

*The Chairman:* The letter of the 21st July reads, "The Education Committee will take evidence on Friday, 24th instant, at 10.30 a.m., when representatives of the Catholic Church and of the Defence League will be heard. Opportunity will be given for a representative of each side to cross-examine witnesses on the other side through the Chairman."

*Canon Garland:* May I have my reply read?

*The Chairman:* Your reply of the 22nd July reads, "I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 21st instant informing me that the Education Committee will take evidence on Friday, 24th instant, at 10.30 a.m., when representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and of the Defence League will be heard. I note that opportunity will be given for a representative of each side to cross-examine the witnesses on the other side through the Chairman. I shall make my best endeavours to comply with the request of the Committee to place our views in typewritten form before each member."

*Mr. Hanan:* It is stated in the minutes that Professor Hunter attended and asked to have the same right.

*The Chairman:* The question is whether Professor Hunter represented the other side.

*Mr. Malcolm:* Our idea was that interested parties should have the right.

*Bishop Cleary:* May I be permitted to point out that there are four parties to this dispute? There is, first, the Bible in Schools League; second, the Catholic Federation, which represents the Catholic bodies; third, the National Schools Defence League; and, fourth, the body of teachers.

*Canon Garland:* All I want to bring up is that I was not made acquainted with the decision of the Committee. I understood from the letter I received that there would only be one person cross-examining on each side, and in one of my letters I pointed out that there were two parties—those for and those against the Bill.

*Professor Hunter:* May I be allowed to say something?

*The Chairman:* I think not. We will hear Professor Hunter, but I propose to give Canon Garland the opportunity, if he wishes afterwards, of asking further questions.

*Mr. Malcolm:* Before we go on, Mr. Chairman, would you make it clear to Canon Garland that we do not wish any consideration for our time to prevent him from indulging in further cross-examination. There was a sentence in his statement which might produce that impression.

*The Chairman:* I have urged upon all witnesses to conserve our time, in view of the amount of work that the Committee have to get through.

8. *Professor Hunter (to witness).* Am I right in saying that your objections to this scheme are based on the inherent injustice of it?—That is exactly the position. I have already, I think, sufficiently explained that Catholics are not opposed to Bible in schools. We are in favour of Bible in schools, and we are the only body of people in this Dominion who have made immense sacrifices in favour of it. I represent only one small portion of the Catholic body of this Dominion, yet in a little over three years the Catholic people of Auckland City alone have put into this cause of biblical and religious instruction in our schools £69,100. We are the only true Bible in Schools League, and we oppose this scheme of the Bible in State Schools League solely because of its injustice—first of all, injustice to objecting taxpayers, who would be compelled to bear a portion of the cost of the scheme; second, injustice to teachers—conscientiously objecting teachers—who would be compelled to impart the lessons under this scheme; and, thirdly, we object to what we call a most odious formula—that is, the Irish proselytizing conscience clause, and the practical compulsion of a certain number of the children to be instructed in these lessons without the consent of their parents, without even their parents being consulted or considered in the matter. These we consider grave injustices in the scheme of the Bible in State Schools League. As I have said in my principal evidence, if the League eliminates these objectionable features from its programme we will heartily join hand-in-hand with the League in order to help them to bring a measure of religious instruction into the public schools.

9. What is the position of Roman Catholic teachers in New South Wales? Can a convinced and conscientious Roman Catholic teacher give unsectarian general religious instruction, as required by law, in the public schools, and yet act in accordance with the principles and constitution of his Church?—I expected that question to be asked by the organizer of the Bible in State Schools League, and in consequence I prepared a statement on this matter.

10. *The Chairman.* I hope it is a short one?—It is not, but I will ask permission to read a portion of it. The Church and "unsectarianism": We may here leave out of further consideration those Catholic teachers in New South Wales who impart "common" or "unsectarian" "general religious instruction" in good faith, through ignorance of Catholic principles and Catholic discipline bearing thereon. As stated, they have in so far and for the time being unconsciously become Protestant teachers imparting a "reduced" or "skeleton" form of Protestantism. Such a "common," or "reduced," or "skeleton," or "fundamental," or "unsectarian" biblical or religious teaching is wholly unacceptable to Catholics and contrary to Catholic teaching. No Catholic teacher may have act or part in propagating it. No Catholic parent may permit his child to be instructed in it. It was condemned for school use by the Irish Catholic Hierarchy in 1824; again at their general meetings of the 26th January, 1826, and the 12th February, 1840; by a papal rescript of the 16th January, 1841; by decrees of the Synod of Thurles in 1850; and by the Synod of the Province of Dublin in July, 1853 ("Mixed Education," Dublin, 1859, pp. 32, 194, 412, 413, 414; "Acta et Decreta" of the Maynooth National Synod of 1875, p. 331). It may be added that such "common" or "unsectarian" teaching is condemned by the unanimous voice of Catholic theologians. "Evidence of content": Here we have the overwhelming positive evidence of a presumption that no Catholic teacher or parent instructed hereon, and loyal to Catholic faith or conscience, can have act or part in the teaching of so-called "unsectarianism" of the League and of the Bill at present before Parliament. In view of this evidence we are bound to assume that no properly instructed Catholic teacher in