

tinctly Protestant. I confess if these arguments were brought forward in favour of their claims, I do not see how you could refuse their demand. And I think they will put forward some such claims.

96. Would you say that the introduction of this book into the schools will break up our national system of education?—Yes.

97. *Mr. Willis.*] The time necessarily occupied in teaching this book will take up time now devoted to other purposes?—That would not be my way of looking at it. If the question were put to me, as to the relative importance of teaching the Bible and other subjects, I would say that the Bible must take pre-eminence, providing always that it be properly interpreted.

98. Then, you say it would not serve any purpose, and it would occupy a lot of time?—No, it would not serve the purpose of religious instruction.

99. *Mr. Collins.*] At the conclusion of the various lessons there is a list of words to be explained: I want to ask you whether it is possible to explain such words as “nativity,” “inspiration,” “revelation,” “atonement,” or “redemption,” without introducing dogmatic instruction?—I would say that these words should not be put in charge of the ordinary teacher to interpret. Fancy a public teacher explaining the “atonement,” “revelation,” or “inspiration.” The greatest theologians we have have not succeeded in doing that yet. That is one among many other reasons why I do not believe in having this book introduced into the schools. It is easy enough for a man who accepts a dogmatical creed; but the majority of intelligent men will not accept it in that dogmatical form. That only confirms my opinion, that this book, as a means of giving religious instruction, ought not to be introduced into our public schools.

Right Rev. the BISHOP of WELLINGTON (*Dr. Wallis*) examined.

100. *The Chairman.* Is the Committee to understand that you appear on behalf of the Anglican Church of the Diocese of Wellington, or as representing the whole of the Anglican Church of New Zealand?—I have not been deputed to represent either: I came here because I was invited. I shall be pleased to tell the Committee anything I know; but I have been here for so short a period that you must take my remarks *cum grano*.

101. Will you be good enough to give the Committee your views on the question of the introduction of the Bible, or the Irish National Scripture Lesson-books into the public schools of the colony. Many members of religious bodies are in favour of having the Bible read in the schools; others, for reasons that appear to them important, are in favour of this Scripture lesson-book being read as a text-book; would you be good enough to give us the views of the members of your Church in the Diocese of Wellington?—I have taken this work in hand because I had a mandate to do so from our General Synod. The Synod accepted the Irish National Scripture Lesson-book in preference to the Bible because there appeared to be some difficulty as to the conditions under which the Bible could be taught in the schools, and because other religious bodies were in favour of religious instruction being given to the children from some manual. I should perhaps say why the Synod itself was in favour of this text-book in preference to the whole Bible: it was mainly because teachers without training would find the Bible a difficult book to teach. The Scripture lesson-book contains a number of questions and answers which it was hoped would be useful to them, and it was thought well that we should all have the means of knowing what teaching was being given in the public schools.

102. Is there any further statement you wish to make to the Committee?—I think not, unless it is desired; I have already sent in a paper which contains my views more in detail.

*The Chairman:* The members of the Committee will ask you questions, which will give you the opportunity of elucidating your views more at length.

103. *Mr. Willis.*] Do you think it satisfactory that the reading of this book, as now proposed, will be available only for scholars of the Fourth and above the Fourth Standard? Do you mean that it would give complete satisfaction, or that it would give such satisfaction that nothing more will be asked for?—I can only say that I have talked with the clergy about it, and I have heard the views upon it of many members of the Church; and nobody has ever said that if we get this we shall ask for something more.

104. Do you consider it would be an important thing to have the children under the Fourth Standard instructed in religion as well as those of the higher standards?—I should be very glad if it could be done, but I do not think that anything more can be done than what is at present proposed.

105. Do you think this teaching will necessarily make the children more moral?—Not necessarily, any more than it would make the teachers more moral.

106. Do you think that our children are less moral than those of New South Wales?—I have not sufficient knowledge to enable me to form an opinion. I have been so short a time in this country that I know but little of New Zealand; I know nothing of New South Wales.

107. If it would not make the children more moral, what advantage is there in making it compulsory in the public schools?—It would not make the children more moral, any more than church-going makes those who attend the services more moral, but it would help them to become moral.

108. Do you think that the children of Roman Catholics, where religion is so strong a part of their education, are better in that respect than the children of our schools?—That is a question which a new comer can hardly answer; but I think they are likely to be more moral.

109. You mean that the children are likely to be more moral?—Yes.

110. You say those children would be likely to be more moral?—Yes, I think so; but whether they are or not I cannot possibly tell.

111. With regard to the teacher, do you not think it would militate against the position of the teacher—say a Catholic teacher—if he were compelled to read this book, and it was suspected that he was not reading it in all sincerity?—He ought not to be compelled to read it; I would have nothing to do with compelling such a teacher against his conscience.