

seeks to prove them by His Lordship's words. He does not interpolate the words "the Nelson system" into the Bishop's mouth?—He declares that I myself made the statement in regard to the Nelson system, and then gives a statement which purports to be my statement in regard to the Nelson system, but in which the Nelson system is not even hinted at. That is a true case of interpolation. There are various ways of interpolating a statement: one is at the head or introduction of a quotation, another in the body, and another at the close of the quotation; and there is not one whit of difference in moral wickedness between the three. I wish to point out one thing more which makes this a more apparently deliberate and a more apparently reprehensible action. It is in the same pamphlet of mine from which he quoted, p. 167. Here is what I say: "In all cases in which the teachers decline to impart biblical instruction, &c. (as above), arrangements could no doubt be made for the same by volunteer or paid helpers at far less cost than Catholics would be willing to pay for the religious education of their children." Here you have my assertion of the right of entry, not alone before formal school hours or after formal school hours but during formal school hours, and he makes it appear that I am against the right of entry and scorn the right of entry even before formal school hours. Now, there is one further remark I have to make. This is the only one point of misrepresentation which I have brought up in connection with the League's propaganda, and it is a flagrant case; but it is nothing compared with the points I wish to bring out when I get Canon Garland under cross-examination. I have said in my statement, "We have already had ample premonition of this in the following constant and lamentable features of the League campaign: its vehement denunciations of honourable and God-loving men and women who have dared to differ with it; its persistent misrepresentation of the beliefs, aims, words, and acts of opponents; its bitter and unwarranted personal attacks; and its never-ending appeal to those deplorable feelings of sectarian animosity which have made New South Wales a warning example to the whole of Australasia. These are strong statements. I am prepared to prove them in detail, and I invite thereon the freest cross-examination by those who are most interested in testing the truth or otherwise of my assertions." When I get Canon Garland under cross-examination you and your Committee will get a vastly better insight into the methods—the lamentable methods—by which this League campaign is being carried on by Canon Garland, and then the Committee will be in a position to see who has been "lacking in straightforwardness" in their propaganda.

23. *Professor Hunter.*] You say you are prepared to attempt to decide this question by means of a conference. Am I right in thinking that representatives of those who uphold the present system would be invited to attend any such conference?—I have said in my principal evidence, Mr. Chairman, that we are prepared to attend a conference with only one proviso—namely, the recognition of the proper equal rights of all before the law—that is to say, that all interests should be represented. I have stated here in my principal evidence, furthermore, that, although we ourselves are entirely opposed to any other system for our children, we recognize the position of other faiths who believe in the system being entirely secular, and who rely upon the Church and the home doing the work of religious instruction. That is in the early part of my evidence. I have always taken it for granted that all conflicting interests would be represented in our proposed round-table conference, including those who represent the State Schools Defence League, and so long as the principle of proper equality of rights of Catholics and other people is recognized we Catholics would joyfully meet in conference and assent even to a temporary or partial solution of the question if it did not affect the religious rights or consciences of others. Yet we are represented by Canon Garland as being an anti-Bible party, an atheistic party, and so on. We Catholics are the only real Bible-in-schools party, and we are prepared to help the so-called Bible-in-schools party to get the Bible into the schools on conditions that will be fair to all users and supporters of the schools.

*Canon Garland:* I am anxious to ask a question which will allow me to draw attention to the fact that there is nothing in the article by the Rev. Robert Wood referring to the evidence of this Committee.

*Mr. McCallum:* I say there is. Read the statement. It is a deliberate attempt to influence this Committee.

*Canon Garland:* Here is the only statement referring to the Committee: "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, Father Roche, &c., at the present time." The extracts are not from evidence before this Committee at all, but are extracts from documents published outside this Committee and prior to its sitting.

*Witness:* May I point this out in answer to what the Canon says: The four points mentioned in this League document, on which we are accused of lack of straightforwardness, are points on which I have given evidence before this Committee. Moreover, this evidence is traversed by referring back to alleged previous statements of mine on these very same subjects. Yet, again, the purpose of doing this is openly declared—namely, to influence the deliberations of this Committee, and to show that in the evidence which I have given before the Committee, representing not alone myself but the other Bishops and the Catholic body in New Zealand, both they and I have been guilty of double-mindedness and lack of straightforwardness. That is where this document, accepted now as a League document, touches the deliberations of this Committee on a matter which has been brought before the Committee—on evidence which I have laid before the Committee in my principal statement.