been allowed to pass without a word from you—the proud engineer of the whole business—by way of apology, withdrawal, qualification, or explanation to the man you had wronged, or to the public you had misled. The people of Wellington are amazed that a leader in a great religious movement should thus show himself blind to what has hitherto been regarded in this country as one of the fundamental obligations of honorable controversy. You have come to us from Australia as the advocate of a special system of religious instruction. As to the merits of that system public opinion in this country is much divided. But there is, I think, something like unanimity among us that some of the controversial methods which you have brought with you might, with advantage, have been left on the 'other side of the water.' It is significant to note that the objectionable methods which Mr. Atkinson denounces are precisely the methods of which Bishop Cleary, the Rev. J. H. Mackenzie, and Mr. John Caughley have had to make such frequent and bitter complaint.

About the same time that Mr. Atkinson was uttering his strenuous protest against the methods of the League organiser as applied to his own case Mr. Caughley was drawing attention in the Wellington papers to a fresh series of misstatements and misrepresentations perpetrated by Canon Garland in connection with the attitude taken by the teachers. As our readers will remember, the N.Z. Educational Institute, representing nearly 3000 teachers, at the annual conference held at New Plymouth by an overwhelming majority declared against the League's proposals. Addressing a meeting of the Women's Bible-in-Schools League at St. John's Schoolroom, Wellington, the day after his denunciation of Mr. Atkinson, Canon Garland remarked: 'In regard to the opposition of the teaching profession it was evident that there were dissentients amongst them. It was quite true that a resolution against the Bible-in-Schools League had been passed at the conference of teachers held at New Plymouth, but, at this conference, a pamphlet-the work of Bishop Cleary and Professor Mackenzie-opposing the Bible-inschools movement, had been placed before each delegate. There was no one to supply delegates with the Bible-in-schools' side of the case. What was the value of an opinion expressed in such circumstances?' Mr. Caughley, who was president of the Institute at the time the conference was held, has not the slightest difficulty in demolishing Canon Garland's assertions; and his clear, concise, and comprehensive refutation of the bundle of misstatements perpetrated by the League representative is given in full in another column. It is well deserving of the attention of our readers.

Dr. Gibb takes a Hand

Amongst those who commented on the utterance falsely attributed to Mr. Atkinson was the Rev. Dr. Gibb, who delivered a characteristic broadside, and one which may quite possibly get him into trouble. Amongst other things, he said: 'We are guilty, too, of 'political cant.' It is indeed hard to tell exactly what our censor means by this, but it is at least an insinuation that we are in a political sense insincere. or, in still plainer terms, hypocrites. Think of it! Mr. A. R. Atkinson, being the self-constituted judge, the ministers and people of the Anglican Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Methodist Church, and the Salvation Army are a shoddy set of knaves, destitute of honesty of purpose and purity of intention. poverty-stricken cause that requires the use of slander. Curses, they say, come home to roost. In the long run the insults which are being hurled at us by the Atkinsons and Clearys of New Zealand will injure not us but them, and the side for which they stand. This they will presently find to their cost.'

In the course of one of his letters to the press denying having uttered the statements attributed to him, Mr. Atkinson thus refers to Dr. Gibb's ebullition: 'It is quite unnecessary for me to deal in detail

with argument and denunciation which I have already proved to be based upon a misconception, and I value my dignity too much to be tempted into retaliation. With Dr. Cibb's personal attentions to myself I am constrained from dealing by the further eason that I have laid the matter before my solicitor, with a view to having it tested in a court of law.

The Grey by Election

Our contemporary, the Otago Daily Times, whose editorial utterances are usually characterised by carefulness and accuracy, was betrayed into a strange lapse from its customary high standard in this respect in a leading article which it devoted on Monday of last week to the subject of the Grey by-election. The Daily Times, as everybody knows, is a strong Government paper; and in its espousal of Mr. Michel's cause, following the lead of a Hokitika correspondent to whose communication we gave publicity in these columns, it suggested that the Tablet had been a little less than just to that gentleman in that it had imputed some degree of personal responsibility on his part for the deplorable tactics that had been employed. In support of its contention our contemporary quoted professedly from the Tablet the sentence, 'It will take him all he knows to live down the bad blood and ill impression left by this most unpleasant and embittered contest'-which sentence was a mere tag to a paragraph which made it perfectly clear that it was Mr. Michel's supporters who had employed the tactics reprobated, the 'bad blood' referred to being obviously the bad blood between Catholic and Protestant—and also the further sentence, 'The taint attaching to him in this election is morally certain to follow him into other contests.' [The italics are ours.] The following reply, addressed to the Editor of the Daily Times, appeared in Wednesday's issue of the paper, and sufficiently explains itself.

'Sir,—I am quite content to leave the utterances of the Tablet on this subject to speak for themselves provided that those who discuss them do not tear sentences from their context, and provided also that the would-be critics do not, as you have done, flagrantly misquote the Tablet. I had said that the Tablet's censures in connection with the by-election were meant for a section of Mr. Michel's supporters, and for Mr. Michel only so far as he failed (up to the time of the first ballot) promptly to repudiate and dissociate himself from the tactics employed. Not content to let the matter go at that, you insist on suggesting that the Tablet did nevertheless impute to Mr. Michel some degree of personal complicity in, or personal responsibility for, the discreditable tactics made use of, and you prove your contention by interpolating into an alleged quotation from the *Tablet* words which were never written by me and which have never appeared in the *Tablet*. You quote the *Tablet* as saying: The taint attaching to him in this election is morally certain to follow him into other contests.' The words in this sentence which suggest direct personal culpability or responsibility are the words 'attaching to him;' and these words were never written by me and do not occur in the Tablet article from which you profess to quote. They are an interpolation, for which you are solely responsible. Let me give the sentence as it appears in the Tablet of July 'Moreover the taint attaching to this election is morally certain to follow him into future (not, as you say, 'other') contests." Your interpolation, giving a directly personal turn to a sentence from which a personal reference had been carefully excluded, was, of course, inadvertent; but what is to be said or thought of the accuracy of a writer who cannot even quote correctly words that are under his very eyes?

'And there is something more to be said. The remaining clause of the very sentence you quote makes it clear as noonday that no direct personal reflection on Mr. Michel was intended. Let me quote the sentence in full: "Moreover, the taint attaching to this election is morally certain to follow him into future contests, and the mistake made by his Grey supporters is likely to cost him dear." That puts the matter with