

was given in the *Presbyterian Outlook* of February 25, 1913, when I wrote as follows:—'No amount of subsidy to Catholic schools would reconcile me to several important planks in the League's platform. I will mention only three of these—(a) Subsidy or no subsidy, I would protest, even with my dying breath, against the wrong which the League proposes to inflict upon the vast body of conscientiously objecting teachers, requiring Catholics among them to violate specific and oft-specified principles and laws of their Church, and facing all such objectors with the following alternatives:—Proselytism to League views, hypocrisy, or dismissal. (b) No possible subsidy to Catholic schools would ever reconcile me to the League's conscience clause, which was devised in Ireland for the purpose of 'weaning the Irish from the abuses of Popery'. . . (c) No possible subsidy to Catholic schools would reconcile me to the principle of deciding vexed questions of religion and conscience by a count of voters' heads.' Well-meaning people of other faiths have frequently suggested that, as a matter of policy, Catholics should support the League, thus enormously strengthening our claim to a subsidy for the secular results achieved in our schools. To all such I have invariably replied, both publicly and in private: 'What we Catholics gain herein we will not gain by subterfuge; what we lose, we will not lose by an ignoble silence where sacred rights and principles are involved.' The opinions expressed above are not mine alone; they are the view of the Catholic Episcopate, clergy, and laity of New Zealand. Archdeacon Willis said lately in the *New Zealand Herald* that Catholics would accept the League's platform if given grants for their schools. Archdeacon Willis should be willing to grant that we know our wants and views much better than the League orators and writers by whom he has been, in this matter, misled. Just one thing more (and this is the direct answer to the question): We can never surrender our moral and natural right to our fair share of Catholic taxes for the secular (not religious) results achieved in our schools. But, on numerous public occasions I have intimated, in substance, what follows: Even apart from the question of such grants, Catholics would give fair and friendly consideration to any reasonable scheme laid before them, based on equal treatment and freedom of conscience.' That is the position we take up apart altogether from this question of grants. We will consider any proposal whatever that is submitted to us by the League, and we shall be glad to see even a partially successful scheme of religious instruction in State schools inaugurated by or for the League, we ourselves not foregoing, however, what we reckon to be our just and inalienable claim.

I submit that my question did not in any way relate to a correspondence with Archbishop Willis with regard to the Roman Catholic Church supporting a scheme for State aid. My question was: Is the Roman Catholic Church determined on continuing its policy of seeking State aid for its schools irrespective of whether there is religious instruction or no religious instruction added to the present system? I am not referring to the League's proposal at all.

Mr. Chairman, that question has already been answered definitely. We can never surrender our moral and natural right to our fair share of Catholic taxes for the secular (not religious) results achieved in our schools. And in that respect we differ entirely and in principle from the demands of the League that the Government, through Government officials, and at the Government expense, shall supply them with what the law in Australia calls 'general religious instruction,' suitable for themselves alone at the cost of the public pocket.

The Bishop's answers have, to my mind, completely dealt with his sixty pages of statement, and I do not intend to pursue the examination, because I know how valuable the time of this Committee is.

Mr. Hanan: We do not want that—you must ask questions.

Canon Garland: May I submit that the Bishop was allowed to do more than answer my questions. However, I bow to whatever you instruct me.

The Chairman: I desire to know what you wish to ask in the way of questions. I cannot allow you to make a speech on it.

Canon Garland: I do not intend to make a speech, but I wish to say at less length than the Bishop took to answer one of my questions why I am not proceeding. The reason I am not proceeding is that the answers to my questions cover, in my judgment, the whole of the 60 pages of his statement, and I wish to save the time of the Committee.

Bishop Cleary: Mr. Chairman, I wish on behalf of myself and on behalf of those I represent to dissociate myself entirely from the reflection cast upon your fairness in regard to the answers given to those questions.

Canon Garland: I did not cast the least reflection upon your fairness, Mr. Chairman. I am absolutely satisfied with your fairness.

Professor Hunter: I wish to ask one or two questions.

Canon Garland: I understood from your official communication to me, Mr. Chairman, that there was only to be cross-examination by one representative from each side, and I take it there are only two sides in this matter, those for and against the Bill. I understood there was to be only one from each side, and I have not arranged for other people to come and ask questions.

The Chairman: I do not think there was any understanding to that effect.

Canon Garland: May I have the letter read?

The Chairman: The letter of 31st July reads:—'The Education Committee will meet on Tuesday, 4th August, at 10.30 a.m. for the cross-examination of the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary. Further evidence than cross-examination in connection with the Bible-in-schools petitions will not be taken until the evidence on the Education Bill is completed. This will necessitate a delay of probably about a fortnight. I will communicate the date of next meeting as early as possible.'

Canon Garland: There was an earlier letter in which I was informed that it was the intention to receive witnesses and asking if we had any witnesses to bring forward.

Mr. Hanan: I would call attention to the minutes. On the motion of Mr. Malcolm it was decided that interested parties be allowed to cross-examine the witnesses through the Chairman. At the same meeting Professor Hunter attended and expressed a similar desire. Then we resolved that interested bodies be allowed to cross-examine the other side through the Chairman.

Canon Garland: Might I have the letter read that was sent to me, because that fact was not communicated to me?

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 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 22nd July reads:—'I have the honor to acknowledge your letter of 21st inst. informing me that the Education Committee will take evidence on Friday, 24th inst., 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 endeavors 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