

over vast areas of that country no priest will go into the State schools. There is, in fact, Church legislation covering a great part of New South Wales forbidding the priests to go into the State schools. Much as we love the children, much as we search them out, though many the sacrifices we make for them, in large areas of New South Wales the objection to the system is so fierce that no priest will set his foot inside a State school.

13. *The Chairman.*] By legislation, do you mean?—By our own Church legislation. I will quote a part of it, from legislation passed by Cardinal Moran. According to the official report of the Catholic Education Congress some years ago (1911) Cardinal Moran reaffirmed the diocesan law against the clergy teaching religion in the public schools. He said they should bring the children to a neighbouring church or house or elsewhere: "they must make it plain that there was no peace with the system so far as Catholics were concerned." He goes on to say, "The reports of the Education Department made it appear that they had paid nine hundred such visits last year. These were in the remote country districts where there were no Catholic schools, and where the children were obliged to attend State schools. The priests merely called at the schools to assemble the children for preparation for the sacraments, but did not actually teach them in the schoolroom, taking them to a neighbouring house, if available, or otherwise gathering them under a gum-tree." This is from page 31 of the report.

14. *Professor Hunter.*] What sort of influence does the Bishop think that that would have on the religious faith of the children—I mean, such incidents as I refer to in my question?—I think I can safely leave the answer to that question to the Committee to work out in their own minds. It would have an extremely detrimental effect upon the children in one way; it would naturally impress upon the children the profound objection that Catholics have to this system, and the intensely anti-Catholic nature of this system, because we Catholics look upon the system in New South Wales as a proselytizing system. That is its regular name there—the proselytizing system.

15. Does the Bishop think that if the League's scheme were adopted Catholic teachers who did remain in the State service would be placed at a great disadvantage in the matter of appointments?—They would be placed at a very obvious disadvantage. I have already referred in my principal evidence to the statement of a number of prominent League leaders that the teachers who refused to fall in with this scheme of Bible-extracts in State schools would be driven out of the Public Service, would be deemed unfit to remain in the Public Service, and so on. Moreover, it is obvious that when a Catholic applied for a position in a school the first question the School Committee would ask would be, Is he willing to teach these lessons? A Catholic, by the very principles and rules of his faith, cannot in conscience teach those "unsectarian" lessons, and he would be at once ruled out of Court. I have here in my hands a number of protests by Catholic teachers, and more are forthcoming. These are merely a selection. They all declare that as a matter of conscience they could not teach these lessons. I do not see myself how they could teach these "unsectarian" religious lessons with a safe conscience. You would put the Catholic teacher in the public schools, by the new scheme, in the position, already described in my principal evidence, of having either to violate his conscience or to go without bread-and-butter. A number of them have intimated that they will not violate their conscience—that they will sacrifice their positions sooner than adopt this scheme.

16. In the *Dominion* of the 14th July Canon Garland is reported to have said that in 1882 Roman Catholics "advocated a referendum in Switzerland, and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere." Will Bishop Cleary say if the facts are as stated by Canon Garland?—Would Canon Garland state if he was correctly reported? I should like him to do that before I give my answer. I have the report here. [Report shown to Canon Garland.]

*Canon Garland:* This is the statement as reported to have been made by me: "Mr. Massey had drawn attention to the fact that the principle of the referendum as suitable to such a matter had already been recognized by Roman Catholics, who had voted for it in the House on a former occasion." (That refers to the New Zealand House.) "Indeed, this had been done elsewhere, as, for instance, in Switzerland in 1882, when a referendum was taken which was regarded as the most notable in that country, both from the importance of the question voted on and from the large number of electors who went to the poll. It was taken as the result of a request in which Roman Catholics had joined, and upon which they united with orthodox Protestants and with religious people generally to vote as against the minority composed of German Radicals, free-thinkers, and socialists. The motto adopted by the Roman Catholics and orthodox Protestants throughout the whole of Switzerland was 'God in the schools.' It was opposed by a bogus cry against Roman Catholicism, and with a denunciation of the danger of clericalism. He asked, If it were right for Roman Catholics to demand and take part in a referendum under the cry 'God in the schools' in Switzerland in 1882, how could they find the principle of the referendum wrong in New Zealand in 1914? He did not mean for a moment that he supposed if the referendum were provided by Parliament that Roman Catholics would vote 'Yes.' He believed the greater majority of them would vote 'No,' but that did not affect the principle in question that in 1882 they advocated a referendum in Switzerland, and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere." That is a fair report of what I said.

*Professor Hunter:* I think I will leave my question as it is. It is perfectly obvious.

17. *The Chairman.*] The question asked is, Are the facts as stated by Canon Garland?—The facts are not as represented by Canon Garland. His statement is absolutely positive that Catholics advocated a referendum in Switzerland and here denied the right to settle the question of religious instruction in schools by the method which they advocated elsewhere. That statement is not in accordance with fact. I have here another and clearer statement on the question by Canon Garland—not Canon Garland speaking and being reported by a reporter, but Canon Garland