

has been taken up officially by the League and published by the League, by arrangement, as an advertisement for the purpose of influencing this Committee. In the first place, the statement is made that strong language has been used by Catholic Bishops, and by me in particular, in regard to the secular system, and large quotations are made hereon. In the course of my evidence here I have given strong expressions of opinion in regard to the secular system, but I have also quoted much stronger expressions of opinion in regard to the secular system from members of the Bible in Schools League, some of whom have called it a system of "white heathenism," a system of "dogmatic secularism," "Godless," "the desolating blight of secularism," a system that "degrades morals," a system that is "a relic of barbarism," and so on. It is made to appear in this article as if we Catholics alone had spoken strongly against this system, whereas we have not spoken in language as strong as that used by the League. In the course of my evidence I have made it clear that we Catholics favour biblical and religious instruction in the schools, and are willing to meet the Bible in Schools League people in conference in order to arrive at a proper settlement of the matter. This particular publication now before the Committee states that we are not acting straightforwardly in this matter, but standing out to defend this secular system, and so on. I need not again refer to the statements made in regard to the conference, but I will go on to another part where it says that we are "root and branch opposed to this secular system." We are not root and branch opposed to it. We are opposed to it for our own people, but, as I have said in the course of my evidence, we are prepared at all times to leave the system secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious. This is stated in the course of my evidence: "We aim at making that system truly national—truly suited to the conscientious as well as the intellectual requirements of all the people of the nation—secular for those desiring it secular, and religious, on fair conditions all round, to those desiring it religious." Canon Garland was here when that was read out, and yet a week later this statement is published by him that we are out and out for the maintenance of the present secular system and not acting straightforwardly in this matter. The statement has been made here that we are against the Bible in State schools. I have already pointed out that we are in favour of it on certain conditions. This was stated in the presence of Canon Garland, and yet a week afterwards he comes out and publishes this statement in the Press which was written by the League organizer in Otago, and which is brought forward here in Wellington for the purpose of influencing the deliberations of this Committee. Now, one thing more. In the course of my evidence I made indirect reference to the Nelson system. It comes under the heading "The Right of Entry." It reads, "A word may perhaps be here permitted as regards the Catholic attitude towards the right of entry of the clergy during school hours. Speaking personally, I would not object to it provided that the rights of conscience of parents, teachers, and pupils were properly safeguarded." Then I go on to speak of the difficulty of single-roomed schools, and so on. Yet here comes this statement published by the League as a League document in order to influence the views of the Committee, and it says, "The Nelson system as a solution has been held up to scorn by Dr. Cleary." That is the right of entry of the clergy nominally (and at best by legal fiction) before school hours—really and actually within school hours—and then a quotation is made from my pamphlet "*Secular versus Religious Education*," published in 1909. Now, I will point out to the Committee a piece of amazing misquotation. The League article quotes my words—"As regards the implied permission to teach about God and His law outside the hours devoted to the system, that provision serves only to emphasize the exclusion of God from the actual working of the system. Christians might conceivably have been permitted to do as much in Notre Dame, Paris, at the close of the revolutionists' worship of the Goddess of Reason. During school hours our law has put God out of calculation; it has excluded all doctrinal references to Him, or to moral duties towards Him or in Him, to the children's neighbours or themselves. It compels the earnest Christian teacher to check his best thoughts and muzzle his tongue and play a part. Bishop Neligan, of Auckland, described God as 'an extra' in our secular system. But 'extras' are provided for by the system; God is not. If He is brought into the working of the system He is brought in surreptitiously and as a stowaway, and all teaching regarding His law is as contraband as pipe-opium." Now, this is made by the League to appear that I am here holding up to contempt and scorn the Nelson system. Mr. Chairman, would you be kind enough to see if I made any reference whatever to the Nelson system in the paragraph? The words "the Nelson system" have been interpolated there, and if a man interpolated words in a will or a public document he would find himself in the dock. And this was published by the League a week after I had declared myself, in Canon Garland's hearing, as having no objection to the right of entry of clergy, even in the formal school hours, provided the rights of others were respected. There is no reference to the Nelson system in my statement quoted by the League. I will go further and say that from the beginning to the end of that pamphlet of mine there is not one solitary reference throughout to the Nelson system. I will go still further and say that in my long career as a journalist, and in the great amount of work done in connection with this movement, I have never published a statement regarding the Nelson system. There is only one mention made to Nelson in the whole of this pamphlet, and that is the reference to the old Nelson denominational system of education which existed in the days of the Provincial Parliaments. Canon Garland was here and heard my indirect reference to the Nelson system and the right of entry, and yet a week after he had heard it he published that as a League document in order to influence the views and deliberations of this Committee.

21. *Canon Garland.*] May I ask the Bishop where the words "Nelson system" occur, as suggested, by interpolation?—If you will come here I will show it to you. [Witness pointed to the words "the Nelson system as a solution has been held up to scorn by Dr. Cleary."]

22. May I point out that it has not been interpolated as a quotation from the Bishop's statement. It has been placed there as a heading. The writer, having stated his premises, now