

sitting in his chair and writing a document to appear in the *Outlook* of the 11th November, 1913—"The Case stated for a Referendum on the Bible in Schools." This is his statement: "The suitability of the referendum for settling the question of religious instruction was recognized in the following cases: Switzerland in 1882 took a referendum upon a proposal to remove religious instruction from the schools; a vast petition was drawn up; within a short time 180,995 signatures were appended (proportionately the signatures already available in New Zealand are greater); the referendum was taken, and since then the question has remained finally settled." That is an absolutely clear statement by Canon Garland, and that statement is reproduced in other terms in this statement of his which appears in the *Dominion* of the 14th July. I have dealt with this matter in the course of a letter to the Press, which I have here. I am prepared to read that part of it referring to Canon Garland's statement. There was no such issue in Switzerland as that of religious instruction in the schools. "The issue of the Swiss referendum of 1882 was, briefly, State (canton) rights against Federal (central Government) rights in the inspection and organization of education. (See, for instance, Boyd Winchester's 'Swiss Republic,' pp. 260-261; Ogg, 'The Governments of Europe,' p. 435; 'Annual Register' for 1882, p. 268.)" Those are only a selection of close on forty books on the referendum in Switzerland which I have read, and on this one point there is no division of opinion amongst them. Then I go on to say, "Switzerland has the referendum; New Zealand has not. Historically and constitutionally, as I can show, the Swiss referendum is essentially a form of substitute for the American veto. It enables electors to reject or approve certain classes of measures after they have been passed by Parliament. It has nothing whatever to do (as the League's proposed plebiscite has) with promoting future legislation. As stated, the issue of the Swiss referendum of 1882 was federal against cantonal (provincial) inspection, &c., of schools. This issue was, in its nature, purely a matter of political policy. There is no Catholic doctrine or principle which forbids a referendum on such an issue, whether in Switzerland or New Zealand. Many Swiss Catholics and 'orthodox' Protestants feared that the Federal Government's Radical majority, chiefly from the Protestant cantons, would drive religion out of the schools if they got control of them. But the issue of 'religious instruction in schools' was never placed before the electors. The League's scheme of 1914 is not a referendum. It does not submit to popular veto or approval measures passed by both Houses of Parliament. It is a mere plebiscite for future ballot-box legislation over the head of Parliament. It also deals with questions of religion, religious conscience, and 'religious instruction.' The Swiss referendum of 1882 dealt with purely temporal matters of school inspection and school administration." Canon Garland's statement is contrary to fact. The Catholic people did not vote there upon this question of religious instruction in public schools, and there is no difference in the policy or discipline of the Catholic Church in Switzerland and in this country upon that subject. They would oppose the League plebiscite there as we oppose it here.

18. *Professor Hunter.*] Then your answer to my statement is that the statements made by Canon Garland are not correct?—That is so; they are contrary to fact.

19. I should like now to ask, Has the witness seen a League article by the Rev. Mr. Wood, an organizer of the Bible in Schools League, in the *Dominion* of the 30th July, charging the Roman Catholic Bishops with "lack of straightforwardness" in their campaign, and directing the attention of this Committee to the matter? If so, will the witness state his views on the League article in question?—I am glad this question has been brought up. I had meant to bring it up myself independently. The League article in question by the Rev. R. Wood has been published, by arrangement, by the League with a view of influencing the views and opinions of this Committee upon such evidence as I may give here and have already given. It is an attack of the most serious kind, and I will point out one part of it which makes an appeal practically to this Committee. It states, "This championing of secularism on the part of the Roman prelates ought to be considered very carefully by the parliamentary Committee at present sitting to hear evidence for and against the referendum on Bible in schools. It is the duty of that Committee and the duty of every member of Parliament to have an intelligent knowledge of what the Roman prelates have said in the past about our secular system of education, and if they do so they will have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that there is a lack of straightforwardness in the propaganda of the Roman Bishops." Mr. Chairman, I need not point out the importance of a statement of that sort, and the palpable effort that it makes to influence the views of this Committee by pointing out certain things: first, that the Roman Bishops have made a number of serious statements reflecting upon the secular system; second, that we are doing all in our power to destroy this present system; and, third, that we are doing all in our power to maintain the present system. This refers to the evidence which I am giving here to-day; it covers a great part of the evidence mentioned here to-day; it tries to traverse it and to show that the evidence is false, that I am acting a part in this matter together with my fellow-Bishops, and that we are not straightforward in this matter. If this is not an attempt to influence the views of the Committee, then I do not know what such an attempt could be.

20. *The Chairman.*] I think you must confine yourself to the attack made here upon your evidence?—I will do so.

*Mr. Hanan* brought up the question of whether the publication of the League's letter was not a breach of privilege, in order that the matter may be dealt with afterwards.

*Witness:* May I point out that this letter refers to four points of my evidence, and that they are seriously misrepresented in this document with a view to influencing this Committee. It is an article "in reply to the Roman Catholic Bishops." It deals with matters of evidence which have been brought forward by me on behalf of the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand and the Catholic people of New Zealand, and it has been published by the League as an advertisement, by arrangement, in the *Dominion*. The article is no longer the Rev. Mr. Wood's publication; it