in the northern dioceses by the society in this work,. And it was estimated that the voluntary work that was done would have been worth £50,000 more if it had had to be paid for.<sup>1527</sup> With the great increase in merchant shipping using Australian ports, the work of the Missions to Seamen was also greatly expanded. The Reverend William Hoog, the chaplain in Brisbane, worked under great pressure, and in 1943 it was found necessary to open a full-time chaplaincy for the duration of the war in Townsville.

The effect of the war on religious life in Queensland is less easy to estimate. There were, as we have seen, great overflowing congregations in the early years of the war in response to calls for special days of prayer, but these were in the nature of exceptional occasions and could not be said to indicate any general growth in religious practice. The chaplains, for their part, met with a mixed response among the men in the armed forces. In the closely settled areas the war situation possibly had the effect of increasing church attendances slightly, but in the more scattered areas the opposite was the

<sup>1522</sup> The latter moved to St. Hilda's property at Southport after the immediate coastal danger had passed.

<sup>1523</sup> The story is graphically told in Evans, E.C., *The Genesis of a Public School in the Tropics*, pp.27-48.

<sup>1524</sup> *Church Chronicle*, August 1944.

<sup>1525</sup> *Ibid.*, April 1942.

<sup>1526</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1943, p.119.

<sup>1527</sup> Booklet: *Six Years' Service for the Armed Forces and Merchant Navy*.

case. This was chiefly due to the thin spread of pastoral ministrations in these districts. St. Francis' College did not close down entirely as it had done in the first World War, but by 1943 there were only nine students left, which meant a grossly inadequate rate of ordinations; while at the same time there was hardly any intake of clergymen from overseas. It was the smaller dioceses and the bush brotherhoods that suffered most, because they largely depended on the younger clergy, who were most likely to be called upon for chaplaincy work. By 1945, for example Bishop Ash found that he had only fifteen clergymen left in Rockhampton diocese, as against twenty-five in 1939; and no fewer than seven priests were each looking after two parishes or districts.<sup>1528</sup> It was a similar story in the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul in Brisbane diocese. By 1945 only four bush brothers were left actually working in the whole brotherhood area plus the parish of Chinchilla.<sup>1529</sup>

This shortage of clergy in the west naturally made its mark on the effectiveness of the church's work. Bishop Ash found that in every parish in his diocese except two the numbers of communicants declined during the war.<sup>1530</sup> The same decline occurred in the west of the Diocese of Brisbane.<sup>1531</sup> It must be remembered, however, that these estimates were based on the only statistical records available, namely numbers of acts of communion. A decline was inevitable in these figures, because with the shortage of priests many bush districts were receiving less frequent opportunities for Holy Communion; it does not necessarily indicate a falling off in people's concern for spiritual things.

The financial situation of the church was markedly affected by the war. The initial financial effect was disadvantageous: it was costly to make the adaptations to properties necessary for wartime requirements (for example, the provision of air raid shelters), and the diversion of money to patriotic causes had some effect on the church's income. As the war proceeded, however, and inflationary trends developed in the economy, the church was greatly assisted by the diminution in the real value of its post-depression debts. In addition, the schools which had been losing money (especially Slade School) began to prosper, so that a heavy burden was removed from central church funds. The result was, as we have seen, that the great debt of Rockhampton diocese was eliminated by 1944; and though the improvement was slower in Brisbane, the treasurer of synod, A.J. Thompson, was able to announce by 1945 that the corner had been turned, and that for the first time there had been a small surplus in the accounts of both synod and the cathedral chapter.<sup>1532</sup> The position was still far from buoyant, as the deficiency accounts, which showed the accumulated losses on current expenditure, still totalled more than £42,000, apart from the great capital debt still borne by the diocese.<sup>1533</sup>

As the war drew to a close there was far less of the simple optimism that had characterised thinking towards the end of the first World War. There were hopes for the future, but little confident talk of "a war to end war" partly because of the lessons learned from the over-optimism of the twenties, and particularly because of indications already observable of further ideological conflict between the democratic nations and Soviet Russia. From the early stages of the war church leaders quietly urged the need to make plans for the post-war world. As early as 1940 Dr. Wand spoke of the need of a plan for a new world order, and he suggested that a political structure might be required that would lie between the extremes of a host of isolated sovereign states and one super-state.<sup>1534</sup> Late, in 1945, the new archbishop, Dr. Halse, welcomed the proposal to establish the United Nations, and in a joint request with Archbishop Duhig and the leading Methodist minister, the Reverend, H.M. Wheller, he asked the British Ambassador to the United Nations, Lord Halifax, to take special care on behalf of the church in Queensland "that the challenge of Christian principles is kept before the Conference whenever grave decisions are to be made on World problems".<sup>1535</sup> Yet generally speaking it was true that after the disillusionment of a generation of crisis the church approached the end of the war without any striking blueprints for a brave new world. Perhaps behind the fact lay the conviction that from the Christian point of view such blueprints were bound in any case to be superficial, and could not meet the deepest needs of man.

In 1945 the war ended, first with Germany, and then with Japan. Already in the conclusion of the war the shadow of things to come was cast across the earth with the explosion of the first atomic bomb. The possibilities thus opened up, together with new ideological conflicts that were emerging, suggested that the years of crisis were not yet at an end.

<sup>1528</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1945, p.11.

<sup>1529</sup> Bush Notes, January and February 1945. For a time the following year, there were only two brothers at work in the area where eight had ministered before the war – Bush Notes, February 1946.

<sup>1530</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1946, p.14.

<sup>1531</sup> Bush Notes, May 1943.

<sup>1532</sup> Church Chronicle, July 1945.

<sup>1533</sup> For details, see Treasurer's Report, Brisbane Year Book, 1944, p.45.

<sup>1534</sup> Church Chronicle, November 1940.

<sup>1535</sup> Ibid., July 1945.

## CHAPTER 17: A WORLD OF CHANGE.

### i. The post-War Scene

It was an uneasy peace that settled over the world in 1945. In some respects there were parallels with 1918 – the crushing defeat of the erstwhile enemy, the creation of a new international organisation, the universal desire to forget the war and settle down to normal life.. Yet there were immediate problems that had had no parallel after the first war- such as the division of the world into two power blocs, the threat implied by the very existence of the atomic bomb, and the already clamorous demand of some of the former colonial peoples for independent status. It was readily apparent that six years of total war, with its attendant political, economic and scientific upheaval, had left behind a very different world from that of 1939. It seemed that the world must become used to change itself as the normal condition of society.

Australia could not escape influence of these world-wide conditions in a situation where it was a truism to say that the world had become a smaller place. Yet Australia was differently affected by the war from the nations of the old world. Although for the first time war had come close to Australian shores, the country was untouched by battle, air attack and atrocities, such as many nations had suffered. Instead of destruction, Australia had known construction as a result of war, and though the great expansion of industry and communications had been directed primarily to military purposes, it left a material heritage and aroused a constructive effort that could easily be diverted to purposes of peace, and it presaged a boom in the Australian economy without parallel since the days of the mid-nineteenth century gold rushes. There was a bursting sense of national achievement and an expectation of still greater achievement to come. There was now a new feeling of independence, for if the ties of sentiment with the United Kingdom had been little weakened, Australians were aware of far less practical dependence on the mother country in spheres alike of defence, economy and culture.

In this environment of national self-confidence, high employment, good wages and rapid growth in population and industry, the prevailing atmosphere in post-war Australia was one of optimism. The note of pessimism current in European philosophy and theology found little reflection in Australia, despite the vague consciousness of world tensions that formed a distant background to Australian expansion. For the church it was an environment not unfavourable to the building up of the externals of institutional church life: whether it favoured the acceptance of some of the deeper implications of the Gospel was not so readily clear.

As happened after the first World War, the church in Queensland found itself with an almost complete change in Episcopal leadership in the post-war period. The changes had already commenced during the war with the translation of Archbishop Wand to Bath and Wells, to be succeeded as archbishop in 1943 by the Most Reverend Reginald Charles Halse, formerly Bishop of Riverina.

The new archbishop was already well known, as he had first come to Queensland thirty years before to serve as warden of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas in North Queensland.<sup>1536</sup> Halse's early years had been typical of many of the bush brothers of his era – an English public school education (St. Paul's), classical studies at Oxford, and a curacy in an East End slum parish. Vigorous, fresh and adept at sport, he was typical of the attractive young priests being produced in that hey-day of the Anglo-Catholic movement in England in the early years of the century. As a bush brother in the north, his extensive pastoral visitations had won the affection and respect of country people. Then as headmaster of All Souls' School, Charters Towers, which he founded in 1920, he had made his mark on secondary education, by creating a school noted for its bush-like informality and family spirit, centred around a very definite teaching and practice of the Christian faith. Halse was no disciplinarian, but he had a great influence on the boys of his small school, and his continuing love for boys was reflected when, even as archbishop of a great diocese, he made a point of interviewing personally each student in the church schools of his diocese. He talked to them of their interests, problems and aspirations, noted their names (for which he had a prodigious memory) in tiny notebooks, and never failed to conclude the interview with an individual prayer and blessing.

Yet Halse had become known as much more than a bush brother and headmaster. In North Queensland he was recognised as Bishop Feetham's right-hand man in diocesan affairs, and he was noted throughout Australia as a mission preacher and retreat conductor. His favourite theme, especially in the schools, was his "Modern Pilgrim's Progress", in which he brought Bunyan's allegory up to date in dramatic and penetrating fashion. Even as Bishop of Riverina, which office he held from 1925 to 1943, he visited Queensland on a number of occasions to conduct parochial missions or fulfil preaching engagements.

Archbishop Halse was enthroned in St. John's Cathedral at the height of the war on 3<sup>rd</sup> November, 1943. Although already sixty-two years of age, he demonstrated his remarkable physical vigour by undertaking a rapid round of parochial visits in

---

<sup>1536</sup> See above, p.361f.

fulfilment of what he conceived to be his essentially pastoral calling.<sup>1537</sup> Disclaiming any pretensions to original scholarship, such as had characterised his predecessor, Halse described his conception of his task:

Rightly or wrongly, I interpreted the reason for my selection to fulfil this high office as a desire on your part that I should continue to make personal contacts and to exercise a pastoral ministry in the country parishes as well as in the city.<sup>1538</sup>

This was the keynote of his episcopate. As his coadjutor bishop was already in his seventies, much more country work fell to the archbishop than might normally be expected: yet he entered upon long and exhausting country tours with remarkable energy and enjoyment. He liked to count up the number of occasions on which he had administered confirmation in a month, and sometimes the total was thirty or more. With the ability to live on a few hours' sleep each night – for he customarily became his liveliest about midnight – and aided by surreptitious catnaps at convenient moments, he performed an amount of work that would have daunted most men of much younger age.

One of Halse's greatest assets was his natural dignity. Utterly simple in his way of life, and having a bachelor's carelessness about neatness of dress, he yet looked very much a bishop. Particularly when participating in great liturgical functions his presence was gracious and dignified, yet completely unaffected, and his rich, sonorous voice was probably without peer in quality. Amidst the business of administration or in the pressure of great occasions, everything was done without apparent hurry. What was written of him by a contemporary of his bush brother days remained true throughout his life: "I never saw him hurry – but he was always 'there'. I never saw him surprised or disconcerted or – visibly – annoyed".<sup>1539</sup>

Indeed, Halse never forgot the lessons and methods learned as a bush brother. Having lived so long in Australia, he was much more immediately at home in his diocese than some of the archbishops who had preceded him; and clergy and laity alike found him readily accessible at all times. His correspondence was written in his own hand, and throughout his episcopate he never employed a secretary. The methods of modern business meant little to him. This scarcely made for efficiency of administration; yet he never failed to attend diligently to interviews or correspondence, and the very informal nature of his methods bore valuable witness to the importance of preserving a personal note in the church's work, in an age increasingly characterised by impersonal mass organisation. The itinerancy of his bush brotherhood ministry also influenced him throughout his life. He loved travelling, both inside and outside his diocese; and indeed, in his Riverina days, he was jokingly known to some of his colleagues as the "Bishop of Never-in-'er". To the close of his life he engaged on long and exhausting pastoral tours and overseas trips, and it was typical that the last three months of his life were spent on a journey around the world.

One particular quality that Halse had developed in his early ministry and that always remained with him was the ability to improvise. He was warden of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas during the first World War when the number of brothers was depleted, and gaps had constantly to be plugged. Then in founding a new school he had learned to adapt "the most improbable means to the most triumphantly useful ends".<sup>1540</sup> He never lost this capacity to 'make do': no unexpected emergency threw him off balance, and he always appeared to have some card up his sleeve with which the crisis could be met, at least in makeshift fashion. This was a useful asset, especially in the difficult days of the second World War and in the severe staff shortages in his diocese in post-war years. But he grew to delight in improvising; and it was this very quality that hindered him from being a great administrator, for there was always the inclination to make do with present resources rather than to make bold and comprehensive plans for future development. He was too ready, for example, to save manpower and money by combining various offices in the one person, and while this often solved immediate problems, it was a short-term policy, and was apt to diminish the efficiency of the person concerned by loading him with too heavy and varied a burden.

Dr. Halse's inflexible calmness also had its positive and negative aspects. It sprang from a deep spiritual life that was built around a regular pattern of the daily offices, meditation and Holy Communion. It led to a serenity that appeared unruffled, even in the gravest crisis or disappointment, and to a complete lack of personal ambition for advancement. When honours were placed upon him, he enjoyed them – whether it was the acting-primacy, the presidency of the Australian Council of Churches, or his knighthood; but he never took any steps to seek honours or promotion. The other side of this quality of calmness was a passivity in reaching decisions and initiating action. Archbishop Halse rarely spoke out strongly on controversial issues, and the clergy were sometimes disappointed that a clearer lead did not come from the archbishop. In this he contrasted markedly with his immediate predecessor: he was neither a decisive leader nor a firm disciplinarian. Archbishop Halse's position in the province was different from that of Archbishop Wand. Wand was a positive planner and originator of policies, which were frequently followed by the other bishops and dioceses of the province. Halse was rather,

<sup>1537</sup> In *Church Chronicle*, July 1944, for example, the archbishop recorded visits to 24 parishes in the past month.

<sup>1538</sup> Brisbane *Year Book*, 1944, Archbishop's synod charge, p.20.

<sup>1539</sup> B.P. Robin (later Bishop of Adelaide) in *N.Q. Jubilee Book*, p.79

<sup>1540</sup> Article on Halse by Bishop Feetham, *N.Q. Jubilee Book*, p. 32.



in the midst of the unsettled and unsettling conditions of the post-war world, the steadying influence, while it was left to the younger bishops of the province, and his subordinates in his own diocese, to make the more positive moves. It was significant that, though an inveterate traveller himself, he left it to the other bishops of Queensland to attend the Anglican Congress in Minneapolis in 1954, because he believed they would be able to gain more experience from it for the well-being of the province. As we shall see, it was others who took the lead in most of the new directions of church work in the post-war years. Yet Halse remained in a quite unique sense the leader of the province. His wide experience, his personal contacts made in frequent metropolitan tours, and his unquestioned relationship of guide and mentor to most of the bishops and many of the clergy of the province, all contributed to give him a patriarchal position which was a stabilising force in the midst of a flurry of new ideas and developments. His strength was that even in advanced years he remained alert to fruitful and positive trends, so that while not himself a great initiator, he was ready to encourage (or sometimes subtly restrain) those who were searching for new methods by which the church might fulfil its mission.

The archbishop had a far more subtle mind than many realised. If it was true that he was not a bold strategist, it was also true that he was a master tactician and diplomat. His very quality of passivity was used as a weapon of positive policy, for he was an expert in the art of purposeful inactivity when it served his purpose. His motto might almost be said to have been, "Time heals all wounds", and his method of meeting discord and strife was to display inflexible calmness until the fury was past. He then quietly proceeded along the path which all the time he believed to have been right. As one observer put it, "he became adept in the tactical arts of psychological suggestion, of the subtle implication"; and again, "he would choose with uncanny precision the best moment to make it appear that his opponent really deserved the credit for the idea which he had in fact put forward himself."<sup>1541</sup>

It was part of such a character to be tolerant, and Archbishop Halse was always more ready to find points of agreement with others than points of difference. "His greatest gift", commented Bishop Batty on Halse's arrival in Brisbane, "is that of the ministry of reconciliation".<sup>1542</sup> This was very true: to the archbishop, everything that would create discord, whether in world affairs, among classes in the nation, among Christians of various creeds, or within the Anglican Church itself, should be shunned. Whenever strikes occurred in the troubled industrial situation in the post-war years, he would always be on the side of arbitration.<sup>1543</sup> From the start, he was one of the leaders of the World Council of Churches in Australia, and worked unceasingly to encourage the growth of unity among the various denominations. He sought, with notable success, to continue the amicable relations that had existed between his predecessor and Archbishop Duhig, and he steadfastly declined, when goaded by the press, to make comments that might stir up sectarian bitterness. We shall have cause to examine at more length this quest for reconciliation which became more and more his dominating concern.

On 9 August 1962 Reginald Halse died peacefully in Brisbane at the age of 81 after a brief illness. He had just returned from a world tour, in which the knighthood had been conferred on him by the Queen, the first such honour given to any Anglican bishop outside the United Kingdom. There were those who thought he should have retired earlier: but to the end he retained remarkable vitality, and the fact was that he had so devoted his life to the active service of God in the sacred ministry of the church that it was virtually impossible for him to pull up the roots. His was a dedicated life, and though as leader and administrator he had his weaknesses, the respect and affection in which he was held was suggested by the deep and reverent silence of the crowds that lined the route of his funeral procession.

The degree of flux in the episcopate of the province in the years since the war is indicated by the fact that whereas it never fell to Archbishop Wand as metropolitan to consecrate a bishop, Dr. Halse consecrated two diocesan bishops for each of the mainland dioceses (apart from Brisbane), as well as two assistant bishops for New Guinea. Bishops Feetham, Davies and Ash were all ageing when Halse came to Brisbane. The first to retire was Bishop Fortescue Ash, who had spent a gruelling nineteen years in the Diocese of Rockhampton, and who believed that, having cleared the diocese of its crippling debt, he could best hand over the task of new construction to younger hands. Ash himself took up the post of commissioner for the centenary appeal for funds and missionaries being conducted by the Australian Board of Missions.

Three times the Rockhampton synod met to elect a new bishop. On each of the first two occasions the candidate declined the office, and on the failure of the third synod to elect, the appointment lapsed to the bishops of the province.<sup>1544</sup> Their choice fell on the Reverend James Alan George Housden, who at the time was vicar of the Melbourne parish of Christ Church, South Yarra.

Bishop Housden's appointment was significant, because he had gained most of his parochial experience in Queensland, both in the missionary Diocese of Carpentaria and in Brisbane, and he was a graduate of the University of Queensland and of St. Francis' Theological College. He was in fact the first old Franciscan to be elevated to the episcopate. His

<sup>1541</sup> Anglican, 16 August 1962.

<sup>1542</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1943.

<sup>1543</sup> e.g. Ibid., August 1946 and April 1948.

<sup>1544</sup> Rockhampton Special Synod Proceedings, October 1946, January 1947 and April 1947.

appointment was something of a surprise, for there had been few marks of brilliance in his career; but he had a reputation as a faithful and popular parish priest, who had built up a strong spiritual life in every parish where he had worked. In contrast to his immediate predecessors he was known neither as an organiser (like Ash) nor a scholar (like Crick), but he soon showed in his episcopate not only the deep pastoral concern with the lives of his people which made him loved and respected throughout the diocese, but also unsuspected abilities of administration and vision. Housden's status in fact grew with his episcopate, and with increasingly wide experience based not only on his work in his own diocese, but also on overseas visits to England, America and China, his voice became steadily more influential in the councils of the Australian church as a whole. For more than ten years he worked untiringly as Bishop of Rockhampton, until the recognition of his gifts led to his translation to the wider sphere of work in Newcastle in 1958.

It was not long before there was another episcopal change, this time in North Queensland. In September 1947 Bishop John Feetham died after a long illness which had gradually sapped his strength. It was the end of a long and notable episcopate, thirty-four years in length, in which even in his own lifetime he became an almost legendary figure. This led the North Queensland synod, after an investigation by a special commission, to have him proclaimed as a 'saint and hero of the Anglican Communion' in 1962.<sup>1545</sup> Yet with all his greatness, Feetham was never a business-like nor patient administrator: that the diocese had proceeded as smoothly as it had, had been due in no small measure to the long and faithful service of the diocesan secretary and registrar, C.E. Smith, who since 1926 had been primarily responsible for the business affairs of the diocese. North Queensland was left in 1947 with a strong religious tradition, but with a financial and administrative structure that was in need of drastic overhaul.

To accomplish such a reconstruction in the shadow of so illustrious a predecessor was to prove a task of unusual difficulty. For this role the synod elected as its next bishop the Reverend Wilfrid Bernard Belcher, who was at the time of his election vicar of a parish in Durban. Belcher was remembered in North Queensland for his effective work on the Atherton Tableland as a member of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas twenty years earlier, and his election signified the same desire for a pastoral bishop as had been apparent in the recent episcopal elections in Brisbane and Rockhampton. Unfortunately, however, Bishop Belcher lacked the striking gifts to enable his personality to stand out in contrast to that of John Oliver Feetham, and he never succeeded in catching the imagination of the diocese. He recognised that changes were required in diocesan administration,<sup>1546</sup> but he lacked the decisiveness and sureness of touch to carry through the necessary reforms. Belcher was cast in the wrong role, and his resignation in 1952 after an episcopate of less than five years was not altogether a surprise. Nevertheless his term of office did make it possible for his successor to grapple much more effectively with the problems that Belcher recognised, but was unable to solve.<sup>1547</sup>

It was Bishop Belcher who was responsible for "discovering" a new bishop for the see of Carpentaria, which fell vacant with the resignation of Bishop Stephen Davies in 1949. From a worldly point of view this was a very unattractive bishopric, and indeed had been since its creation. Its area was immense; its white population was small and scattered; there was need of constant and sometimes dangerous travel by land, air and water; there were problems of determining policies and exercising a pastoral ministry to the aborigines; and it was a diocese that could not hope to support itself either in manpower or finance. It was no easy task for the bishops of the province, on whose shoulders the choice lay, to find a man of the requisite calibre to occupy such an unrewarding post, and for a considerable period Archdeacon A.P.B. Bennie had to act as administrator of the diocese.

The Reverend Wilfrid John Hudson was rector of an English parish when Bishop Belcher lighted upon him on a visit to England in 1950. Like his predecessor, he had served an Australian apprenticeship in a bush brotherhood, having been principal of the Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd in the Diocese of Bathurst from 1937 to 1942. This link was later to be renewed, when the B.G.S. extended its sphere of work to take in the Northern Territory, which lay in the Diocese of Carpentaria. Bishop Hudson brought great spiritual and pastoral gifts to his work, and continued the Carpentarian tradition whereby the bishop is a father-in-God to his clergy and people rather than an administrator or great scholar. Constantly hindered by lack of staff and finance, he led the diocese for ten hard years in which the new government policy of aboriginal assimilation required radical re-thinking of the nature of the church's mission to the aborigines. Firm, yet courteous, in his administration, Bishop Hudson won the affection of his people in his thankless task, until in 1960 he gave up the reins to accept appointment as Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane and head of the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul.

With these new leaders the church faced the many pressing questions that occupied the international and local scene. Pre-eminent among them was the question of communism, which both as a philosophy of life and as the ideology of one of the great world power blocs presented a clear challenge to organised Christianity. It was generally agreed that Marxian

<sup>1545</sup> Anglican, 7 June 1962. The day set aside for his commemoration was 15 September

<sup>1546</sup> Townsville Daily Bulletin, 2 July 1948.

<sup>1547</sup> For further details, see Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, Chap. 7.

communism, grounded as it was on materialism and atheism, was thoroughly antipathetic to Christianity. On the practical policy to be adopted towards communism, however, there were differences of opinion in the church.

There were those like Archdeacon W.A. Hardie, one of the most influential of the Brisbane clergy,<sup>1548</sup>

who bluntly declared that "Communism is the enemy of the Christian Church. Communism is the enemy of God".<sup>1549</sup> It was Hardie's powerful oratory that carried a motion through the Brisbane synod in 1950, at the time when the federal government was planning legislation to ban the Communist Party in Australia:

That this Synod is of the opinion that Communism is a menace to religion and freedom, and approves in principle of legislative measures to counteract the subversive activities of the Communist Party in this country.<sup>1550</sup>

The motion was approved, and an amendment to alter the last part of it was defeated.

There were other voices in the church which sought to take a more positive line on communism, even though they were as strongly opposed to its philosophy. Thus, Archbishop Halse, speaking to the same synod, reminded members that for the Christian it should not be a matter of choosing between communism on the one hand and capitalism or socialism on the other:

It is becoming clear that behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and in China there are many Christians who, while repudiating its atheism and materialism, see more of the spirit of Christ in the tenets of Communism than in the social inequalities of the systems in their midst which it has superseded. If we on the other hand are still convinced that Communism as a power in the world is fundamentally opposed to God and spiritual values, we must still bear in mind that neither Capitalism nor socialism by itself can ever solve the world's problems. We must press on to a Christian social order which 'allows full expression to human personality in freedom and responsibility, and in which work is carried on in a spirit of dedicated service to God and men'.<sup>1551</sup>

In Rockhampton, Bishop Housden expressed a similar point of view: it was not by faith in democracy, or free enterprise, or socialism alone that communism must be met, but by a living faith in God.<sup>1552</sup> While he did not specifically oppose anti-communist legislation, Bishop Housden insisted that legislation was not the real solution to the problem: what was really needed was an awakening of the conscience of the nation to the real nature and purpose of communism.<sup>1553</sup> The following year, the bishop spoke more strongly on the dangers of a negative kind of militant anti-communism:

The Church as a whole has not been stampeded into joining in a heresy hunt against Communists who are described as the source of all evil in this land. That is simply not true. Atheistic Communism is only one among many evils in our country, and if every communist so called were removed tomorrow many or most of the present evils would remain. The Church holds no brief for Communism, but must not be diverted from her whole task of opposing evil by following a spotlight directed to one particular brand of evil which obscures all the other evils surrounding it.<sup>1554</sup>

If Anglican leaders were not so vehement as some other clergymen and politicians in their denunciation of communism, this was the reason. They believed it was false to portray communism as the anti-Christ of the age, and they recognised that in practice western capitalism was as materialist as communism, and that this underlying materialism, of which communism was only one variety, was a more fundamental evil than communism itself. After Bishop Housden visited communist China in 1956 as a member of a delegation from the Church of England in Australia to the Anglican Church in China, he expressed a more favourable view of Chinese society than was commonly presented in the Australian press, and showed a willingness to recognise the positive achievements of the communist regime.

One delicate problem that arose in connection with communist tactics concerned the attitude which the church should adopt with regard to the 'peace movement'. It was widely suspected that under the guise of a disinterested quest for peace this movement was in fact an instrument of the policy of international communism, and that churchmen were being used as dupes to provide a front of respectability for the peace rallies.<sup>1555</sup> It was not easy, however, for Christians to escape the charge of insincerity in their desire for peace if they withheld their support from the peace movement. On this matter, Bishop Housden spoke out emphatically:

<sup>1548</sup> Later Dean of Newcastle, and from 1961 Bishop of Ballarat.

<sup>1549</sup> Church Chronicle, May 1948.

<sup>1550</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1950, p.103

<sup>1551</sup> Ibid., Archbishop's synod charge, p.94.

<sup>1552</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1948, p.14.

<sup>1553</sup> Ibid., 1950, p.12.

<sup>1554</sup> Ibid., 1951, p.13.

<sup>1555</sup> This view was confirmed by the experience of a young Anglican layman, Thomas Treherne, who visited Europe in the early 1950's as a trade union delegate to a youth peace rally. He found that

The enemy within is very cunning, and disguises himself without compunction. He is now fluttering the olive branch of peace. Under the guise of Peace Movements he endeavours to trap the unwary Christian into supporting him, but it is only his methods that have changed, not his nature.<sup>1556</sup>

As the peace propaganda grew in intensity, it was obvious that the church must make its position clear, and a World Council of Churches committee on international affairs, meeting at Bishopsbourne and consisting largely of Anglican members, carefully considered the matter, and in articles in the press set out the church's attitude to the peace movements and associated questions.<sup>1557</sup> It was made clear that pacifism was not to be regarded as the logical Christian policy in the face of the aggressive communist tactic of "peace".

On other party political questions the Anglican attitude was typically one of non-involvement. Socialism was never anathematised by the Anglican Church, as it had been an official Roman Catholic pronouncement, though at times various Anglican leaders pointed to the possible dangers in socialism as in unbridled capitalism.<sup>1558</sup> The issue upon which most heat was generated was the proposed nationalisation of banking by the Labor government. On this matter some church leaders gave their views as individual citizens, mostly in opposition to the proposal, but no official Anglican attitude was agreed upon. There was a move in the Brisbane diocesan council to come out in opposition to bank nationalisation, and the Archbishop-in-Council did in fact express "deep concern" at the possible consequences of the proposed legislation. A sub-committee was appointed to consider what Christian principles were at stake, and to publish an official statement; but opinion within the diocesan council was strongly divided, and no further statement was ever issued.<sup>1559</sup>

Likewise the split in the Labor Party in the 1950's, which had such direct implications for the Roman Catholic Church, was not of direct concern to the Church of England. Again it was Bishop Housden who expressed the Anglican position after the bitterly contested state election of 1957 in which the Labor split was the dominating factor:

The church's role in politics has been called in question during the recent State Elections. We believe it to be the duty of the Church too state the moral and spiritual issues involved and to leave it to the conscience of the individual Christian to vote as he feels led by God. The idea of the Church becoming a 'pressure group' in the political sphere is abhorrent to Anglicans.<sup>1560</sup>

The bishop went on to criticise the claim which one political party<sup>1561</sup> made during the election to have the support of most churches as being "contrary to truth and good taste".

Other major social issues that concerned the church in the post-war years will be discussed in subsequent sections. It will be convenient, however, to mention several other matters here.

One concern was the changing character of the Australian population as a result of large-scale immigration from non-British countries, which had the effect of diminishing the Anglican proportion of the population.<sup>1562</sup> This was naturally a matter of concern to Anglican leaders, yet in view of the obvious necessity for large-scale immigration, a policy of opposition to continental immigration was out of the question. Anglican bishops did, however, urge their people to take practical steps to encourage a larger number of British – and Anglican – migrants to come to Australia. In 1957 a pastoral letter was sent by the primate, Archbishop H.W.K. Mowll, on behalf of all the bishops, to be read in every parish church:

It is not that we think disparagingly of these latter people continental Europeans; they have made a real contribution to our national economy, and, some of them, to our culture; but we should make every effort to bring the utmost of British and Anglicans that we can.<sup>1563</sup>

Parishes were urged to take an active interest in the 'Bring out a Briton' campaign, and individual families were encouraged to sponsor migrants. Some parishes did take action on a small scale; the general response from church people was, however, fairly limited.

A quite different matter of concern was the rising tide of divorce, and of the consequent breakdown of the Christian conception of family life and the sanctity and permanence of marriage. The bishops and clergy frequently expressed their opposition on theological grounds, to divorce, and the established practice was to refuse to re-marry divorcees in Anglican

<sup>1556</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1950. p.12.

<sup>1557</sup> e.g. Brisbane Courier Mail, 25 June 1954.

<sup>1558</sup> See, for example, Archbishop Halse's sermon, 'The Federal Election – How We Ought to Vote', Church Chronicle, December 1949.

<sup>1559</sup> Minutes, Brisbane Diocesan Council, 2 October 1947, 6 November 1947 and 12 February 1948. See also Bishop Housden's comments, Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1948, p.14.

<sup>1560</sup> Ibid., 1957, Bishop's address, p.8 f.

<sup>1561</sup> The Queensland Labor Party.

<sup>1562</sup> Census figures show that in Queensland between 1947 and 1961 the Anglican proportion of the population declined from 35% to 32%. Biggest gains were made by the Roman Catholic Church.

<sup>1563</sup> Pastoral Letter, British Migration, 1 September 1957.

churches while the partner of the marriage was still living. This rigid attitude was unpopular, as it was directly contrary to the post-war trend to greater laxity in marriage customs. The clash between the two types of approach to marriage and divorce came to a head in 1959 with the proposed federal legislation for uniform laws, which widened the grounds for divorce in certain important respects. A meeting of the Australian bishops in Brisbane, over which Archbishop Halse presided as acting-primate, completely opposed the extension of divorce on two proposed grounds, while expressing appreciation of certain other aspects of the legislation.<sup>1564</sup> The controversial clauses became law, and the church's opposition proved ineffective; but it did serve to publicise the concern of the church for an increasing social problem that was having marked effects on the nature of Australian society. Meanwhile as this rearguard action was being fought against the extension of divorce, the church paid attention in the post-war years to positive measures to foster the stability of marriage: more emphasis was placed on pre-marital counselling by the clergy, some support was given to marriage guidance councils, and in some parishes programmes of sex education within a Christian context were designed to help those looking towards marriage.

The old topics of liquor, gambling and Sunday observance also occupied the church's attention in new forms in the post-war years. It has become apparent throughout our history that the Church of England has traditionally taken a moderate attitude on all these matters, and Bishop Ian Shevill went so far as to deprecate publicly the negative attitude of some Christian denominations on these issues.<sup>1565</sup> Nevertheless, concern was expressed, particularly in the Diocese of Brisbane, at the possible effects of legislation that might markedly change existing patterns of behaviour, and the Brisbane diocesan council issued a lengthy statement in 1961 on the subjects of off-the-course betting, Sunday sport and liquor reform.<sup>1566</sup>

In 1953 the Brisbane synod had pledged its "unqualified active opposition to any movement to legalise 'off-the-course' betting,"<sup>1567</sup> and this attitude was reaffirmed in 1961 in the face of government proposals for the extension of legal gambling facilities. The protest, however, evoked no response from the government. On the question of Sunday sport, the diocesan council's statement specifically dissociated the Church of England from any view that organised Sunday sport was necessarily evil in itself, but safeguards were requested to ensure that the quietness of Sunday rest be preserved for those who desired it, that commercialised sport be prohibited during the customary hours of worship, and that the proper recreation of all workers be preserved. A later protest by the diocesan council against the proposal to play the Davis Cup challenge round in Brisbane on a Sunday gained considerable publicity, and the dates were eventually altered. On liquor reforms proposed by the government, the statement was generally favourable, and guardedly approved of the licensing of selected cafes to serve liquor with meals.

In most of these matters the stand taken by the church went against the tide of popular public opinion, and in one respect the Church of England was in a difficult position. Its very attitude of moderation was an extremely difficult one to defend logically. Those denominations which simply opposed gambling, liquor and Sunday sport as morally wrong in themselves found it easy to be consistent in their very extremism, while those Christian bodies – and others – who saw no harm in the trend towards a secularised Sunday, and increased facilities for betting and drinking, were in the easy position of swimming with the tide. By its attitude of moderation in these matters the Church of England lay itself open to charges of inconsistency, and it was probably true that the Anglican policy needed to be more coherently defined and clearly explained. Yet by its nature this kind of policy defied precise definition: it involved the decision as to where the line should be drawn beyond which practices that were harmless enough in themselves could become dangerous to the individual and society. Such decision was bound in some sense to be arbitrary; yet the church stood by the conviction that a decision must be made if Christian standards were not to be gradually corroded.

## ii. Christianity and Colour

For years before the war it had been apparent that relationships between the white and coloured races of the world were bound to change their character. Yet the dramatic suddenness with which this has happened could hardly have been foreseen even in 1945. First in Asia, and then in Africa, new coloured nations came to independence on a rising tide of nationalism, and some of them quickly rose to positions of importance in international affairs. Even in areas not directly affected by revolutionary changes, the post-war years witnessed a marked change in attitudes in race relationships.

As we have seen throughout this history, the church in Queensland had always had a special interest in this question. Not only geographically was Queensland the closest part of the continent to large masses of coloured peoples in Asia and the Pacific, but within Queensland itself, particularly in the north, there was the internal problem of a multi-racial society to a

<sup>1564</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1959, p.85f.

<sup>1565</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1958-9 Bishop's synod address, p.48.

<sup>1566</sup> Duplicated statement, available at Diocesan Registry.

<sup>1567</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1953, p.108.

small degree. The church had always talked in terms of the principle of the brotherhood and equality of men, even when such talk was scoffed at by most white men, and regarded only as a distant ideal by many practising Christians themselves. Post-war conditions rendered a searching re-examination of the whole question urgent.

The White Australia policy was one matter clearly affected by changing world attitudes. Particularly rigid application of the policy by the Labor government in the late forties made it a matter of considerable public controversy, and the church began to reconsider the question more seriously than it had done since early in the century. We noted then that church leaders had accepted it in general terms, though with certain major reservations;<sup>1568</sup> but with changed conditions by 1950, these reservations began to become more and more prominent. The Brisbane synod in 1949 carried a motion deprecating the use of the term 'White Australia',<sup>1569</sup> and the following year Archbishop Halse spoke carefully on the subject. Making it clear that he was not advocating unrestricted Asian immigration, he went on:

In view of the growing resentment of Asian and African peoples to anything resembling a colour bar, it seems highly desirable that there should be a quota of a few carefully selected citizens of Asian countries admitted each year to permanent citizenship in all countries like Australia, and if that is so, it is the duty of the Church to say so, no matter how unpopular such a suggestion may be with all political parties. We must remember that God has made of one blood all nations and peoples and tongues, and it is therefore sub-Christian to exclude anyone from free and equal citizenship if the only justification for such action is based entirely on colour.<sup>1570</sup>

Such a suggestion was, indeed, an unpopular one at the time. It was unpopular with the political parties, who feared its political consequences; it was unpopular with the trade unions, who were traditionally prejudiced in favour of a white Australia on economic grounds; and it was unpopular with many ex-service interests, on the grounds of a potential military threat to Australia from an enemy within. Yet church leaders and synods continued to press for a breaking down of the rigid racial policy, and the later fifties saw an increasingly favourable climate of opinion to some modification of the traditional policy.

The distinctive Christian approach to race relationships was shown in another respect. When anti-Japanese sentiment was still very strong in Australia in 1947, Archbishop Halse, accompanied by the Reverend Ian Shevill,<sup>1571</sup> made a flying visit to Japan as a goodwill gesture to Japanese Christians.<sup>1572</sup> Even more significant was the return visit of the presiding bishop of the Anglican Church in Japan, the Right Reverend Michael Yashiro, in 1950. It was the first visit of a Japanese national to Australia after the war, and it aroused considerable controversy and hostility in some quarters. But it was a valuable practical witness by the church to the need to put aside the bitterness of war and resume happier racial relationships.

The concern of the church for fostering better relations with the non-European races was stimulated by the growing awareness that Australia occupied a unique position as a white Christian nation in an Asian-Pacific non-Christian environment. It was the religious equivalent of the political awakening which led Australia to sponsor and participate in the Colombo Plan. The result was a radical reappraisal of the whole missionary task of the church. The old relatively haphazard method of undertaking missionary enterprise according to accidents of interest and opportunity was being replaced by a new degree of planning. The word 'strategy' came to be more frequently heard in connection with missions.<sup>1573</sup> Missionary effort began to be planned in accordance with changing trends in the world's political and economic structure, and at the same time striking new forms of propaganda were undertaken on the home front to bring home to church people the challenge which the church faced on the mission field in the changing world situation.

The appointment of the Reverend Ian Shevill as organising secretary for the Australian Board of Missions in Queensland in 1945 signalled the beginning of the new approach to missionary organisation on the home front. A young priest with a flair for publicity and a facility at painting striking word-pictures, Shevill typified the new attitude. He underlined the importance of missions in the face of non-Christian religions and philosophies that were competing for the allegiance of mankind. Sensing the opportunities for mixed youth groups in the church, in contrast to the segregated groups of pre-war years, he built up branches of the Comrades of St. George, a society of young men and women dedicated to special interest in missionary work. He even organised a group of women to staff a city café, whose proceeds were to go to the missionary cause.<sup>1574</sup> The result was a steady rise in contributions to missionary work from every diocese in the province, and a greater consciousness of missions as an integral part of the work of the church than there had ever been before in Queensland.

<sup>1568</sup> See above, Chap. 14, iii.

<sup>1569</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1949, p.99.

<sup>1570</sup> Ibid., 1950, Archbishop's synod charge, p.96.

<sup>1571</sup> Later, from 1953, Bishop of North Queensland

<sup>1572</sup> Church Chronicle, October 1947.

<sup>1573</sup> See, for example, the address of the Rev. Ian Shevill to the Brisbane synod, Church Chronicle, August 1951.

<sup>1574</sup> Ibid., April, 1946.

This degree of planning at the state level was in itself a part of national planning of missionary endeavour. For example, a concerted campaign was conducted by A.B.M. from 1947 to 1952 to recruit fifty new missionaries and raise a special fund of £100,000 in order to recoup wartime setbacks and make new advances. Bishop Fortescue Ash, formerly of Rockhampton, directed the campaign, and by its conclusion all the Queensland dioceses reported passing their objectives.<sup>1575</sup> This was a notable effort, as it was additional to ordinary missionary contributions. Unfortunately before the appeal concluded, disaster struck in New Guinea in the form of the eruption of Mt. Lamington, with great losses of life, and material damage for the church estimated at £25,000. Archbishop Halse, as metropolitan, broadcast a special message of encouragement to New Guinea from his cathedral, and Brisbane diocese alone sent £3,000 as immediate help, while several priests and laymen immediately volunteered to go to serve in New Guinea to fill the gaps that had been created.<sup>1576</sup> The Mt. Lamington appeal was an emergency measure. More carefully planned as a part of the overall missionary strategy of the post-war years was the Australia-wide South-East Asia appeal for £100,000, launched in 1953, with the joint support of A.B.M. and the Church Missionary Society. This was intended as the church's answer to the continuing spread of communism in south-east Asia, and though the appeal did not achieve its financial goal, it did enable a considerably increased measure of assistance from Australia to the church in south-east Asia.

Behind this last appeal lay a conception that was increasingly predominant in missionary strategy, that the objective must be to develop indigenous churches rather than to perpetuate old-style foreign missions. One method adopted towards this end was to provide training in Australia for potential leaders of the newer indigenous churches, in a manner closely akin to the technical training provided in Australian universities and colleges under the Colombo Plan. Under this scheme selected theological students or priests from Melanesia, the Torres Strait islands, Borneo, Korea, Japan and Burma spent periods at St. Francis' College for theological training, sometimes in association with practical experience in Brisbane parishes. In the same way, promising Papuan and aboriginal high school children were sent in small numbers by mission authorities for education at church schools in Queensland, particularly All Souls' and Slade. At the same time more attention was being devoted to the training of native ordinands at colleges within their own dioceses, both in Carpentaria and New Guinea. Archdeacon A.P.B. Bennie went to the Torres Strait to direct the work at St. Paul's Theological College, Moa, in 1946, and in 1951 the former vice-principal of St. Francis' College, the Reverend E.L. Cassidy, went to New Guinea to take charge of the Newton Theological College. The climax of this work was the consecration of one of these Papuan ordinands, the Reverend George Ambo, to be an assistant bishop in New Guinea in 1960.

In this regard the church in Queensland, itself a missionary outpost of the English church only a century before, might be said to have reached maturity. Not only did it become a base for Australian missionary enterprise, but it began to play a small but significant part in helping the younger churches of Asia and the Pacific to self-support.

Within Queensland itself the aborigines and Torres Strait islanders did not seem to be directly affected by the world-wide aspirations of coloured peoples in the years immediately after the war. Yet changing world attitudes on race relationships naturally made their mark on opinion in Australia, especially as Australia's aboriginal policy came under searching international scrutiny in the United Nations and elsewhere. Up to the early years of the twentieth century there had seemed no need for a long-term aboriginal policy: it was taken for granted that the aborigines would die out, and that missionary work amongst them was a philanthropic enterprise designed to make their last days as comfortable spiritually and materially as possible. The church realised, before the government and public opinion, that the aborigines were not dying out, because it was chiefly on mission stations that the decline of aboriginal population was reversed. Yet, no new long-term policy had been developed.

Early in the century church and government had agreed that segregation of aborigines was the only practicable policy, if they were to be protected from exploitation and unequal white competition. But even early in the twentieth century bishops like Gilbert White were pointing out that segregation might not be the final solution, even though it was the only reasonable short-term policy. It was, however, only after the second World War that the problem was coherently considered. The result, accepted by both church and state, was the policy called Assimilation, which implied not necessarily absorption nor inter-marriage with whites, but "ultimate equality of opportunity, of status and responsibility".<sup>1577</sup>

The official adoption of this policy by the Queensland government in the early 1950's implied a great change in the whole conception of the nature and purpose of church mission stations. Before the war the church's task was regarded as being to win converts to Christianity, while making some attempt to educate the children, care for the sick and keep the peace. To assist in the social and educational aspects of this work, the state government had made grants of £1,000 a year to Yarrabah, and £1,100 altogether for the missions within Carpentaria diocese, namely Mitchell River, Edward River and

<sup>1575</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1952, p.37.

<sup>1576</sup> Church Chronicle, March 1951, and Brisbane Year Book, 1951, p.41

<sup>1577</sup> This, with much of the material in this section on Assimilation, is based on a statement issued by the Diocese of Carpentaria, "Long Term Planning for Aboriginal Missions", published in Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1958, p.28ff.

Lockhart River. Under pressure of wartime and post-war inflation these amounts were increased, so that by 1951 the three Carpentarian missions, for example, received a total of £2,400, an amount which scarcely represented any increase in real values. The change in the quantity of government assistance, symbolising the new concept of missionary work, was quite marked in subsequent years. In 1952 the government gave £7,375 to the Carpentaria missions, and rising by annual amounts, the figure had reached £17,900 by 1958.<sup>1578</sup>

At first sight this would appear to make the church's task on the aboriginal missions much easier. In fact, however, the opposite was true. The new policy meant that entirely different standards were required in the way of housing sanitation and food supplies, which in turn required not only vastly increased capital expenditure, but also a different type of staff, including engineers, builders, agriculturalists and welfare workers, as well as the traditional priests, teachers and nurses. The trouble was that the increased grants were grossly inadequate to finance the requirements of the standards expected under the new policy, and they in no way helped to provide the expert additional staff that was now needed. The work of the missions was completely changing in character: it was no longer predominantly religious, as it required financial, technical and human resources that were not readily available in the church.

At Yarrabah the problem was even greater than in the Gulf missions. Yarrabah was a much older and more highly developed station, its inhabitants were further advanced, and in view of its proximity to Cairns it was in closer contact with European life. It had sometimes been portrayed by mission enthusiasts as a model mission, and indeed much had been accomplished against powerful odds; yet for many years there had been indications that the results achieved were not such as might have been expected after more than half a century of concentrated effort. As early as 1933 the Right Reverend Horace Dixon, presiding over the Brisbane synod in the absence of the archbishop, had shocked synodsmen by a frank disclosure of deplorable conditions obtaining at Yarrabah.<sup>1579</sup> Two years later, Bishop Feetham spoke of the "ups and downs" of Yarrabah<sup>1580</sup> and pressed A.B.M. to cede control of the mission to the Diocese of North Queensland. This was done in 1937,<sup>1581</sup> but far from solving the problems, debts continued to mount and staff proved as hard to find as ever.

By 1948 the annual expenditure on Yarrabah was £19,000, a sum made possible only by considerable government grants. Even with these subsidies a great debt had accumulated, which was only met by a special government grant of £11,000, together with another £3,000 for a new launch.<sup>1582</sup> By 1955 the government had to make good a further debt of £14,000.<sup>1583</sup> The difficulty was not so much that church support for missions was declining, as that so much of the work now coming under the scope of the mission was of a secular nature, and could scarcely therefore be paid for from ordinary missionary contributions. Difficulties continued to mount: trained staff was always hard to find,<sup>1584</sup> and there were criticisms of mission administration inspired by a minority of discontented aborigines, who gained the support of the Cairns Trades and Labour Council.<sup>1585</sup>

By 1959 it was clear that the situation could not continue indefinitely. Bishop Shevill spoke to his synod on the subject:

The Church at Yarrabah is no longer running a mission but a large Social Service project which it is often felt is beyond the manpower resources which the Church can marshal and the financial resources which the Government can make available.<sup>1586</sup>

Finally in July, 1960, after long negotiations, an agreement was made between the Diocese of North Queensland and the government as to the future of Yarrabah. It was agreed that Yarrabah should become a government station. A sum of from £150,000 to £200,000 was to be spent by the government on improving facilities on the mission, and every effort to be made to raise living standards. The Church of England was given, however, sole spiritual rights at the settlement, and a chaplain was to be appointed by the Bishop of North Queensland, and paid by the government.<sup>1587</sup>

It was with considerable relief that the diocese handed over what had become an oppressive burden to the government. The story of Yarrabah had not been one of total failure, though all that had been hoped for had not been accomplished. Resources of staff and money had been inadequate from the beginning; there had been a tendency to "spoon-feed" the

<sup>1578</sup> *Ibid.*, p.29.

<sup>1579</sup> *Church Chronicle*, July 1933.

<sup>1580</sup> *N.Q. Year Book*, 1934-5, Bishop's synod address, p.30.

<sup>1581</sup> *Ibid.*, 1936-7, p.45.

<sup>1582</sup> *Minutes*, N.Q. Synod, 1951 and 1952.

<sup>1583</sup> *Northern Churchman*, September 1955.

<sup>1584</sup> From 1950 to 1960 A.B.M. sent 21 missionaries to Yarrabah, whose average length of service was 1 year 7 months. In the same period the diocese provided 41 members of staff, who served for an average term of 2 years 4 months. In these ten years there were four superintendents. *Northern Churchman*, August 1960.

<sup>1585</sup> *N.Q. Year Book*, 1955-6, p.51 and 1957-8, p.52

<sup>1586</sup> *Ibid.*, 1958-9, p.61

<sup>1587</sup> *Northern Churchman*, August 1960.



aborigines for too long; and the spiritual and material progress of the inhabitants had been uneven. The church had pioneered the work when the rest of the community had shown little concern for the aborigines, but the new concordat was a recognition that at a certain point of development the scope and nature of a mission like Yarrabah went beyond the range of activities and resources of the church.

On the missions in Carpentaria, where the aborigines were more remote and backward, and embraced a much larger proportion of full-bloods, the situation was different. Conditions were still very primitive, and though Bishop Hudson and his diocesan council recognised the wisdom of the government policy of assimilation, they were aware that it must be a gradual process. First aboriginal standards of living, hygiene and education must be made incomparably higher than they had been, or absorption into European civilisation would have disastrous social consequences. As an official statement of diocesan policy put it:

They are at present quite unable to withstand the impact of white civilisation, as it exists, without suffering spiritual and moral deterioration.<sup>1588</sup>

The statement pointed to aboriginal shanty towns on the outskirts of certain Australian cities as a demonstration of the truth of this claim. The next step, then, was to be

The development of Aboriginal Communities where they can be educated to become self-supporting units, retaining such of their own customs and culture as are not incompatible with Christian civilisation, and at the same time advancing in education, living standards, economic activity and a sense of personal responsibility. By such means they will in time become capable of meeting the white man on an equal footing and taking their place in the community as citizens of the Australian Commonwealth.<sup>1589</sup>

One prerequisite of this was the development of local industries on the missions, so that the aborigines might work towards self-support, in contrast to the mistaken policy which had first been adopted at Mitchell River and elsewhere of making the aborigines so dependent on the rations provided by the mission that they lost all sense of the need for personal initiative.

The unfavourable nature of the country, the shortage of trained technical staff, and the capital costs involved in establishing industries combined to make the theory difficult of realisation. At Mitchell River the cattle industry, which had been operating since 1917, was flourishing, though the parlous state of diocesan finances caused its income to be used for general diocesan purposes rather than for local development. At Lockhart a trochus industry was commenced in 1951. This mission had become badly run down and the people riddled with disease, but a fresh superintendent, a relatively new convert to Christianity, John Warby, took the mission in hand and quickly inspired new life in it.<sup>1590</sup> It was on this station in 1954 that an A.B.M. Officer, the Reverend Alf Clint, of strong socialist sympathies and a zealot for co-operatives, founded the first aboriginal co-operative among the natives engaged in the trochus industry. Known as the Lockhart River Aboriginal Christian Co-operative Society Ltd., it provided a valuable experiment in the fostering of aboriginal self-support and of a sense of mutual responsibility.<sup>1591</sup> The significance of this experiment in the whole missionary policy of the church among the aborigines was well illustrated by a reported comment of Canon F.W. Coaldrake, chairman of the Australian Board of Missions:

We've got to realize that missions, as we know them, are on the way out. If only we can swing our missions over to co-operatives, these aborigines will be trained to enter white society on a better footing than is possible at the moment.<sup>1592</sup>

The problem, however, was succinctly expressed in the words that followed:

All we need is the trained staff, the organization, the money, the intelligence to do it. Three of these we have to find.<sup>1593</sup>

The concept of co-operatives as the panacea for the ills of aboriginal missions did not command universal consent, and it is still too early to pass judgment. Already difficulties have appeared: changed economic conditions have since ruined the trochus industry, and efforts to find a new economic base for Lockhart's co-operative have had to be made. Warby, however, believes that the Lockhart co-operative was strikingly successful in helping to develop "character, especially a sense of responsibility, self respect, self-reliance and initiative" among the aborigines,<sup>1594</sup> and that in this major objective it was a distinct success.

Another doubt surrounds the question as to whether the 2,500 square miles of Anglican mission reserves in Carpentaria are sufficient in resources to support the total population of the reserves at standards of living at all comparable to those of

<sup>1588</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1958, p.31.

<sup>1589</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1590</sup> For further details, see Tennant, K., Speak You So Gently, p.26ff.

<sup>1591</sup> Ibid., passim. Also General Synod Proceedings, 1955, p.125.

<sup>1592</sup> Tennant, K., op.cit., p.172.

<sup>1593</sup> Ibid.

<sup>1594</sup> In a private letter to myself, dated 22<sup>nd</sup> November 1960.

the white population. Certainly they are not unless there is undertaken a long-range programme of capital development which appears to be beyond the present resources of the church.<sup>1595</sup>

What will be the future of the Gulf missions is still uncertain. Widespread publicity by the new Bishop of Carpentaria, the Right Reverend John Matthews, brought the deplorable material conditions (with their resultant spiritual and moral effects) to the attention of the Australian public in 1961.<sup>1596</sup> Bishop Matthews set about a deliberate campaign to awaken both the government and the church to the urgent need to guide the aborigines to better standards of life, and set about recruiting additional staff for the aboriginal missions with some success, both in England and Australia. Nevertheless, the resources required will be enormous, and it remains to be seen whether the government will ultimately be willing to accept the kind of concordat that was reached in relation to Yarrabah. The most hopeful elements in the situation have been a willingness to face up frankly to past failures and to the inadequacy of present methods, and to experiment with new types of approach to aboriginal work.

The Torres Strait islanders are quite distinct from the aborigines, and the problems of the straits mission have been somewhat different. A major consideration has been the growth of population to something more than 7,000 with the consequent threat of over-population in relation to the resources of the little islands. In the islands the church has only been responsible for the directly spiritual work, and the government has provided educational and other social facilities.<sup>1597</sup> Yet the church has remained a strong centre of social life, and one of the great ambitions of the islanders has been to be elected to the post of churchwarden of the island church.<sup>1598</sup> The growth of the native ministry has brought closer the day when the ideal of a priest on every island with any reasonable population will be achieved. The islanders, however, have been affected by the same economic threat that assailed the Lockhart shell industry, and A.B.M. has had to assist them to find other avenues of employment.<sup>1599</sup>

From all that has been said, it may be seen that one of the most significant changes in the nature of the work of the church since the war has been in missionary policy. Changing attitudes to race relationships have made it inevitable that this should be so, and though it has demanded painful reassessments of policies and methods it can scarcely be doubted that the change has been a healthy one. Already it is clear that the Anglican Church has been fairly ready to adapt itself to the different needs of a new age.

### iii. Financial Revolution and Its Consequences.

The church emerged from the second World War with its finances markedly affected both by the war and its attendant inflation. The war itself had a twofold effect. On the one hand the shortage of parochial clergy resulted in a diminution of contributions to church funds in some areas: it was a natural consequence that where the ministrations of the church were deficient, financial support from parishioners was bound to drop. On the other hand, the existence of building restrictions, which had almost brought to a standstill the erection of new churches, halls and rectories, had given the opportunity in many places for the accumulation of building funds; and the desire to erect buildings as war memorials stimulated this accumulation of finance – especially at the parochial level – for building purposes. This trend was encouraged by the fact that contributions to war memorial funds were allowed as income-tax deductions.

The inflation that had begun during the war and continued increasingly in the post-war years likewise had a twofold effect. On the one hand, the endowments of the church, upon which central diocesan funds in particular had partly depended, declined in real value. In some cases even the nominal income fell due to lower interest rates; but in every case real income declined due to the depreciation of the pound. On the other hand, in dioceses like Brisbane, where there was heavy indebtedness, inflation had the helpful counterbalancing effect of greatly reducing the real value of the debts. The current income of the church by way of direct offerings of the people rose steadily with inflated values; yet ingrained habits of giving were slow to alter, and the increased giving of church people was inclined to lag behind the increased costs which the church had to meet.<sup>1600</sup>

The financial outlook varied from diocese to diocese at the end of the war. Rockhampton was relatively in the best position as Bishop Ash's tireless efforts had eliminated entirely the debt in that diocese. In North Queensland the school debts had

<sup>1595</sup> General Synod Reports, 1960, p.39.

<sup>1596</sup> See, for example, Brisbane Courier-Mail., 20 February, 1961, and Anglican, 28 April 1961

<sup>1597</sup> The exception to this is St. Paul's Mission, Moa, which is entirely a church settlement, and where the church maintains a school, store, dispensary and theological college. The people on St. Paul's are not Torres Strait islanders, however, but Melanesians descended from the kanakas.

<sup>1598</sup> Tennant, K., op.cit., p.169.

<sup>1599</sup> General Synod Reports, 1960, p.40.

<sup>1600</sup> These considerations were fully discussed by R.T. St. John, Registrar of the Diocese of Brisbane, in a lecture at the Clergy Summer School, Toowoomba, January 1957.

been reduced, but there were still annual deficits in the administrative costs of the diocese. In Brisbane the desperate annual losses of the thirties had been checked, but there remained a heavy burden of debt, scarcely reduced at all from the worst period of the depression; and what was even more serious, there remained a mental attitude of conservatism and fear in financial affairs that restrained every positive move that the diocese might make. The clergy were left personally in serious financial straits: in Brisbane in spite of the wartime rise in cost of living, the minimum stipend of rectors of parishes was only £350 in 1946, while in the north it was frequently less. At best, the church was financially back where it had been after the first World War before the depression struck; at worst, it was still suffering the effects of the unwise investments of the twenties and the crash of the thirties. What is even more astonishing is that the Dioceses of Rockhampton and North Queensland were still being supported to the extent of about £1,000 a year in each case by their English auxiliaries.<sup>1601</sup>

In 1946, following the resignation of Gordon Gall, who had served as registrar of the Diocese of Brisbane with great loyalty for thirty-four years, Archbishop Halse appointed a young economics graduate, Roland St. John, as his successor.<sup>1602</sup> A member of a well-known New South Wales clerical family, St. John brought to his new position both a thorough knowledge of church affairs, and a financial and administrative ability of rare quality. He recognised what many business men on church committees had not realised, that even in its business affairs the church could not always use the same methods as commercial enterprises, because its aims were different.

We must remember that the Church is a Church and not a business. In the long run, its success – as a Church – will depend on its spiritual strength, rather than its financial resources. If the first is healthy, there will be little difficulty about the latter.<sup>1603</sup>

Yet this implied no mandate for inefficiency in the management of church affairs, and the announcement in 1956 of the complete elimination of the deficiency accounts of the diocese, which had totalled more than £40,000 in 1946, was a remarkable demonstration of the skilful handling of the financial affairs of the church by the registrar.

Nevertheless the immediate post-war years saw no drastic alteration in the ways in which church funds were collected. In the parishes, the haphazard method of receiving offerings in the collection plate at church services continued to be the basic form of parochial income, supplemented by donations for special purposes such as building funds and missionary work. The dioceses continued to depend on income from endowments, compulsory and voluntary assessments of the parishes, and special direct appeals for particular purposes. The success of these special appeals depended on their popularity, as well as on the degree of publicity and organisation associated with them. The appeal for rebuilding St. John's College on the new site at St. Lucia, for example, made only very slow progress despite the strenuous efforts of the warden, the Reverend A.C.C. Stevenson, because tertiary education aroused little interest among the majority of church people. On the other hand, an appeal for the St. John's Cathedral Completion fund, after languishing for some time, was highly successful due to the skilful organisation and publicity arranged by the Very Reverend Denis E. Taylor, together with emotional attraction gained by its association with the Queen's visit in 1954.<sup>1604</sup> Yet the mushrooming of building funds, both parochial and diocesan, in an attempt to make up the leeway caused by twenty years or more of relative inactivity created such a multiplicity of conflicting appeals that each of them found it increasingly difficult to succeed by the old methods. The climax of an impossible situation was reached when Archbishop Halse listed in one of his monthly letters in the Church Chronicle twenty different causes deserving the support of church people.<sup>1605</sup> The unfortunate impression was being created that the church was primarily concerned with raising money.

It was in the north that a radically new approach to church finance first made its appearance in Queensland. Following the resignation of Bishop Belcher in 1952 the North Queensland synod elected the Reverend Ian Shevill to succeed him, and he was consecrated bishop in Brisbane on 19 April 1953. Young, vigorous and forward-looking, the new bishop quickly impressed his personality upon his diocese. He had the kind of mind that saw things whole, that thought in terms of 'strategy' (as in his A.B.M. days), and that expressed itself in a striking epigrammatic form of speech which reflected a personality that was always conscious of the dramatic. Individual facts were less significant to him than broad visions, so that while he might fall into errors of detail his policies and pronouncements were presented with an impressiveness that enabled new plans to be carried through in the face of opposition or inertia.

<sup>1601</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1950 p. 18. This amount continued in spite of a resolution passed the previous year by synod that the diocese should try to become self-supporting. Also Northern Churchman, February 1951.

<sup>1602</sup> Church Chronicle, December, 1946.

<sup>1603</sup> St. John, R.T., "Better Management of Church Affairs", in Church Chronicle, September 1948.

<sup>1604</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1954, p.102. £127,052 was added to the Cathedral Completion Fund in the year ended 31.3.54, though not all of this was due to the Queen's Visit appeal.

<sup>1605</sup> April, 1950.

In facing the problems of his somewhat run-down diocese Bishop Shevill sought to develop a coherent plan of action rather than follow the piecemeal methods of the past. He first examined the history and future prospects of his diocese, and he recognised the changes in society and economy that had occurred since its foundation;

This complete change in less than half a century challenges us to re-think our Diocesan policy strategically and prayerfully in the years ahead. We shall have to consider whether cities of over 15,000 people can remain as single parishes served by two priests. We shall have to consider the work of the Bush Brother in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century in a land of dwindling populations and air-borne graziers. We shall have to re-think parochial finance in order to lift a great burden from the back of gallant church women, and think in terms of budgets rather than bazaars. We shall have to accept the fact that we are living in a new streamlined age which thinks in pounds more often than in pennies and accept boldly our unique vocation as the only white tropical Diocese in the world of giving a soul to a new and vital civilization which is springing up in an area which past ages deemed unfit for white habitation.<sup>1606</sup>

With this vision before him Bishop Shevill planned his strategy. It was clear that the church needed more priests to extend its ministry, new methods of evangelism and publicity to bring the Gospel to a greater number of people, and more churches to bear visible witness to the relevance of the Christian faith. None of these things could be accomplished without money – a quantity of money that traditional methods of church finance had entirely failed to provide. He attacked as heresy the common view that money was an unspiritual thing and that “as the church is here to teach spiritual truths money should only be mentioned like a lunatic relative – occasionally and with shame”.<sup>1607</sup>

After taking initial steps to check the continued deficits in the administrative funds of his diocese,<sup>1608</sup> the bishop launched an appeal for £100,000 in order to complete the unfinished cathedral, rebuild the girls' schools of the diocese, and provide capital for expansion in new areas.

The Reverend A. E. Turner was appointed appeal commissioner, but despite intensive organisation and vigorous prosecution of the appeal, it was soon clear that the traditional method of church fund-raising would take an impossibly long time to reach the goal.<sup>1609</sup> It was at this time, in 1954, that Bishop Shevill visited the United States, together with the Bishops of Rockhampton, Carpentaria and New Guinea and other Australian delegates, to attend the Pan-Anglican Congress at Minneapolis.

Increasing contacts between the Australian and American churches had already brought reports to Queensland about the methods of church finance employed in America, but it was the personal visits of the bishops in 1954 that really aroused interest in the possibility of similar techniques being employed in Australia. During his time in the United States Bishop Shevill studied the methods both of the promotion department of the Episcopal Church and also of the Wells Organisation, the largest firm of church fund-raisers in the country. He was impressed by what he saw. He came home convinced that in the 'every-member canvass' he had found the principle that could revolutionise church finance in Australia, and he believed that it would be particularly salutary if conducted on a diocesan, rather than a parochial, basis.

On his return Bishop Shevill accordingly launched what he termed the Anglican Building Crusade in North Queensland. His plan was to seek pledges for a three-year period throughout the diocese, additional to parishioners' ordinary contributions to their parishes. Half of the funds so raised was to be devoted to diocesan building projects, while the other half was to remain in the parishes for local building purposes. Within a short time the bishop himself travelled throughout the diocese with Canon Turner: committees of laymen were formed in almost every parish; loyalty dinners were held, at which the plans were laid before church people; and teams of canvassers visited parishioners in their homes to obtain their pledges of regular financial support. The results were impressive, and four months after the crusade had started, the bishop exultantly wrote, “the Crusade is sweeping forward with remarkable results both spiritual and material”.<sup>1610</sup> Not only were the financial results highly satisfactory,<sup>1611</sup> but it was noticeable that many men who had formerly taken no active interest in the church were among the keenest workers, and there were perceptible increases in church attendance and active membership of church societies.

Despite these impressive results, errors were not unnaturally made in this first application of American fund-raising methods of the church in Queensland. There was a lack of trained personnel, the wide area covered by the canvass meant some diminution in intensity, and the limitation of concern to building funds was probably unfortunate. Yet the pioneering

<sup>1606</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1953-4, Bishop's synod address, p.42.

<sup>1607</sup> Northern Churchman, February 1955.

<sup>1608</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1952-3, pp. 36-38. also Rowland, E.C., The Tropics for Christ, p. 82 ff

<sup>1609</sup> Northern Churchman, January and May 1954.

<sup>1610</sup> Ibid., June 1955.

<sup>1611</sup> In the Crusade, 4,478 pledges were received, totalling £142,141.5.10. Of this amount £115,590. 3. 6 was actually received. Full details are given in Rowland, E.C., op.cit., Appendix C. p.159.

experiment had been made, and it was significant that it was made on a diocesan scale, for later experience was to show that a narrow parochial spirit could all too easily be associated with successful parish canvasses.

By 1955 the Wells Organisation, which had already conducted a few parish canvasses in southern states, was commencing work in Queensland, St. Stephen's Parish, Coorparoo, being the first to employ them. With their long experience in America and their greater resources of manpower and techniques than were available in North Queensland, they achieved results that were even more striking in terms of money pledged and number of laymen actively engaged in the canvasses. The success of their first venture led others to follow, and in a short time a wave of parish canvasses had commenced in Brisbane and Rockhampton dioceses, under the direction of the Wells Organisation. Quickly the whole activity mushroomed: one or two new firms commenced work in the same field as Wells, and in a few parishes similar techniques were employed without the use of professional directors. Sometimes these were successful, sometimes they failed. Nevertheless, within a few years of the first canvasses in 1955, the every-member canvass in some form had become the normal method of church finance in the majority of parishes in Queensland. In North Queensland as the three-year period of the Building Crusade drew to a close, most of the parishes moved over to the more thorough-going type of every-member canvass.

In the first flush of enthusiasm for the new techniques there was some tendency – fostered by the propaganda of the professionals – to regard the every-member canvass as the solution to all the church's problems. Financial anxiety, which had dogged the work of the church since the foundation of Queensland, seemed to be banished; a new kind of efficiency appeared to be transforming parochial administration; and, most important, an easy way had apparently been discovered to bring people to church. The definitive exegesis of the text, "where your treasure is, there will your heart be also", had at last been discovered!<sup>1612</sup>

Nevertheless, there were from the beginning some who were alive to certain dangers inherent in the new methods. Bishop Housden, who also visited the United States in 1954, commended the new techniques on his return, and urged the parishes in his diocese to consider their adoption.<sup>1613</sup> He went on, however, to sound a note of warning. One danger which he envisaged was that parishes might become so concerned with their own building projects that they might neglect the wider work of the church. This actually occurred in some places: despite their record income their missionary contributions declined through absorption with local projects which had only been made possible by the success of their canvass.<sup>1614</sup> This happened especially in parishes where influential laymen with little conception of the total mission of the church became for the first time members of their parochial councils, and pressed for the speedy execution of local building schemes.

Another danger was alluded to by Bishop Housden:

It is just as easy for a rich church as for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God. I saw signs of that danger in the Episcopal Church of America last year.<sup>1615</sup>

The truth behind these warnings soon became apparent. It was possible for spiritual values to become inverted, and it did occur that diocesan and missionary funds sometimes languished while individual parishes enjoyed unprecedented prosperity. It soon became apparent, too, that pledges did

not ensure conversion, as might have been anticipated from the propaganda of some of the professional firms, and that contacts made in the canvasses needed to be followed up by approaches at a directly spiritual level if any permanent difference was to be made in the real vitality of the church.

For diocesan authorities the new methods of church finance required considerable readjustment. Because people in the parishes were being asked to make sacrificial pledges, often with the promise that no other requests for money would be made to them by the church, appeals for central diocesan funds or projects lost much of their force. The maintenance of the various homes and institutions of the church, and the provision of building funds for the theological and university colleges, became more difficult than ever. Besides, many of the canons providing for assessments from the parishes and for offerings on particular days to be allocated to special diocesan funds were rendered anachronistic, and proved impossible to observe to the letter. Readjustments between diocesan and parochial authorities became necessary, and much depended on the willingness of parish officers to see the situation from the wider viewpoint. In an attempt to regularise the position both Rockhampton and North Queensland dioceses decided in 1959 to conduct diocesan canvasses, in which the parishes were invited to make pledges to the diocese from their parochial income, just as

<sup>1612</sup> Mat. 6.21. This text was in fact frequently used by Wells.

<sup>1613</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1954, Bishop's synod address, p.12.

<sup>1614</sup> A.B.M. Report Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1958, p.26. The awareness of this danger, and consequent steps taken to counteract it, soon arrested this tendency.

<sup>1615</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1955, p.15.

individuals made pledges to the parish.<sup>1616</sup> The metropolitan Diocese of Brisbane for various reasons moved more slowly, and unlike most of the other big dioceses throughout Australia did not even establish a fully effective department of promotion.<sup>1617</sup>

Meanwhile Bishop Shevill, with his eye on considerations of strategy and his keenness to learn from the example of the American Episcopal Church, sought to place the whole matter of promotion on a national level.<sup>1618</sup> He believed that this work, instead of being done as had happened in most cases at a parochial level, or in the case of his own building crusade on a diocesan level, could best be done by the whole Australian church.<sup>1619</sup> At the general synod of 1955 he had a committee established to examine the possibility of founding a national department of promotion, which should be responsible not only for fund-raising, but for many aspects of the educational and public relations work of the church.<sup>1620</sup> Bishop Shevill himself became chairman of a national council on promotion, a consultative body which the 1962 general synod declined to develop into a full department of promotion. Nevertheless the way was opened for promotion to develop along national lines.

While the new financial and promotional techniques did not solve all the problems of the church, as a few early and ill-advised enthusiasts appeared to hope, the positive effect which they had on the expansion of the material side of the church's life was nonetheless quite remarkable. The building boom that followed the end of the war was not, however, solely the result of the wave of canvasses: the fact was that for years many parishes had been accumulating building funds for the replacement of outdated buildings or to build afresh in new areas. Even before the era of canvasses a few modern, permanent churches were erected such as that at Hughenden in 1953 and Gympie in 1954. A survey of the Diocese of Brisbane for the ten-year period 1946-1956, that is, before the new techniques had much time to take effect, revealed a remarkable rate of material expansion in the diocese. In that period sixty-five new church sites were acquired, as well as sixteen additions to existing sites; thirteen parochial districts were raised to full parochial status, and six new parochial districts created; forty-two churches or mission halls were erected in areas where no previous church building existed, while thirteen permanent new churches were built to replace old buildings; twenty-four new rectories were built or acquired, in addition to substantial additions to thirteen others; and sixteen new parish halls were built. In the same period almost all the church schools and homes were extended or greatly improved at a cost of many thousands of pounds.<sup>1621</sup>

This material expansion, that was already proceeding apace, was greatly hastened by the financial revolution involved in the every-member canvasses. Particularly noticeable was the great increase in the number of permanent church buildings that resulted. In some earlier periods, notably during Bishop Webber's episcopate, there had been a striking growth in the number of temporary wooden churches – which had a habit of becoming remarkably permanent – but there had been no period when so many permanent brick or concrete buildings were erected. In North Queensland, mainly as a result of the Anglican Building Crusade, some nineteen new churches or schools were dedicated between 1953 and 1958, of which a considerable proportion were permanent buildings.<sup>1622</sup>

For a relatively small diocese, it was a notable achievement, particularly the completion of the two major diocesan projects, the building of a new St. Anne's girls' school in Townsville, and the completion of St. James' Cathedral, which was finally achieved in 1960. In Brisbane, too, the increase in permanent churches was striking. Before 1946 there were thirty-five brick or stone churches in the diocese. An additional thirty-seven were built in the period from 1946 to 1962.<sup>1623</sup>

The number of new churches being constructed created an interest in ecclesiastical architecture that was unprecedented in Queensland. In view of the relatively insignificant amount of church building that had been undertaken between the two world wars there were at the end of the war few architects who had taken any special interest in the requirements and trends of ecclesiastical architecture. Again it was Bishop Shevill who took a lead.

Almost immediately after his arrival in North Queensland the bishop wrote a long article in his diocesan paper in which he set out his views on church architecture:

<sup>1616</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1959, p.18; N.Q. Year Book, 1958-9, p.80. In the N.Q. diocesan canvass, £68,592 was pledged to the diocese over three years. Northern Churchman, March 1960.

<sup>1617</sup> The so-called department of promotion in Brisbane was a purely advisory body, with no full-time officer. Brisbane Year Book, 1958, p.100

<sup>1618</sup> "Promotion" was the term increasingly employed to cover various methods of promoting the growth of the church, including publicity, mass education, every-member canvasses etc.

<sup>1619</sup> See his views in article, "Finance and the Australian Church", Northern Churchman, March 1956.

<sup>1620</sup> General Synod Proceedings, 1955, p.45. Also Anglican 13 February 1959.

<sup>1621</sup> Statistical survey prepared by R.T. St. John, January 1957.

<sup>1622</sup> Rowland, E.C., op.cit., p.85f.

<sup>1623</sup> Statistics prepared by R.T. St. John, October 1962.

It is one of the unfortunate facts of history, that the English Church expanded across the world at that period when the architectural taste of England was at its lowest ebb. A Gothic revival in literature, art and thought had produced an architectural freak known as 'Church-warden Gothic' (i.e. a 19<sup>th</sup> Century Church-warden's idea of Gothic). As the missionaries sailed abroad they planted this bogus form of art wherever the English Church was established. As a result, the Anglican Communion is today littered with little pseudo-gothic pigeon boxes which accord with their natural setting as awkwardly as might a pagoda in the midst of Flinders Street, Townsville.<sup>1624</sup>

It was a clarion call for a new approach to church architecture, in which new churches might speak in the idiom of the age instead of being pale imitations of the art forms of an earlier generation. It demanded that they should be relevant to contemporary Australian life in using local materials and taking into account conditions of climate and environment. It was not, of course, an original cry: revolutionary trends had for some time been evident in church architecture overseas, and already a very few local architects were beginning to take up these ideas.<sup>1625</sup> But now it became the official policy of a diocese to encourage – indeed, almost to insist upon – the building of churches in the modern idiom, and so the innate conservatism of the majority of church people was forcibly challenged.

Bishop Shevill laid down strict rules requiring approval by himself and the diocesan council of the plans for proposed new churches, and he personally made frequent suggestions as to possible improvements in the plans. It was made a definite diocesan policy to encourage the employment of such architects as accepted the bishop's general principles, and wherever possible parishioners were encouraged to assist in gathering the local materials that were to be employed in the building. In this way an attempt was made to make the church more relevant to the total life of the community. The ultimate aim, the bishop wrote on one occasion, was "the conversion of a materialist generation far more than the raising of bricks and mortar".<sup>1626</sup>

In the other dioceses of the province similar trends were soon observable, though there was not the same degree of central supervision in the approval of plans as in North Queensland, and contemporary designs were less universally adopted. In some cases, however, the designs were strikingly modern: there was some experimentation with shapes other than the traditional rectangular or cruciform pattern, and there was a trend towards the adornment of buildings with contemporary religious sculpture and art.

It remains to be seen what judgment will be passed by future generations upon the new styles of ecclesiastical architecture. One element in the choice of relatively stark designs, rarely emphasised by architects, was their relative cheapness. The immense rise of building costs after the war gave to 'functional' architecture economic as well as aesthetic advantages. Whether in some cases the economic aspect outweighed the aesthetic must be left for future decision; but already it seems clear that some of the new churches were strikingly successful as buildings that could lift man's thoughts Godward, while others in their modernity reflected more of the earthbound aspirations of an affluent society. This much may, however, be said: the post-war years saw something of a revival of the old alliance between the church and the arts that had been little in evidence for many years and had perhaps never before really existed at all in Queensland.

The building boom was the most obvious index to the financial revolution that transformed the outlook of the church in the post-war years. But the greater financial resources made available to the church had not only material consequences: they helped eradicate the last vestiges of that hesitancy to advance which for so long had dominated the church after the years when bankruptcy seemed just around the corner. There was still more for the church to do at home and abroad than resources allowed, and the affluence of post-war years was only affluence by comparison with the grinding poverty of its earlier life; yet for the first time in its history the church in Queensland was able to make plans with a spirit of confidence that the means might be available for their execution. The ultimate results of the revolution, spiritual and material, remain to be seen; but the indications are that the Anglican Church may at last have escaped from its stultifying tradition of being an unendowed church with the mentality of an endowed church.

#### **iv. Evangelism in City and Country.**

Prosperity is no real index to spiritual vitality: but the post-war years were marked not only by financial improvement but by a deeper concern for evangelism, the positive proclamation and communication of the Gospel so that men might be drawn to Jesus Christ. Indeed from the new promotional methods themselves an awareness arose among clergy and laity alike of the possibility of adapting these methods to serve directly spiritual needs.

Nevertheless, whatever new techniques might be employed, the key factor in evangelism remained what it had always been – the supply of an adequate number of faithful and well-trained priests. At heart the Christian religion is a matter of personal relationships, and can only be mediated by persons. Throughout our history we have seen that if lack of

<sup>1624</sup> Northern Churchman, July 1953.

<sup>1625</sup> Cf. the paper given by a Brisbane architect to a clergy conference in 1953, printed in Church Chronicle, January 1954.

<sup>1626</sup> Northern Churchman, April 1955.

sufficient money had always been one impediment to the effectual proclamation of the Gospel in Queensland, the other great impediment was the inadequate supply of men committed to the task.

At the end of the war the manpower situation appeared as depressing as ever, and all the Queensland dioceses found that even with the return of military chaplains their rolls of clergy were smaller than before the war. The smaller dioceses had suffered most, but even in Brisbane the clerical shortage was serious.<sup>1627</sup> Several factors made the position worse; population had grown steadily; there was urgent need for the formation of new parishes in some areas; and there was a growing demand for the deployment of some of the clergy in specialised work outside the normal parochial limits. In these circumstances the remaining clergy were seriously overworked, and Bishop Dixon commented in 1948 that there had been more priests breaking down with nervous and physical strain due to overwork than he had ever known before.<sup>1628</sup>

The plain fact was that an insufficient number of men was offering from within Queensland for the sacred ministry. While numbers of recruits were still obtainable from England this situation had not been so serious, but this supply was now reduced to a trickle, mainly comprising specialists coming to particular jobs. The only solution was a marked increase of ordination candidates from within the province.<sup>1629</sup> The problem was Australia-wide, but it was more serious in Queensland than in the southern states, because church life was less firmly rooted than in the south and there had been a greater tradition of dependence upon England for manpower. It was particularly noticeable that very few ordinands emerged from country parishes, where the irregularity of opportunities for worship made it difficult for vocations to be fostered. Queensland contained a larger proportion of scattered country parishes than did the southern states.

In the late 1940's a conscious effort was made to foster vocations to the priesthood. More attention was paid to the subject in sermons, conferences and church publications. The archbishop in particular never missed an opportunity to emphasise to young people the privilege of being called to this work, and other bishops of the province followed his example. There was a minor post-war boom in the numbers of ordination candidates from among ex-servicemen, but by 1949 this was tapering off, and there were only seventeen students in St. Francis' College. This was, however, the lowest ebb, and numbers began to rise, a trend that was encouraged by the policy of the Reverend Ivor Church, who became principal in 1951. Efforts were made to interest the parishes in the work of training for the ministry, and likely young men were encouraged to visit the college and meet the students. At the same time the Society of the Sacred Advent began to take more active measures to bring the vocation of the religious life before young women, especially by sending some of the sisters to speak at youth conferences and parish meetings. In this way the vocation of church work was put much more forcefully to youthful members of the church than ever before, and the increasing number of candidates for holy orders indicated that these efforts were having some effect.<sup>1630</sup>

Nevertheless there were no immediate prospects of there being sufficient priests to satisfy the evangelistic opportunities that were opening up. This was specially true because of the heavier pressures upon the parochial clergy. Work in the schools was taking up an increased proportion of their time with the multiplication of state primary and high school classes; the new promotional techniques were apt to increase the organising and administrative duties of the clergy; and at the same time the development in some parishes of vast new housing projects made regularity of pastoral visitation more and more difficult to attain. In these circumstances attention naturally turned to the possibilities of making more effective use of lay manpower, whose potential was being so clearly revealed by the hard and effective work done by many laymen in the every-member canvasses. The theological trend towards re-examination of the doctrine of the church as the Body of Christ, in which the laity had their own ministry just as the clergy had theirs, reinforced the emphasis on lay evangelism that had arisen from practical necessity.

Soon after the end of the war a conference of Clergy in Brisbane recognised that a prime cause of the relative failure of the church was the inability "to rouse the laity to the need of active co-operation in this task of personal evangelism".<sup>1631</sup> To point to the problem was easier than to find the solution, but frequent allusion to the subject gradually helped to mould the opinion that the laity should be concerned not only with the financial and administrative aspects of church life, but also with the church's primary evangelistic task. There were some experiments: at Bundaberg, for example, Canon H.J. Richards formed a small group of men into what was called the Guild of St. Philip, who systematically visited from house to house in pairs, seeking information for the parish rolls, enquiring after the sick and aged, and distributing suitable literature.<sup>1632</sup>

<sup>1627</sup> In 1946 there were 135 clergymen in Brisbane diocese, of whom only 116 were holding full-time appointments. In 1938 there had been 144, of whom 128 were on the active list.

<sup>1628</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1948, Bishop's synod address, p.84.

<sup>1629</sup> In 1952 Archbishop Halse reported that in the past eighteen years an average of only three ordinands per year had come from within the Diocese of Brisbane. Ibid., 1952.,p.85

<sup>1630</sup> In 1960 there were 50 students at St. Francis' College, compared with 18 in 1950.

<sup>1631</sup> Church Chronicle, April 1946.

<sup>1632</sup> Ibid., August 1953.



The effect of the every-member canvasses in utilising the skills and energies of large numbers of formerly inactive laymen has already been mentioned. This in itself represented a form of evangelistic enterprise, because these men in visiting parishioners in their homes not infrequently found themselves – rather unexpectedly – bearing active witness to their faith. It became clear, however, that laymen could only do really effective evangelistic work if they were first trained, and one of the characteristics of the post-war years was a growing emphasis on adult religious education. The diocesan board of religious education organised a winter course of lectures for adults in Brisbane in 1951, and these aroused such interest that they became annual fixtures for the next ten years, until the provision of adult educational programmes in many parishes rendered them redundant.

The most significant development in this sphere, however, came from the United States. In 1956 the director of the General Board of Religious Education in Australia, V.K. Brown, visited America in the course of a world tour, and returned full of enthusiasm for what was called a “new approach” to Christian education for adults. This was based upon the science of group dynamics, which had been developed by American educational psychologists, and which laid the stress upon learning as a group process rather than a mere imparting of information. Various types of conferences formed integral parts of the method, particularly “church and group life laboratories” for the clergy and “parish life conferences” for the laity. The aim of the latter was to develop what was termed in the jargon of the new approach, a “concerned core” of lay people, who through planned group experience were helped grow to a sense of responsibility in the life of the church. One of the limiting factors of this method was that only a small number of people could be dealt with at once, and there was a need for the right kind of trained leadership before an effective programme could be undertaken. The first parish life conference was held in Queensland in 1957,<sup>1633</sup> and by 1959 some twenty-nine of the Brisbane clergy had taken part in a group life laboratory. As with most new techniques, exaggerated hopes were held by some enthusiasts as to what would be accomplished; but there have been indications of the growth of small but effective groups of “concerned” laymen and women in the parishes which have participated in parish life conferences and missions.

In the post-war years closer attention was paid to the need to provide a specialised ministry to various groups in the community. Sunday schools continued to be the chief means of evangelism among children, although they embraced only a minority of the nominally Anglican children in the community,<sup>1634</sup> and the instruction given in them was still of uneven quality. The integration of religious education with the worship of the church, of which we observed the beginnings in the pre-war period, proceeded to a much greater extent, though there was not the development of all-age Sunday schools such as appeared in some other denominations. Nevertheless, under the capable direction of Miss Hilda Beaumont in Brisbane, assisted by graduates of St. Christopher’s College, which the General Board of Religious Education established in Melbourne to train specialists in religious education, the best techniques of Christian education were introduced into the state. Through regular conferences, summer schools, and personal visits to Sunday schools considerable progress was made in improving the standards of Sunday school teaching.

For some teen-agers and older men and women, the various church societies continued the work which had been begun earlier. On the whole these societies did not grow appreciably in numbers, and some like the C.E.M.S. were weaker than before the war. Leaders of the youth societies noted a stronger interest in spiritual and intellectual activities than before the war when sporting and social activities had been more prominent. The trend in the youth groups was to mixed, rather than segregated, societies, first in the Comrades of St. George, and since 1958 in the Young Anglican Fellowship.<sup>1635</sup> Generally speaking, however, these church youth groups had relatively little success in attracting and influencing members of street gangs that were prominent in the streets of the bigger towns, and they appealed more to the better educated and more intelligent young people.

One group for whom the need for a special ministry by the church had become increasingly apparent after the war was the aged. The number of old people in the community had grown steadily with the improvement of medical science, and studies in geriatrics had shown more vividly the mental problems associated with old age. Before the war small numbers of aged men and women were being cared for at St. John’s Home and St. Clare’s Home in Brisbane. After the war, however, the accommodation in these homes was found to be quite inadequate to the demand, and an additional home for aged women, the Neilson Home, was opened at Indooroopilly in 1950.<sup>1636</sup> In 1958 an intensively organised house-to-house appeal raised a large part of the funds required, in addition to government subsidies, to build St. John’s Home for men on a

<sup>1633</sup> A series of so-called parish life conferences had been conducted by a visiting American priest in North Queensland in 1955, but these appear to have been of a different character. Northern Churchman, July 1955.

<sup>1634</sup> In 1959 there were more than 335 Sunday schools in the Diocese of Brisbane, with a total enrolment of approximately 30,000.

<sup>1635</sup> An indication of the spiritual concern of members of these societies is perhaps given by the fact that in 1958 there were 23 members of the Comrades of St. George in training for the ministry at St. Francis’ College.

<sup>1636</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1951, p.25.

much larger scale.<sup>1637</sup> Generous commonwealth and state government subsidies were of great assistance in building old people's homes, and these augmented large bequests from the estates of P.J. Symes and Sir Edwin Tooth to make possible the erection of three more modern homes – Symes Thorpe, Toowoomba in 1961; Symes Grove Zillmere, in 1962; and the Edwin Marsden Tooth Memorial Home, Manly, which is not yet completed. Carefully designed to meet the needs of the aged, and made as personal and homely as possible, these homes were well equipped to meet a pressing social problem.

Another kind of specialised ministry was provided in the appointment of full-time Anglican chaplains at the Brisbane General Hospital and the Brisbane Mental Hospital at Goodna. The latter case was specially significant, as the chaplains (Anglican, Roman Catholic and Protestant) were supported by the government, though chosen by the authorities of their respective churches. A precedent for such an arrangement had already been provided in Melbourne, and the government showed its appreciation of the value of this spiritual work of healing by providing excellent chapels at the hospital. Apart from his personal ministry, the Anglican chaplain at Goodna, the Reverend E.A. Bradley, organised groups of regular visitors from various parishes to visit the mentally ill, as a means of assisting in their restoration to normal social relationships.

Through these various specialised agencies greater efforts than ever before were made by the church to make the Gospel relevant to as many age-groups and sections of the community as possible. As a more direct method of evangelism there was a considerable revival of parish missions. In these, emphasis was placed more upon teaching and strengthening the regular and fringe members of the church than on making emotional appeals to outsiders. In many of the missions teams of workers assisted the missionaries, whether groups of students as in the annual missions undertaken by St. Francis' College, or teams of parishioners organised along lines resembling those of the every-member canvass. In short, lay participation was stressed here as in many other sides of church activity since the war. In the Billy Graham crusade in 1959 the Anglican Church was officially non-committal, though individual priests took a strong stand for or against the methods there employed. On the whole the Anglican attitude was one of caution towards a method that was feared by many to be emotionally superficial and theologically questionable.<sup>1638</sup> A few parishes reported increased church attendance as a result of the Graham crusade, but generally speaking the effect on the Anglican Church was very small.

The great increase in secondary school and university enrolments after the war made the educational field a particularly crucial one for evangelism. For the church, as for the state, the revolution that occurred in secondary education posed great initial problems. Following the failure of the Anglican primary school system to compete with the state schools in the early years after separation, the church devoted most of its attention to the secondary education sphere, and until the second World War church and private schools were still responsible for the bulk of secondary education in Queensland. The rapid development of the state secondary educational system since the war affected the church schools in two ways: one was that many country children who could previously receive secondary education only by attending a boarding school could now attend a state high school in their own district; and other was that there was likely to be far less support from the majority of church people for the establishment of new church schools, as so many new state high schools were being commenced.<sup>1639</sup> Besides, in the face of competition from the established church and grammar schools and the improving standards of the state high schools, it was quite impossible to found new church schools in the cheap and primitive conditions in which most of the existing schools were founded in the early years of the century.

The great increase in the number of children proceeding to secondary education meant that most of the existing church schools were not immediately adversely affected by the increased competition from state high schools, and indeed their numbers of pupils increased steadily, and in some cases there were long waiting lists for entry. This was achieved despite the necessity to raise fees very steeply, due to the sharp rises in staff salaries. In spite of high building costs, most of the schools – in the case of North Queensland schools, with diocesan support – were in a position to undertake large building programmes to extend accommodation and improve facilities. This prosperity of church schools reflected the confidence of many people who believed that there were advantages – either spiritual or social – in their children receiving an education in a church school in spite of the costs involved. The schools that suffered were the smaller ones, especially in North Queensland and Rockhampton, because they lacked the capital to provide the kind of facilities and amenities that would permit them to compete with either state schools or well-established church schools.

One smaller educational venture in North Queensland deserves special mention. This was a small preparatory school, St. Barnabas', at Ravenshoe, which was founded in 1953 with two distinctive features. One was that it had an agricultural

<sup>1637</sup> *Church Chronicle*, March 1958.

<sup>1638</sup> *Church Chronicle*, March 1959; *Northern Churchman*, March 1959.

<sup>1639</sup> It was significant that although the Brisbane synod in 1954 appointed a committee to consider the establishment of new church schools, the only venture since the war, St. Paul's School, Bald Hills, was made possible only by the bequest of Sir Edwin Tooth, and not by popular subscription.

emphasis, and while not simply an agricultural school was intended to give training in agricultural, as well as ordinary, subjects. The other was that it was staffed by a teaching order, the first male teaching order in the Anglican Communion.<sup>1640</sup> This order started on informal lines, taking its origin from the acceptance of a lay teaching brother into the Bush Brotherhood of St. Barnabas' in 1949.<sup>1641</sup> Recognising the need for regularisation of the proposed teaching brotherhood, Bishop Shevill invited a well established community operating in South Australia, the Society of the Sacred Mission, to send one of its number to direct the new brotherhood, and in 1958, under the new arrangement, one priest and four lay brothers were admitted as novices of the teaching brotherhood. For various reasons, however, the membership of the order soon declined, and in 1960 the teaching order came to an end, though the school itself continued.<sup>1642</sup>

The cost of staffing new church schools without the aid of such teaching orders led to exploration of an alternative kind of venture in the educational field. This was to increase the number of hostels where country children could be accommodated under the care and influence of the church while attending a state school. In the west, this system had been in operation at Charleville since 1919, and it was the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul that took a new interest in this field in the fifties. Two new hostels were opened under the control of the brotherhood, one at St. George and one at Mitchell, and by 1959 each was accommodating over forty children.<sup>1643</sup> Finding suitable staff proved a constant problem but the hostels flourished, and became an important extension of the church's work in the west. The development of bus services, however, to take children long distances to and from school, changed the situation, and by 1960 the number of children in the hostels was showing a distinct decline. In North Queensland, too the possibility of establishing hostels was considered, but the proposal was rejected in favour of placing all available resources into saving the existing church schools.<sup>1644</sup>

With steep rises in expenses the cost of maintaining these church schools began to prove increasingly burdensome, especially in the north, where the girls' schools in particular were small in size and consequently less economic to maintain than the bigger schools. Anxious to keep the church schools open without having to resort to such high fees as to exclude those of moderate income, some churchmen in the north began to see state aid as the only solution. This was already a highly controversial issue, because of the claims of the Roman Catholic Church over many years for state aid for their extensive school system. Nevertheless in the 1956 synod in Townsville Canon C.C. Hart, principal of All Souls' School, moved that the synod dissociate itself from recent criticism of the principle of state aid to church schools, and "advise the Government of Queensland that the Church of England in North Queensland is of the opinion that such aid would be welcomed and appreciated".<sup>1645</sup> The motion was warmly carried by the synod, but it had a cold reception amongst members of the Church of England in the southern states, who feared the advantage that would accrue to the Roman Catholic Church, and whose church schools were generally wealthy and well-established.

Archbishop Halse attempted to narrow the issue to one that appeared to be more practicable and less highly controversial. Drawing the parallel with state aid to university residential colleges (over which there had been no controversy) he argued that the state might reasonably give assistance to church boarding schools, as they provided a service for country children which was not provided in any other way by the state.<sup>1646</sup> The wisdom of this proposition commended itself in the north, and in 1959 both the North Queensland and Rockhampton synods supported the principle of state aid for secondary boarding schools.<sup>1647</sup>

While the three mainland dioceses of Queensland were agreed on asking for this measure of government aid for their schools, there was still a divergence of attitude among them. North Queensland and Rockhampton, faced with really pressing financial problems in their little schools, were inclined to adopt more direct and aggressive policies, whereas in Brisbane the recognition of the far-reaching implications of state aid led to a more cautious attitude. Thus Bishop Shevill took the step in the 1960 state elections of writing to the three party leaders to ask for a statement of policy on the issue. The premier (G.F. Nicklin) and the opposition leader (J.E. Duggan) were both tactfully non-committal. Only the Q.L.P. leader (V.C. Gair) explicitly approved of state aid,<sup>1648</sup> and as his party had no chance of forming the government this assurance could have little practical value.

As the problem came more and more before public attention, particularly in the face of constant Roman Catholic claims for assistance for their schools, a comprehensive report from a select committee was presented to the Brisbane synod in 1961. Frankly recognising the complexity of the issue the report analysed the various arguments that had been put forward by all

<sup>1640</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1952-3, p.60.

<sup>1641</sup> Northern Churchman, September 1952.

<sup>1642</sup> Ibid., August, 1960.

<sup>1643</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1958, p.134.

<sup>1644</sup> N.Q. Year Book, 1957-8, p.63

<sup>1645</sup> Ibid., 1955-6.

<sup>1646</sup> Church Chronicle, December 1956.

<sup>1647</sup> N.Q. Year Book., 1958-9 p.54; Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1959. p.26.

<sup>1648</sup> Northern Churchman, April 1960.

the interested parties and finally recommended a policy of seeking an increase of indirect aid, which was already being granted in the form of scholarship allowances, tax concessions etc.<sup>1649</sup> The implication of the report was that further state aid was justified, but that it should be granted in such a way as to avoid the sectarian consequences that would inevitably result from more direct forms of aid.

This report, which was almost unanimously adopted by the Brisbane synod, did not go as far as the northern dioceses would have liked. Nevertheless the financial demands being made on the government at the time by the need to expand its own high school system, especially in the light of plans for a longer secondary school course, made acceptance by the government of even these limited proposals unlikely. The provincial synod appointed a commission the same year to make a joint approach to the government,<sup>1650</sup> but apart from obtaining an assurance that the scholarship allowances would be continued in spite of the abolition of the scholarship examination, there was no practical result.

One other issue in relation to schools raised itself in the post-war years. The multiplication of state primary and high schools added greatly to the burden of the clergy in giving religious instruction in the schools. This was a privilege that had been won with difficulty, and that had been highly valued; but the practical problems were becoming immense. In some country and outer suburban parishes the number of schools to be covered by a lone priest was frequently such as to consume a major proportion of his time, and classes were often so huge and so uncomfortably crowded that effective teaching became almost impossible. This caused in some quarters a serious re-examination of the whole question of religious instruction in the state schools. In 1953 Canon H.J. Richards, of Bundaberg, announced his intention to cease teaching in the schools. In the past he had given religious instruction to 1,700 children in 27 of the 35 state schools in his parish. He went on:

I realised that in our efforts to evangelise the children we were fighting a losing battle unless we tackled the influence of their home life, which is often indifferent, if not actually hostile, to the church. We could not do both....<sup>1651</sup>

The announcement aroused considerable controversy within the church, and eventually the decision was rescinded. Yet it brought to the surface a problem that had been causing serious concern to many of the clergy. A theological, as well as the practical, question began to be raised: does religious instruction, divorced from worship, have any real value?

The theological question remains unanswered. More than one solution to the practical problem of finding enough instructors was considered. One was to employ suitable lay teachers to assist with religious instruction in the schools, and following the consent of the education department to this proposal a considerable number of lay people began to undertake this work, especially in the metropolitan area. Another suggestion of using the Victorian system whereby an agreed syllabus would be taught indiscriminately to classes of all denominations by clergy or lay teachers was strongly opposed by the Anglican clergy.<sup>1652</sup> It was feared that such a method would break the valuable personal contact between a clergyman and his own children, and would also result in the teaching of an emasculated version of Christianity. There was, however, more support for a suggestion that the visits of the clergy to high schools might be supplemented by (not replaced by) the teaching of an agreed syllabus on religion by specially trained members of school staffs.

The growth of the University of Queensland after the war was perhaps even more startling than that of the schools, and this growth, and the transfer of the centre of the university to the new site at St. Lucia, presented an additional challenge to the church. As early as 1937 Archdeacon W.H. Stevenson, then warden of St. John's College, had pointed out the need to plan a new college at St. Lucia, and a site had been selected on university land in 1940.<sup>1653</sup> The war had interfered with plans, however, and after the war pre-occupation with raising funds to complete St. John's Cathedral forced the college project into the background, and it was not until 1956, as a result of the strenuous efforts of the Reverend A.C.C. Stevenson (who died before the college was opened), aided by the joint colleges appeal and the generous state government subsidy, that the new college was opened at St. Lucia with Canon A.L. Sharwood as the new warden.

St. John's College was not, however, the only Anglican interest in the university. On the basis of the biblical courses which had been introduced into the university curriculum largely at the instigation of Archbishop Wand, the Anglican Church encouraged proposals for a full Department of Divinity, which provided first a diploma, and later a full degree course. The University of Queensland was the first Australian university to provide such a degree course. Lecturers, appointed on a part-time basis, included several Anglican priests, though only a relatively small number of Anglican students availed themselves of the course.

<sup>1649</sup> Report is printed in full, Brisbane Year Book., 1961, pp.198-211.

<sup>1650</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1961, p.36.

<sup>1651</sup> Church Chronicle, August 1953.

<sup>1652</sup> E.g. Northern Churchman, April 1961. Similar views were expressed in a survey of the Brisbane clergy about the same time.

<sup>1653</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1937, p. 205; 1940, p.207.

An important evangelistic venture among the students at the university was the formation in 1957 of an Anglican Society. Anglicans had traditionally played a leading part, both in leadership and student membership,

in the Student Christian Movement, though the Evangelical Union attracted few Anglican members in Queensland. By the mid-fifties, however, it was apparent that the S.C.M. was failing to make contact with a great proportion of potentially interested Anglican members, and in order to meet this need a specifically Anglican Society was founded. The new society grew rapidly in the initial stages, and by 1958 had become one of the most active of the student societies. It was, however, subject to the fluctuations typical of under-graduate societies, as was the S.C.M., in which a number of Anglicans continued to participate. Generally speaking it was true that the church was not making a very effectual intellectual impact on the life of the university.

In the field of popular education the use of the mass media of communication, the press, radio and, increasingly, television – became more important after the war. Generally speaking the press willingly publicised church news, though as with other kinds of news it was snippety, headline-catching items that customarily received undue attention as against serious contributions to public thinking. Bishop Shevill, with his flair for publicity, was particularly alert to maintain good relations with the press. In 1959 he established a diocesan centre at Townsville, which was responsible among other things for preparing and distributing news releases for the press, as well as directing the diocesan paper.<sup>1654</sup> The bishop himself always took a lively interest in this side of the work of his diocese. The other dioceses were less obviously organised for publicity. Television was the greatest challenge to be faced, with its advent in Brisbane in 1959. Here it was the dean, the Very Reverend William Baddeley, who displayed a flair both for cultivating good relations with the television stations, and for taking a lead in planning and compering Anglican programmes. The Church of England declined to join the inter-denominational Christian Television Association, in the belief that it would be better able to present a positive message on its own; and although working on a negligible budget the early ventures in television were generally considered quite successful.

The post-war years witnessed something of a change in the situation faced by the church in the bush. In Queensland the bush brotherhood method of ministering to the bush had been relied upon more than in most parts of Australia. The three Queensland brotherhoods – St. Paul in Brisbane, St. Andrew in Rockhampton, and St. Barnabas in North Queensland – had enjoyed fluctuating fortunes, and for fifteen years the Brotherhood of St. Andrew had ceased to exist altogether until its revival in 1931. By the second World War, however, the three brotherhoods seemed to be flourishing. Their numbers of clergy were high, they had developed a peculiar tradition and esprit de corps, and the proportion of Australian-born priests among their membership was steadily rising.

By the end of the war the situation was quite different. The number of bush brothers had declined catastrophically as departures were not replaced by new recruits. The worst hit was the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, which was down to one member in 1950.<sup>1655</sup> Though it was the first of the brotherhoods, it had always been the least stable in membership; its traditional philosophy, that its task was to prepare the way for more normal parochial methods, doubtless helped to ensure its eventual demise. Yet even the Brotherhoods of St. Paul and St. Barnabas appeared to be having difficulty in attracting young Australian priests. In part this was a reflection of the general shortage of clergy, and in part it resulted from a trend to earlier marriage, which affected young clergymen as well as other sections of the community and made fewer of them willing to commit themselves to a five-year period of celibacy. There were, however, two other significant elements in the situation. One was that the great majority of ordinands were coming from city parishes. They did not have the personal concern for the bush and its people that priests born and bred in the outback might have; yet at the same time they were enough in contact with the bush for it to lack the romantic quality that had so attracted many young English priests of a generation before. The atmosphere of adventure of the packhorse days was no longer nearly so strong. The other element, related to the first, was a doubt as to whether the bush brotherhoods had not lost their *raison d'être*. Was the bush brotherhood system, once so necessary a part of Australian conditions, not now merely an expedient to give the west its religion 'on the cheap'? As against this, men who had grown up in the bush brotherhood tradition argued that in terms of ethos, team work and practical advantages the brotherhoods still had a distinctive role to play in the west.<sup>1656</sup>

The fact was, however, that in order to maintain the numbers of the two continuing brotherhoods in Queensland resort had still to be made to England for recruits. This was specially true of the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, but even the Brotherhood of St. Paul, while predominantly Australian in membership, depended upon English-trained heads after the retirement of Archdeacon F. Knight in 1950. At the same time, the traditional brotherhood structure tended to be modified in one of two ways.

<sup>1654</sup> Northern Churchman, June 1959.

<sup>1655</sup> Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, 1950, p.20.

<sup>1656</sup> Cf. article by Archdeacon F. Knight, Bush Notes, November 1946.

One was the way of making the brotherhoods more permanent by making it possible for members to take permanent vows rather than the fairly loose short-term vows that were traditional. It was in the north, where the Brotherhood of St. Barnabas had always been inclined to adopt something of the flavour of a modified religious community, that this suggestion was most strongly favoured. Its fruit was the formation of the teaching brotherhood, which was discussed in the last section, but which did not survive.

In the Diocese of Brisbane, there was the opposite kind of trend, namely that the brotherhood districts became more like ordinary parochial districts, and their bush brother more like an ordinary parish priest. Particularly with the improved financial outlook that resulted from western prosperity and the adoption of the new methods of church finance, there were undercurrents among the laity for a more normal kind of parochial life. In practice the bush brothers in Brisbane diocese had never achieved the original intention of working together from one or more centres, but had been forced by conditions of distance to work in isolation and only come together for quarterly meetings. Growing district independence was a natural development from this. In 1956 each brotherhood district was given lay representation in synod.<sup>1657</sup> This was followed in 1958 by the passing in synod of a canon providing for greatly increased lay responsibility in the administration of the various brotherhood districts.<sup>1658</sup>

The final solution to the problem of the best method of evangelism in the bush remains to be found. The conditions of modern transport and better financial organisation appear to suggest, however, that modification of the original brotherhood methods are likely to become permanent, and that more normal parochial life is likely to grow in the bush districts.

Having considered the various methods, some still experimental, some firmly settled, by which the church sought after the war to extend its ministry of the Word and Sacraments, we must ask how effective these endeavours have been.

Accurate statistics in these matters are difficult to obtain, and in any case, statistics can never reveal the whole truth in dealing with categories that are primarily spiritual.<sup>1659</sup> The only statistics on church attendance, for example, have been obtained from Gallup polls covering the whole commonwealth: the samples are so small as to make them unreliable on an Australia-wide basis, and they are of little value for showing the situation in Queensland. Nevertheless these polls confirmed the commonly held view that church attendance among nominal adherents of the Church of England was worse than that of the other major denominations. An Australian survey in 1955, for example, suggested that for every 100 regular worshippers at church, 45 were Roman Catholics, 21 Anglicans, 10 Methodists, 7 Presbyterians, and 4 Baptists, whereas Anglicans formed about 40% of the population.<sup>1660</sup> This was not, however, a new situation, because we have seen throughout our history that from the early nineteenth century it was only a small proportion of those who claimed to adhere to the Church of England who practised their religion. The reasons for this were considered in earlier chapters. There was evidence, however, of improvement in the post-war years. The only diocese where a systematic effort was made to secure statistics was North Queensland, where it was reported in 1960 that the number of acts of communion in the diocese had increased by 60% over a six-year period.<sup>1661</sup> Other statistics showed that from 1950 to 1960 the staff of clergy in the diocese had almost doubled, the number of parishes increased by 25%, and the annual income of the parishes had quadrupled. These figures are not conclusive: it is impossible to estimate, for example, what proportion of the increased number of acts of communion was due to the provision of more frequent opportunities for the faithful to receive the Sacrament, and what proportion was due to a rise in active church membership. Yet they do confirm the widely held view amongst experienced churchmen that there has been a noticeable increase in church attendance since the war, and particularly in the 1950's.

There does in fact appear to have been a more favourable climate of opinion towards religion since the war, an increased interest in programmes of adult religious education and a greater readiness by many of the laity to give greater personal service and financial support to the church. This in turn led to an increasing number of vocations to full-time service. At the same time fears have been expressed as to the superficiality of the religious quickening, especially in connection with promotional techniques, but these criticisms are not readily susceptible of immediate judgment. Certainly there have been large areas of society still relatively untouched by the church's message, and the Anglican Church has continued to include a vast nominal membership whose churchmanship is so loose as to be almost meaningless. Yet the evidence does suggest that the evangelistic work of the church since the war has not been without definite result.

<sup>1657</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1956, p.111. there had been lay representatives in earlier years, but this practice had been discontinued in the 1930's. See Bush Notes, June 1935.

<sup>1658</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1958, p.88.

<sup>1659</sup> Cf. comments on the question of standards for measuring the success of the church made by Bishop Housden in his synod address, Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, September 1948, p.10.

<sup>1660</sup> Current Affairs Bulletin, "Churchgoing in Australia", 16 June 1958.

<sup>1661</sup> Northern Churchman, August, 1960.

### v. Queensland and the Wider Church

The changes in international politics since the war had their counterpart in the field of ecclesiastical relationships. As the Commonwealth developed out of the British Empire and the number of self-governing members increased rapidly, so the Anglican Communion was evolving out of the national Church of England and its colonial appendages. The international movement that manifested itself in the formation of the United Nations was paralleled by the ecumenical movement, finding expression in the World Council of Churches. There were even ecclesiastical, as well as political, summit conferences.<sup>1662</sup> The parallels were not exact; but some common factors were at work in shaping both sets of developments.

On the subject of Christian unity there was a noticeable dichotomy of opinion among Queensland Anglicans. There was general agreement, on theological and practical grounds, on the desirability of Christian unity, and on the fact that no such unity would be complete until it embraced Christians both in the catholic and protestant traditions. It was also fairly generally held by Anglicans that the Anglican Communion, because of its doctrinal and historical links with both the catholic and reformed churches, was in a position to play a distinctive role in the quest for reunion. There was divergence of opinion, however, on the method that should be adopted. On the one hand there were those who believed that the best approach to reunion lay through active Anglican participation in the World Council of Churches, which embraced most of the major Christian communions except the Church of Rome; on the other hand there were those who feared that this would lead only to a form of pan-Protestantism, and that the Anglican Church should first seek to cultivate closer relationships with Rome and the Eastern Orthodox Church.

The chief advocate of the World Council of Churches as a primary means of reconciling Christians was Archbishop Halse himself. For some years before he came to Brisbane Halse had been actively involved in discussions on intercommunion between the Church of England and the leading Protestant churches, and he had been largely responsible for a formula for mutual commissioning of ministers which he hoped would solve the vexed question of providing mutually acceptable ministries in all the churches concerned.<sup>1663</sup> He therefore naturally welcomed the formation of the World Council of churches in 1948, and he constantly advocated full Anglican participation in it. Recognising that chief opposition to the World Council among his people came from a section of the Anglo-Catholics, he particularly argued that there was nothing 'un-Catholic' in participating in the ecumenical movement.<sup>1664</sup> He encouraged the formation of a Queensland regional committee of the World Council,<sup>1665</sup> and himself presided over this committee each alternate year. His election to the presidency of the Australian Council of Churches in 1959 was the culmination of a life-long interest in the cause of Christian unity.<sup>1666</sup>

Under the archbishop's leadership the Church of England played an active part in ecumenical activities in Queensland. Emphasis was placed, however, on efforts to clarify the basic theological issues separating Christians rather than on easy short-cuts by such means as intercommunion or interchange of pulpits. Thus a conference of clergy and ministers was held in 1952, largely at Dr. Halse's instigation, to discuss different views on the theology of the church, in which the Anglican, Orthodox and Protestant churches participated, and to which the Roman Catholic Church sent a speaker. A similar conference, on the theology of the Bible, took place the following year.<sup>1667</sup> Later in the fifties theological discussion proceeded at a deeper level within the local sub-committee on Faith and Order, which brought together many of the

<sup>1662</sup> Notably the visit of Archbishop Geoffrey Fisher to Pope John XXIII in 1961.

<sup>1663</sup> The prayer and formula proposed by Halse, as slightly amended by the group considering intercommunion, is printed in an appendix to a document, entitled Intercommunion, A Summary of the Discussions and Proposals of an Australian Group, 1937-40. This document, together with correspondence and other documents on related subjects is included in a file headed Intercommunion among Archbishop Halse's papers. The prayer and formula, which became significant because they provided a basis for later proposed reunion schemes in India, were as follows:- Prayer: Almighty God, Who hast bestowed upon Thy servants diverse gifts of the Holy Spirit and hast called them to minister on Thy behalf to the souls of men, Empower by Thy Holy Spirit this laying-on of hands with prayer that it may be used of Thee to the enrichment of our ministries in the service of Thy Holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

The Formula: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfil the ministry of reconciliation, and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed. And see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying on of hands". In this formula the archbishop's gift for ambiguity was fully and deliberately exercised, and he was careful to exclude the words "ordination" or "re-ordination", which would imply either the invalidity or the validity of the previous ministry of those being commissioned. See letter in the same file, Halse to Bp. F. de W. Batty, 8 July 1943.

<sup>1664</sup> e.g. Church Chronicle, May 1952.

<sup>1665</sup> Inaugurated at a public meeting in Brisbane Church Chronicle, April, 1949.

<sup>1666</sup> Ibid., March 1959.

<sup>1667</sup> Ibid., December 1952 and January 1954.

leading theologians in Brisbane.<sup>1668</sup> From time to time ecumenical youth conferences were also held, at which care was taken to send Anglican delegations who had some degree of theological training.

Nevertheless many of the Anglican clergy did not share the enthusiasm of their archbishop for the World Council of Churches. In the course of time, some changed their mind. Bishop Housden, for example reversed his opinion after attending a central meeting of the W.C.C. in England and wrote back, "I am completely converted to the absolute necessity of the World Council of Churches".<sup>1669</sup> Others, however, continued to fear that there would be a compromise of theological principle in a superficial quest for unity. Writing back to his diocese from the Evanston conference of the World Council in 1954, Bishop Shevill chose to describe the symbol of the conference as "a boat adrift, without captain, crew or rudder", and he scathingly went on:

The symbol is well chosen for at the end of the first week, it is impossible for an observer to tell where the Assembly is going or what it hopes to achieve. To my Anglican mind this would seem desirable, but to the greatest concourse of Protestants ever gathered together in history, it would seem irrelevant.<sup>1670</sup>

This fear as to where the World Council of Churches was heading was shared by a number of the clergy, but their dilemma was to know what alternative road could be taken towards Christian unity. On the one hand the World Council of Churches seemed likely to lead to a pan-Protestantism that could be prejudicial to ultimate Christian unity by dividing Christians into two clearly divided camps; on the other hand the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church appeared as intransigent as ever in insisting that the only path to unity was by the submission of "non-Catholics" to the Papacy. The only course left was to make the first approach to the Orthodox Churches, which though small in Australia, formed a considerable part of catholic Christendom. It was this dilemma that inspired private motions at the synods of Brisbane, Rockhampton and North Queensland in 1959, urging that negotiations for unity be undertaken first with the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

While there were these divergent points of view as to the best way to seek wider unity, there continued to be a large proportion of the clergy, and probably even more of the laity, who were so immersed in the details of parochial life that bigger questions of unity seemed irrelevant. Indeed, it was true generally of the post-war years that while there was greater exploratory work on the theological plane than for centuries past on question of unity, comparatively little of this seeped down to the level of parochial congregations. Nevertheless even the theological dialogue represented a significant change of attitude from a generation before, and the continuing good personal relations of the leaders of the Christian communions in the state enabled greater headway to be made than this bare summary of developments might imply.

To many Anglicans the ecumenical movement appeared rather unrealistic and its theological jargon nebulous, and their wider interests found fuller satisfaction in the new concept that was emerging of the Anglican Communion. The term 'Church of England' had long been anachronistic in many parts of the world, because ever since the American Revolution there had been evolving in place of a national church with some relatively insignificant colonial outposts a fellowship of autonomous, but very closely related national churches. They were bound together by substantially the same standards of faith and worship, shared a common ethos, and were in full communion with one another. The Australian church was, however, one of the last parts of the Anglican Communion to become fully alive to the changed relationships that had developed. It was only perhaps in the post-war period that the Australian church caught up, both constitutionally and psychologically, with the reality of the changed Anglican world situation.

There had always been a particularly close relationship between the church in Queensland and the mother church in England. Even up to the second World War this had the character of a mother-child relationship, and there was comparatively little direct intercourse between Queensland and the other branches of the Anglican Communion. After the war close contacts with England were maintained. Queensland bishops continued to pay occasional visits to England, and though they scarcely expected to return with the yield of human and financial booty that had resulted from such trips half a century before, there was still a small flow of English priests, and a little money, to the church in Queensland. But the flow was now a two-way affair. English church leaders paid return visits, notably the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, who came in 1950 and 1951 respectively; appeals were made in Queensland for certain English church building funds; and a growing number of Queensland clergy were spending time in English parishes, gaining experience and making some contribution to the life of the English church.

At the same time there was much closer contact than ever before with other branches of the Anglican Communion. In part this was a natural consequence of closer world communications, but it partly sprang from an awareness that the whole corpus of Anglican wisdom did not necessarily reside in the English church, and that valuable lessons, applicable to Australian conditions, might be learned elsewhere. We have noted the interest in American techniques in finance, Christian education and pastoral methods, and the visits of such American church leaders as the Right Reverend H.K. Sherrill,

<sup>1668</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1957 p.91

<sup>1669</sup> Church Chronicle., August 1949.

<sup>1670</sup> Northern Churchman, October 1954.



Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church of America, and the Right Reverend Horace Donegan, Bishop of New York, and specialists in certain fields, helped to strengthen these ties. A few American priests even came to take up appointments, particularly in the Diocese of North Queensland. Exchanges of visits to or from the churches of China, Japan, Korea and other missionary territories also helped to foster interest in those varied parts of the Anglican Communion, while the particular problems of the Province of South Africa in the face of the government's apartheid policy focussed more attention than even before on that province. In short there was a new awareness of the international character of the Anglican Communion. The result was that the church in Queensland grew a little less English, and was subject to those American and other international influences that were affecting Australian life generally.

The evolution of the Anglican Communion in its modern form rendered the constitutional status of the Australian church even more anomalous. It was the only major part of the Anglican Communion without a properly constituted national life. It was clearly urgent that the long drawn-out constitutional movement should reach finality. Queensland no longer provided the chief leaders of the movement, but no part of the Australian church was more conscious of the need for a satisfactory constitution.

By 1950 the constitutional question appeared to have reached complete deadlock. The latest draft of the constitution had been rejected by a considerable number of dioceses, and in Queensland only the Diocese of Brisbane had accepted it. Even in that diocese there was strong opposition from churchmen of various schools of thought, and only the support of the archbishop and a brilliant speech by Archdeacon W.A. Hardie won the rather unenthusiastic vote of the majority.<sup>1671</sup> The old objections again formed the chief grounds of complaint – over-rigidity of the draft and the preponderance of the laity on the appellate tribunal.

In view of this new failure, the old proposals for proceeding with a separate constitution for the Province of Queensland were revived. The provincial synod agreed in 1949 to proceed with drafting a provincial constitution, on the understanding that it might be displaced later by a national constitution, if an acceptable one were produced.<sup>1672</sup> The archbishop was particularly emphatic that nothing should be done that might render a national constitution more distant. He hoped “to point the way to the rest of the Australian Church attaining that degree of autonomy which is necessary for its life, growth and progress”.<sup>1673</sup> Even such ardent advocates of the provincial method of proceeding as Bishop Belcher and Archdeacon A.P. Bennie were careful to leave the way open for this further development.<sup>1674</sup> The fruitfulness of the provincial approach was never, however, tested, because new suggestions by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Fisher, led to a hopeful breakthrough towards agreement on a national constitution, which determined the Queensland provincial synod to hold its hand.<sup>1675</sup>

The revised draft of the national constitution was at last approved by a convention which met at the time of general synod in 1955, and it was generally agreed to be the best yet produced. It continued to be rigid, so far as possibility of alteration was concerned, but it was satisfactory to many of the Queensland critics in that it placed the Thirty-nine Articles among the “Ruling Principles”, instead of among the unalterable “Fundamental Declarations”; and while the appellate tribunal still comprised a majority of lay legal members, the authority of the bishops in matters of doctrine and discipline was more carefully safeguarded than in the earlier drafts. It was generally agreed that the compromise thus achieved was far from perfect, but the majority of churchmen were reasonably satisfied.

Before coming into operation the draft had to be accepted by twenty Australian dioceses. In Brisbane the obvious willingness of the majority of the clergy, including the more advanced churchmen, to accept the draft, led to a curious reversal of attitudes. In the 1920's, as we have seen, it was lay fears about “cutting the painter” and possible changes in standards of doctrine and worship that had provided the chief opposition in Queensland to the constitution. In the thirties and forties, it was the clergy who led the fight, on grounds of over-rigidity and the lay preponderance in the appellate tribunal. Now, in the mid-fifties, the old lay opposition rose again to fight the last battle. The “cutting the painter” argument had lost its force: it was the doctrinal issue that constituted the main ground of attack.

Since 1953 there had been a marked resurgence in Brisbane of the tense party strife that had existed in the twenties. One difficulty was that the 1662 Prayer Book, to which the church was legally bound by the existing constitution of the diocese, had been rendered obsolescent in certain respects by changes in modern life and the findings of modern liturgical scholarship. It was almost impossible to observe all the rules of the Prayer Book to the letter; but some of the inevitable

<sup>1671</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1947, pp 26-7 and 42; Church Chronicle, October 1947. For the northern dioceses, see Rockhampton Synod Proceedings, January 1948, pp 16-7 and 30; N.Q. Synod Minutes, 1947.

<sup>1672</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1949, p.19.

<sup>1673</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1950, Archbishop's synod address, p.84.

<sup>1674</sup> Cf. Bishop Belcher in Northern Churchman, January 1951, and Archdeacon Bennie in Church Chronicle, January 1950.

<sup>1675</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1952, p.20.

divergences from the letter of the law that had arisen were feared by a group of laymen to be tending towards Roman Catholicism. Under the surface there was an undercurrent of confusion and dissatisfaction among the laity about changes in forms of worship that had been made in certain places. In 1953 a Brisbane barrister, P.W. Henderson, launched a fierce attack in synod upon St. Francis' College, which he claimed to be the source of the trouble, through the training given to the theological students. The nature of the criticism was, however, unfortunate, as it appeared to impeach not only extremist doctrines and forms of worship, but also many practices and beliefs that were generally recognised as being within the normal range of Anglican standards. The result was that even the moderate clergy were angered, and the synod debate was conducted in camera in a tense atmosphere. A compromise motion was finally adopted, that a committee be appointed to examine the whole question of "lawful authority" in the Church of England in Queensland.<sup>1676</sup>

The work of the committee thus appointed was entirely inconclusive. Its meetings were few and brief, and it was dogged by a sense of frustration because the existing legal situation was so anomalous, and must remain so until a satisfactory Australian church constitution was accepted.<sup>1677</sup> The critics, however, were not satisfied with what they regarded as a side-stepping of the central issue, and each year after 1953, P.W. Henderson, with the support of two other prominent Brisbane barristers, G.L. Hart and C.G. Wanstall, continued their attack on what they regarded as extreme Anglo-Catholicism in the diocese. The consideration of the new draft of the constitution in 1956 took place against this background. Before synod met the three barristers issued a circular letter in which they set out their case, attacking the constitution on precisely the grounds of those alterations in the earlier drafts which made it acceptable to the majority of the clergy. Particularly they protested against the removal of the Prayer Book and Thirty-nine Articles from the "Fundamental Provisions". They argued that "the Prayer Book and Articles may cease to be observed in any sense within the next generation", and that "the proposed constitution offers no certain or practical means of safeguarding the reformed and protestant standards of the Church of England".<sup>1678</sup> The debate in synod was long and tense, but of a high quality, as was a further debate at the same synod on the Church of England Defence Association, which a group of laymen had established anew to support the protestant cause.<sup>1679</sup> The result was not only an overwhelming vote in favour of the new constitution, but also a very considerable clearing of the air, assisted by the assurance of the opponents of the constitution that they would now loyally accept it.<sup>1680</sup> The passing of the critical measure appeared to be followed by far more amicable relations between all sections of the clergy and laity.

The constitution was passed with considerable debate, but rather less bitterness, in the synods of the northern dioceses, and with the subsequent acceptance of it by a sufficient number of the other Australian dioceses, it was possible for legislation to be prepared for the state parliaments to enable the new constitution to take effect. After long delays, caused largely by complications in drafting the bills, the new constitution finally came into operation on 1 January 1962, and the Church of England in Australia was provided after half a century with an adequate constitutional framework for the fulfilment of its mission.

---

<sup>1676</sup> Brisbane Year Book, 1953, p.112.

<sup>1677</sup> For majority and minority reports of the committee, Ibid., 1955.

<sup>1678</sup> Hart, G.L., Henderson, P.W. and Wanstall, C.G., Circular Letter to Clerical and Lay Members of synod, 12 June 1956.

<sup>1679</sup> Anglican, 20 July 1956.

<sup>1680</sup> The fulfilment of this assurance was demonstrated by the fact that G.L. Hart, Q.C., M.L.A. played an important part in piloting the bill to give effect to the new constitution through the Queensland parliament in March 1961, and that Mr. Justice C.G. Wanstall (as he now was) was offered by Archbishop Halse, and accepted, in June 1961 the position of chancellor of the Diocese of Brisbane.

**PART VI: CONCLUSION.**

## CHAPTER 18: THE CHURCH IN THE SIXTIES.

The beginning of the 1960's makes a convenient terminal point for this history. In 1959 the Church of England concluded its first century of organised diocesan life in Queensland;<sup>1681</sup> a succession of new episcopal appointments significantly altered the leadership of the church in the province; and the inauguration of the national constitution of the Church of England in Australia on 1 January, 1962 symbolised the opening of a new epoch in the life of the church.

It will suffice to mention in brief the various changes in the episcopate. The translation of the Right Reverend J.A.G. Housden to Newcastle was followed by the consecration in February 1959 of the Reverend Theodore Bruce McCall, formerly home secretary of the Australian Board of Missions, to be Bishop of Rockhampton.<sup>1682</sup> Then the bishopric of Carpentaria fell vacant, due to the resignation of the Right Reverend W.J. Hudson, who became Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane. In this case the right of election was vested in the bishops of the province, who chose the Reverend Seering John Matthews, who had a short time previously resigned the deanery of Rockhampton in order to undertake missionary work in Carpentaria as priest-director of the Torres Strait mission. The service at which he and the Reverend George Ambo, the first Papuan to become a bishop, were consecrated was generally accounted one of the most moving occasions in the history of St. John's Cathedral. Finally the death of the Most Reverend R.C. Halse in 1962 led to the election of the Right Reverend Philip Nigel Warrington Strong, Bishop of New Guinea, to the archbishopric of Brisbane.

These changes were significant; but the achievement of Australian church autonomy was of even more long-term importance. The changing nature of the Australian church has been reflected in our method of treating the history of the church in Queensland. Up to the end of the nineteenth century it was convenient to trace the life of each diocese separately, for each had its own particular circumstances and distinctive characteristics.

In considering the first half of the twentieth century it became more natural to consider trends in the province as a whole, for there emerged throughout the state common patterns of church life, of which the creation of the province was an outward and visible sign. We have now reached a point, however, where the greater degree of unity in the Australian church makes it almost impossible to isolate the church in any one state from its wider Australian background.

What has the Church of England accomplished in Queensland during its history? Before discussing that question we must consider the criteria by which the success or failure of the church are to be measured. The secular historian is apt to measure a church's achievement by the degree of its political and social influence. But the church is not primarily a political agency, even though its life and doctrine inevitably have political implications. Indeed in those periods of history when it has sought to use primarily political means to accomplish its purposes – as in the investiture controversy of the 11<sup>th</sup> Century – the church has been least true to its real vocation.

The Anglican Church has traditionally eschewed the role of a political pressure group in Queensland, and only on rare occasions, when its immediate interests were immediately bound up with politics – as in the education controversy of the 1860's – did it depart from this attitude. The few attempts to act as a political pressure group have not been very successful, for the Church of England lacks the degree of control over the opinions of its members necessary for effective political action. If in one sense this suggests the weakness or lack of cohesion, in another sense it reflects a positive Anglican attitude, namely a respect for the right of the individual to follow his conscience in applying the principles of Christianity to the complex problems of political and personal life.

This is not to say that the church has little or no political influence; but its influence is primarily indirect. The church cultivates among its members (and others) certain attitudes of mind, which help shape political and moral decisions on particular issues. Occasionally the church makes official political pronouncements, and more frequently individual churchmen – not necessarily the most responsible ones – do the same on their own initiative; but the chief political influence of the church is not exercised either by public pronouncements or by string-pulling behind the scenes, but rather by shaping at a deeper level attitudes to life, which affect the decisions that are made. It is chiefly in this sense that the church has political influence, and in this sense the Church of England has made a profound contribution to the life of Queensland. In fostering attitudes of respect for the individual as a person of value in God's sight, of recognition of the right of the individual to follow his conscience in matters of moral choice, and of comprehensiveness and tolerance in outlook, the Church of England has helped mould the basic materials from which the life of a democratic state is shaped. Yet even when this is recognised, it must be repeated that in any case political influence is not the criterion of the church's effectiveness.

---

<sup>1681</sup> The centenary celebrations of the Diocese of Brisbane in June 1959 brought together most of the bishops of the Australian church, and culminated in an impressive solemn Eucharist in Festival Hall, Brisbane, attended by more than four thousand people.

<sup>1682</sup> Another priest had previously been elected by the synod of the diocese, but his election lapsed owing to the failure of the diocesan bishops to confirm it.

Nor is the influence of the church in creating a civic moral code the chief test of its success. From the days of the penal settlement there have been those who have regarded the church primarily as the moral bulwark of society. It was chiefly for fostering moral restraint that chaplains were considered a necessary part of the staff of convict settlements. The same attitude has persisted in more recent times: religious instruction in state schools has largely been justified on the grounds of improving juvenile morality; and some well-intended magistrates have in recent times made it a condition of a bond for youthful criminals that they attend church for a specified period of time. Christianity is of course concerned with morality, for its concern is with the offering of the whole of life to God. But it holds that the moral life springs from a living personal relationship with God, and that divorced from that relationship, Christianity is reduced to a cold rather harsh and quite impracticable code of ethics. Success in forcing the forms of Christian morality on society is no necessary indication that the church has been genuinely successful: it might imply, as might political influence, that the church has surrendered its real vocation for some lesser task.

What, then, are we to take as the criterion of a church's success? The church's own assessment of itself is that it exists for the glory of God, the extension of His kingdom, and the changing of men's lives so that they might be brought into living relationship with God. This will, of course, have implications for the changing of society as a whole. These are categories in which the historian, as historian, is bound to feel uncomfortable. They are not susceptible of measurement in terms of statistics. Numbers of nominal adherents, amounts of money raised, the number of churches built, are no necessary guide to the spiritual vitality of a church; and even statistics that show numbers of communicants or 'decisions for Christ' cannot conclusively reveal the inner convictions of men's lives. Yet the historian can only work in categories such as these, and in them he can arrive at partial judgments. What is important is that he had the humility to recognise that his judgments cannot be more than partial, and that in the things of the spirit, with which the church by its very nature is primarily concerned, his judgments must be very tentative indeed.

The history of the Anglican Church in Queensland has been a mixture of success – if that word is applicable in this context – and failure. The achievements have been considerable. A network of parishes has been built up throughout the state, each with its own organised life. Five dioceses have been formed and provided with appropriate means of support and constitutional machinery. There have been leaders of marked wisdom and ability, and some at least of prophetic vision. Lives have been changed in quality and outlook by the preaching of the Gospel and the ministry of the sacraments. There have been notable examples of sacrificial devotion, from clergymen and laymen alike and some lives – including probably many unknown – of heroic sanctity. Though the church can claim few if any original theologians in Queensland, its scholars have consistently sought to relate modern knowledge with the church's faith. Through its social work the church has helped many people in physical or spiritual need, among the aged, the infirm, the children of broken homes and others. The list of achievements could be continued at length.

Nevertheless critical Anglicans have themselves recognised that much has been left undone, and that in relation to its nominal size the Church of England has been half-hearted and sometimes ineffective in certain important respects. Throughout Queensland history, standards of church attendance have been poor, and really committed members of the church have been only a small proportion of the nominal membership. There has always been a lack of sufficient men and women dedicating their lives to full-time service in materially unrewarding vocations within the church, and as a result outgoing missionary work at home and abroad has often lagged. Even with improved methods of fund-raising, many churchmen have given little financial support to their church.<sup>1683</sup> Many members of the church have been vague in belief, and this has reflected inadequacies in the training provided at home, in Sunday schools and church day schools. On moral and political issues the Church of England has sometimes been indefinite in its attitudes and unsure in its influence. Throughout the history of the state the critic could find much that speaks of human failure in the life of the Church of England.

The basic reason for this measure of failure was that the church found difficulty in overcoming the serious disadvantages of its initial heritage. As we saw in our introductory chapter, the Church of England came to Australia when its life was at a low ebb in England. Eighteenth century rationalism had left it doctrinally vague; it had become caught up in the English social structure in such a way as to leave its hold on the working classes pitifully weak; and the evangelical and catholic revivals, while arousing new vigour, zeal and spiritual depth, left an aftermath of party divisions, which were transplanted to Australia. The convicts and immigrants who came to Australia were largely from among the unchurched, and they came to a pioneering society where there was little leisure or desire to appreciate the things of the mind or the spirit. This fostered a strongly materialist attitude in the early years of the life of the colony, which continued to exert its influence even in the later days of a settled and more affluent society. In this environment, in itself so unfavourable for the appreciation of the spiritual life, the church lacked the resources of manpower and money to do much more than hold a defensive line against the secularist forces arrayed against it.

<sup>1683</sup> See, for example, remarks of the Right Rev, John Hudson, *Church Chronicle*, November 1962.

It was not, however, only these material disadvantages that the Anglican Church had to overcome. For a long time it was unconsciously dominated by an establishment mentality. In England the church lived in a society where the Christian religion was legally entrenched and where most people belonged to the Church of England. The reality of the Australian situation was very different; but the church was slow to shake off its inherited mental attitude. It was not surprising that the churches which came from the old world without the buttresses of legal privilege were more readily able to adapt themselves to their still unprivileged position in their new country.

The Church of England fought to maintain its privileged position in Australia; but when it failed – and the battle was virtually lost even before the Diocese of Brisbane was established in 1859 – its adaptation to its unaccustomed situation was slow and painful. There was no tradition of lay initiative, except in a negative and sometimes anti-clerical direction; there was no sense of obligation to support the church financially and there was little awareness of the urgent need to go out and convert people. Furthermore the typically Anglican approach to theological and moral questions, often described as the *via media*, all too often became a negative compromise between Catholicism and Protestantism without the positive virtues of either, instead of being a dynamic synthesis of both. As such, it was scarcely calculated to catch the imagination of an unsubtle people. Finally the top leadership of the church was until comparatively recently almost exclusively English, both by birth and in mental attitude; and though the leaders which the English church gave were in many instances men of first-rate calibre both spiritually and intellectually, there was a sense in which they were apart from broad Australian life. Perhaps the fact that the nationally constituted church still retains as its formal name ‘The Church of England in Australia’ indicates that the remnant of this mentality persists.

Yet this is to show the situation in its darkest aspect. In fact, particularly as the twentieth century grew older, the Anglican Church did succeed in adapting itself to its environment in a very large measure. Australian born and trained leaders were coming more to the fore; the popular image of the Anglican priest was no longer that of the effeminate parson of the *Bulletin* cartoon;<sup>1684</sup> and the active membership and leadership of the church was more broadly spread across all sections of the community. Nevertheless there are some respects in which the Anglican Church must radically think out its position in Australian life, and it remains to suggest certain directions in which the church must critically examine itself in the light of its history.

First, the church needs to reconsider critically the image which it presents to the world. A residue of the establishment mentality has continued, not in expecting any official privileged standing from the state, but in thinking of the Church of England as the church of the Australian people. In England it was the church of the people, and even those who had little or no real religious affiliations traditionally went to the parish church for such occasional offices as baptisms, weddings and funerals, and expected to receive these ministrations without obligations of membership on their part (apart from the payment of the customary fee). Such an attitude was understandable in England where church and state were in some sense co-terminous; but it led to church membership becoming almost meaningless. This attitude carried over to Australia, and it is well recognised that even to the present day, many who have in reality no religion mark themselves as ‘C. of E.’ on the census paper. The image has thus been maintained of the Church of England as a vague religious society useful for the moral instruction of the young in schools and Sunday schools, and pleasant and comforting to have available for the traditional occasions of baptism and marriage, and for bringing a little solace to the dying and bereaved. In this kind of attitude the proclamation and living of the Gospel in its fullness has had little place.

It is not, of course, suggested that this is the image which committed churchmen have of the church, nor that these remarks apply only to the Church of England; and indeed efforts to tighten up the concept of church membership have been proceeding since the days of the penal settlement. We noted Bishop Tyrrell’s endeavours to enforce some standard of church discipline in the days when Moreton Bay was still part of the Diocese of Newcastle, and Bishop Tufnell’s ruling that only communicants should vote in church elections. These were the earliest instances of a quiet, continuing process whereby the obligations of church membership have been more widely taught and recognised. One important effect of the Anglo-Catholic movement was to define more sharply the obligations of church membership, and there has been considerable theological discussion in recent times on whether the children of quasi-pagan parents ought to be baptised before they are old enough to accept for themselves the obligations involved.

This process of reconsideration of the terms of church membership has already had noticeable effects. The old practice of indiscriminate baptism of children without notice at a set time on Sunday afternoons has become far less common; in many places efforts have been made to insist upon godparents who are practising Christians; confirmation has in general been taken much more seriously than in earlier years; positive attempts have been made to use the occasional offices of baptisms, weddings and funerals as opportunities for instruction of the unchurched in the meaning of the faith; courses of adult religious education have aimed to create a laity more alive to the obligations of church membership; and the duty of

---

<sup>1684</sup> The bush brotherhood tradition has been partly responsible for the change, as well as the recognition of the hard and faithful work of many ordinary parish priests.

financial support has been much more effectively driven home through every-member canvasses. These measures have meant the loss of some nominal members to the Church of England, and sometimes unnecessary tactlessness and rigidity on the part of some of the clergy have contributed to this loss. Yet such losses are inevitable if church membership is to have real meaning, and by and large the people lost to the church through this mild exercise of discipline have been so vague in their religious belief and practice that their loss has made little practical difference either to themselves or to the church; and the gain in quality of membership and in real commitment of many other church members has more than offset this loss. As religion loses the props of legal privilege and social custom that supported it in earlier generations, the church must learn to depend entirely on committed membership; but this will be a healthy lesson to learn. It will be to the extent that the Church of England casts aside entirely its establishment complex, is willing to face nominal loss of membership (and consequently perhaps to cease to claim to be the biggest church in Australia) and takes seriously its mission to convert people rather than simply to minister to the converted, that it will be able to fulfil its vocation.

It is easy to criticise the church – particularly the clergy – because this missionary task at home has not been more effectively tackled.

The fact is, however, that despite real and valiant efforts the clergy have not had a fair chance. The figures in Appendix IV show that in 1954 there was only one clergyman to every 2,045 Anglicans in Queensland, and this figure was only a little worse than the general average since 1870. When it is remembered that these people are in many cases scattered over wide areas of country, it will readily be seen that carrying out of necessary routine ministrations to such extensive flocks has left hardly any time for constantly overworked parish priests to engage in intensive outgoing work.<sup>1685</sup> By comparison with the Roman Catholic Church with its larger number of priests as well as big religious orders, and with the smaller protestant churches with their compact congregations, the clergy of the Church of England have been in a very disadvantageous position. It seems clear that part of the psychological readjustment that is needed is a degree of commitment that will lead greater numbers of candidates to offer for the full-time service of the church. There are indications that this is happening. In 1961 a record number of seventeen men and women went from the Diocese of Brisbane alone to train for missionary service; and the postulants' guild, formed in 1961 to guide boys and young men considering taking holy orders, had eighty members within a year of its formation. It is still too early to know whether this will be a continuing trend; but perhaps no single factor will be more vital in the future success of the church.

Secondly, in a shrinking (and shrunken) world the church must learn its world-wide interdependence if it is to hold its own and expand. The population explosion in the predominantly non-Christian areas of the world, the resurgence of vigour in what a few years ago were regarded as relatively moribund religions, and the spread of communism over great areas of the earth have created a pressing challenge to world Christianity unequalled since the period of Moslem expansion in the middle ages. This is, of course a situation not to be faced in Queensland alone, nor by the Church of England alone, but the church in Queensland cannot evade its responsibility in this universal crisis. It involves two considerations.

The first is that the church in Queensland needs to be aroused to a more urgent sense of the wider mission of the church in the face of the anti-Christian forces in the world, and despite its own internal problems to enter wholeheartedly into the world-wide missionary enterprise. On the basis of the experience of the English church in the nineteenth century, there is good ground to believe that if this were to happen, there would be a simultaneous quickening of church life in Queensland itself. The nature of overseas missionary work has changed considerably since the war in view of the self-conscious independence of so many formerly dependent territories and of the consequent changes in race relationships which we considered in the last chapter. But though the forms of missionary enterprise will in some respects be different, the basic need is as great as ever. The church in any nominally Christian country will henceforth only be able to survive and grow if the church throughout the world survives and grows. It is this conviction that has led to a campaign in Brisbane diocese in 1962, known as 'Forth'. Conceived by the organising secretaries of the Australian Board of Missions and Home Missions, Canon E.E. Hawkey and the Reverend D.H.W. Shand, and personally led by Bishop Hudson as administrator of the diocese, the campaign has aimed to arouse the parishes to an awareness of the 'total mission' of the church at home and abroad. Its inspiration derives from a small book by an English missionary theologian, Douglas Webster,<sup>1686</sup> which in simple but compelling terms portrays the church's task in terms of mission. The degree to which the whole church accepts this concept of its task will be of great significance for its future growth.

The other consideration is that the ability of Christianity to overcome the forces arrayed against it may well be influenced by the degree of Christian unity that is achieved, and again this must concern every church in every part of the world. In the

---

<sup>1685</sup> An interesting comparison with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, which has been far more successful in winning converts than the Anglican Church in Australia, is given by this parallel figure: the Diocese of Massachusetts has one clergyman to every 473 members of the church.

<sup>1686</sup>

Australian scene Queensland has been distinctive in two respects. The first is that there have been unusually amicable personal relations among the leaders of the various churches, and notably between the Roman Catholic archbishop and a succession of Anglican archbishops. The second is that the Church of England, while active in the ecumenical movement, has taken a more rigid attitude than in many other parts of Australia on matters like intercommunion and the absolute necessity of episcopacy for a fully valid ministry. The distinctive attitude of the Anglican Church in Queensland on the latter issue was clearly revealed in 1961, when the Metropolitan of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon asked the provinces of the Anglican Communion as to whether they would be prepared to enter into full communion with the united churches which would be formed as a result of proposed reunion schemes in North India and Ceylon. Whereas the provincial synod of New South Wales gave a direct affirmative answer, the provincial synod of Queensland replied in the negative on the grounds of "grave doubts about its orthodox doctrine" in the case of the North India plan, and the unsatisfactory nature of the method of unifying the ministry in both schemes.<sup>1687</sup> Only Archbishop Halse dissented from the decision of the Queensland synod. Most of the provinces in other parts of the Anglican Communion adopted a position between these two extremes, expressing general approval of the union schemes, but having serious reservations in certain respects.

This decision has shown that the church of Queensland is still very wary about suggestions for reunion with Protestant churches. The reason, however, is not merely one of conservatism. Many of the Anglican clergy have a real fear that precipitate action might lead to a merely pan-Protestant unity which would make complete unity, embracing Roman and Orthodox, as well as Protestant, churches more distant. The signs of changing attitudes in the Roman Catholic Church have recently indicated that unity in that direction might not be so completely out of the question as it appeared to be a few years ago, and this is likely to fortify the Anglo-Catholic conviction against hasty schemes for reunion. Nevertheless the trend towards unity is undoubtedly one of the great facts of the present age, and the future of the whole church may well depend on its outcome.

Thirdly, the future of the Anglican Church will in part depend on the success with which it makes its constitutional machinery work, and adjusts itself to its new national status. Although the new constitution has been accepted by every diocese, its imperfections are widely admitted, from different points of view. Whether or not it works will depend on the degree to which the old suspicions and rivalries, which in the past have dominated inter-diocesan life in Australia, are replaced by a spirit of unity and co-operation. There have been two major reasons for the hesitations of the past. One was the great discrepancy in size and importance of the respective dioceses. On the 1954 census figures, for example, the Diocese of Sydney contained 27.6% of the population of Australia, the Diocese of Melbourne 17.7% and Brisbane 9.8%; at the other end of the scale smaller dioceses like North Queensland and Rockhampton had only 2.1% and 0.9% respectively. Under the old constitution of general synod representation was weighted in favour of the smaller dioceses, and the larger dioceses, especially Sydney, were concerned because their distinctive viewpoints could be swamped by the votes of the numerous small dioceses. For this reason Sydney had always been particularly sensitive about allowing general synod to be given too much authority.

The other cause of suspicion had been the fact that in Australia divisions of churchmanship had generally hardened along diocesan boundary lines. In early years when the importation of clergy from England was the responsibility of the diocesan bishop, men were naturally drawn from those circles with which a bishop was familiar, and there was a natural tendency to bring out men of similar thought patterns to himself. In the course of time these men inclined to elect their next diocesan bishop from their own school of thought. In this way dioceses became associated with particular brands of churchmanship, ranging from Sydney at one extreme to the northern Queensland dioceses at the other, and a great gulf separated the extremes.

The meeting of the first general synod under the new constitution in May 1962 was a test of whether the traditional rivalries could be overcome and the church operate as an effective unity. It is still too early to give any definitive answer to that question, but it was generally agreed that the indications at the first general synod were distinctly hopeful.<sup>1688</sup> The representation of the larger dioceses was more in their favour than in the old general synod, and this gave them a sense of confidence; and issues of Party churchmanship were scarcely in evidence at all. The very fact that a motion for the establishment of a commission on Prayer Book reform – an extremely contentious item – was moved by the Right Reverend T.B. McCall and seconded by the Right Reverend M.L. Loane, representatives of quite different types of churchmanship, was itself a hopeful sign. It remains to be seen whether the commission can reach agreement on detail.

In Queensland itself there has been evidence of a softening of extreme Anglo-Catholic attitudes in certain respects in recent years. While the general standard of churchmanship has moved fairly steadily in a catholic direction, the Anglo-Catholic wing has shown itself less inclined to follow Roman Catholic precedent in details of worship and belief. In part this

<sup>1687</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1961 p.35.

<sup>1688</sup> Anglican, 24 May, 1962.



reflects a more self-confident attitude about the catholicity of Anglicanism, and in part it has resulted from Roman Catholic uncertainties which have led to internal criticisms of, and changes in, certain traditional practices in that church. The quest for mutual understanding associated with the ecumenical movement has also had its effect on the Church of England: as Anglicans have become conscious of the need to understand other denominations, so they have recognised the positive value of other schools of thought within their own church.

The degree of real unity attained by the church under its new constitution may depend largely upon the personal qualities of leadership displayed by the bishops, especially the primate. The primate's legal power is small, but he is in a position to exercise a very considerable moral influence, and Queensland Anglicans welcomed the unanimous election by the first general synod of the Most Reverend H.R. Gough, Archbishop of Sydney, as the first primate of the nationally constituted church. His broad and fair-minded attitude to all parts of the church has encouraged the hope that his leadership will foster a real unity of spirit.

The role of the province and of provincial synod must necessarily come under question as the national church assumes more real significance. As we have seen, the Province of Queensland has traditionally been the most closely knit in the Australian church, and the Queensland provincial synod has been the most effective of the four relatively ineffective provincial synods of Australia, though its value has been less in legislative authority than in helping to develop a family spirit and common outlook among the dioceses of the province. The legal status of provincial synod was weakened in 1952, when the Brisbane diocesan chancellor, F.T. Cross, ruled that it was unconstitutional for the dioceses of the province to delegate to provincial synod the right to accept or reject on behalf of the whole province determinations of general synod. The provincial constitution purported to give this power to provincial synod, and this had imparted to provincial synod special constitutional importance. In a report in 1961 the new chancellor, Mr. Justice C.G. Wanstall, concurred in the earlier ruling, and commented that the new national constitution "confirms and entrenches the status of the Diocese", and so by implication leaves provincial synod with a relatively humble status.<sup>1689</sup>

Legal weaknesses apart, it is clear that the continued existence of the province as a significant unit in the church is threatened by the emergence of a genuine national church structure. It is doubtful whether there is scope for strong synods at three levels – general, provincial and diocesan. The diocesan synods are firmly entrenched, and general synod appears likely to grow in authority: it seems likely therefore that the province will be further weakened in fact if not in theory. Some churchmen, conscious of Queensland's distinctive contribution as a province, regret this possibility, and Canon A.P.B. Bennie initiated a move at the 1961 provincial synod to ensure the continuance of the province as a significant unit. The standing committee of synod was instructed to

take what constitutional action it deems necessary to enable Provincial Synod to fulfil legally the functions assigned to it under its own constitution in so far as these do not contravene the Constitution of the Church of England in Australia.<sup>1690</sup>

Nevertheless it remains to be seen what place the province can have in the future polity of the Australian church, and it is important that the church be willing to adapt its constitutional arrangements to meet real needs rather than try to preserve a structure that no longer has real significance.

It is, of course, true that legal machinery in itself cannot ensure the effective performance of the church's spiritual work. Throughout most of its history the church has functioned in Queensland without a really satisfactory legal framework, and indeed the new constitution has made no immediate difference in practice to the daily life of the church. But the fact that the legal system by which the church was theoretically bound has in the past been so out of touch with the reality of the Australian situation has had the effect of placing the law into disrepute. The exercise of authority has depended rather on whatever moral power bishops possessed, based upon custom and individual personality, than on any consistent system of canon law. The result has been that individuals, both clerical and lay, have largely done as they liked in certain aspects of church life, and this state of affairs has come to be regarded as normal. The danger inherent in a watertight constitution is that of a new legalism, which would be as fatal to spiritual life in the church as legalism has always been; but if the constitution is rightly used, it may lead to a wise and accepted exercise of lawful authority in the church which will leave the parishes less subject to damage from the whims of eccentric individuals. If the Anglican Church can face its legal position realistically, not being dominated by constitutionalism, but developing a reasonable and respected system of canon law, then its life as an organised society might be greatly strengthened.

Fourthly, coherent reconsideration is required of the future pattern of relationships between church and state. It seemed in the nineteenth century that this matter was finally decided, and that with the complete separation of church and state, the church must expect no assistance whatever from the state, financial or otherwise, in the propagation of the faith or the fulfilment of its policies. With its tradition of close relationship with the state in England the Anglican Church did not at first

<sup>1689</sup> Provincial Synod Proceedings, 1961, p.32.

<sup>1690</sup> Ibid., p.36.

accept this solution happily, though the Non-conformist churches on the whole not only accepted it, but were among its chief advocates.

The twentieth century has seen some reversal of the earlier secularist trend. The state scholarship grants formed an increasingly significant form of indirect financial aid to church and other private secondary schools; provision for religious instruction in the primary, and later the high schools, gave official sanction to religion in the state schools; the customary practice by which the government nominated three religious leaders (including the Anglican archbishop) to the senate of the university related religion and education at the tertiary level; substantial government subsidies for building church university colleges were a form of undisguised direct aid; grants of increasing amounts were provided for the aboriginal missions of the church; both commonwealth and state governments gave substantial subsidies towards the building of church homes for the aged, and certain other types of social service work; and most recently, it has been agreed that stipends of chaplains at the Brisbane Mental Hospital should be entirely met by the government, and chapels have been built at government expense. On top of all these forms of assistance by the government to the churches (which are universally accepted almost without question) has arisen the more controversial request for further state aid to church schools.

There are several reasons for the increased willingness of state authorities to give assistance to the church in these undertakings. One is the recognition that by performing certain kinds of work the church saves the government considerable expense, as the total cost would otherwise have to be provided by the government. This is true, for example, of homes for the aged, and of aboriginal missions. It is cheaper for the government to subsidise funds raised by private subscription by the church than to have to provide the whole amount required from public revenue. A second factor that has been increasingly recognised in recent years is that church homes can provide a personal kind of atmosphere that is more appropriate for many types of social work than the impersonal coldness of a state-controlled system. There has also been a renewed recognition that spiritual factors cannot be neglected in dealing with human personality, and that, for example, in treating the mentally ill or the delinquent, the ministrations of the church can often be an integral part of the treatment given.

For the church this changed attitude represents a great gain. The changing pattern of church-state relations is still far from complete, and as we suggested in the last chapter, the future of aboriginal missions, and of church schools still remains to be clarified. What is needed is a systematic re-thinking of the whole question of relative spheres of responsibility of church and state in these various fields. What has happened so far has been the result of a series of *ad hoc* decisions, and a consistent pattern remains to be determined. This is, of course, part of a world-wide problem. There lie in the present situation the possibilities of a much healthier church-state relationship than appeared likely in 1900. But at the same time the church must be aware of a twofold danger: that it might come to be regarded once more (as in penal days) as simply a useful instrument for moral reform and social work, and so have its fundamental mission submerged; and that government aid might imply a measure of government control, with the consequent threat of political pressure on the church. It would be a retrograde step for the Church of England, as it frees itself from inherited political and psychological shackles, to be seized upon by new and more subtle forms of bondage.

Fifthly, the intellectual challenge of the age must be faced. In every generation the church must do this afresh, and in doing it must steer the course between two opposite temptations: either to bury its head in the sand and allow the Gospel to become irrelevant to the thought forms of the age, or so to re-interpret the Gospel in the light of current intellectual fashions that the real content of the faith is lost. In the past the problem has not been unduly acute, as very little original thinking has been done in Australia, and Australian thought, both secular and theological, has been chiefly a delayed reflection of that in Europe, especially England. For its part the church can claim to have produced no original theologian in Queensland, even though there have been some theological teachers of ability.

Henceforth, however, the intellectual content of Australian life is certain to grow, and the direct intellectual challenge to Christianity is certain to increase. The Australian universities are growing at a remarkable rate, not only in numbers of staff and students, but in achievements in thought and original research.

In the intellectual sphere, two serious weaknesses are noticeable within the Church. One is the continued lack of original scholars, either in academic theology itself, or in the field of Christian apologetics, that is, the relation of theology to the intellectual patterns of the age. The reason for this lack of original thinkers is clear: the desperate manpower shortage among the clergy, as well as the lack of sizeable endowments, has made it impossible for the church in Queensland to provide those posts of relative leisure and freedom from administrative pressures, that are necessary for the serious pursuit of intellectual activity. A very small number of young priests have in recent years engaged in advanced study, both in Australia and overseas, but there are very few essentially academic posts available in the church itself where research and writing can be done. Even the Australian theological colleges – and St. Francis' College has certainly been no exception – have been so understaffed that their lecturers have been burdened with teaching and other activities to the exclusion of original work.

The other weakness is that in a period when an ever-increasing segment of the community at large is proceeding to a university education the proportion of graduates among the clergy has actually declined. A survey in 1955 showed that in the Australian church as a whole only 19% of the clergy were university graduates. In Queensland, the Diocese of North Queensland had the best proportion with 33%, Brisbane 12%, Rockhampton 11%, and Carpentaria 4%. It is interesting that the missionary Diocese of New Guinea had 20% graduates.<sup>1691</sup> These figures illustrate a serious situation, and while it is true that many of the most devoted and effective parish priests are non-graduates, the decline in the intellectual standards of the clergy in relation to the community at large is fraught with danger. Nor does the present position with theological students suggest a rapid improvement in this situation. It is clear that the church, if it is to make its presence felt in the changing intellectual atmosphere of Australia, must not only increase the numbers of the clergy, but their intellectual equipment as well. This implies the need for much more effective evangelistic work within the university, from which a constant flow of ordination candidates should be coming.

At the same time, the church badly lacks in Queensland specialists who are equipped to relate the Christian faith to the frontiers of modern thought. The classical education which typified the majority of the English priest-graduates who came to Australia last century and in the first quarter of the present century was excellent of its kind, but in the present generation the church needs to keep abreast far more effectively of developments in the physical and social sciences, and particularly in such spheres as psychology, with which religion is intimately concerned. Psychology and psychiatry in Australia have been largely non-Christian in orientation; and it may be that this presents the foremost scientific challenge to Christianity in the twentieth century as Darwinian evolutionary theory did in the nineteenth. At present, this is one of the weakest spots in the church's armour.

This relating of specialised knowledge to the Christian religion can only be possible if the church learns to take its laity seriously. The church has made relatively little use of its laymen in Queensland; indeed in popular thought the church has almost been identified with the clergy, to the extent that a man taking holy orders is said to be 'going into the church'. A comprehensive effort is required to marshal the intellectual resources available in the laity and to relate the specialised knowledge of many laymen within their own fields to Christian theology and life. This involves the cultivation of an alert laity that not only passively receives instruction in the faith, but makes an active contribution to the thought and government of the church.

Finally, the Church of England needs to find more coherent ways of expressing its social philosophy. We have considered the attitudes taken up by the church on matters such as race relationships, liquor, gambling, sexual morality, divorce and the use of Sunday. The Anglican Church has adopted fairly consistent attitudes on these matters, and although there has been development and evolution of attitudes as circumstances have changed, and there have been individuals within the church who have adopted quite different viewpoints, there has been a clearly discernible Anglican temper throughout. The chief trouble has been not so much that the church has had no attitude, as that it has been comparatively unsuccessful in communicating it effectively to the community at large. The Anglican point of view has often appeared to outsiders as a kind of compromise of expediency between rigid Roman Catholic or Non-conformist viewpoints on one side and the laxer outlook of the community at large. On matters like liquor and gambling, for example, the typical Anglican attitude is one of moderation, that is, that these things are not sinful in themselves, but may become so when used to excess or in such a way as to have harmful consequences. This is a positive and well-reasoned Christian point of view; but it has often been presented so unconvincingly that it has appeared to the world as a weak compromise between total abstinence – wrongly regarded as the true Christian attitude – and the natural worldly desire to enjoy a drink or a gambling thrill. Similarly, the church's refusal to re-marry divorcees has often been made to appear as an obscurantist unwillingness to face the facts of life, rather than a consistent theological and practical policy in the face of the pressures towards destruction of stable and permanent family life.

These are matters which are very intimately bound up with the day-to-day life of the community, and on which it is vital that the church make itself thoroughly understood, if religion is to be relevant to the whole of life. The fault has been not so much with the social philosophy of the church, as with its failure to explain it clearly, convincingly and positively.

There are, also, relatively new matters that deserve much more systematic attention by Christian social thinkers than they have so far received. On such matters as these Christianity should be directly relevant: the problem of the monotony that has become associated with so much of the repetitive work of a mechanised age, manifesting itself not least in a spirit of destructive boredom among a section of the youth of the community; the positive use of the leisure time that occupies an increasing proportion of the week for many people as working hours are inevitably shortened through automation; the loss of a sense of individuality in a system of mass production and mass organisation of business; and the mental pressures created by the pace of modern life and the unprecedented degree of rapid change in society. These all present an opportunity for the church to speak with relevance, for they are all matters related to man's ultimate attitude to life, which is

---

<sup>1691</sup> Figures made available to me by the Bishop of North Queensland.

the concern of religion. How much the church can win the allegiance of the community will partly depend on how effectively it can speak to these deep needs of the human personality.

So, in the sixties, the church faces an unpredictable age, which can scarcely expect to know real stability for some years to come. In this situation the church must be at the same time flexible in adapting itself to circumstances, and yet firm on those unchangeable elements in its faith, on which alone it believes the salvation of individuals and of society depends.

In its early years the Church of England in Queensland was not noted for flexibility. The pressures of life in a new and ever-changing environment have gradually forced it to look at itself afresh, and there are signs that it is now adapting itself much more realistically to the situation in which it is set. If there is little ground for expecting with the optimists some dramatic religious revival in the near future, neither need we share the pessimists' fear that the church is dying, or even well-nigh dead. It may be, however, that the greatest adaptation has still to come: a dying of the Anglican Church as such in order to bring its treasures into a greater, visibly united, Holy Catholic Church of Australia. But the historian must resist the temptation to peer so far into the future.

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX I: THE ORIGINAL CONSTITUTION OF THE DIOCESE OF BRISBANE – 1868.**

## Title

1. THE CONSTITUTION for associating together as a BRANCH OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND, the members of the said Church resident in the Diocese of Brisbane, in the Colony of Queensland, agreed to at a Synod of the Bishop, the Clergy, and Laity of the said Diocese, assembled in the City of Brisbane, this eighteenth day of June, 1868.

IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST

AMEN.

Preamble.

2. WHEREAS it was desirable that the members of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Brisbane should be associated together as a Branch of the said United Church, and that a representative body should be constituted for the government of the same: AND WHEREAS, until due provision shall be made in that behalf by competent authority, it is desirable that the members of the said Church should, so far as they lawfully may, associate themselves together by voluntary compact, as a Branch of the said United Church, for the ordering of affairs, the management of the property, the promotion of the discipline of the members thereof, and for the inculcation and maintenance of sound doctrine and true religion throughout the said Diocese to the glory of Almighty GOD, and the edification and increase of the Church of CHRIST: AND WHEREAS the Bishop, the Clergy, and the Laity, by their representatives, have met together to determine the FUNDAMENTAL PROVISIONS on which the members of such BRANCH of the said Church shall be thus associated together, and for the purpose of deciding on the CONSTITUTION and defining the powers and jurisdiction of the governing body of such Branch of the said Church, and of prescribing the terms and conditions on which the property of such Branch of the said Church shall be held and administered:

Now therefore, the said Bishop, Clergy, and Laity in Synod assembled do solemnly declare and establish as follows:-

## I. FUNDAMENTAL PROVISIONS

## Declaration of Doctrine

3. This Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Brisbane, doth hold and maintain the doctrine and sacraments of Christ, as the LORD hath commanded, and as the said United Church of England and Ireland doth receive the same, together with the Holy Scriptures and the book known as The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the form or manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and also – The Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces and the whole Clergy in the convocation holden at London, in the year of 1562. And the Synod hereinafter constituted for the government of this Branch of the said Church shall also hold and maintain the said doctrine and sacraments of CHRIST, and all and every of the said Scriptures, books, and articles hereinbefore enumerated.

## Proviso for Alteration

4. Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the said Synod from accepting such alteration of the above named matters, books, and formularies as may from time to time be adopted by the said United Church of England and Ireland.

## Proviso for Interpretation of Meaning

5. Provided also, that in case any manner of question or dispute shall arise, as touching the interpretation or meaning of any of the aforementioned matters, doctrines, books, formularies, or articles, or any part or portion of them, such question or dispute shall be decided in conformity with any judgments, orders, and decrees relative thereto, given or made in any Ecclesiastical Court, or any Court of Law in Great Britain, or any Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

And the said Bishop, Clergy and Laity do further declare and establish as follows:

## Constitution of Synod.

6. There shall be a governing body for the management of the affairs of the said Church, to be call the Synod of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the Diocese of Brisbane, in the Colony of Queensland,

which shall consist of three distinct orders; viz., the Bishop, the Clergy, and the Laity; the consent of all of which orders, by their majorities, shall be necessary to all acts binding upon the Synod, and upon all persons recognising its authority.

#### Fundamental Provisions.

7. The foregoing provisions shall be deemed FUNDAMENTAL PROVISIONS.

#### II. PROVISIONS NOT FUNDAMENTAL

##### Synod to be holden once a year

8. The Synod shall be convened and holden at least once in every year by summons of the Bishop of the Diocese, stating the time and place of meeting; and the Bishop, or, in his absence, a Commissary appointed by him in writing, shall be President of the Synod, and may adjourn, prorogue, or dissolve the same with the concurrence of the Synod.

##### The present the first Synod.

9. The Synod now sitting, having been convened in pursuance of resolutions made and passed at a conference of the Bishop, the Clergy, and representatives of the Laity, assembled in Brisbane on the 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> days of September, in the year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty-seven, shall be taken to be the first Synod of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Brisbane, in the Colony of Queensland.

##### New Elections

10. The Synod shall, from time to time, determine at what periods new elections of Delegates shall be made.

##### Standard of Qualification.

11. It shall be lawful for the Synod to fix the standard of qualification, and to appoint the time and mode of registration, for the purpose of determining what persons are admissible to take part in the election of Lay representatives, and also to declare what qualifications shall be required of the persons so to be elected as Lay representatives.

##### Persons declared incompetent not to hold any office.

12. No person shall be permitted to take part in the proceedings of any Synod, or of any Committee, whether as elector or representative, or shall hold any office, whether honorary or of emolument, who shall have been declared incompetent by any tribunal acting under the authority of the Synod, or who shall have declined when required by the same authority to sign a declaration of his adhesion and submission to the provisions of these presents.

##### Patronage.

13. The Synod shall have full power to determine how and by whom all patronage shall be exercised, and in what manner, and on what conditions every Clergyman, Trustee, Lay Reader, Church Warden, School Master, or other office bearer or agent, whether Clerical or Lay, shall enter upon the use and occupation of any portion of the Church property held in trust under the provisions of these presents, and in what manner and upon what conditions all such office bearers, whether Clerical or Lay, shall receive their respective appointments; and the Synod shall have full power to fix the amount of all salaries, dues, fees, or other emoluments, payable to any person out of the proceeds of any property held by or in trust for the said Synod.

##### Officers to be removed by the Synod.

14. All Clergymen, Trustees, Church Wardens, School Masters, Lay Readers, or other office bearers or Agents, who shall be so appointed, or who shall receive any income or emolument from or out of the said trust property, and all office bearers who, whether receiving any emolument therefrom or not, shall have consented to hold their appointments under and in conformity with the provisions of these presents, shall be liable to be deposed, removed, or suspended from their respective appointments by the Synod, if from any cause whatever the Synod shall deem it expedient and proper to exercise such power, and whenever any Clergyman, Trustee, Lay Reader, Church Warden, School Master, or other office bearer or agent, whether Clerical or Lay, shall be deposed, removed or suspended from his appointment he shall ipso facto cease to have or exercise such function or office under the provisions of these presents, and shall be absolutely deprived of all rights, emoluments, stipend or salary, to which by virtue of such appointment he would thereafter have been entitled but for such deposition, removal, or suspension; and shall forthwith deliver up to the Synod, or to Trustees appointed by them, all such trust property and all such deeds, books, papers, money, and effects belonging, or relating thereto, as may then be in his occupation, possession, or power.

##### Judicial Tribunal

15. Subject to the provisions of these presents, the Synod shall constitute and appoint a tribunal to hear and decide all questions of doctrine or discipline, as touching any person, whether Clerical or Lay, who shall hold any office or appointment whatsoever under the control of the Synod; but the decisions of such tribunals shall not be final until they shall have been confirmed by the Synod.

Persons holding Church Property to render account.

16. The Synod may call upon any person holding property belonging to the Church in the Diocese, or in any parish thereof, or in which the Church or any such parish is in any manner interested, to render a full account of all such property, and of the manner in which the same and every part thereof is applied and disposed of.

Management of Church Property.

17. It shall be lawful for the Synod to frame such regulations as shall be found necessary, from time to time, for the management and disposal of all church property, moneys, revenues, and collections, not diverting any specifically appropriated, or the subject of any specific trust, nor interfering with any vested rights, and for the government of all persons holding office under, or receiving emolument from, the Synod, and generally to make all such regulations as shall be necessary for the order, good government and efficiency of the said Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland.

Diocesan Council.

18. It shall be lawful for the Synod to appoint a Standing Committee, consisting of not less than four Clerical and four Lay members, to act as a Council to the Bishop, and to assist him in conducting the business of the Synod at such times as it shall not be sitting: provided always that such Committee, which shall be called the Diocesan Council, shall bring up a report of their proceedings at the commencement of each session of the Synod.

Delegated Authority

19. It shall be lawful for the Synod to delegate to any Board, Committee or Commission, either specifically as the case may require, or under such regulations as shall be laid down by the Synod, all or any of the powers conferred upon the Synod by these presents, excepting always such provisions as are herein declared to be fundamental; provided also all acts done by virtue of such delegated authority shall be submitted to the next session of the Synod for ratification.

Election of Bishop.

20. In case of the avoidance of the See, saving the rights of the Crown, if any exist, the nomination of a Bishop shall proceed from the Clergy, and shall be submitted to the Synod for approval. Provided always that it shall be lawful for the Synod to delegate the nomination of a Bishop to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Archbishop of York, or the Bishop of London.

Church Property to be conveyed to Synod.

21. All real or personal property now held by any one in trust for the purposes of the said Church, or which shall hereafter be conveyed to the Synod or to Trustees on behalf of the Synod, shall be held upon trust; and such Synod or Trustees shall and do stand seized and possessed of and interested in the same or otherwise shall and do convey, settle, assure, or assign the same upon and for or according to such trusts, intents, and purposes, and under and subject to such powers, provisions, declarations, and agreements, and in such manner and for such objects and purposes, whether religious, missionary, ecclesiastical, collegiate, scholastic, or charitable, as the Synod of this Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland shall from time to time direct or appoint in writing under the hand of any person authorised by the Synod in that behalf, subject, however, to any special covenants and declaration of trusts imposed by any founder, donor, testator, or other benefactor, which shall have been assented to by the Synod, or by any Board or other person authorised by the Synod in that behalf.

Property held subject to declaration of Trust.

22. Any Trustee in whom any property real or personal shall be vested, either solely or jointly with other persons or person, for or on behalf of the Synod, shall hold the same with the powers and subject to the limitations, restrictions, declarations, and provisoes contained in the several clauses of a model trust deed, hereafter to be prepared and agreed upon, and any Board or Commission appointed by the said Synod for that purpose, shall possess and may exercise all and any of the powers vested in the Synod, as shall be by the said Synod in that behalf prescribed.

Doctrines to be taught by Officers.





to at a Synod of the Bishop, the Clergy, and the Laity assembled in the said City of Brisbane, on the eighteenth day of June, in the year of our Lord One thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the said Bishop, Clergy, and Laity have hereunto subscribed their hands.

**APPENDIX II: BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON THE BISHOPS OF QUEENSLAND.**Diocese of Brisbane.

Tufnell, Edward Wyndham First Bishop of Brisbane, 1859-1874.

Born: 1814, Bath; youngest son but one of John Charles Tufnell.

Educated: Eton, Wadham College, Oxford. M.A. Hon. D.D., 1859.

Ordained: Deacon 1837, Priest 1839.

Appointments: Curate of Broadhinton (Wilts) 1840-46; Rector of Beechingstoke 1846-57; Rector of St. Peter & St. Paul, Marlborough, 1857-59; Prebendary of Salisbury 1850-59.

Consecrated: 14 June 1859, Westminster Abbey by Abp. of Canterbury (J.B. Sumner) and Bps. Of London, Oxford, Llandaff, Salisbury, Capetown Grahamstown, Columbia, Argyle.

Bishop of Brisbane 1859-74; afterwards was Curate in Charge at Charing; Vicar and Rural Dean of Croydon; Canon of Chichester and Vicar of Felpham.

Married: Laura Tufnell (a cousin) during a visit to England, 1865-7.

Died: 1896.

(Source of much of this material: Tufnell, E.B., The Family of Tufnell (1924), p.39)

Hale, Mathew Blagden. Second Bishop of Brisbane, 1875-1885.

Born: 1811, Alderly (Gloucestershire); third son of Robert Hale and Lady Theodina Bourke (whose father was an Archbishop of Tuam).

Educated: School at Wolton-under-edge; Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A. 1835; M.A. 1838; Hon. D.D.

Ordained: Deacon 1836, Priest 1837.

Appointments: Curate of Stroud. Then occupied three benefices of his own. Archdeacon of Adelaide, 1847-56.

Consecrated: 25 July 1857, Lambeth Palace Chapel.

Bishop of Perth: 1857-75

Bishop of Brisbane: 1875-85. Afterwards for a brief time Rector of Ozleworth, Gloucestershire.

Married: (i) Sophia Clode, 1840 (died 1845)

(ii) Sabina Molloy, 1848. (Western Australia).

Died: 1895 at Cheltenham.

Webber, William Thomas Thornhill. Third Bishop of Brisbane, 1885-1903.

Born: 1837, the son of a surgeon, William Webber,

Educated: Tonbridge School, Pembroke College, Oxford. B.A. 1859; M.A. 1862; Hon. D.D. 1885.

Ordained: Deacon 1860; Priest 1861.

Appointments: Curate of Chiswick; Vicar of St. John the Evangelist, Red Lion Square, London, 1864-1885.

Consecrated: 11 June 1885, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, by Archbishop of Canterbury, (E.W. Benson) and Bishops of London and Carlisle, Bishops Walsham How, Mitchinson and Tufnell.

Bishop of Brisbane: 1885-1903.

Unmarried.

Died: Brisbane, 1903.

Dawes, Nathaniel. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1889-1892.

For details see under Bishops of Rockhampton

Stretch, John Francis. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1895-1900.

Born: 1855 Geelong

Educated: Geelong Grammar School; Trinity College, Melbourne. B.A. 1874; LI.B. 1887; Hon. D.D. (Oxon) 1897.

Ordained: Deacon 1878; Priest 1879.

Appointments: Curate of:

All Saints', Geelong, 1879; All Saints' St. Kilda, 1880-1;  
E. & S. Brighton, 1881-82; St. Andrew's Brighton 1882-3

Incumbent of:

Holy Trinity, Maldon 1883-5; St. Mark's Fitzroy, 1885-92;  
St. Andrew's, Brighton, 1892-4.

Dean of Ballarat, 1894-5.

Consecrated: 1 November 1895, St. Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, by Bishop of Sydney (W. Saumarez Smith), and Bishops of Melbourne, Ballarat, Goulburn and Brisbane.

Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane: 1895-1900.

Dean of Newcastle: 1900-1906.

Bishop of Newcastle: 1906-1919

Married: Amelia Margaret Weekes, 1885 (Died 1915)

Died: 19 April 1919, Sydney.

Donaldson, St. Clair George Alfred. Fourth Bishop of Brisbane 1904-1921. Archbishop from 1905.

Born: 1863, son of Sir Stuart Alexander Donaldson.

Educated: Eton; Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A. 1st Cl. Classical & Theological Tripos) 1885; M.A. 1889; Hon. D.D. 1904. Wells Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1888; Priest 1889.

Appointments: Curate of St. Andrew's, Bethnal Green, 1888; Res. Chaplain to Abp. of Canterbury (E.W. Benson) 1888-91; Head of Eton Mission, Hackney Wick, 1891-1900; Rector of Hornsey, 1901-04.

Consecrated: 28 October 1904 by Abp of Canterbury (R.T. Davidson), and Bps. of London, Salisbury, Bath & Wells, St. Alban's, Islington, Stepney, Sierra Leone, West Equatorial Africa and Bps. Mather, Montgomery, Hutchinson and Taylor-Smith.

Bishop of Brisbane: 1904-21 (Archbishop from 1905)

Bishop of Salisbury: 1921-1935.

Unmarried.

Died: 7 December, 1935, Salisbury.

Le Fanu, Henry Frewen. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1915-1929.

Born: 1 April, 1870, Dublin; son of W. R. Le Fanu, Commissioner of Public Works, Ireland.

Educated: Haileybury, Keble College, Oxford. B.A. 1893; M.A. 1901; Hon. D.D. 1936. Wells Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1894; Priest 1895.

Appointments: Curate of Poplar, 1894-99; Chaplain to Bp. Of Rochester, 1899-1901; Chaplain to Guy's Hospital, 1901-5; Sub-Dean of Brisbane 1905-9; Archdeacon of Brisbane, 1905-15.

Consecrated: 21 September 1915, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Abp. of Brisbane (St C. Donaldson) and Bps. of Rockhampton, North Queensland and New Guinea and Bp. Stone-Wigg.

Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane: 1915-29.

Archbishop of Perth: 1929-46. Primate of Australia, 1935-46.

Married: (i) Margery Anne Dredge of Norfolk (Died 1926)

(ii) Winifred Whiteley, Perth (in 1941)

Died: 9 September, 1946. Perth

Sharp, Gerald. Fifth Bishop and Second Archbishop of Brisbane, 1921-1933.

Born: 1865, Chester, son of T.B. Sharp.

Educated: Manchester Grammar School; St John's College, Cambridge. B.A. 1886; M.A. 1910; Hon. D.D. 1914  
Lincoln Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1889; Priest 1890.

Appointments: Curate of Rowbarton, 1889-93; Curate of Holy Innocents', Hammersmith, 1893-8;  
Vicar of Whitkirk, Yorks, 1898-1910.

Consecrated: 25 April 1910 in St. Luke's Pro-cathedral by Abp. of Brisbane (St. C. Donaldson) and Bps. of North Queensland and Rockhampton.

Bishop of New Guinea: 1910-1921.

Archbishop of Brisbane: 1921-1933.

Unmarried.

Died: 30 August 1933, Brisbane.

Batty, Francis de Witt. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1930-31.

Born: 10 January 1879 in England, son of Rev. W.E. Batty

Educated: St. Paul's School, London; Balliol College, Oxford; B.A. 1900; M.A. 1906. Wells Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1903; Priest 1904.

Appointments: Curate of Hornsey, 1903-4; Dom. Chaplain to Abp. of Brisbane (St. C. Donaldson), 1904-15; Sub-Dean of St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, 1915-25; Dean of Brisbane, 1925-30.

Consecrated: 25 January 1930 by Abp. of Brisbane (G. Sharp), Bps. of New Guinea, Rockhampton and Armidale, and Bp. Halford.

Bishop Coadjutor of Brisbane 1930-31.

Bishop of Newcastle: 1931-1958 (then retired).

Married: Elizabeth Davis, 1925.

Died: 3 April, 1961, Double Bay, N.S.W.

Dixon, Horace Henry. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1932-1961.

Born: 1 August 1869, Cambridge, son of T. Dixon.

Educated: Fitzwilliam Hall, Cambridge. B.A. 1892; M.A. 1908.

Ordained: Deacon 1893; Priest 1894.

Appointments: Curate of Epping, 1893-4; Curate of St. Michael's, Walthamstow, 1894-7; Curate of St. Matthew's, Burnley, 1898-9; Rector of St. Peter's, Southport, Q., 1899-1905; Headmaster, The Southport School, 1902-1929; Archdeacon of Brisbane, 1930-31; Dean of Brisbane, 1931-2.

Consecrated: 29 March 1932, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Abp. of Brisbane (G. Sharp) and Bps. of Carpentaria, Rockhampton, Grafton, Newcastle, and Bishop Halford.

Married: (i) Florence Godbold, 1897. (Died 1933)

(ii) Enid Morgan-Jones, 1936

Wand, John William Charles. Sixth Bishop and Third Archbishop of Brisbane, 1934-1943.

Born: 25 January 1885.

Educated: King Edward VI School, Grantham; St. Edmund Hall, Oxford; B.A. 1907; M.A. 1911; Hon. D.D. 1934.  
Bishop Jacob's Hostel, Newcastle.

Ordained: Deacon 1908; Priest 1909.

Appointments: Curacies at Benwell, 1908-11; Lancaster 1911-14; Vicar Choral of Sarum 1914-19; Chaplain to the Forces, 1915-19; Vicar, St. Mark's, Salisbury, 1919-25; Fellow, Dean and Tutor, Oriel College, Oxford, 1925-34.

Consecrated: 1 May 1934, St. Paul's Cathedral, by Abp. of Canterbury (C.G. Lang) and Abp. of Capetown, Bps. of London, Winchester, Salisbury and 22 others.

Archbishop of Brisbane: 1934-1943.

Bishop of Bath and Wells: 1943-45.

Bishop of London: 1945-55.

Canon Residentiary and Treasurer, St. Paul's Cathedral, London from 1956.

Married: Amy Wiggins, 1911.

Halse, Reginald Charles. Seventh Bishop and Fourth Archbishop of Brisbane, 1943

Born: 16 June 1881, Luton, Beds; third son of James John and Gulielma Halse.

Educated: St. Paul's School, London; Brasenose College, Oxford. B.A. 1905; M.A. 1907; Hon. D.D. 1947. Kelham Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1906; Priest 1907.

Appointments: Asst. Priest, St. Saviour's, Poplar, 1906-11; Priest-in-charge, St. Nicholas', Blackwell, 1911-12; Warden, Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, N.Q., 1913-25; Headmaster of All Souls' School, Charters Towers, 1920-25; Canon of Townsville Cathedral, 1921-25.

Consecrated: 29 September 1925, Westminster Abbey, by Abp. of Canterbury (R.T. Davidson), Bps. of London, Salisbury, Lichfield and others.

Bishop of Riverina: 1925-1943.

Archbishop of Brisbane: 1943-1962.

Unmarried.

Decoration: K.B.E., 1962.

Died: 9 August 1962, Brisbane.

Hudson, Wilfrid John. Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane, 1961-

For details, see under Bishops of Carpentaria.

Strong, Philip Nigel Warrington. Eighth Bishop and Fifth Archbishop of Brisbane, 1963-

Born: 11 July 1899, Sutton-on-the-Hill, Etwell, Derbyshire; son of Rev. J.W. Strong, Oxford.

Educated: King's School, Worcester; Selwyn College, Cambridge. B.A. 1921; M.A. 1924. Bishop's College, Cheshunt.

Ordained: Deacon 1922; Priest 1923.

Appointments: Curate, St Mary's, Tyne Dock, 1922-26; Vicar, Christ Church, Meadow Lane, 1926-31; Vicar, St. Ignatius', Hendon, Durham, 1931-36.

Consecrated: 28 October 1936, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, by Abp. of Canterbury (C.G. Lang) and Bps. of London, Lincoln, Derby, Guildford, Central Tanganyika and 10 others.

Bishop of New Guinea: 1936-1963.

Archbishop of Brisbane: 1963-

Unmarried.

Decoration: C.M.G., 1958.

Diocese of Rockhampton

Dawes, Nathaniel. First Bishop of Rockhampton, 1892-1908.

Born: 24 July, 1843. Rye, Sussex.

Educated: Private School, Brighton; St. Alban Hall, Oxford. B.A. 1872; M.A. 1875; Hon. D.D. 1896.

Ordained: Deacon 1871; Priest 1872.

Appointments: Curate, St. Peter's, Vauxhall; 1871-77 Vicar of St. Mary's Charterhouse, 1877-86; Rector St. Andrew's, South Brisbane 1886-9; Archdeacon of Brisbane, 1886-9.

Consecrated: 1 May 1889, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, by Bishop of Sydney (A. Barry) and Bps. of Grafton & Armidale, Bathurst, Riverina, Melbourne and Brisbane.

Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane: 1889-1892. (Hon. Rector, St. James' Toowoomba, 1889-90; Hon. Rector, St. Paul's Rockhampton, 1891-2).

Bishop of Rockhampton: 1892-1908.

Unmarried.

Died: 14 September 1910. England.

Halford, George Dowglass. Second Bishop of Rockhampton, 1909-1920.

Born: 9 June 1865, Kensington, son of a physician.

Educated: Felstead; Keble College, Oxford, B.A. 1888; M.A. 1893; Hon D.D. 1908 Leeds Clergy School.

Ordained: Deacon 1890; Priest 1891.

Appointments: Curate, St. Peter's Jarrow, 1890-4; Leeds, 1894-5; Vicar, St. Peter's Jarrow, 1895-7; Head of Brotherhood of St. Andrew, 1897-1902; Archdeacon of Rockhampton 1899-1907; Rector, St. Paul's Cathedral, Rockhampton, 1902-7; Member of College of St. Saviour, Southwark, 1907—8;

Consecrated: 2 February 1909; St. Luke's Pro-cathedral, Brisbane, by Abp. of Brisbane (St C. Donaldson) and Bps. of Grafton & Armidale, and North Queensland.

Bishop of Rockhampton: 1909—1920.

Member of Order of Witness: 1921-1935.

Unmarried

Died: 27 August 1948, Brisbane.

Crick, Philip Charles Thurlow. Third Bishop of Rockhampton, 1921-1927.

Born: 18 November 1882, Bath. Son of Rev. T. Crick

Educated: Pembroke College, Cambridge. B.A. (1<sup>st</sup> Cl. Classical Tripos) 1904; M.A. 1908, Hon. D.D. 1920.

Ordained: Deacon 1906; Priest 1907.

Appointments: Curate of Barnsley, 1906-7; Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge 1906-20, and Dean of Clare 1902-20; Chaplain to the Forces, 1914-19.

Consecrated: 24 February 1921, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Abp of Brisbane (St. C. Donaldson) and Bps. of North Queensland and Carpentaria, and Bp. Le Fanu.

Bishop of Rockhampton: 1921-1927.

Bishop of Ballarat: 1927-1936.

Married: Margaret Edith Jellicorse, 1930.

Died: 12 July 1937, England.

Ash, Fortescue Leo, Fourth Bishop of Rockhampton, 1928-1946.

Born: 1882 Singleton, N.S.W.; son of William Ash

Educated: St. Paul's College, University of Sydney. B.A. 1908

Ordained: Deacon 1908; Priest 1910.

Appointments: Curate, St. Anne's, Strathfield; 1908-11; Curate, Holy Trinity, South Wimbledon, 1911-14; Rector of Ravenswood, 1914-16; Rector of Bowen 1916-18; Chaplain A.I.F., 1918-19; Rector of Mackay, 1919-27; Rector, St. Mark's Warwick 1927-8.

Consecrated: 2 February 1928, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Abp. of Brisbane (G. Sharp), Bps. of North Queensland and Riverina and Bishop Halford.

Bishop of Rockhampton: 1928-1946.

Commissioner, A.B.M. Centenary Appeal, 1947-52.

Married: (i) Kathleen Irene Page, Eton Vale, Q., 1919  
(ii) Christian Wade Watts (widow), Gayndah, 1941.

Died: 22 April 1956, Sydney.

Housden, James Alan George. Fifth Bishop of Rockhampton, 1947-1958.

Born: 16 September 1904, Birmingham, England; son of William James and Jane Housden.

Educated: Essendon High School, Melbourne; University of Queensland, B.A. (1<sup>ST</sup> Cl. Hons. Mental & Moral Philosophy), 1928.

St. Francis' College, Brisbane. Th.L. (1<sup>st</sup> Class Hons.), 1929.

Ordained: Deacon 1928; Priest 1929.

Appointments: Curate, St. Paul's Ipswich, 1928-30; Chaplain, Mitchell River Mission 1930-32; Curate, All Souls' Cathedral, Thursday Island, 1932-3; Rector of Darwin, 1933-37; Vicar, St. Peter's, Coolangatta, 1936-40; Rector and Rural Dean, St. Mark's, Warwick, 1940-46; Vicar, Christ Church, South Yarra, 1946-7.

Consecrated: 28 October 1947, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Abp. of Brisbane (R.C. Halse), and Bp. of Carpentaria and Bps. Cranswick, Halford and Dixon.

Bishop of Rockhampton: 1947-58.

Bishop of Newcastle: 1958-

Married: Elfreda Moira Hennessey, 1935.

McCall, Theodore Bruce, Sixth Bishop of Rockhampton, 1959 –

Born: 29 December 1911, son of Sir John McCall, Agent-General for Tasmania in England.

Educated: Church Grammar School, Launceston; St. Peter's College, Adelaide; University of Queensland, B.A. 1952.

Ordained: Deacon 1935; Priest 1936.

Appointments: Asst. Curate, Milawa, 1935-6; Asst. Curate, St. Augustine's Hamilton, 1936-7; Asst. Curate, Shepparton 1937-9; Rector of Yea, 1939-43; Chaplain A.I.F. 1940-41 and 1943-46; Rector of Macquarie Plains (Tasmania), 1946-50; Rector, Holy Trinity, Launceston, 1950-53; Home Secretary, A.B.M., 1953-58.

Consecrated: 2 February 1959, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Abp. of Brisbane (R.C. Halse), Bp. of North Queensland and Bishop Dixon.

Bishop of Rockhampton: From 1959.

Married: Helen Wilmot, 1939.



Diocese of North Queensland

Stanton, George Henry, First Bishop of North Queensland, 1878-1890.

Born: 3 September, 1835, Stratford, Essex.

Educated: Merchant Taylor's School; Hertford College, Oxford. B.A. 1859, M.A. 1862; D.D. 1878.

Ordained: Deacon 1858; Priest, 1859.

Appointments: Curate of Rotherhithe, London; All Saints' Maidstone; St. Saviour's, Fitzroy Square, London. Vicar of Holy Trinity, St. Giles-in the Field, Holborn, 1867-78.

Consecrated: 24 June 1878, St. Paul's Cathedral, by Abp of Canterbury (A.C. Tait) and Bps. of London, Winchester, Hereford, Rochester, Sydney, Adelaide, New Zealand, British Guiana, Pennsylvania, Ohio, North Carolina, Ontario.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1878-1890.

Bishop of Newcastle: 1891-1905.

Unmarried

Died: 1905, at Newcastle.

Barlow, Christopher George Second Bishop of North Queensland, 1891-1902.

Born: 1858.

Educated: Brecknock College, Wales. Hon. D.D. 1891.

Ordained: Deacon 1881; Priest 1882.

Appointments: Asst. Curate, Mackay 1881-2; Incumbent, Charters Towers, 1882-5; Vicar, St. James' Townsville, 1886-91; Acted as Vicar-General of North Queensland in 1888 while Bishop Stanton in England.

Consecrated: 25 July 1891, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, by Bishop of Sydney (W. Saumarez Smith) and Bps. of Grafton & Armidale, and Newcastle.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1891-1902.

Bishop of Goulburn: 1902-1915.

Unmarried.

Died: 1915 at Cooma, N.S.W.

(It should be noted that the memoir by J.W. Ward in North Queensland Jubilee Book is inaccurate in certain details.)

Frodsham, George Horsfall. Third Bishop of North Queensland, 1902-1913.

Born: 1863, Cheshire, the son of James Frodsham, architect.

Educated: University College, Durham. B.A. 1888; M.A. 1895. St. Aidan's Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1888; Priest 1889.

Appointments: Curate, St. Thomas', Leeds; Senior Curate, St. Margaret's, Ilkley; Rector, St. Thomas', Toowong, 1896-1902. Chaplain of Queensland Defence Force.

Consecrated: 17 August 1902, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, by Archbishop of Sydney (W. Saumarez Smith), and Bps. of Newcastle, Goulburn and Grafton & Armidale.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1902-1913.

Later appointments: Canon Residentiary of Gloucester from 1914; Vicar of Halifax from 1920; Rural Dean of Halifax from 1921; Canon of Wakefield from 1923.

Married: Frances Swinburne, of Workington

Died: 1937.

Feetham, John Oliver. Fourth Bishop of North Queensland, 1913-1947.

Born: 28 January 1873, Penrhos, Monmouthshire, the fourth son of the Rev. William Feetham.

Educated: Marlborough; Trinity College, Cambridge. B.A. 1895; Hon. D.D. 1914. Wells Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1899; Priest 1900.

Appointments: Curate, St. Simon Zelotes, Bethnal Green, 1899-1907; Principal, Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd, Dubbo, 1907-13.

Consecrated: 27 April, 1913, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Archbishop of Brisbane (St. C. Donaldson) and Bps. of Carpentaria and Rockhampton.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1913-1947.

Unmarried

Died: 14 September 1947, Townsville.

Promulgated as "Saint and hero of the Anglican Communion": 3 June 1962 at Townsville.

Belcher, Wilfrid Bernard. Fifth Bishop of North Queensland, 1948-1952.

Born: 25 July 1891, Newbury, England.

Educated: King's School, Bruton; Keble College, Oxford. B.A. 1919; M.A. 1920.

Cheshunt College.

War service: Major in first World War. M.C. 1918.

Ordained: Deacon 1921; Priest 1922.

Appointments: Curate, St. Matthew's Bethnal Green; Member of Brotherhood of St Barnabas (N.Q.) 1924-29; Diocesan Missioner and Hon. Canon of St. Alban's, England, 1930-34; Vicar of Rickmansworth, 1934-41; Vicar of Cheshunt, 1941-45; Vicar, St. Thomas' Durban, 1946-7.

Consecrated: 15 February 1948, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Archbishop of Brisbane (R.C. Halse) and Bps. of New Guinea, Rockhampton and Grafton, and Bps. Halford and Dixon.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1948-52.

Later appointments: Asst. Bishop of Norwich and Rector of Diss, 1953-55; Vicar of York, Natal, since 1955.

Married: Mary Colway, 1940.

Shevill, Ian Wotton Allnutt. Sixth Bishop of North Queensland, 1953-

Born: 2 May 1917, Broken Hill

Educated: Scots College, Sydney; University of Sydney. B.A. 1939; M.A. 1945. Moore Theological College.

Ordained : Deacon 1940; Priest 1941.

Appointments: Curate, St. Paul's Burwood, 1940-45; Q'land Organising Secretary, A.B.M., 1946-7; Education Secretary S.P.G. (London), 1948-51; Home Secretary A.B.M., 1951-3.

Consecrated: 19 April 1953, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Archbishop of Brisbane (R.C. Halse) and Abp. of Sydney, Bps. of Rockhampton, Carpentaria, Grafton, Canberra-Goulburn, and Bps. Dixon, Collins and Ash.

Bishop of North Queensland: 1953 –

Married: Dr. June Stephenson, 1959.

Miles, Grosvenor, Bishop Assisting in the Diocese of North Queensland, 1962 –

Educated: St. Boniface's College, Warminster.

Ordained: Deacon 1932; Priest 1933.

Appointments: Curate, St. Mary's Fishponds, 1932-34; Missionary at Andevorante, 1935-36; at Mahanoro, 1936-38; Examining Chaplain to Bp. in Madagascar, 1936-40.

Consecrated: 7 June 1938. Lambeth Parish Church, by Archbishop of Canterbury (C.G. Lang), Bps. of Leicester, Bristol, Derby, Nyasa and 6 others.

Assistant Bishop in Madagascar: 1938-1960.

Chaplain to Brotherhood of St. Barnabas and Bishop Assisting in Diocese of North Queensland 1962-.

Diocese of Carpentaria.

White, Gilbert. First Bishop of Carpentaria, 1900-1915.

Born: 1859, Rondebosch, South Africa, in the fourth generation of a family of priests.

Educated: Fettes College, Edinburgh, Oriel College, Oxford. B.A. 1881; M.A. 1885; Hon. D.D. 1908.

Ordained: Deacon 1883; Priest 1884.

Appointments: Arrived North Queensland, 1885; Served at Herbert River, Charters Towers, Herberton.

Canon of St. James' Cathedral, Townsville 1891.

Archdeacon of North Queensland 1893-1900. Rector of Hughenden 1898-1900.

Consecrated: 24 August, 1900, St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney, by Archbishop of Sydney (W. Saumarez Smith), and all the Australian bishops, and Bps. of South Tokyo, New Guinea and Melanesia.

Bishop of Carpentaria: 1900-1915.

Bishop of Willochra: 1915-1925.

Unmarried

Died: 1 April 1933, Sydney.

Newton, Henry. Second Bishop of Carpentaria, 1915-1921

Born: 5 January 1866, Victoria, the son of Thomas Wilkinson, and adopted son of Rev. F.R. Newton.

Educated: St. Paul's College, University of Sydney; Merton College, Oxford. B.A. (Sydney), 1889; B.A. (Oxon.) 1893; Hon. D.D. 1920

Ordained: Deacon 1891; Priest 1892.

Appointments: Curate, St. John's Hackney, 1891-3; Rector of Esk (Q'ld) 1893-98; Missionary in New Guinea, 1899-1915.

Consecrated: 21 September 1915, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Archbishop of Brisbane (St.C. Donaldson), and Bps. of Rockhampton, North Queensland and New Guinea, and Bp. Stone-Wigg.

Bishop of Carpentaria: 1915-1921.

Bishop of New Guinea: 1922-1936.

Married: Sara Sully, 1903, Brisbane.

Died: 25 September 1947.

Davies, Stephen Harris. Third Bishop of Carpentaria, 1922-1949.

Born: 22 September 1883, son of Rev. J.B. Davies, Shropshire.

Educated: St. John's School, Leatherhead; Hereford Cathedral School; Emmanuel College, Cambridge. B.A. 1905; M.A. Leeds Clergy School.

Ordained: Deacon 1909; Priest 1911.

Appointments: Curate, St. Matthew's Holbeck, 1909-12; Member of Charleville Bush Brotherhood, 1912-21; Head of Charleville Brotherhood, 1917-21.

Consecrated: 25 April, 1922, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Archbishop of Brisbane (G. Sharp), and Bp. of Rockhampton, and Bps. Halford and LeFanu.

Bishop of Carpentaria: 1922-1949.

Married: Joan Cronin, 1930.

Died: 1962.

Hudson, Wilfrid John. Fourth Bishop of Carpentaria, 1950-1960.

Born: 12 June 1904, Worthing, Sussex.

Educated: Brighton College; King's College, London. A.K.C., 1931.

Ordained: Deacon 1931; Priest 1932.

Appointments: Curate, St. Barnabas; Pimlico, 1931-37; Principal, Brotherhood of the Good Shepherd, Dubbo 1937-42; Curate of Woodham, Surrey, 1942-3; Rector of Letchworth, 1944-50.

Consecrated: 21 September 1950, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane by Archbishop of Brisbane (R.C. Halse) and Bps. of Rockhampton, Grafton, North Queensland, Newcastle and Bp. Dixon.

Bishop of Carpentaria: 1950-1960.

Coadjutor Bishop of Brisbane: 1961-

Unmarried.

Matthews, Seering John. Fifth Bishop of Carpentaria, 1960-

Born: 26 March 1900, Auckland, N.Z.

Educated: St. John's College, Auckland; Fort St. High School, Sydney, Moore Theological College.

Ordained: Deacon 1925; Priest 1926.

Appointments: Curate, St. Jude's Randwick, 1925-6; Christ Church, St. Laurence 1926-9; Priest-in-charge, St. Mary's Fitzroy, Melbourne, 1931-2; Vicar, St. James', Calcutta, 1933-38; Principal, Bp. Westcott School, India, 1938-42; Chaplain, R.A.F., India, 1942-46; Vicar, St. Bartholomew's, Ipswich, England, 1946-50; Chaplain, The Southport School, 1951-54; Archdeacon of Rockhampton and Rector of Winton 1954; Rector, St. Paul's Cathedral, Rockhampton; Dean of Rockhampton, 1959; Priest Director, Torres Strait Mission, 1960.

Consecrated: 28 October 1960, St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, by Archbishop of Brisbane, (R.C. Halse), and Abp. of Sydney, Bps. of New Guinea, North Queensland, Rockhampton, Newcastle, Polynesia, Melanesia, and Bps. Dixon, Hand and Hudson.

Married: Barbara Browning.

**APPENDIX III****i. The Archdeacons of the Dioceses of Queensland.**

Under the bishops the chief ecclesiastical administrative officers are the archdeacons. In some cases the title of archdeacon was given to senior clergymen as a title of honour, and involved little administrative responsibility. In other cases, the archdeacons played a very important part in diocesan administration

The following list of the archdeacons, and the bishops under whom they served, may be useful for reference. In some cases, it was difficult to ascertain the exact dates of appointment, but the list is as accurate as possible.

Diocese of Brisbane

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
B. Glennie	1863-86	Brisbane	Tufnell Hale Webber
J. Matthews	1881-86	Warwick	Hale Webber
N. Dawes	1886-89 1889-92	Brisbane Bp. Coadjutor & Adn. of whole Diocese.	Webber
T. Jones	1886-89	Darling Downs	Webber
A.E. David	1894-1905	Brisbane	Webber
J.F. Stretch	1895-1900	Western Downs (& Bp. Coadjutor)	Webber
A.R. Rivers	1896-1905 1905-1920	Wide Bay & Burnett Toowoomba	Webber Donaldson
E.B. Trotter	1902-08	Western Districts	Webber Donaldson
H.F. Le Fanu	1905-15 1915-29	Brisbane Also Bp. Coadjutor	Donaldson Sharp
E.C. Osborn	1920-24	Toowoomba	Donaldson Sharp
A. Davies	1925-27	Toowoomba	Sharp
W.P. Glover	1927-43	Toowoomba	Sharp Wand
H.H. Dixon	1930-35 1935-44 1944-56 1956-61 1932-61	Brisbane Wide Bay Brisbane Senior Archdeacon also Bp. Coadjutor	Sharp Wand Halse
W.H.W. Stevenson	1935-38	Brisbane	Wand
H. Thomas	1938-44	Brisbane	Wand Halse
A.E. Morris	1938-43	The West	Wand
F. Knight	1943-56 1956-62	The Country Brisbane	Wand Halse
W.A. Hardie	1948-50	Moreton	Halse
F.B.C. Birch	1948-52 1952-54	Lilley Lilley, Moreton, Wide Bay & Burnett	Halse
R.B. Massey	1954-60	Moreton	Halse

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
H.J. Richards	1956-	Wide Bay & Burnett	Halse
W. Hoog	1956-62	The West	Halse
W.J. Hudson	1961-	Senior Archdeacon & Bishop Coadjutor	Halse

Diocese of Rockhampton

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
G.M.L. Lester	1893-97	Rockhampton & Mitchell	Dawes
G.D. Halford	1899-1903 1903-1907	Mitchell Rockhampton	Dawes
G.H. Rogers	1907-27	Rockhampton	Dawes Halford Crick
A. Lee-Kenny	1927-30 1930-3	Without jurisdiction Rockhampton	Ash
A.T. Robinson	1930-38	Mitchell	Ash
J. Norman	1931-35	Rockhampton	Ash
R.B. Davison	1937-40 1943-46	Rockhampton	Ash
S.J. Matthews	1954-60	Rockhampton	Housden McCall
A.A. Fellows	1960-	Without Jurisdiction	McCall
J.B. Grindrod	1961-	Rockhampton	McCall

Diocese of North Queensland

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
H. Plume	1883-88	North Queensland	Stanton
G. White	1893-1900	North Queensland	Barlow
F.D. Pritt	1898-1903	Northern Archdeacon	Barlow
J.D. Garland	1903-07	North Queensland	Frodsham
C.V.P. Day	1903-05	Mackay	Frodsham
J. Campbell	1904-09	Cairns	Frodsham
W.H.W. Williams	1910-13	North Queensland	Frodsham
E.T. Crozier	1916-18	North Queensland	Feetham
R.Thomas	1922-25	North Queensland	Feetham
R.W.H. Moline	1926-29	North Queensland	Feetham
C.G. Brown	1929-39	North Queensland	Feetham
M. D'Arcy Collins	1933-39 1940-43	Mackay North Queensland	Feetham
H.G. Robinson	1943-51	Mackay	Feetham Belcher

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
W.P.Hohenhouse	1946-	North Queensland	Feetham Belcher Shevill
J.H.R.Innes	1951-	Mackay	Belcher Shevill
T.Firth	1956-57	Cairns	Shevill
B.S.Kugelman	1956-57 1958-62	Burdekin Cairns	Shevill Shevill
P.Mayhew	1959-62	The West	Shevill
D.Stuart-Fox	1962-	Cairns	Shevill
B.Tringham	1962-	The West	Shevill

Diocese of Carpentaria

<b>Archdeacon</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Bishops under whom he served.</b>
A.P.B.Bennie	1949-52	Carpentaria	Davies Hudson
P.D.Smith	1949-53	Northern Territory	Hudson Davies
C.G.Brown	1953-60 1960-	Carpentaria Archdeacon Emeritus	Hudson
W.F.Rogers	1954-58	Northern Territory	Hudson
A.H.Bott	1959-	Northern Territory	Hudson Matthews
G.A.Lupton	1961-	Carpentaria	Matthews



ii. **The Deans of the Cathedrals of Queensland.**

Only in the diocese of Brisbane and Rockhampton have deans been appointed. In the other dioceses, and in the earlier years of Brisbane and Rockhampton, the bishops were themselves deans of their cathedrals, and they appointed sub-deans to administer the cathedrals. The following list includes only those who have been appointed deans.

<u>Brisbane</u>			
	F. de Witt Batty	1925-31	(previously Sub-Dean, 1915-25).
	H.H. Dixon	1931-32	
	W.E.C. Barrett	1932-52	
	D.E. Taylor	1953-58	
	W.P. Baddeley	1958-	

<u>Rockhampton</u>			
	S.J. Matthews	1959-60	
	J. Hazlewood	1960-	

**APPENDIX IV:**  
**TABLE OF POPULATION, ANGLICAN POPULATION, NUMBER OF CLERGY AND**  
**NUMBER OF ANGLICANS PER CLERGYMAN AT VARIOUS PERIODS<sup>1692</sup>**

Year	Total Q'ld Population	Anglican Population	% Anglican	No. of clergy	No. of Anglicans per clergyman
1861	30,059	13,419	45	14	958
1871	120,104	43,764	36	18	2,431
1881	213,525	73,920	35	38	1,945
1891	393,718	142,555	36	85	1,677
1901	503,266	185,023	37	106	1,745
1911	605,813	212,702	35	126	1,688
1921	757,634	309,786	41	166	1,806
1933	947,534	331,972	35	187 <sup>1693</sup>	1,775
1947	1,106,415	338,621	35	200 <sup>1694</sup>	1,943
1954	1,318,259	454,095	34	222 <sup>1695</sup>	2,045

Comment:

The census figures reveal a fairly steady proportion of Anglicans to the total population of Queensland, apart from the early years, which were rather unsettled, and the strange anomaly of the 1921 figures.

The extraordinarily high figure of 41% of Anglicans in the 1921 census appears to be unreal. In 1921 the relevant heading on the census paper was simply "Religion", with a blank space inserted. In 1933 the heading was: "State the full name of the religious denomination. There is no legal obligation to answer this question". In 1921 only 16,644 gave no reply to this question, or objected to reply. In 1933, 129,833 gave no reply to the religious question.

It appears that in 1921 a large number of people put themselves down as Church of England who had no religious affiliation whatever. Possibly the war and its social consequences had some effect on this; for example, the number of Lutherans declined from 24,235 to 17,891 from 1911 to 1921, and there was a drop of 8,850 under the heading of "Protestant Undefined", and of 4,473 of those who objected to stating their religion.

In any case, the number stating themselves to be Church of England at each census undoubtedly included a large proportion of purely nominal Anglicans.

<sup>1692</sup> Figures for total population and Anglican population taken from the following sources: up to 1901, Queensland Parliamentary Papers: 1902 Vol II, p.1133; 1911-1947, from Census Bulletins, Commonwealth of Australia; 1954 from Queensland Year Book. The numbers of clergymen are taken from various types of diocesan records, and in some cases where exact evidence was not available, a certain amount of guess work had to be employed. The figures should, however, be substantially accurate.

<sup>1693</sup> European clergy only. There were also 5 Torres St. clergymen.

<sup>1694</sup> Plus 3 Torres St. clergymen

<sup>1695</sup> Plus 10 Torres St. clergymen.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**I. Official Documents.

Census Bulletins, Commonwealth of Australia, 1911, 1921, 1933, 1947.

House of Commons Parliamentary Papers, 1857-1858.

Queensland Government Gazette, 1861-1863.

Queensland Parliamentary Debates, 1864-1900.

Queensland Parliamentary Papers, 1902-1910.

Votes and Proceedings. Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, 1844-1859.

Votes & Proceedings. Legislative Assembly of Queensland, 1860-1901.

II. Church Documents and Records.

Included in this section is a great deal of the primary source material for this study. It includes the reports of proceedings of official church conferences, synods and annual meetings in England and Australia. These documents have been divided into published and unpublished materials, and are arranged in alphabetical order of the first important words in the titles. The English materials are not available in Queensland, and were referred to at the libraries of Harvard University and S.P.G. House, London. Diocesan synod reports are available at the respective diocesan offices. Parish reports and minutes, except where otherwise noted, are in the parishes concerned.

(A) Published

Diocese of Brisbane, Constitution and Canons (Brisbane, 1910)

Diocese of Brisbane, Proceedings of Synod, 1868-1962. Incorporated in Diocese of Brisbane, Year Book, from 1890, except 1932-1934 when no Y.B. was published.

Diocese of Carpentaria, Year Book, 1927-1933, 1958-9.

Diocese of North Queensland, Constitution and Canons. (Townsville, 1896)

Diocese of North Queensland, Proceedings of Synod, 1883-1884.

Diocese of North Queensland, Year Book, 1895-1940 and 1953-1962. Incorporates Proceedings of Synod, from 1894.

Diocese of Rockhampton, Proceedings of Synod, 1893-1962.

London Missionary Society, Annual Reports, 1914, 1915. (London)

Minutes of Diocesan Conference, North Queensland, 1885.

Newcastle Diocesan Church Society, Annual Reports, 1851-1860.

Official Report of the Church Congress Held at Hobart, 1894. S. Bucknell & C.M. Tenison (Eds) (Hobart, 1894).

Official Report of Proceedings of the Adelaide Church Congress, 1902, (Adelaide, 1903)

Proceedings of the Church Missionary Society (London), 1829-1841.

Proceedings of the Conference...in the Diocese of Brisbane, 1867.

Proceedings of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania, 1872-1960

Proceedings of the Provincial Synod of Queensland, 1906-1961.

Proceedings at a Public Meeting of the Members and Friends of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 22 June 1838 (London).

Report of the Missionary Conference of the Anglican Communion, 1894. G.A. Spottiswood (Ed.) (London S.P.C.K., 1894.)

Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, Annual Reports, 1840-1870 (London)

S.P.G. Grants to Colonial Dioceses. (London 1864).

(B) Unpublished.

Annual Reports, All Saints, Brisbane 1874-1950.

Annual Reports, Parish of Dalby, 1894-1958.

Minutes, Chapter of Bush Brotherhood of St. Barnabas, 1925-1955.

Minutes, Chapter of St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane 1929-1955

Minutes, Church Committee, Parish of Gladstone, 1873-1897.

Minutes, Church Committee, Parish of Springsure, 1886-1892.

Minutes, Church Committee, St. James' Townsville, 1870-1879.

Minutes, Council for Education, Diocese of Brisbane, 1899-1927.

Minutes, Diocesan Council, Diocese of Brisbane 1868-1890, 1947.

Minutes, Diocesan Council, Diocese of North Queensland, 1891-1897.

Minutes, Downs Clergy Meetings, 1907-1928. (At St. Mark, Warwick)

Minutes, Meetings of Clergy, St. James', Toowoomba, 1885. (These are at St. Mark's Warwick).

Minutes, Synod of Diocese of North Queensland, 1941-1952.

Minutes, Various Committees, Diocese of Brisbane, 1903-1926.

Minutes, Vestry, All Saints' Brisbane, 1872-1950.

Minutes, Vestry, Parish of Dalby, 1885-1958.

Minutes, Vestry, Parish of Warwick, 1865-1884.

III. Other Collections of Documents.

Clark, C.M.H (Ed.), Select Documents in Australian History, 1851-1900 (Sydney, A. & R., 1955)

Historical Records of Australia (Series 1), Vols. XIV – XXV. (Sydney, Library Com. of C'wth. Part., 1914).

Pring, R. (Ed.), Statutes in Force in the Colony of Queensland, 2 Vols. (Brisbane, 1862).

Pugh's Almanac, 1859-1927 (Brisbane)

IV. Church Registers

Register of Baptisms, St. Philip's Sydney, 1825-1827.

Registers of Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, St. John's Brisbane from 1843.

Registers of Baptisms, Marriages and Burials, St. Matthew's Drayton, from 1850,

Register of Consecrations, Diocese of Brisbane, 1854-1877.

Registers of Baptisms, Marriages, and Burials, St. John's Dalby, from 1860.

Service Register, St. James', Townsville, from 1870.

Service Register, Thursday Island from 1891.

V. Journals and Diaries.

These are of varying value. That of John Gregor was designed for publication, and so is of different character from the others, which were private. Glennie's diary is valuable for the early period, though parts of it were written after the event. A.E. David's Notes are specially valuable as being intended to give an accurate picture of the Diocese of Brisbane to the incoming Archbishop Donaldson. The diocesan diaries contain for the most part brief and formal notes.

David, A.E. : Notes on the Diocese of Brisbane, 1904. (MS in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane).

Diocese of Carpentaria : Diary, 1900-1929. (Bishops G. White, H. Newton, S.H. Davies)

<u>North Queensland Diocesan Diary</u> , (Bishops G.H. Stanton and C.G Barlow)	1882-1884
	1885-1888
	1888-1892
	1893-1894

Glennie, B. : The Glennie Diary 1848-1860. (MS at Church House, Brisbane).

Gregor, J. : Extracts from Journals of Missionary Tours in the Moreton Bay District of New South Wales. (London, S.P.G., 1846.)

Records of clergy, Diocese of Brisbane . (MS in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane with some notes by Bishops Tufnell and Webber on some of their clergy)

White, G. : Torres Strait Island Mission, 1914. (Notes with references to taking over the mission from the L.M.S. Carpentarian Diocesan Registry).

## VI. Letters.

Letters yielded considerable information not available elsewhere. They are divided into published or circular letters and unpublished correspondence. Of the published letters, those of Bishop Tyrrell are in the possession of Professor A.P. Elkin, of Sydney, and the North Queensland letters are in Townsville. The place where the unpublished letters may be found is noted in each case. Of particular value were the correspondence of the Colonial Secretary of N.S.W. for the early Moreton Bay period; the S.P.G. correspondence, including reports from missionaries and letters from bishops and others to the English missionary society; and the Archiepiscopal Correspondence at Lambeth Palace which included many letters between Queensland bishops and various Archbishops of Canterbury.

### (A) Published or Circular Letters.

An Appeal for Funds Towards the Endowment of a Bishopric for Northern Queensland (unsigned and undated)

Hart, G.L. Henderson, P.E.W. Wanstall, C.G.	} <u>Circular Letters to Clerical and Lay Members of Synod, Brisbane, 12 June 1956, 5 June 1957.</u>
---	--

Pastoral Letter of the Australian Bishops, 1905.

Selwyn, A.E. : The Selwyn Letters (Sydney, A. & R., 1902).

Stanton, G.H. : To contributors to the North Queensland Church Fund in England, 28 October 1879.

Stanton, G.H. : Statement, (to N.Q. Diocesan Council), 1881.

Stanton, G.H. : To Members of the Church of England and others in North Queensland (Undated but probably 1881).

Stanton, G.H. : Letter, 12 April 1883.

Trustees of N.Q. Diocese : Letter, March 1880.

Tyrrell, W. : Pastoral Letter {to the laity...in the Diocese of Newcastle on funds for the Maintenance of the clergy} 1 September, 1854.

Tyrrell, W. : Appeal to Members of the Church of England for Contributions towards the Endowment of a Bishopric at Moreton Bay, 21 September 1858.

### (B) Unpublished Letters.

Archiepiscopal Correspondence, Archbishops of Canterbury, 1867-1912. (Letters received by Archbishops C.T. Longley, A.C. Tait, E.W. Benson, F. Temple and R. Davidson. At Lambeth Palace, London).

Despatches of Governors of Queensland to Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1860-1875 (at present on loan to University of Queensland).

Hale Letters. (Typescript extracts of letters of Bishop M.B. Hale, in possession of his son, Mr. Arthur Hale, Redcliffe).

Hassall Correspondence (Letters of Rev. J.S. Hassall, relevant to Queensland in the 1870's, Mitchell Library).

N.S.W. Colonial Secretary's Correspondence. (Inward and outward correspondence of Colonial Secretary of N.S.W., 1825-1850, Mitchell Library, Sydney).

Nicholson Letters (Copies of letters of Mary Nicholson, Groveley in the 1860's, Oxley Library, Brisbane).

North Queensland Letters (Variety of letters relating to early church history in North Queensland, St. James' Cathedral, Townsville).

Scott Correspondence (Letters of Archdeacon T.H. Scott, 1825-1829, Mitchell Library, Sydney).

S.P.G. Correspondence: C,D,E,F, and G Mss., 1825-1925 (Inward and Outward correspondence Of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at S.P.G., House, London).

#### VII. Collections of Cuttings and Manuscripts.

Brotherhood of St. Barnabas Papers. (Historical notes on the North Queensland Bush Brotherhood collated by Bro. Robin Warsop, B.S.B. Ravenshoe).

Canon Jones Papers (records about Canon Thomas Jones), Oxley Library, Brisbane

Church of England Papers (collected by Sir Littleton Groom), Oxley Library, Brisbane

Glover Papers (Historical notes on Darling Downs parishes collated by Archdeacon W.P. Glover, Pilton).

Halford Papers (Cuttings and notes on Bishop G.D. Halford), Oxley Library, Brisbane

Historical Records, Diocese of Brisbane (A collection of a few cuttings etc. in possession of the Archbishop of Brisbane).

Historical Records, Diocese of North Queensland (A collection of cuttings and historical notes in Diocesan Registry, Townsville).

#### VIII. Newspapers and Periodicals.

For the period 1846 to 1867, when the first diocesan conference was held in Brisbane, the secular newspapers, the Courier, and latterly the Guardian, were of special importance, and were used in detail. Some care has had to be taken in the use of these papers, however, as they customarily expressed a protestant point of view which was not sympathetic to the Church of England. The Queensland Evangelical Standard, used in detail from 1875 to 1886, helped fill the gap before the issue of the first regular church paper in Brisbane from 1886. The Courier was also used extensively, particularly for periods of special controversy or interest.

The official organs of the Queensland dioceses are invaluable for regular monthly reports on church affairs. Complete files of these papers exist in the respective diocesan registries with the following exceptions. Brisbane is complete from 1886 except for the year 1890. The Northern Churchman is lacking from 1896 to 1903, but is complete from 1904. The Rockhampton Church Gazette is complete from 1891. The Carpentarian commenced in 1901, but is incomplete for the following periods:- 1906-1912, part of 1918, 1922-1928, October 1935; it ceased publication from the beginning of the war in the Pacific in 1941.

The papers are divided into general and religious lists, and the religious papers are divided into national or diocesan papers on one hand, and parish papers on the other.

##### (A) General.

Boomerang, (Brisbane), 31 December 1887.

Moreton Bay Courier, 1846-1860.

Brisbane Courier, 1860-1933.

Courier-Mail, (Brisbane), 1933-1960.

Daily Mail (Brisbane), 9 January 1911, 12 January 1927.

Guardian (also known as Queensland Guardian from 1861 and Queensland Daily Guardian from 4 April, 1863), May 1860 to June 1865.

Queensland Evangelical Standard, (Brisbane, weekly), 1875-1886.

Queensland Guardian (Brisbane, weekly), 1883-1884. It should be noted that this is quite distinct from the paper by the same name in the 1860's.

Queenslander (Brisbane, weekly), 1 April 1876, 22 May 1880, 5 June 1880.

Rockhampton Morning Bulletin, 20 June 1874, 1 December 1892, 1947-1952.

Telegraph, (Brisbane), 1872-1959 (occasional references only)

Townsville Daily Bulletin, cuttings included in N.Q. Diocesan Diary in 1880's and in Minutes of N.Q. Synod, 1941-1952.

Townsville Herald, 1 August 1876.

Week, (Brisbane, weekly), 15 September 1887-12 January 1878.

Worker (Brisbane, weekly), 27 December 1890, 7 March 1891, 13 June 1891.

(B) Religious Papers - National and Diocesan.

Anglican (Sydney, weekly), 1953-1962.

Australian Bush Leaves (Organ of English Auxiliary of Diocese of Rockhampton), 1897-1900.

Australian Churchman (Sydney, Mitchell Library), 1867-1886.

Banner and Anglo-Catholic Review, (Sydney, Mitchell Library) < 1890-1892.

Carpentarian (Official Organ of Diocese of Carpentaria), 1901-1942 (incomplete)

Church Chronicle (Official organ of Diocese of Brisbane), 1891-1962.

Church Gazette (Official organ of Diocese of Rockhampton), 1891-1962.

Church Missionary Record (Organ of C.M.S., London), 1838-1840.

Church Standard (Sydney, Mitchell Library), 26 March 1920.

Colonial Church Chronicle (Organ of Colonial Bishops Council, London), 1874-73.

Mission Field (Organ of the S.P.G. , London), 1866-1897.

Monthly Record, Diocese of North Queensland, Townsville, 1883-1886.

North Queensland Notes (Organ of English Auxiliary of Diocese of N.Q.) 1909-1932, October 1954.

Northern Churchman (Official organ of Diocese of N.Q., Townsville), 1904-1962.

Religious Papers – Parochial

Bush Notes (Organ of the Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul, Charleville), 1905-1959.

Darling Downs Church News (Archdeaconry of Toowoomba), 1888-1890 (at St. Mark's Warwick).

The Friend (Organ of the Community of St. Barnabas), 1906-1907. (At Ravenshoe).

The Messenger (Christ Church, Milton), 1907-1908.

Parish Magazine, Dalby (St. John's Dalby), 1907-1929.

St. Andrew's Parish Magazine (St. Andrew's, South Brisbane), December 1928, July 1958.

St. John's Parish Chronicle (St. John's Brisbane), 1886-1890.

Thursday Island Parish Gazette (Cuttings, Carpentaria Diocesan Registry).

#### IX. Sermons and Short Religious Writings.

Batty, F. de Witt and others : Notes on the Present Controversy in the Church (Brisbane about 1928).

Donaldson, St. C. : Christian Patriotism (Address in St. John's Cathedral, Brisbane, Lent 1915).

Donaldson, St. C. : A Meditation on the Acts of the Apostles, J.H. Dobbs, Ed. (London, Faber 1937)

White, Gilbert : The Church and Modern Life (Townsville, T. Willmet, 1892).

White, Gilbert : The Intellectual Development of the Ministerial Life (Townsville, Hastings & ones, 1895).

White, Gilbert : A Missionary Vision (Sydney, A.B.M., 1909).

White, Gilbert : Notes on Ritual for the consideration of the Clergy (Brisbane, R.S. Hews, 1902)

White, Gilbert : The Pastoral Ideals of a Bishop (London, Odhams, 1908)

White, Gilbert : The Poems of Gilbert White (London, S.P.C.K., 1919)

#### X. Reminiscences.

Allen, C.H. : A Visit to Queensland (London, Chapman & Hall, 1870).

Backhouse, James : A Narrative of a Visit to the Australian Colonies (London, Hamilton, Adams & Co., 1843)

Banks, M. MacL. : Memories of Pioneer Days in Queensland (London, Heath Cranton, 1931).

Batty F. de Witt : Constitutional Memories (pamphlet, undated)

Browne, Spencer : A Journalist's Memories (Brisbane, Read Press, 1927).

Frodsham, G.H. : A Bishop's Pleasaunce (London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1915)

Gribble, E.R. : Forty Years With the Aborigines (Sydney, A. & R., 1930)

Hodgson, C.P. : Reminiscences of Australia (London, W.N. Wright, 1846)

Knight, J.J. : In the Early Days (Brisbane, Sapsford, 1895)

Lilley, W. Osborne : Reminiscences of Life in Brisbane, and Reflections and Sayings (Brisbane, 1913).

Morris, W.P.F. : Sons of Magnus (Brisbane, Wm. Brooks, 1948.)

Richmond, Frederick : Queensland in the Seventies (Singapore, 1927).

Robin, B.P. : The Sundowner (London, S.P.C.K., 1922)

White, Gilbert : Round About the Torres Straits (London, Cent. Board of Missions and S.P.C.K., 1917).

White, Gilbert : Thirty Years in Tropical Australia (London, S.P.C.K. 1918)

Woollcombe, H.S. : Beneath the Southern Cross, (London, 1913)

Zillmann, J.H.L. : Career of a Cornstalk (Sydney, Duncan & Macindoe 1914)

#### XI. Biographies.

Ashwell, A.R. : Life of Bishop Wilberforce, Vol I (London, John Murray, 1880).

Bell, G.K.A. : Randall Davidson (2 Vols.) (London, O.U.P. 1935)

Burnett, M.M. : Christison of Lammermoor (London, Alston Rivers, 1927)

Boodle, R.G. : The Life and Labours of the Right Reverend William Tyrrell, D.D. (London, 1881)

Benson, A.C. : The Life of Edward White Benson, 2 Vols. (London, Macmillan 1899).

Cowper, W.M. : The Episcopate of the Right Reverend Frederic Barker, D.D. (London, Hatchards, 1888)

Crockford's Clerical Directory, (London, 1890-1959).

Dimont, C.T. & Batty, F. de Witt : St. Clair Donaldson (London, Faber, 1939.)

Groom, Jessie : Nation Building in Australia the Life and Work of Sir Littleton Groom (Sydney, A. & R. 1941)

Halford, G.D. and others : Frederick Hulton-Sams, the Fighting Parson (Longreach, Theo. Barker, 1915)

Jones, E. : Florence Buchanan (London, Cent. Board of Missions & S.P.C.K., 1921)

Johns, Fred. : Notable Australians (Adelaide, Robertson & Co., 1906)

Norman, James : John Oliver North Queensland (Melbourne, G.B.R.E., 1943)

Serle, P.P. (Ed.) : Dictionary of Australian Biography, 2 vols. (Sydney, A. & R. 1949).

Smith, P. McD. : The Strenuous Saint (Life of Rev. W.M. Wilkinson) (Adelaide, Hassall Press, 1947)

Smyth, Charles : Cyril Forster Garbett (London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1959)

Syngé, F.M. : Albert Maclaren (London, S.P.G. , 1908)



- Tomlin, J.W.S. : Halford's Challenge (Canterbury, 1952)  
 Tufnell, E.B. : The Family of Tufnell (private, 1924)  
 Wand, J.W.C. : White of Carpentaria (London, Skeffington, 1949 (?) )  
 Whittington, F.T : William Grant Broughton (Sydney, A. & R., 1936)

## XII. General

The general secondary works are divided into books, pamphlets and brochures, articles, and unpublished theses. On the English background of Queensland church history, only those books specifically referred to in footnotes and a few other more important works are listed in this bibliography. Some of the other books listed have only limited direct relevance to this thesis, but they have been included here as this is the first time a bibliography on this subject has been prepared. Books, articles and theses are listed alphabetically by authors; but pamphlets and brochures, whose authorship is frequently not recorded, are arranged alphabetically either by the first important word in the title, or by parishes. These slighter works are of very mixed value, and for the most part were used to give leads which could be checked from other authorities. Some of the pamphlets contain numerous errors of detail.

### (A) Books.

- Alexander, F. : Four Bishops and their See (Perth, W.A. University Press, 1957)  
 Allen, W.O.B. & McClure, E. : The History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1698-1898 (London, S.P.C.K., 1898)  
 Barton, E.J.T. : Jubilee History of Queensland (Brisbane, Hews, 1909)  
 Batty, F. de Witt. : The Diocese of Brisbane (Brisbane, Hews, 1909)  
 Benson, E.W. : The Cathedral : Its Necessary Place in the Life and Work of the Church (London, John Murray, 1878)  
 Boggis, R.J.E. : St. Augustine's College, Canterbury (Canterbury, 1907)  
 Border, Ross : Church and State in Australia, 1788-1872 S.P.C.K. 1962)  
 Bullock, F.W.B. : A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England in England and Wales, 1800-1874 (St. Leonards-on-sea, 1955).  
 Carpenter, S.C. : Eighteenth Century Church and People, (London, John Murray, 1959)  
 Carpenter, S.C. : Church and People, 1789-1889 (London, John Murray, 1933)  
 Chisholm, A. H. (Ed.) : Australian Encyclopaedia (Sydney, A. & R., 1958).  
 Clarke, B.F.L. : Anglican Cathedrals Outside the British Isles (London, S.P.C.K., 1958).  
 Clarke, B.F.L. : Church builders of the Nineteenth Century (London, S.P.C.K., 1938)  
 Clarke, H. Lowther : Constitutional Church Government (London, S.P.C.K., 1924)  
 Coote, William : History of the Colony of Queensland. Vol 1 (Brisbane, W. Thorne, 1882.)  
 David, A.E. : Australia, in Handbooks of English Church Expansion series (London, Mowbray, 1908.)  
 Davidson, R.T. (Ed.) : The Six Lambeth Conferences (London, S.P.C.K., 1929)  
 Doherty, W.J. : The Bowen Book, (Townsville, Willmet, 1920)  
 Doherty, W.J. : The Townsville Book (Brisbane 1919)  
 Elkin, A.P. : The Diocese of Newcastle, (Glebe, Aust. Med. Pub. Co. 1955)  
 Ensor, R.C.K. : England, 1870-1914 in Oxford History of England series, No XIV (London, O.U.P., 1936).  
 Evans, E.C. : The Genesis of a Public School in the Tropics (Townsville, Willmet, (?) 1947)  
 Garbett, C.R. (Ed.) : The Work of a Great Parish, (London, Longman's 1915)  
 Giles, R.A. : The Constitutional History of the Australian Church (London, Skeffington, 1929)  
 Goodall, N. : A History of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945 London, O.U.P, 1945)  
 Greenwood, G. (Ed.) : Australia, A Social and Political History, (Sydney, A. & R., 1955)

- Gribble, E.R. : A Despised Race: the Vanishing Aboriginals of Australia (Sydney, A.B.M., 1933)
- Gribble, E.R. : Problems of the Australian Aboriginal (Sydney, A. & R., 1932)
- Halevy, Elie : England in 1815, Trans. By E.I. Watkin & D.A. Barker (London, Benn, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. 1949)
- Hammond, J.L. and Barbara : The Bleak Age (London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1934)
- Hawtreay, C.L.M. : The Availing Struggle (Perth, 1949)
- Lang, J.D. : Cooksland in North-eastern Australia (London, Longman, 1847)
- Lloyd, Roger : The church of England in the Twentieth Century, 2 vols. (London, Longmans, 1947)
- Loane, M.L. : A Centenary History of Moore Theological College (Sydney, A. & R., 1955)
- Moorman, J.R.H. : A History of the Church of England (London, Black, 1953)
- Nadel, George : Australia's Colonial Culture (Cambridge, Harvard Uni. Press, 1957)
- Page, N.B. : The Church and Parish of St. John the Evangelist, Red Lion Square, Holborn (London, 1928)
- Pascoe, C.F. : Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G., 1701-1901 (London, S.P.G. 1901)
- Phillimore, W.G.F. : The Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England, 2 Vols, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Revision of 1<sup>st</sup> Edition by Robert Phillimore, (London, Scott & Maxwell, 1895).
- Ramsey, A.M. : From Gore to Temple, (London, Longmans, 1960)
- Rowland, E.C. : A Century of the English Church in New South Wales (Sydney, A. & R., 1948)
- Rowland, E.C. : The Tropics for Christ (Townsville, Diocese of North Queensland, 1960)
- Stock, Eugene : History of the Church Missionary Society, 3 vols., (London, C.M.S., 1899).
- Symonds, E. : The Story of the Australian Church, in Colonial Church Histories series (London, S.P.C.K., 1898.)
- Tennant, K. : Speak You So Gently (London, Gollancz, 1959)
- Thompson, A.T. : Australia and the Bible, (London, B. & F. Bible Society, 1935)
- Thompson, H.P. : Into All Lands: A History of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel In Foreign Parts, 1701-1950 (London, S.P.C.K., 1951)
- Tomlin, J.W.S. : Australia's Greatest Need (London, S.P.G. 1914)
- Tomlin, J.W.S. : The Story of the Bush Brotherhoods (London, Mowbray, 1949)
- Webster, D. : Local Church and World Mission, (London, S.C.M., 1962)
- Wickham, E.R. : Church and People in an Industrial City, (London, Lutterworth, 1957)
- Wyatt, R.T. : The History of the Diocese of Goulburn (Sydney, Bragg 1937)
- Wyeth, E.R. : Education in Queensland (Melbourne. A.C.E.R., 1955)
- Young, G.M. : Victorian England, (London, O.U.P., 1936)

(B) Pamphlets and Brochures

Dioceses

Diocese of Carpentaria (1903)

Diocese of Rockhampton, Diamond Jubilee, 1892-1952 (Rockhampton, 1952)

Feetham, J. O & Rymer, W.V. (Eds.): North Queensland Jubilee Book (Townsville, McGilvray, 1929)

Fraser, Ross (Ed.): A Historical Sketch of the Diocese of North Queensland (Townsville, 1958)

Our Work in Queensland (Colonial & Continental Church Society, London, 1905)

Queensland, in Historical Sketches series (London, S.P.G., undated, but early 20<sup>th</sup> Century)

Sketches of Life and Work in North Queensland (Townsville, 1882)

Parishes (in alphabetical order of parishes)

- St. David's, Allora, Golden Jubilee Brochure (Warwick, 1938)
- Kissick, D.L. : All Saints' Church, Brisbane (Brisbane, 1938)
- St. John the Baptist Church, Bulimba, 1888-1926
- Souvenir of the Opening of Christ Church, Bundaberg, 1927
- Dalby: A Souvenir Brochure, 1851-1951
- Trinity Church, Fortitude Valley (Typescript at Church House, Brisbane)
- Gayndah, Jubilee Year, 1932
- St. Andrew's Church Indooroopilly, Golden Jubilee, 1939.
- Shrapnel, W. : The Annals of a Pioneer Church in the Backblocks of Queensland. (typescript of Kingaroy parish)
- Cornish, H.K. : Memento of the Centenary of St. Paul's, Ipswich, 1855-1955.
- Centenary of the Parish of St. Mary the Virgin, Kangaroo Point, 1947.
- Smith, L.P.G. : St. Andrew's Church of England, Longreach, 1895-1955, Diamond Jubilee.
- Addison, K.H. : The Growth of Lutwyche Parish (Brisbane, 1951)
- Perry, Hope : St. Paul's, Maryborough, Centenary (Maryborough 1953)
- Smith, E.H. : Notes on the History of New Farm (typescript, Bishopsbourne)
- A Retrospective Sketch of the History of the Parish of South Brisbane (1908)
- The Story of St. Andrew's, South Brisbane (Brisbane, 1959)
- Quetta Memorial Church (Thursday Island)
- St. Thomas' Church, Toowong, Diamond Jubilee, 1930
- 1848-1948. A Souvenir Brochure, St. Mark's Warwick.
- Morgan, Sir A. : Some Reminiscences (Warwick, 1912)
- Parish of St. Mark, 1862-1962, (Warwick, 1962)
- Institutes and Societies.
- Bush Brotherhood of St. Paul., Jubilee Book, 1901-1951.
- The Making of St. Martin's Hospital
- Short History of the Society of the Sacred Advent, 1892-1942. (Brisbane 1942)
- Six Years' Service for the Armed Service and Merchant Navy (Soldiers & Sailors' C. of E. Help Society, 1939-1945)
- Slade School Magazine, Special Jubilee Issue, 1950.
- The Story of all Saints' Hostel, Charleville, 1914-1944
- (C) Articles and Lectures.
- Berwick, G.T. : "The Birth of the Bush Brotherhood", in Theology, May 1947.
- Donaldson, St. C. : "Australia", in Ellison, J. & Walpole, G.H.S. (Eds.) Church and Empire (London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1907)
- Frodsham, G.H. : "Church Legislation in Australia", in Australasian Church Quarterly Review, January, 1911.
- Frodsham, G.H. : "Community Life and Bush Brotherhoods", in Australasian Church Quarterly Review, December 1912.
- Hicks, C.M.E. : "Bush Brotherhoods and the Community Life", in Australasian Church Quarterly Review, September 1912.
- Mackenzie, A.P. : "Christopher George Barlow, Bishop", in Southern Churchman, 15 October, 1915.
- Pike, Joseph : "Pioneering the Church in Tropical Queensland", in Australian Church Quarterly, June 1936.

Rayner, K. : "Rome and Canterbury: Two Attempts at Rapprochement, 1890-1930", in Australian Church Quarterly, January 1960.

Rayner, K. : "The Home Base of the Missions of the Church of England, 1830-50", in Journal of Religious History, June 1962.

St. John, R.T. : "Diocesan Administration in Australia", in St. Mark's Review, November, 1960.

Shevill, Ian : Blueprint for a National Church. (Anglican Truth Society, 1959)

Stewart, F.W.S. Cumbrae : "Notes on Registers and Memorials at St. John's Cathedral", in Historical Society of Queensland Journal, Vol. I No 1.

Walker, B.P. : Memories of the Church in the Upper Burnett Fifty Years Ago (unpublished Paper delivered at Pialba Conference 1956.)

Wentworth-Shields, W.F. : "In Memoriam, Christopher George Barlow, Bishop", in Southern Churchman, 15 September, 1915.

White, Gilbert : "Missions to the Heathen", in Australasian Church Quarterly Review, June, 1912.

White, Gilbert : "Some Problems of Northern Australia", in Victorian Geographical Journal, Vol XXV, 1907.

Wyatt, R.T. : "A Wine Merchant in Gaiters", in Royal Australian Historical Society Journal & Proceedings, Vol XXXV, 1950.

(D) Unpublished Theses.

Rayner, Keith : The Attitude and Influences of the Churches in Queensland on Matters of Social and Political Importance (Presented to University of Queensland, 1951)

Thompson, J.A. : History of the Contributions of the Church of England to Education in Queensland (Presented to University of Queensland 1946).