

*Mr. Statham:* Mr. Chairman, I must object to the questions being put in that form. It is a most unfair thing to besmirch the character of this gentleman by asking questions which are full of inference. If Canon Garland is going to give evidence on the point that will be a different matter.

*Mr. Sidey:* He is only asking the question of the witness whether he knew of the gentleman.

*The Chairman:* I think Canon Garland is within his rights in asking such questions.

*Mr. Statham:* Canon Garland is not alleging that this gentleman is guilty of any of those things.

*Mr. McCallum:* He is laying the foundation for his own evidence. Later on he may give that evidence, and he has a right to put those questions now in order to lay the foundation.

9. *Canon Garland* (to witness).] May I ask if you have quoted all the statements that were made and reported in *Hansard* in rebuttal of those statements?—No.

10. You are aware, I presume, that Parliament by its vote of, I think, something like two to one showed that they did not accept any of those statements as a reason for refusing to introduce religious instruction?—No, I am not aware of that.

11. May I put it another way: that notwithstanding the statements of your friends here Parliament passed the Religious Instruction Act which those statements tried to prevent?—After the referendum.

12. You are aware of the fact?—Yes, I am aware that after the referendum taken by the people, by which 26 per cent. of the electors voted for the proposal, Parliament, being tied by the granting of the plebiscite, passed the Bill.

13. While those statements were made they carried so little weight with Parliament and with the people that they received no attention, and the verdict of both the people and Parliament was to the contrary. Would you tell me the date when those statements were made?—I cannot give the date offhand, but I think it was in 1910.

14. It was in 1910 they made the statements after the people had declared their will?—That is so. I believe that is true.

15. So it means that Parliament treated those statements of members with so little attention that they gave legislative effect to the will of the people notwithstanding those statements?—No, I do not think that. Parliament passed the Referendum Bill, a referendum was held, and 26 per cent. of the people voted for the proposal. Some of the members of Parliament were not satisfied that it was a good thing to do, but the majority of the members thought they were bound by the decision of the 26 per cent. of votes cast at the poll in favour of the proposal.

16. It is clear that Parliament did introduce religious instruction notwithstanding those statements by Mr. Lesina and others whom you have quoted?—Yes, undoubtedly.

17. In your statement you referred to Mr. Chesterton?—Yes.

18. You quote him as against us. Are you aware of his particular views on the subject of religious instruction in schools?—There is his statement here, yes.

19. That is not his whole statement. He is an ardent advocate of State aid to denominational schools?—I should not be surprised at that.

20. You are aware of that?—No.

21. He argues in favour of a definite religious teaching being given, but condemns the present system as incomplete because it is not definite enough: he goes further than we do?—In a different road.

22. I want to come to that famous circular that you quoted which has been published in your leaflets during the public controversy, and I really want to get to the bottom of it. If I remember rightly I think you said it was issued in 1909?—No, I did not.

23. You said in your statement, "This evidence as to friction and ill feeling and 'lamb-stealing' is supported in a circular issued in the name of Mr. W. Wilkins, Secretary to the Council of Education, Sydney, on 15th July, 1900"?—That is right.

24. Would you mind telling me your authority for saying it was so issued?—You had better let me produce the document. I have not got it here, but I will produce it to the Committee. The position is really this: that this document was reissued in 1900 from the Education Office. The objection you raised was that this man was dead. The man was dead at the time it was sent out, but it was a standing circular with the Department that was sent out. The only way to solve that will be to lay the document before the Committee, and I will do so next sitting-day.

25. Are you aware that the present Director of Education failed to identify the document?—No, I am not. I am aware of the fact that we have written to him asking him about it, and have got no reply.

26. I have received a cable from him, but perhaps it would not be fair to read it?—I have seen the cable, but I have not seen the cable you sent.

27. I will read it [cable handed to witness]?—But this says the circular was doubtless issued. He has not identified it, but says it was doubtless issued.

28. Doubtless issued long ago, but not in 1900?—The date when the issue came to us was 1900.

29. You received it in 1900?—From the office. It was dated at the head 1900.

30. From the Department?—Yes. I will get the circular.

31. You and your League went to a good deal of pains to gain information from Australia about the working of the system?—We have taken a little trouble, but not nearly so much as we would like.

32. You wrote, in fact, a number of letters to try and get some information?—Yes, we have sent some letters for information.

33. And I notice in your statement in one or two places you do not give the names of the members of Parliament—you only say that "another member wrote"?—Yes. The reason for