

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.

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.

I should like now to ask: Was the witness seen a League article by the Rev. Mr. Wood, an organiser of the Bible-in-Schools League, in the *Dominion* of July 30, 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 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.

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.)

Bishop Cleary: 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 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 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,' 'God-

less,' '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 favor 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 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 at page 51,—'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 favor 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 organiser in Otago, and which is brought forward here in Wellington for the purpose of influencing the deliberations of the 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, provided that the rights of conscience of parents, teachers, and pupils were properly safeguarded.' . . . 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 a legal fiction) before school hours, really and actually within school hours, for united 'undenominational' religious instruction of all consenting sects; 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 in part: 'As regards the implied permission to teach about God and His law outside the hours devoted to the system, that provision serves only to emphasise 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 neighbors or themselves. It compels the earnest Christian teacher to check his best thoughts and muzzle his tongue and play a part. Bishop Nelligan, 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