

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 13 AUGUST 1875

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Friday, 13 August, 1875.

Trans-shipment of Cattle.—Western Railway Bill.—State Education Bill.

TRANS-SHIPMENT OF CATTLE.

MR. PALMER asked the honorable the Colonial Secretary, without notice, whether he had received the information promised by the honorable member for Brisbane, the other night, with reference to cattle which were said to have been re-shipped in Sydney and sent here? He asked the question, because he had seen the Chief Inspector of Stock, about half an hour ago, and he said he had received no information on the subject, and he was confident nothing of the sort had ever occurred.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have only to state I saw the honorable member for Brisbane, last night, and he informed me he would be able to furnish me with the information to-day; I have not yet received it. After a short pause the honorable gentleman continued:—The honorable member has furnished me with the information now; I will forward it at once to the Chief Inspector of Stock to report upon.

WESTERN RAILWAY BILL.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS moved—

That the Western Railway Bill be returned to the Legislative Council, with the following Message:—

“MR. PRESIDENT,

“The Legislative Assembly having had under consideration the Legislative Council’s amendments made to the Bill intituled, ‘*A Bill to authorise the making of a Railway from Dalby to Roma and to provide funds for the construction of the same by the sale of Crown Lands*,’—

“Disagree to the amendment in page 2, clause 5, after line 35, which proposes to insert new sub-section 1.

“Because, the effect of that amendment would be to deprive the majority of the people of Queensland of the right of bidding for the purchase of Crown lands not at present alienated, or liable to be claimed under Pre-emptive Right; and would also, by removing from public competition a large area of the best lands provided for sale under this Act, greatly diminish the revenue expected from the sale of lands within the Western Railway Reserve.

“And agree to the amendment, page 3, clause 9, sub-section 9, line 43, which proposes to omit the word ‘two,’ and insert the word ‘three.’”

Question put and passed.

STATE EDUCATION BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved—

That the Speaker do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill.

Mr. MACROSSAN said, before the honorable the Speaker left the chair, he should like to ask the honorable gentleman in charge of this Bill, if he thought it right or desirable to go on with the consideration of a measure of such great importance, when there were not one-half the members of the House present? True, the honorable gentleman might say notice had been given for a long time, but still, he (Mr. Macrossan) thought, no matter how long that notice had been given, it would be only doing what was fair and just, even to the measure itself, that it should be considered as thoroughly as possible, and in as large a House as possible. It need not be thought that he was going to obstruct the passage of the Bill, because, although he should certainly say a good deal upon the different clauses of it, he should not adopt that course. He thought the Ministry themselves, if they did not wish to have the Bill obstructed, would do well to take some of the other business that was upon the paper. There were nineteen notices on the paper, any one of which might be proceeded with to-day, and every one of which was of less importance than this measure. He should urge upon the honorable the Colonial Secretary, as well as the honorable the Attorney-General, to take this into consideration, and go on with some other measure. There were not twenty members in the House.

Mr. PALMER said he was about to ask the same question the honorable member for the Kennedy had asked—whether the Government really thought Friday was a proper day, and whether it was proper in a House of that sort, with not one-half the members in it, to go on with business of so much importance? It looked very much as if they wished to shelve the Bill—very much like it. He thought it was not at all a proper day, but that Tuesday would be a much better day to proceed with a Bill of such importance; and if the Government had any intention whatever of carrying it, they would at once postpone it until that day, because it would not be allowed to go far in committee to-day. Although he was in favor of the principles of the Bill, as he had declared over and over again, he would not allow it to go through in a thin House—he would take good care it did not go through. It would be much better to go on with some other business. It was always difficult to form a quorum on Friday, and he warned private members the other night not to give up Thursday, and they now saw what the effect would have been. The Government, with all their powers at their back, found great difficulty in getting a quorum; and he did believe a House of that sort was not one in which they should

go on with business of such great importance. He was certain of it; and he recommended the Ministry to postpone it, and name Tuesday for proceeding with it. As he said on the second reading of the Bill, as a matter of conscience he should vote for it; but he should, at the same time, be very much ashamed of it in consequence of the way in which it was carried. He did not believe a Bill of this importance should be carried by a Ministry the head of which had broken his pledges to his constituents, and by supporters who had also broken their pledges, and he should be thoroughly ashamed of the way in which it was carried. He thought it would be far better to let the Bill go over this session, and stand over until members had met their constituents again, and had answered for their changes of opinion. The Bill was introduced by a Government the Premier of which had given a positive pledge not only that he would not support such a Bill, but that he would, in fact, support a wider system of denominational education than the system at present in force.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he should certainly feel ashamed of himself if he submitted to be dictated to by the honorable member for Port Curtis, or any party, in the course of action which the Government proposed taking with regard to this Bill, or any other Bill; and when that honorable member told the House he would be ashamed to deal with the Bill when the Premier of the Government had broken his pledge, he thought that honorable member ought to be the last in the House to come forward and accuse any member of the Government of having broken pledges. He (the Colonial Secretary) had never broken a solemn pledge made to the Legislature of the country.

Mr. PALMER: *Nor I.*

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He had never told the House that he should refuse to enter into a contract with regard to the Torres Straits mail route, unless Brisbane were made the terminal station, when, at that moment, the contract was signed and executed. He could enumerate some other cases, but he should not do so. He thought the honorable member should be the last member in the House to throw such a thing up at him. With regard to the assertion that the Government intended to shelve the Bill, he thought the House could not have stronger evidence of what was the desire of honorable members opposite. What appearance had they made in the House to-day? They had determined not to make a House, if possible; and he (the Colonial Secretary) believed they would never have a larger number of members in the House during the remainder of the session than they had now. He thought it would be a most suicidal act on the part of the House to consent to prolong this measure, for which the people of the country were now anxiously waiting.

Mr. PALMER: As a matter of personal explanation, I deny I ever pledged myself with regard to the terminus of the Torres Straits mail route as stated by the Colonial Secretary. I said, in the course of the debate in the House, that I should endeavor to have the terminus here, and the instructions sent to the Agent-General will show that every endeavor was made.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said, it appeared that, so long as this remained an abstract question, the honorable member for Port Curtis was quite in favor of it, but, so soon as there was any chance of it becoming a practical question, to be carried out, he told them he would obstruct the passing of the measure. The honorable member said he would not allow it to be gone on with in a thin House; and he (the Colonial Treasurer) would ask, whose fault was it that there was a thin House? With the exception of the members for Ipswich, who would be down before they had got very far through the Bill, he believed the usual supporters of the Government were there. The number on that side of the House was quite as large as was usual at the commencement of business, and it was certainly not the fault of the Government, or their supporters, that there was a thin House. He gave notice, on moving the adjournment on Wednesday night, that this Bill would be proceeded with on Friday, so that the House was not at all taken by surprise. And what would be said if the Government adopted the suggestion of the honorable member for Kennedy, and postponed the Bill, and went on with the Loan Estimate? Why, it would be said they had committed a direct breach of faith—that they had told the House they should go on with the Education Bill; that they had not done so, and that the members on that side of the House did not care a dump about the question, and preferred other business being taken instead. They would hear of nothing else but breaches of faith from one side and the other, and he thought with some degree of reason. The Government had done everything they could to get on with the measure, and with the business of the country; and surely the honorable member for Port Curtis, when he agreed that Government business should take precedence on Fridays, did not suppose that the Government should postpone everything, because the honorable member for Kennedy and himself objected to going on with business in a thin House; because the same argument might be used with regard to any measure. He was sure they would object to the Land Bill, and he was also sure they would object to any Bill of a financial character. It was at great inconvenience that some honorable members had attended, and it was most unreasonable that because honorable members opposite did not choose to attend, nothing should be done. It was known they were not out of town. There were half-a-dozen he could name—

Mr. MACROSSAN called attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: He was given to understand that there were several honorable members of the other side of the House in the refreshment room; and there was no reason why, if the honorable member for Port Curtis brought pressure to bear on them, there should not be, instead of a thin House, a pretty large House. No argument had been advanced why the Government should not go on with the business that had been set down, and of which two days' notice had been given. As for the desire on the part of the Government to shelve the Bill, he thought, if they compared the conduct of the Government with the conduct of the honorable member for Port Curtis, they could form their conclusions as to who were desirous of shelving the Bill, and who were desirous that it should become the law of the land.

The question was put and passed, and the House went into committee accordingly.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that the preamble be postponed.

Mr. WALSH said he had been in the hope that the Government, seeing a thin House, would consent to the suggestion made by the honorable member for Kennedy, and not persist in going on with such an important measure. It was too important a measure, he maintained, to discuss in detail when there were so few members in the House; and the Government themselves ought to protect their own measure by refusing to discuss it except in a full House. He should prefer to see a call of the House to discuss this, the most vital question which had come before them for years, rather than that it should be pushed on, as seemed to be the desire of some honorable members, in a thin House. True, as the honorable the Colonial Treasurer had said, an announcement had been made that it would be proceeded with that day; but no announcement would keep members in the House on Friday. There were some honorable members absent who had strong convictions on the question, and one told him last night that his private business absolutely required his attendance at home; and he (Mr. Walsh) said the Government should be the last to endeavor to press on the measure under such circumstances. They were strong, and they ought also to be considerate, and not bring it on on a day proverbial in all Parliamentary history for doing business in a slovenly and slipshod manner. Friday had been proverbial for discussing matters of no great importance, which members cared very little about. He did not think there would be a quorum, and he, for one, was scarcely able to discuss the question as he should wish. The incoming and outgoing mail had occupied the attention of honorable members, and they had not been able to apply themselves to the Bill as they would desire; and

there were other matters which had prevented himself and other members from devoting that attention to it which its importance demanded. He should feel it his duty to oppose the Bill, especially when there were so few members present; and he hoped the Government would make the day for the discussion a real field day, when there would be a full attendance, and it would be fully discussed, and they could have a fair trial of strength, and decide whether it was to become the law of the land or not. The moment he saw a good majority in favor of the Bill he would yield; and he asked the Government to wait and try the strength of the committee when there was a full attendance of members.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said, although there was rather a small number of members in the House, if the members in another part of the building—important members of the Opposition—were brought in, there would be as large an attendance as on any other day of the week. He did not think it reasonable to ask the Government not to go on with the Bill because honorable members were in another part of the building. It was near the end of the session, and therefore very desirable that they should get on with the Bill.

Mr. McILWRAITH said the only members he had found in the refreshment room were Mr. Low and Mr. Morehead, and he was not aware they were important members of the Opposition.

Mr. MACROSSAN thought the argument of the honorable the Minister for Works, about it being near the end of the session, fell very harmlessly;—because, whose fault was it that the Bill had been delayed until the end of the session? It was not the fault of any member opposed to the Bill, but of the Government themselves. There was not a member more opposed to it than himself, but he had done nothing to prevent it from passing until now. The fact was that the beginning of the session was frittered away with small Brisbane Bills, and it was several weeks before the second reading of this Bill was moved. He said, if the Government were sincere with the measure, they would have begun it on almost the first day of the session. And if they believed, as they said, that the country was in favor of it, with the charges hanging over the supporters of the Government, and the honorable gentleman at the head of the Government, they would go to the country on the measure, but they dare not do so, and they knew it. That was the reason why they tried to push it through at the end of the session, and in a thin House.

Mr. PECHEY wished that the opponents of the Bill would speak out plainly and straightforwardly, and not indulge in innuendoes and insinuations about broken pledges. If any member had broken his pledges to his constituents, why did they not name him, so as

to give him an opportunity of answering 'the charge?'

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PECHEY: He thought honorable members—

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PECHEY: He thought honorable members who wished to oppose the Bill should do so in a fair and straightforward manner. Let them argue the Bill upon its merits, and if any of them had given pledges they were not prepared to carry out, he supposed the best thing they could do was to go back to those to whom they gave those pledges, and consult them as to whether they were justified in voting in the way they intended to do—

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PECHEY: He thought such charges, if they had any foundation whatever, should be made in a straightforward manner, so as to enable honorable members to whom they referred to controvert them if they were able to do so.

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PECHEY thought it did not add to the dignity of the House to hear shouts of laughter proceeding from outside the gangway. He really thought—

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. PECHEY: He was about to remark that it did not add to the dignity of the House that it should be thrown in the teeth of the Government that they were not anxious to proceed with the business whilst they saw the Ministerial benches full, and the benches at the back of them also, full of their supporters. Whilst they were trying to go on with business, they were twitted with not being anxious to do so, whilst at the same time shouts of laughter, which one might think came from a herd of Yahoos, were issuing from below the gangway; and he understood that something like physical force had been used to prevent a member from entering the Chamber. He thought if they were to proceed with that sort of thing, the sooner that House dissolved, or the sooner they resorted to bowie knives and revolvers, the better.

Question put and passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 1 be postponed. He said it was a formal clause, and the blank would be filled up afterwards.

Mr. WALSH again urged that the Bill should not be proceeded with in a thin House. He did not like to make himself conspicuous in opposing the progress of the measure, nor

should he do so if there were any thing like a fair attendance of honorable members; but when he knew that the country was poorly represented, and when he knew that a large number of members had pledged themselves to their constituents—

MR. PECHEY: Name, name.

MR. WALSH: He believed the honorable member was one. He had information to that effect, and from the information he possessed, he did not think the honorable member would deny it.

MR. PECHEY: I flatly deny it.

MR. WALSH: He was bound to take the honorable member's denial. He could only say he was informed by one of the most respectable persons—

MR. PECHEY: Perhaps the honorable member would give the name of his authority.

MR. WALSH: He did not think there was any necessity for it. He was very glad to hear the honorable member deny it, because he had placed himself in a proper position; but there were other honorable members who would not deny it. He had the written pledges of some honorable members in his possession now, that they would oppose this Bill, and support the present equitable system of education.

HONORABLE MEMBERS on the Ministerial benches: Name, name.

MR. WALSH: He should not have referred to the honorable member for Aubigny had he not so prominently, and, he thought, rather anxiously, demanded it; and it was a fact, that there were members who were returned solely on the pledges they had given to their constituents on this question: they had not gone to their constituents, and if the Bill were carried, it would be by their votes it would be carried; and he said, therefore, the country was not represented. When he saw members who had given pledges breaking those pledges—

HONORABLE MEMBERS on the Government benches: Name, name.

MR. WALSH: He believed the honorable the Colonial Treasurer did inferentially give a pledge. He believed, when competing with Mr. Newton the election for East Moreton, he inferentially gave a pledge to support the present system. He did not think the honorable gentleman would deny it. He knew he tried to out-Herod Herod on that occasion. When Mr. Newton went to a certain extent, "Ah," he (the Colonial Treasurer) said, "Hadt you better believe a man who never said he would go on the other side?" He (Mr. Walsh) was sure the honorable member for Bandanba would not call "name." They were not representing the people of the colony on this question. Did the honorable member for Brisbane represent his constituents?

MR. STEWART: Yes.

MR. WALSH: He denied it. Did the honorable member for Bandanba represent his?

MR. FRASER: Yes.

MR. WALSH: He was certain that honorable member would never have been returned, if he had dared to say he was an advocate of this Bill. He did not think the honorable member for Aubigny would have dared to say so; he was sure the honorable member for Enoggera would not; he knew the honorable member for Wide Bay would not, and he knew the honorable member for Maryborough would not. In fact there had been treachery—trickery, as far as the country was concerned.

MR. DOUGLAS: Does the honorable member impute that to me?

HONORABLE MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. WALSH: He did not; but for the honor of the country—for the honor of Parliament—he would exhort the Government to postpone the consideration of the Bill until there was a fuller meeting of Parliament, or until the people had an opportunity of expressing an opinion on the subject. There could be no more momentous question, and the people were not represented—they were misrepresented; and the Government were going to take advantage of a thin House to press the measure through against the wishes of the colony at large.

MR. MOREHEAD said the honorable member for Brisbane got in by a majority of four votes. He did not represent Brisbane at all; he simply represented a majority of four votes.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the honorable the Speaker had accused him of breaking a pledge he had given to his constituents. He was not quite sure whether the honorable gentleman was in jest or in earnest; if he spoke in jest, it ill became the position he occupied in that House; and, if he spoke in earnest, he told a deliberate lie—

MR. MOREHEAD rose to order. For a gentleman occupying the position of leader of that House—for, in the absence of the honorable the Colonial Secretary, he was the leader—to make use of such language, was a disgrace to the Assembly. It was a disgrace to the House that such words should escape the lips of the honorable member, and he called the attention of the Chairman to the words made use of by the honorable the Colonial Treasurer. He moved that the words be taken down.

MR. DOUGLAS thought the words ought to be taken down, whether they were applied to the honorable member as Speaker of the House, or as the honorable member for Warrego.

MR. MCILWRAITH—amid great confusion—said no business would be done until the words were taken down.

The CHAIRMAN: What are the words?

HONORABLE MEMBERS: "Deliberate lie."

MR. MACROSSAN said the words were applied to the honorable gentleman as an officer of that House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—amid continued cries of "Order! order!" and great confu-

sion—was understood to say that since the words were used, a speech had been made, and it was a well-known rule of Parliament that, after a speech had been made, the words could not be taken down.

MR. IVORY: The Attorney-General is stating that which is not true.

MR. WALSH said he extremely regretted the strong language which he had made use of. What he had intended to say was, that the honorable gentleman had in effect said to the people, "It would be much better to trust me on the question of national education than a man who first started on one tack, and altered it to gain a few votes." He (Mr. Walsh) remembered the case well, and the honorable the Colonial Treasurer must remember that Mr. Newton—

MR. DOUGLAS understood the words were to be taken down, or had they been taken down?

MR. WALSH: He believed the words had been taken down, and he was, therefore, in order.

MR. DOUGLAS thought, if the words were taken down, the House was bound to deal with them.

MR. J. SCOTT thought there could be no doubt whatever on the point. The Standing Orders provided:—

"92. When any member shall object to words used in debate, and shall desire them to be taken down, Mr. Speaker will direct them to be taken down by the Clerk accordingly.

"93. In a committee of the whole House, the Chairman will direct words objected to to be taken down, in order that the same may be reported to the House.

"94. Every such objection shall be taken at the time when such words are used, and not after any other member has spoken."

MR. WALSH: He was going to give an explanation of this unfortunate affair.

MR. DOUGLAS: They had nothing to do with any explanation. They should deal with the words. It was an infraction of the proper order of the House.

The CHAIRMAN said the following words had been taken down by the Clerk:—"The honorable the Colonial Treasurer had made use of the words 'a deliberate lie,' in reply to a speech of the honorable member for Warrego."

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Those were not the words at all. The words were:—"If the honorable gentleman spoke in jest, his speech ill became the position he occupied: if he spoke in earnest, he uttered a deliberate lie." He thought, if the words were to be taken down, they should all be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN said the Clerk was not a shorthand writer, and it was impossible to take them down as they were uttered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY was understood to contend that the whole of the words should be taken down.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS said they could not understand the meaning of

the words by themselves—without the context.

MR. IVORY: Most people understand the meaning of the word "liar," except yourself.

MR. PECHER thought the whole sentence should be taken down. They should not take down a single word. They must have the connection in which the words were used.

MR. IVORY did not think there was any necessity for connection with "deliberate lie," or "deliberate liar." It was simply the same thing. It was worse, in fact. The honorable member said if the honorable the Speaker spoke in jest, he was telling a falsehood, and if he spoke in earnest, he told a deliberate lie—admitting that he might have been speaking in earnest, and yet he told a deliberate lie, thereby making the accusation all the greater.

MR. AMHURST did not suppose for a moment the honorable gentleman intended to use the expression. Why did he not withdraw it?

MR. DOUGLAS said he must confess he did not catch all the honorable gentleman said, but he did catch the words "deliberate lie." It was given with very considerable emphasis, and in a manner likely to be unpleasant. Such an expression, even as a hypothetical conjunction, did not contribute to the good order of their proceedings, and he thought the sooner they settled the matter the better. Under any circumstances the words "deliberate lie" should not be applied to anything.

MR. McILWRAITH did not think there was any necessity to take down the whole of the words. He thought the context seemed to make it all the stronger. The honorable the Colonial Treasurer stated that if the honorable member for Warrego spoke in jest, he was doing something unbecoming his position as an officer of the House, and if he spoke in earnest, he told a deliberate lie. And that was not the first time that honorable member had been as near as possible calling gentlemen liars. Perhaps, if this were allowed, there would be more than one gentleman on the Treasury benches to whom the same expression would be applied; and there would be very little business done this session or perhaps next, but there would be more fighting and quarrelling both inside and outside of the House.

MR. PALMER said, he thought, before this the leader of the House, the honorable the Colonial Secretary, would have taken action in the matter. If they were to have such language used as had been applied by the honorable the Colonial Treasurer to the honorable member for Warrego, that evening, they should soon come to a pretty pass. On one occasion already, this session, telegrams had been sent to the neighboring colonies stating that somewhat similar conduct had taken place, and the gentleman who sent them had told him (Mr. Palmer) that they were true—that the word "liar" had been used. He (Mr. Palmer) must say that, during the ten years

he had been in the House, he had never heard such gross language used as had been used by the honorable the Colonial Treasurer, and he did it in bad temper; he meant it, and laid particular emphasis on it. He had had ample opportunity of retracting it, but he had not done so; and he (Mr. Palmer) certainly supposed the Premier, the leader of the House, was the proper party to take action respecting it, and to move that the honorable gentleman be instructed to retract the words and apologise for them. But he had not seen fit to do so. He (Mr. Palmer) hoped he did not think that was the style of language which would conduce to the proper conduct of business in that House, because it certainly would not. If the word had been used to some gentlemen he saw sitting around him, the result would be that the speaker would have the heaviest book in the place thrown at his head, and that would have been a very nice method of conducting business! He thought if a gentleman in the position of the Colonial Treasurer applied the words "deliberate lie" to a member of the House, other honorable members would be justified in using stronger language, and they would then degenerate into a fighting club, and the strongest party would win. Why, they would be going down to that House with revolvers next. He certainly thought it was the most disgraceful thing that had ever occurred in that Assembly; and he was sorry indeed that such discredit should have been brought, not only on that House, but on the colony. The words should have been retracted at once; and it was the duty of the honorable member at the head of the Government to have taken action at once. He should now move—

That the words, as taken down, be reported to the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY would like to know what the words were; he had not heard them read.

Mr. PALMER: The words have been taken down.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: When they had been read, it would be time to move that they be reported to the House. The honorable member for Port Curtis seemed very anxious to drag him into the matter; but he could safely say that there was no member of that House who had at all times more strenuously avoided giving offence than he had done. That, he thought, might always be done, even when acting in self defence, without affecting the sense of the arguments which might be chosen to be advanced. At the same time, as had been stated by the honorable member for Maryborough, the words which had been used were unparliamentary; and even if the language was not intended to have any application to the honorable member for the Warrego, the fact remaining that they had been used, he thought it would be better for his honorable colleague

to act in accordance with Parliamentary usage, and withdraw the expression made use of.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he should like to know from the honorable member for Warrego if that honorable member had spoken in earnest. He thought he was entitled to ask for that information.

Mr. J. SCOTT thought that whether the honorable member had spoken in earnest or not had very little to do with the question; the words objected to were decidedly unparliamentary; they were, "a deliberate lie." Those words had come straight and clear from the honorable Colonial Treasurer; that which had gone before the use of the words or had followed since, had no bearing whatever on the question before the committee, which was the use of the words, "a deliberate lie." Such words were a disgrace to any Legislative Assembly; and he very much regretted that they should have been used in the Assembly of Queensland, more especially so by a Minister of the Crown. He thought that it was one of the greatest blots that could rest upon the name of the colony.

Mr. McILWRAITH thought that, as suggested by the honorable Colonial Secretary, the words which had been taken down should be read, as, at present, no honorable member appeared to know what had been taken down.

The CHAIRMAN said that the words had not been wholly taken down; it was utterly impossible that the Clerk, who was not a shorthand-writer, could have taken them down. The only words he had heard used were those which had been mentioned by the honorable member for the Mitchell, and they were "a deliberate lie." Of the words preceding or following those, he had no knowledge. The words "a deliberate lie" had been taken down. He might say that, in his opinion, they had been used hypothetically.

HONORABLE MEMBERS: Oh! oh!

Mr. THOMPSON said that as the Chairman had informed them that the words had been taken down, his duty was simply to put the question that they be reported to the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY thought the honorable member would find that he was in the wrong; if the words were reported at all, they must be reported as having been used concerning some honorable member, and it had been for that reason that he had suggested that the words should be taken down and read. If the words had not been taken down it was not competent for any honorable member to address the committee; and as honorable members had addressed the committee, he did not see how the words could now be taken down.

Mr. IVORY thought it was quite clear to honorable members what was the context in connection with the words used; they had been used in reply to some remarks made by the honorable member for the Warrego, and were "a deliberate lie." That was patent

to the committee, and it was not, therefore, necessary that the context should be taken down.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, that with all due deference to the opinions expressed by the honorable Chairman, he did not think that the words "a deliberate lie" had been used in a hypothetical sense at all by the honorable Colonial Treasurer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had no objection to withdraw any words which he had made use of that were offensive to the committee. He admitted that he had made use of an unparliamentary expression, but at the same time he must say that the honorable member for the Warrego was the last person who should have uttered the words he had made use of; for, unless he had been strangely misinformed, it was that honorable member who had taken Mr. Newton—the gentleman who had opposed him (the Colonial Treasurer) at the last general election—to Bishop Quinn, and had arranged the change of views of that gentleman. The honorable member was well aware of all that had taken place at the time.

Mr. IVORY rose to a point of order. The honorable Colonial Treasurer was going into matters not connected with the question before the committee.

The COLONIAL TREASURER would ask the Chairman to keep the honorable member in order.

The CHAIRMAN: What was the point of order?

Mr. IVORY: The point of order was that the honorable Colonial Treasurer was not speaking to the matter before the committee; he was diverging into a totally foreign—

Mr. PALMER thought the point of order should be, that the honorable Colonial Treasurer's conduct being under discussion, that honorable member should leave the House; the honorable member was certainly not in order in addressing the chair.

Mr. J. SCOTT thought the honorable Colonial Treasurer was entitled to make an explanation; but having done that, it was his duty to withdraw from the House.

The COLONIAL TREASURER: As he had before stated, he admitted that he had made use of an unparliamentary expression, and he was then about to explain as an excuse for having done so, the peculiar circumstances connected with what had been stated by the honorable member for the Warrego, and which he thought it was only due to himself that honorable member should have acknowledged. However, he had no desire to take up the time of the committee; he admitted that the expression he had used was unparliamentary, and he now begged to withdraw it, and to apologise to the committee.

[The Honorable Colonial Treasurer here withdrew.]

Mr. WALSH said the honorable Colonial Treasurer was wrong, as he had not used any influence with the Roman Catholic Bishop of

Brisbane. He did not think that reverend gentleman was in the colony at the time—at any rate he was not in Brisbane to his knowledge; had he been, he (Mr. Walsh) would certainly have gone to see him on the subject, but he was not. He was very glad that the honorable member had withdrawn the expression he had made use of. He had himself, he admitted, been rather strong in the language he had used when he had put the question, and the honorable member had replied; but he well remembered that when that honorable member was addressing his constituents, he had called upon them previous to his election to believe in him who had given no pledge on the subject of education, rather than in his opponent, who had changed his opinions since first soliciting their votes. He was quite sure that the honorable gentleman would admit that that was the opinion circulated at the time; and when the honorable gentleman had challenged him to say that he had given a pledge, he had called that to mind, and considered that he was quite justified in reminding the honorable gentleman of it. He trusted it would be a lesson to the honorable member, and to honorable members generally, that in the heat of debate they should not forget the respect they owed to that House. He was particularly sorry that such an unpleasant circumstance should have taken place, and more especially that he should have been in any way connected with it.

Mr. DOUGLAS moved—

That the explanation and apology offered by the honorable the Colonial Treasurer, be accepted by the committee.

Mr. PALMER said they were getting quite out of order; the question was that the words be reported to the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS had made the suggestion, as, the honorable Colonial Treasurer having made the *amenae*, he thought the matter need not go any further. He did not wish to prolong the debate, and that appeared to him to be the best course to adopt.

Mr. PALMER said he had no objection to accept the explanation and apology of the honorable Colonial Treasurer; but what he did object to was, hanging one motion on to another. He had no objection to withdraw his motion.

Mr. DOUGLAS said that as the motion of the honorable member for Port Curtis had not been put from the chair, he thought the best plan, and the shortest, would be to adopt his suggestion.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thought that, as the matter had been settled, they had better go on with the Bill.

Mr. PALMER: The Chairman had not put any question—in fact, he did not seem to take any notice of what had been moved. As he (Mr. Palmer) said before, he was willing to withdraw his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The question was put—That the explanation and apology of the honorable Colonial Treasurer be accepted, and agreed to.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL rose for the purpose of replying to some of the remarks of the honorable member for the Warrego. That honorable gentleman had appealed to the Government to know whether it was their intention to proceed with the Bill that night, as there was such a thin attendance of honorable members; and, in reply to that, he begged to say that it was their intention to go on with the Bill, and that they were thoroughly in earnest in so doing. He thought the proceedings of that evening would show who were in earnest and who were not. Reference had been made, over and over again, to its being a thin House; but he had gone over the names of honorable members, and found that there were only seven who were likely to be absent the whole evening; so that, so far from there being a small attendance, he thought there had not been a larger one during the session. He trusted, therefore, that that reason, which had been urged as an excuse for not going on with the Bill, would be withdrawn. He had only one thing more to say—namely, that the honorable member for the Burnett had made use of language towards himself which was quite as offensive, if not more so, than the language which had been used by his honorable colleague, the Colonial Treasurer. He had not, however, taken notice of it at the time.

An HONORABLE MEMBER: What was it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The honorable member said, "The Attorney-General says that which is not true."

Mr. PALMER thought that was not like charging an honorable member with telling a deliberate lie. He often said that an honorable member was saying that which was not true.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The honorable member for the Burnett used the words in a most offensive manner.

Mr. IVORY said, if he was to be called to order every time he said that an honorable member was saying that which was not true, he should be called to order very frequently—in fact, in dealing with the present Government, he had very often to do so. If the honorable Attorney-General was so thin-skinned, he was sorry for him; but he thought the honorable member had, during the present session, frequently accused himself of saying that which was not quite true. He admitted that he had a certain impulsiveness of manner, but he should not be blamed for that. Impulsiveness of manner certainly should not be construed into that unparliamentary language which, he was sorry to say, was sometimes made use of by gentlemen on the Treasury benches.

Mr. WALSH trusted that the Government would not proceed with the measure any further that night. The honorable member at the head of the Government must see that the

committee was not in a proper humor to deal with what was, in reality, the most important Bill of the session. He would ask that honorable member, if the committee was in the humor in which they could properly discuss the question of education? Why, they wanted instruction themselves.

Mr. PALMER: On the nature of truth.

Mr. WALSH: He was quite sure the Government would not find that any great amount of business would be done on Friday afternoons, for many honorable members would not attend on those afternoons; and when he had heard the notice of motion given by the honorable Colonial Treasurer, he had felt quite sure, from his long Parliamentary experience, that it was a mistake. He would suggest that the Government should not go on any further with the Bill, and that it would be better to spend the remainder of the sitting in some lighter work than discussing a measure dealing with the education of the children of the colony.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY would remind the honorable member that he had actually consulted him as to whether it would suit his convenience to go on with the Bill that afternoon, and the honorable member had consented to it.

Mr. IVORY said it was well known that he was an ardent supporter of the Bill—that he did not deny; but there was one thing certain, that the small number of honorable members present, and the temper the committee was in, did not justify the Government in going on with such an important measure that afternoon. It was a most important question—in his opinion, one of the most important—and no Government should attempt to force it on when there was not a full attendance. He would ask, whether, if the honorable members on his side withdrew, the Government would dare to go on with the Bill. He was as ardent a supporter of the Education Bill as any; but he objected to proceeding with it when so many honorable members were absent, and he thought it was bad policy of the Government to press it forward in the way they were doing.

Mr. MOREHEAD would also point out that the committee was not in a humor to go on with the Bill, as they had had an angry discussion; and if there was any measure which required calm deliberation, it was that dealing with the education of the colony. He did not think they were likely to do any good by going on with the Bill that afternoon, and he thought the Government would do well to postpone it, and take some other measure on their list.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he remembered that an honorable member had referred to a book he held in his hand, namely, "Plato on the Republic." Speaking of dialectics, which was to form part of the system of higher education, Plato was asked:—

"Everything then, relating to arithmetic and geometry, and all the previous instruction which

they should receive before they learn dialectics, ought to be set before them while they are children, and on such a plan of teaching that they may learn without compulsion—why so? ‘Because,’ said I, ‘a free man ought to acquire no learning under slavery: for the labors of the body, when endured through compulsion, do not at all deteriorate the body, but as for the soul it can endure no compulsory discipline.’ ‘True,’ said he. ‘Do not then,’ said I, ‘my best of friends, force boys to their learning, but train them up by amusements, that you may be better able to discern the direction of each one’s genius.’ ‘What you say,’ replied he, ‘is reasonable.’ ‘Do not you remember our stating then,’ said I, ‘that the boys should even be carried to war as spectators on horseback, and be brought as near as possible with safety, and allowed, like young hounds, to taste the blood?’ ‘I remember,’ said he. ‘Whoever, then,’ said I, ‘shall appear most forward in all these labors, studies, and dangers such as these, are to be selected to a certain number.’ ‘At what age?’ said he. ‘When they have finished their necessary exercises,’ said I; ‘for this period of life, even should it last two or three years, cannot accomplish anything else, for fatigue and sleep are hostile to learning; and this, too, is none of the least of their traits, what each will prove himself in his exercises.’ ‘Certainly,’ said he. ‘And after this period,’ said I, ‘such as have formerly been selected of the age of twenty, are to receive greater honors than others; and those studies which in their youth they have pursued promiscuously must be brought before them in one view, that they may see the connection of the whole with each other, and with the nature of real being. This, indeed, is the only kind of instruction that will abide permanently in those in whom it is engendered. And this,’ said I, ‘is the best criterion for distinguishing talents naturally fitted for dialectics from those which are not so.’”

Now, they had had their worst tempers drawn out that night, and he would, therefore, recommend what he had just read to the consideration of honorable members, and to the youthful honorable Attorney-General;—they were all cutting their teeth, but that honorable member especially.

Question.—That clause 1 of the Bill be postponed.

Mr. WALSH said he did not want to see the clause postponed at all, but he wanted to see the whole Bill postponed, and with that view, although sorry to do so, he should have to move that the Chairman leave the chair. He had come quite unprepared that evening to discuss the Bill, as he had not thought for one moment that the Government would force it on. Again, he did not feel quite well enough to discuss it, yet, if compelled to do so, he would do what he considered his duty to the country, and state the objections he had to the Bill. He would ask, first of all, whether there had been any necessity for such a measure?—had the country shown in any way that it required it? By what means had the Government brought it forward? He did not think that a single petition had been presented to the House or the Government on the subject, or that a single public

meeting had been held to express an opinion on the subject—nothing had taken place to show that the country was not satisfied with the present Act, and for the life of him he could not understand why the Government should have thought it necessary to bring in a Bill dealing with the education of the children of the colony, who were, he believed, being as well educated, as a rule, as any in the world. The present Act, he considered, so far from generating bitter feeling, had always worked as smoothly and well as any system could work, and he objected to their disturbing the present excellent school arrangements of the colony.

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed,—

Mr. WALSH proceeded: He wished to show that he could not understand where the necessity was for bringing in the present Bill at all, at any rate during the present session—or where the necessity was for, as he had said, disturbing the excellent school arrangements that now existed. They found that, under the present system, the children of the different creeds, the parents belonging to the different creeds, and the clergy of the various denominations, had all been agreeing amongst themselves, and had enjoyed the present school system as it stood; and yet it was proposed, at the instigation of a few angry spirits—a few industrious angry spirits—to introduce a system which would set all creeds quarrelling for all time to come—

Mr. PECHAY rose to order. He thought the honorable member should explain to whom he referred when he said a “few angry spirits.”

The CHAIRMAN said the honorable member was perfectly in order.

Mr. WALSH: They were about to introduce a system of education which was the very reverse of the one in existence, and which had worked so happily in the colony; they were about to introduce a system which would have the effect of causing one-third of the population to war against the other two-thirds, and which, instead of causing the clergy to encourage their flocks to educate their children together, and to live happily together, would be the means of introducing a bitter religious feeling—

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed,

Mr. WALSH proceeded: It was on that ground particularly that he deprecated the introduction of the present hostile system, a system that would dismember the community, and alienate people of different religious creeds more than ever.

Mr. McILWRAITH again called attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum was formed.

Mr. WALSH said he was perfectly sure from what he saw of the disposition of the committee that there was no chance of going on with the Bill. In consequence of the fre-

quent interruptions, he was unable to make a connected speech. He had a few remarks which he was anxious to make, and he would again put it to the honorable the Premier whether it would not be better to postpone the further consideration of the matter until the following Tuesday, or Wednesday, when the committee would be in a better humor to go on with it. It was now as much as the Government could do to keep a quorum present, and in a short time, he believed there would not be one. It was a perfect farce to endeavor to push on that momentous Bill at a time when the Government could hardly make a quorum.

After a pause,—

Mr. WALSH continued: If the honorable the Premier would not listen to his appeal, it was his duty to go on with his remarks; but he should do so under protest, and he must say that he was very sorry indeed that the Government persisted in their present course. He had pointed out that the system of education now in existence had worked smoothly, and had had the effect of softening down the acerbities between creeds; and that now, at the instigation of about a dozen dissatisfied persons in the colony, they were going to introduce throughout the length and breadth of the land, a law that would create dissension and bitterness. He ventured to say that if the Bill passed, in ten years after the passing of it, so hostile would be the feeling between Protestants and Roman Catholics, that not even in Ireland could it be exceeded. He was not blind to what was going on even at the present time; for, when he was in Victoria, a few months ago, he had noticed the effect of the education system in force there—a system which had been introduced for the purpose of disheartening the Roman Catholics; and what, he would ask, had been the result? Why, he had found that they had thousands more children in the Roman Catholic schools than they had ever had; and the same would be the result here, if the Bill became law. As a Protestant, he protested against its being passed: it would raise up angry feelings; it would awaken them unnecessarily, as there was no occasion for the Bill at all. If the children of the colony were at present neglected, the case would be different, but they were not—they were better cared for than in any other part of the world. But no, the present was a fancy Bill, got up at the instigation of a few opponents of the Roman Catholic religion, merely to cause dissension, and it had been foisted upon the Government in a way which was not at all creditable to the honorable gentleman who was the Premier of the colony. He contended that there was no necessity for the Bill; and because he felt that to be so, he expressed himself strongly on the subject, as he always should do and had done. He would ask the honorable Premier, if he knew of anything that necessitated a change? He would ask that honorable gentle-

man, if he did not know that thousands of children who now enjoyed the benefit of a common school education would be estranged from those schools? Did he not know that if the Bill passed and became the law of the land, those children would be taken away from the public schools where they were now being well educated, and would be sent to schools where the most narrow-minded priestly dogmas would be taught. If he was a Roman Catholic he should regard the Bill as being directly aimed against them; and, although no one had less interest in common with Roman Catholics than he had, he contended that the Bill was intended as a persecution against them. Instead, however, of doing good to the Protestant cause, it would do immense injury to it—it would weaken it. Now, they had heard a great deal about free, secular, and compulsory education, and he did not hesitate to say that he was opposed to all three. He looked upon free education as decidedly injurious to the people of any country; and he regarded compulsory education as being repulsive, inimical, and unsuited to democratic institutions. It had been proved to be unsuited to any democratic country—even to America, which was the country of democratic institutions, and was never enforced in that country. He looked upon State education as an interference between parent and child; it was an interference demoralizing alike to both parent and child. The State, he contended, had no more right to step in between parent and child as regarded the education of the latter, than it had to feed, clothe, or in any way undertake the management of it. Why should he, for instance, be relieved of his duties as a parent by the State? Why should he cringe and beg the country to educate his children? Why on earth should he go and absolve himself of his duties as a parent, and allow the State to possess itself of them, more especially in a colony like Queensland, where every parent could afford to educate his children? One of the great objects of the promoters of the Bill seemed to be, that whilst they allowed people to neglect to educate their own children, they wanted them to have a share in educating the children of others. He had stated that he was opposed to free, secular, and compulsory education, and he would go on to say why—he was not speaking his own thoughts only, but also those of others. He held in his hand a book containing one of the most masterly opinions of the subject; it was an article in the *Quarterly Review*, of April, of the present year. He might say, that the writer was in favor of some sort of national system of education, but he clearly showed what were its demerits when not properly carried out. National education was necessarily defective, for they all knew that whatever the Government took in hand was generally worse done than it would be by private individuals; and he contended that when all the children were compelled to

go to the Government schools, they would be drifting into a system the management of which could not be better described than by the words the "Government stroke." The article from which he was about to quote was on "National Education in the United States," as represented by the reports of Boards or Commissions in the various States. He might mention that in the United States there was not one general system of national education, but each State had its own system of education, and there was a Commissioner of Education to examine into, report upon, and fix upon the education of the people. It was the reports of that Commission for the years 1868-1873, to which the writer of the article referred, and to which he wished to direct the attention of honorable members. The reviewer stated that it was a fallacy to suppose that the children in the United States were better educated than those in England; they were worse educated, and he (Mr. Walsh) drew attention to that, because it was the fashion with many honorable members to point to the United States as an example to this colony, and to say that the children were better educated in that country; the article before him showed that they were worse educated than the children in England. The first remark he would quote was—

"A striking illustration of the actual state of things in the United States as respects school terms and school attendance has been afforded by the legislation of New York State during the past year. The first legislative attempt in the State of New York to carry out compulsory education was passed into law on the 11th of last May. The provisions of the Act are remarkable and, to an English reader, very instructive and suggestive. They may be commended to the particular attention of Mr. John Morley and others who have set up the United States as an example to England in the matter of public elementary education."

The following was what the writer said in respect to the secular system:—

"It will be gathered from what has now been seen respecting Boston, that private schools are still in use in the States, especially for the children of the more refined and highly educated classes. This is the case, to some extent, in large cities in all parts of the States; and such schools are naturally found in the largest proportion where the cities are largest, and where the organisation of society is the oldest and the highest. They abound in such cities as Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. Not seldom, again, high denominational schools attract scholars from the best families. The Methodist Episcopal Church, being the largest church in the States, has many such schools or, as they are commonly called, colleges. The Protestant Episcopalians, also, in proportion to their numbers, have many such. The Presbyterians, the Baptists, and the Congregationalists, have their share. Female colleges especially are often denominational. It need hardly be said that among the Roman Catholics denominational schools and colleges of every grade are very numerous. Indeed, the Catholic primary school organisation prevades almost every part of the Union—every

part where Roman Catholics are found in any numbers. The Roman Catholics are strongly supported by many of the Episcopalians in demanding that a denominational system of rate-aided schools should be established throughout the Union, as a lawful alternative where the common school does not meet the demands of all classes. In some places denominational primary schools, which are nearly always Roman Catholic, constitute a powerful opposition to the common-school organisation. The Methodists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, and the Congregationalists, generally combine to support the common-school system, although this is not always true of the Presbyterians. Although, however, the Methodists and Presbyterians supported the common-school system, they are exceedingly energetic and liberal in providing secondary and collegiate education, organised on a denominational basis. Not only Methodist 'colleges' male and female, but Methodist 'universities' are springing up in all directions. Ordinarily, indeed, the State college or university, however liberally conducted, is set within a denominational framework, and is regulated by a faculty, for the most part, of one denominational color, and connected with a particular church."

The whole tendency, the writer went on to show, of education in America was denominational—where it was once secular, it was rapidly wearing out; and he also showed by figures how rapidly the denominational system was growing, and how rapidly the national system was falling off. For instance, he mentioned:—

"In New York City what are called the corporate schools, and, with these, 'the denominational schools,' do no inconsiderable share of the work of primary education. The Report of the Board of Public Instruction for 1872 shows that the percentage of increase in the average attendance at the common schools has steadily diminished since 1862, having been 61 per cent. increase for the period 1857 to 1862, 21 per cent. increase from 1862 to 1867 (inclusiv-), and no more than 9 per cent. from 1867 to 1872; whereas during the same intervals the average attendance at the corporate schools had increased successively 34 per cent., 47 per cent., and 36 per cent. The average number now taught in the corporate schools is 23,418—these schools being foundation schools, chiefly in the nature of charities, which provide aid in the way of food and clothing for children who are, or are alleged to be, in very needy circumstances. But, apart from the corporate schools, the Report informs us that the increase of attendance in the denominational or parochial schools—these schools in New York being chiefly Roman Catholic, Dutch Reformed, and Episcopalian, the first class being much the most numerous—has during the same period been much greater; and that the increase in the corporate and parochial or denominational schools, taken together, accounts for the comparatively small attendance at the public schools."

He wished honorable members particularly to follow him in what he was reading. It was the custom to take America as their example, and yet it was proved in the article before him that the secular system was rapidly giving way in that country to the denominational

system; that was the fact in the United States at the present moment. And, so he contended, would it be the case in Queensland; they might attempt to force upon the people a secular system, but there were a large number of persons who would look upon that as a hostile act, and would accordingly withdraw their children from the national schools, and the denominational schools would thus increase as they had done in America. Further on, the writer said:—

“In fact, from such causes as have now been intimated, the dominion of the common school system in the States, as it has hitherto existed, appears to be almost everywhere more or less threatened. The Roman Catholics insist that the existing schools are virtually Protestant schools, and demand that their children should be taught in Catholic public schools. It becomes increasingly evident that things cannot remain as they are. Either the common schools must become purely and professedly secular, or else special provision must be made for the Catholics.”

He would ask honorable members to take those words to heart:—

“In no country indeed, as yet, has it been found possible to maintain permanently a system of unsectarianly Christian common schools, against the pleas and persistence of the Roman Catholics. In Holland, their zeal and pertinacity in insisting on their claims, led, eighteen years ago, to the conversion of the former unsectarian system of Protestant common schools into a secular system. That experiment remains, at present, at best a doubtful success. In Canada, the price paid for the maintenance of common schools, on an unsectarian Christian basis—for the rest of the population, is separate and special provision for the Roman Catholic. In Germany, in France, and in Ireland, alike, the experiment of combined literary, and moral, and separate religious instruction, has been thoroughly tried, and in all it has proved alike, a failure.”

And so it would be in this colony. They talked of allowing ministers or priests to enter their schools for an hour or two a-day; but they knew it would be a farce. Children who had been drilled in secular education all day, would not put up with instruction from the priest after that secular instruction was over; so that, whilst pretending that religious instruction would be given, it would be virtually shut out from the children. He would conclude with one or two more short remarks by the same writer. He said:—

“The range of education in the States, age for age, is decidedly lower in the graded public schools than in good English schools.”

Again:—

“There is nothing assuredly in the results of American free school education to encourage us in this country to adopt so costly an experiment. Neither as to efficiency, nor attendance, does it promise for us any improvement: and as respects compulsion, we have seen how absolutely mythical is the idea, that the United States have mastered, or even attempted to grapple with, that problem. Boston may have its truant officers; New York city a compulsory law, which from the first has

been absolutely a dead letter; Rhode Island and Connecticut may be in the infancy of an attempt to carry out a degree and extent of compulsion which would be futile and ridiculous in this country.

“Meantime we cannot fail to connect the principle of free education with that weakening of parental influence,”—

that was what he wished particularly to warn the committee of—

“and that perilous depreciation, not to say contempt, of family responsibilities and duties which are at this moment the most painful and portentous symptoms in connection with the fast and ambitious social life of the States. This is a subject on which we dare not enlarge; but it cannot but be felt that for children to be educated, not under any direction or responsibility of the parent, but solely at the charge and under the direction of the State, and for parents to shrink from family responsibilities, are two facts which well agree. Other points may also be noted. The youth whom the State has educated *in loco parentis* has scarcely left school before he becomes, in most parts of the Union, an independent citizen and voter, from whom an original and individual opinion on civil and political questions is due; and so, under his father's roof he becomes an independent political power. All these matters go together, and all tend to add intensity to the social evils, over which the wise and good in the United States lament.”

That was the effect of State education in the United States, which they had from that writer; it was a weakening of the parental influence—

Mr. MACROSSAN called attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum was formed.

Mr. WALSH: He had endeavored to show, that afternoon, as far as he could, that there was no necessity for the Bill. It would not educate the children any better than they were now being educated, but it would have the direful effect of setting politician against politician, creed against creed, and man against man; and although he believed that many persons were of opinion that it would do away with religious animosity and dissension, yet he could not shut his eyes to the fact that it would not have that effect. In Victoria, it had been a failure, as religious rancor was never so strong as it was at present in that colony. Again, teaching their children was a matter of conscience with parents, but with that the Bill would interfere. Honorable members might ask how it would interfere, but to that he would say, that by the proposed State system, they would be driving away a number of children from the common schools, for a large proportion of people would not send their children to schools in which they did not believe, and would be obliged to send their children out of the colony. The Bill would also have the effect of keeping out masters who kept private schools, and thus persons who, like himself, could not here give their children the education which their consciences told them they

should give, would have to send them to be educated elsewhere. If the Bill became law, one-third of the population would have to contribute towards the support of a system which their consciences told them was not correct, and under which they could not allow their children to be educated. The consequence would be, that there would be a separate system of education, which he did not hesitate to say would be pernicious in its effects, and which would not get a footing in the colony if the Bill was not passed. He would ask the honorable Premier to say whether the Bill, if carried, would not necessitate the establishment of a number of sectarian schools, for they knew that there were a number of persons who said that they would not send their children to the State schools, and who said, "If you will not allow us to have the present system, with which we are quite satisfied, we will have our own schools." He would ask the honorable gentleman whether he would like to sprinkle over the length and breadth of the colony schools of a sectarian character, in which most pernicious doctrines were taught? He had mentioned, some time ago, the instance of the sectarian school at Maryborough. If the School Board had done its duty in that case, and had given aid to that school, which had been started by Roman Catholics, the case would have been different; but they would not give any aid—they were a bigoted Board. If they had granted that aid, there would have been something like 150 children educated in it under the supervision of the Government, and taught from books authorised by the Government; but a bigoted Board refused the aid;—and what had been the consequence? Why, that the last time he went to Maryborough, he found every child withdrawn from the National School, and a most flourishing Roman Catholic school established instead. He believed there would be ten such schools to every one now, if the Bill was passed into law; and he should certainly be pleased if he found that any section of his fellow-colonists refused to be coerced, as it was intended they should be, by the Bill. The State had no right to take money from the pockets of the people, and compel them to send their children to schools, knowing, at the same time, that their children could not conscientiously receive the education at those schools. He would like to know what the Nonconformists, the Presbyterians, and other denominations, would think if the Roman Catholics were stronger, and compelled the Government to establish monastic schools, and obliged people to send their children to them. Why, they would say it was tyrannical. The Nonconformists called their schools secular, but he denied that they were, as there was as much, or more, bigotry in them than was to be found on the other side. He would again remind honorable members that if they made America their guide, they would find the secular system

to be as great a failure in this colony as it was there. The Americans, as a free people, condemned the compulsory system, and said it was an interference with democratic institutions, as the State had no right to say to what schools children should be sent. He would warn honorable members that if they pushed the Bill to its extremity they would sow the seeds of the most violent religious discord in the colony that they had ever witnessed in their time. He saw it plainly coming, and it was because of that that he dissented so strongly from the Bill, and was so anxious to induce the committee to pause before it rushed into an educational system which there was no necessity for, which nothing in the shape of reason or justice justified, and which he did not hesitate to say, had not been demanded by the voice of the people of the colony.

Mr. MACROSSAN thought that after the manner in which the honorable member for the Warrego had shown the failure of the secular system in the United States of America, it would not be out of place for him to call attention to the same failure of the secular system which had been established in Victoria. But before doing so, he must draw attention to the difference between the system now in force in this colony, and when the question was first taken up. At the time when it was first taken up by Mr. Lilley, it was stated that there were a large number of children not being educated, and that a certain section of the community were unduly favored. Now that had been dragging its weary length along year after year, and politicians had been trying to make the best out of it up to the present time; but he thought of all questions education was one which should be discussed apart from politics. The people who had taken up the question some years ago were to be excused to a great extent, because they imagined that by so doing they would be bringing education to thousands of children who were not being educated, and they were also of opinion that secular education had been a great success in various parts of the world. At that time Victoria had not moved in the matter at all, but it was in the same position as this colony was in when the question was first mooted; but that colony had recently preceded Queensland in the one respect of establishing a purely secular system. He would not detain the committee by dwelling upon the means by which that system became the law in Victoria, but since he had last addressed the House, he had obtained more information of the success, or rather the non-success, of the operation of that law. If honorable members would take the trouble of looking over the files of the *Melbourne Argus*, or read the telegrams which appeared in the Brisbane papers, stating that free secular education was a failure, they would pause before they plunged the colony into that which would not advance education, but would entail greatly increased

expenditure on the people. He believed that the honorable member for Maryborough, and others with that honorable member, were for making concessions which they thought they should not do, for the purpose of trying to conciliate the Roman Catholic people in the colony; but he would refer those honorable members to a telegram which had appeared not very long ago, stating that the Dean of Melbourne had pronounced the secular system a failure in Victoria. He did not know whether any argument he had made use of, or might bring forward, would be of any real service in settling the question, but at the same time he should not like to be addressing empty benches, and for that reason he should call attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. BEATTIE said, although he was thoroughly in favor of the Bill, at the same time he should be much better pleased if a measure of so much importance could be discussed when the members of the Opposition were present. He thought such a measure should not be gone into if honorable members were purposely keeping away, and that the Government might very fairly take the matter into consideration.

Mr. KINGSFORD: Perhaps the honorable member for Fortitude Valley would bring the members he referred to up from below.

Mr. BEATTIE: He was not aware there were any of them below. He was satisfied that when he came up stairs there was not a single member of the Opposition in the part of the building he was then in.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there was almost a majority of the whole House present, and some honorable members had come down at great personal inconvenience to proceed with the Bill. It had been said by honorable members who were opposed to it, that it was one of the most important Bills that could be brought before Parliament; and it would be wrong to refuse to discuss it because some who opposed it, and others who professed to support it, did not choose to take their seats in the Chamber. He had every respect for the opinions of those who opposed the Bill; but for those who had spoken of the deep interest they felt in it, and their desire to see it passed, and who absented themselves that their absence might be an excuse for not passing it, he did not feel respect. He thought they ought to go on with the measure, so that the country might know who really meant to deal with the education question and who did not. Although he quite agreed with the honorable member for Fortitude Valley, that it was extremely unsatisfactory for the Bill to be discussed under such circumstances, he thought the responsibility must rest with those who wilfully absented themselves.

Mr. PETTIGREW said, during last session certain honorable members made it their business to retire from the House, and they

had done the same to-night, and he knew the sentiments of those gentlemen perfectly well. In private, they were decidedly in favor of the Bill, but, for political reasons, or, rather, he should say, constituents' reasons, they voted against the second reading of the Bill, while, at the same time, they were particularly anxious it should pass. In fact, if they came to the real question at issue, he very much doubted that there was a single member in the whole forty-two who did not wish the Bill to pass. He had spoken to a great many, and he had not found one out of the forty-two who was not personally in favor of the Bill.

Mr. BUZACOTT said he was sorry the members with whom he had hitherto acted, should have thought it desirable to absent themselves from the House to-night. He hoped it was a mistake—that they had not intentionally remained out of the House, because, when a subject of that sort was under consideration, he thought they ought all to be there; and, although in a minority—although unable to prevent or obstruct the passing of the measure—they ought to remain in order to try if they could not improve it; and he was prepared to assist them in every way. As it was, he did not think they ought to allow the absence of honorable members on that side of the House to stop the progress of the Bill. He said honorable members on both sides ought to be prepared to consider the Bill, and if they thought any of its provisions were hurtful, they should protest against them strongly at the time; but if they were to introduce a system of this sort, that the minority should absent themselves from the House, when a measure came before it they did not approve of, they would soon find that legislation would come to a complete standstill. He would strongly stand by those with whom he had been associated, so long as they pursued what he considered to be an honorable and straightforward opposition; but he would not submit to have the proceedings of the House brought to a standstill, because honorable members chose voluntarily to absent themselves. He felt strongly on the subject. He had come down to the House more than anything else to assist in settling this question; and, after being there four months, and sitting evening after evening, it was not fair to expect that he should consent to form one of the minority who absented themselves to obstruct it. He hoped honorable members would go on with it; and if the members of the Opposition chose to stay away, he did not think those who were there prepared to pass the measure could be held responsible. They could not perhaps do with it as it ought to be done by; they should not have so complete and acceptable a measure in every respect as they otherwise should have; but it would not be their fault, but the fault of those who chose to remain absent.

Mr. MACROSSAN had no desire to become the apologist of honorable members on the other side, who chose to absent themselves

during the consideration of such an important measure; but there was one reason urged by the honorable member for Stanley, which, if correct, should, he thought, be taken into consideration. The honorable member stated that honorable members were staying away for constituents' reasons, and he (Mr. Macrossan) supposed he meant the constituencies were opposed to the Bill. He could put no other meaning on the expression. He quite sympathised with the honorable member for Rockhampton, and other honorable members who had to sacrifice so much private business to assist in legislation, and who, he knew, were extremely anxious to get home; but he thought it was scarcely an excuse that the session was nearly at an end, because the Bill ought to have been brought forward at an earlier period, and then there could have been no excuses of that kind. The honorable member for Maryborough seemed to take up the secular system as a means of conciliating the Roman Catholics, and he (Mr. Macrossan) could assure him that if he had become a secularist on that ground, it was certainly a wrong ground. Because any honorable member who knew history in the past, or contemporary history, must know that Roman Catholics would never consent to be secularised in the manner this Bill proposed, and he was certain there were thousands of Protestants in this colony who were of the same opinion as Roman Catholics. If the honorable member would look at the history of the Victorian measure and its results, he would come to a different conclusion. When that measure was introduced, there was, no doubt, a necessity for an alteration of the system then existing, but he denied that there was a necessity for the measure introduced. It was necessary to bring in the thousands of neglected children who were not receiving education, and he believed that idea was one of the strongest reasons which led to the passing of the measure now in force. When the Bill was before the Victorian Legislature, it was urged that the waifs and strays should be educated, or they would become a burden on the colony, and, as far as that was concerned, the legislation there had been a failure. The waifs and strays were still outside, and that colony had gone to enormous cost for that which it had not yet achieved. The idea of bringing Roman Catholic children into the State schools had also been a complete failure, and to show what had been the idea of many prominent gentlemen in Victoria, he would read a few extracts. But, before doing so, he would show the futility of that House, or of any other Legislature, attempting to force a system of education upon Roman Catholics which they could not conscientiously adopt. Anyone who had read the history of the countries from which they had come, England, Ireland, and Scotland, and more particularly Ireland, would know that education had been a great question there for a long period. The idea in Ireland, in the

middle of the last century, was to bring Roman Catholic children into the State schools, and they were successful, but only by abduction. They were successful, to a certain extent, in getting orphan children, and the children of the poor, who had to accept education at the expense of their consciences, and by the adoption of a most unfair and ungenerous course of procedure, which, he thought, no member of that House, with their present ideas of freedom of opinion and freedom of conscience, would think of descending to. Again, when the national system was introduced into Ireland, there was no class accepted it more heartily, and without any mental reservation than the Roman Catholics. They were quite content with the system of education introduced by Lord Stanley, which was the same as now existed in this colony, namely, to separate the religious instruction and to combine the secular. They believed it would be the means of enabling them to educate their children without any undue interference with their religion; and yet, at the present moment, denominational education prevailed in Ireland to as great an extent as in any country in the world, and under the auspices of the English Government. And it was not the Catholics who had brought that about, but the Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, and he could prove it most easily. The system had not been established more than ten or a dozen years, when the trust placed in it by the Catholics was broken in upon most rudely. The Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Murray, Dr. Whately, and other prominent individuals of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian churches, formed the National Board, in the same way as the Board was established here, and they drew up rules and regulations, and decided upon the books to be used, and the Catholics thought nothing unfair in that, and freely accepted it. But what did they find in Archbishop Whately's life by his own daughter—a man who was the head of the Established Church in Ireland—a man, who would be thought above anything unfair, or who would attempt to interfere with the consciences of those who did not belong to his church? He said:—

"The education supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. I believe, as I said the other day, that *mixed* education is gradually enlightening the *mass* of the people, and that, if we give it up, we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from the *abuses of Popery*. But I cannot venture *openly* to express this opinion. I cannot *openly* support the Education Board as an *instrument of conversion*. I have to fight its battles with one hand, and that my *best*, tied behind me."—(*Bishop Whately's Life*, by his Daughter, 1st ed., pp. 244-6.)

Would it not have been natural for people, circumstanced as the people of Ireland were, to at once withdraw themselves as far as

possible from a system of education under which proselytism could be carried on in an underhand way? The upshot of that system in Ireland had been this:—That a greater number of denominational schools had sprung up than ever there was before, and there was a greater number in the North than in any of the other provinces. At the time the present system was introduced in Victoria, a number of Protestant gentlemen held a meeting, at which there were members of different denominations, and the general conclusion came to at that meeting was, that religious education was a good thing, that the Bible was good and was unsectarian, and should be used; but for the purpose of weaning Catholics from their own schools, they should go in for secular education. Amongst those gentlemen were Dr. Symons, a Methodist gentleman, Dr. Robertson, a member of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Cairns, Dr. Macartney, the Dean of Melbourne, and others who had since changed their views on the subject entirely. They had come to the conclusion that the system was a failure in two respects—one because the Roman Catholics would never adopt it, and also because the waifs and strays of society were still uneducated. But he would appeal to the honorable member for Maryborough, and to other gentlemen who thought similarly to what he did on another point, and it was this: He believed that honorable gentleman, and those who were working with him conscientiously in the cause of education, were unthinkingly the tools of another great party behind them. They did not know it; because he was certain, if the honorable member for Maryborough, and those who acted with him, for one moment surmised such was the case, they would withdraw from it. There was a large and increasing party—not only in the colonies, but in all parts of the world—a powerful, increasing, and very aggressive party, that he might call the party of pure secularism, for the sake of secularism itself. He knew there were many secularists who were religious men, but it was not to them he alluded; he meant the secularists who were beyond the pale of religion entirely; and he said that party was using the honorable member for Maryborough and others, who, not like him, had got extreme prejudices against the Catholic Church, to protect their own, and to obtain their end, which was the abolition of all religion whatever. He had before him several authorities in proof of what he said, and he could produce many others. In a publication he received from Sydney a short time ago, there was a long article entitled, “Secularism in the present,” and he should read an extract from it:—

“I have said before, and it cannot be too often repeated in our days, that Protestantism has no rational standing ground; the right of private judgment, logically developed, kills faith and establishes free thought; the weaker Protestants must

go to Rome, and the sturdier must come to us; the real representative of Christianity is the Roman Catholic Church, which is now the Papal or Ultramontane.

This is well; we know what we have to fight against; the war is *à l'outrance*—Reason against Faith, Science against Dogma, Liberty against Despotism, Progress against Inertia, Civilization against Barbarism, Nature and Human Nature against the Unnatural and the Inhuman. We know how this strife has gone on in the past, we see how it is going on in the present—we think we can foresee how it will go on in the future.”

And who were the “us” referred to? The atheists who supported this newspaper, and who supported the *National Reformer* and other gazettes in England, and they were an increasing portion of society. He respected their opinions as citizens; they had a right to express their sentiments: but he denied their right to attempt to force their system of education upon others, and to use at the same time, as a means of doing so, men who thought in a great measure with him upon the education question. In another article, in the same paper, there was much stronger language used than that. In an article from the *National Reformer*, a paper published in London, it said:—

“It hardly requires the gift of prescience to foresee that in the times that are approaching, the world of the European race will be ranged into two, and only two camps—on the one hand, Vaticanism, or the rule of Superstition and Unreason, of Error, Delusion, Intolerance, and Violence; on the other hand, Science, or the enlightened and peaceful domain of organised Common-sense. Between these two camps there will be no *pied-à-terre*. No such temporary halting places as Protestantism and Theism can continue to be tenable. It will have to be Yes or no—no half Yes's, no half No's—Reason or Unreason. No one can doubt which of the two camps will prevail.”

Those, he believed, were the men whom the honorable member for Maryborough was unthinkingly assisting in that system which they wished to prevail all over the world. But he believed himself that what the gentleman who wrote that article said was perfectly correct—that the result of the system would be the death of Protestantism. There could not be any doubt about it. Step by step, to follow it to its logical limits, as it must be followed, Protestantism would gradually become extinct; and, as that writer said, the civilised world would be divided into two camps—those who implicitly and undoubtingly believed, and those who believed nothing at all. To prove what some of the people of Victoria thought of the system there, he would read one or two extracts. He had an extract from a newspaper called the *Kyneton Guardian*, a liberal paper, but in no way connected with Catholicism, which stated:—

“Those who hoped that the question of national education would be settled by the Act of 1872, are probably convinced by this time that

their expectations stand very little chance of being realised. Those who believed that the measure would have the effect of utterly suppressing the influence of denominationalism must admit that they were in error. The question, indeed, appears to be more remote from settlement than it was fifteen years ago, and at least in one direction an impetus has been given to denominationalism, which is likely to produce results far other than those which the advocates of the existing system of public education contemplated. It was predicted that after the first impulse of indignation had subsided, our Roman Catholic fellow colonists would be content to fall in with the rest, and make use of the State schools rather than incur the expense and undertake the responsibility of supporting separate establishments of their own. So far, however, the facts have altogether falsified the prediction. Whilst they are as vehement as ever in their protests against what they stigmatise as the gross injustice of compelling them to contribute towards the support of a system from which they are unable to derive any benefit, they are energetically working to establish schools for themselves. And although it does not suit the extreme secularists to admit the fact, as far as we are able to judge, clergy and laity appear to be in thorough accord upon this subject. We believe the number of Roman Catholic children who are attending State schools is altogether inappreciable, whilst not a day passes that we do not hear of some fresh effort being made to guard against all necessity or excuse for their doing so. In several localities the State schools are comparatively empty, and those belonging to the denomination overcrowded; and this not merely in places where the population is small and scattered. In Richmond, for example, we are told that whilst the new State school, designed for the accommodation of 500, has only a third of that number on the roll, the Roman Catholic school has an average attendance of over 300. Appeals for pecuniary aid are liberally responded to whenever and wherever they are made, and there appears not the slightest reason to believe that the Education Act of 1872 will ever be accepted by a denomination which numbers nearly a fourth of our population. In the *Lenten Pastorals*, which have recently been issued by the Archbishop of Melbourne and the Bishop of Ballarat, special attention is devoted to the question."

The experience in that colony showed that the Catholics had not come into the State schools; that whilst they had to contribute to the support of the State schools, they were working to establish schools for themselves. That was written eight months ago, and the present state of affairs was still worse than was shown by that extract. By a report which was not yet published in Victoria, but which members in that colony had been told would be published in a month, and of which some particulars had been given, they found that all the efforts of the secular system had been reduced to this:—that 5,000 children had been added to the rolls. For that purpose, the people of Victoria had established a system, which would lead, as it was leading now, to infinite bickering. It was leading

one-fourth of the population to look upon themselves as suffering from persecution, and also leading the colony into immense debt. They had expended nearly a million of money, and they asked for three-quarters of a million for this year, £300,000 for buildings, and considerably more than £400,000 for the working of the schools; and all for an increased attendance of 5,000 children. He believed the system they now had in this colony was the best in the world as far as primary education was concerned; and although the system previously in force in Victoria was inferior to it, yet, bad as that was, the increase in the State schools would have been as great as under the present system, while, at the same time, 23,000 Catholic children receiving education in denominational schools would be in the State schools. He found, in 1868, the number was 77,000, and in 1870 it had increased to 107,000, an increase of 30,000; and the increase, under the present system, had been only 5,000, notwithstanding its enormous cost. But, as far as the Roman Catholics of that colony were concerned, what had been the result? And, in showing what had been the result, he hoped honorable members would take into consideration that the same result would follow here from the establishment of the same system. Like causes would produce the same results. The result had been that, wherever the aid had been withdrawn from a school in Victoria, it had been immediately re-opened under the denominational system. In the beginning of the administration of the system, no doubt under the surprise with which the people were taken, there were some denominational schools permitted to be closed, but within six or nine months they were re-opened; and now, as the capitation money had been withdrawn, as it was gradually, the schools were re-opened under the auspices of the Church, and under the direction of the teachers of the Church, more exclusively than they were before. But, worse than that, the State had been put to enormous expense in the building of large schools, which he believed could scarcely be surpassed, in any part of the world, as far as material construction was concerned, and they were not half-filled, but some of them had even been closed for want of scholars. In one instance, one of these large schools was attended by only four scholars, and even they ultimately deserted the teacher. In the town of Kilmore, there were three or four denominational schools; and the Minister, finding this out, had a school built capable of accommodating the children of all denominations, and three months after it was built and open there were only one hundred and odd in it, and there were two hundred in the Roman Catholic school, and they were not all Roman Catholic children, some being the children of Protestant parents who believed in the system of giving religious instruction in schools. He was perfectly satisfied the same thing would

take place here if the same system were adopted, and numbers of Protestant children would be drawn to the Catholic schools, because parents would have confidence that the faith of their children would in no way be tampered with. But in addition to that, the result of the system would be, that, politically, the great body of Catholics in the colony would regard themselves as being injured—and rightly, too, if they were deprived of a fair share of the taxation they paid towards education. As honorable members knew, and as the honorable the Premier stated, he did not believe a single school would be transferred; and the House was therefore legislating with the full knowledge and conviction that Catholic children would not accept the system proposed, and that they were therefore inflicting a positive injury upon their Roman Catholic fellow-colonists. They would maintain their own schools, and have to support the schools of the State; and if they could not have schools of their own, as would probably be the case in some parts of the colony, they would have to send their children to schools their consciences did not approve of. He hoped honorable members who supported the Bill would place themselves in the same position as the minority at the present time in this country, supposing that minority did exist, and let them ask themselves what would be the result? He would read another extract, to show what had been the result in Victoria:—

“Catholics are united as they never before were united in this colony, and never were their schools so well attended. It was expected that the Godless Education Act would tempt Catholic parents to set aside the authority of the Church, and that it would destroy the faith of their children; but it has only served to evoke a strong and unconquerable Catholic spirit, the fruit of which will be a gain to the Church in Victoria for very many years to come.”

He would particularly make that appeal to the honorable member for Maryborough, for he was sure if that honorable member thought he was acting as an agent for that powerful party, he would not adopt the course he was now taking. The *Argus*, the strongest secular newspaper in Victoria, said:—

“It may be a just inference that the only sound principle of religious education is to leave the mind of the child unbiassed by the religious belief of his parents, and allow him to grow to maturity before inviting him to decide for himself among the various faiths offered for his acceptance.”

He was sure, if the honorable member took the trouble to inquire into the workings of the great party he alluded to, he would admit he had been unknowingly acting as an agent in their cause.

Mr. WALSH again appealed to the honorable the Colonial Secretary to reconsider the matter, and not press the Bill on that evening. He was sure it was not receiving that attention it ought to receive, and probably the

effect would be, that it would be thought lightly of in another place.

Mr. MILES was entirely opposed to the Bill, and recommended the Government to withdraw it altogether, especially as there were five or six members pledged to support the non-vested system, and the honorable the Premier was one of them. He contended that, under the circumstances, the only way to settle the question was to withdraw the Bill and to appeal to the country; and for these reasons he moved—

That the Chairman do now leave the chair.

Question put, and declared in the negative.

Mr. McILWRAITH said, with regard to the clause before the committee, he had been in the House since the question was put, and he had heard no reason why it should be postponed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The reason why it should be postponed was, that it contained some blanks which could not be filled up until the number of sections was ascertained.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he should vote for the motion of the honorable Attorney-General under those circumstances; but he could give a much stronger reason why it should be postponed than the fact that the number of sections might be varied, and that was, that one of what should be the principal parts of the Bill was omitted. He considered that there should be a part providing for the education of children in the bush, which subject, he considered, was more deserving of a separate part than any other provision in the Bill. It was well known that in towns there was no difficulty in persons getting education for their children, but the real difficulty was in getting children in the bush educated; yet the Bill, with the exception of one short clause, namely, that referring to itinerary teachers, utterly ignored that great want. It was true that itinerary teachers were to be appointed, but he believed they would be a failure. On looking over the evidence taken by the Commission, he found that there was no evidence whatever taken on that point, although there certainly ought to have been. It was true that there might have been some difficulty in getting such evidence; but still, when the Government had gone to such expense, he thought the Commission should have recommended some provision for having children in the bush educated. They all knew what the itinerary teachers would do; they would visit a station once a-week perhaps. But what ought to have been provided was, that boarding-schools under Government management should be established, in towns like Roma, Blackall, Springsure, and other places, so that facilities should be afforded to people living in the bush to send their children to school. It must be admitted that no more important question could come before the committee than the education of those children who lived in the bush—children

who had all the inquiring spirit of youth, and yet had no means of being educated. They were, as a rule, brought up with men who had very loose notions of the conditions on which property was held, and, altogether, they were placed under peculiar circumstances, namely, under the control of a class of men who led them on to ideas that were apt to bring them to destruction, as had been seen in the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria. It was perfectly evident that even if there were schools at Roma and other outside towns, they could only provide education for children living within three miles of them; but in the whole of the Maranoa district, there was no means of educating children. The whole extent of the Bill before them was simply to provide education for the towns, whilst the children in the bush were to be neglected altogether, and on that account, he should oppose the Bill, in which he had failed to find any clause providing for the want to which he was referring. He thought that the Government should establish a system of boarding-schools; he knew that the parents of children in his district would be perfectly willing to pay for the board of their children, and were, generally speaking, well able to do so; they did not wish to be treated as paupers, but all they wanted was to have the means provided by which their children should enjoy the same privileges of education as those who lived in towns. What he complained of was, that the Commission had quite ignored the matter altogether, and had avoided it by merely introducing into their report a clause recommending the appointment of itinerary teachers. As he had already said, they would be a failure, and the people living in the country would find, that whilst they were being heavily taxed for the education of others, their own children were entirely neglected. He could see, even at the present time, that there was a disposition to hug the towns; he knew that many people lived in the towns on the most meagre amount earned by hard labor, merely for the purpose of being able to send their children to school; men who, by going into the bush, would get double the wages. But that would not be the case if proper provision was made for the education of children in the bush—not only that, but the men would go into the bush and help by their labor to add to their own prosperity and that of the country. Anyone who was in the habit of visiting stations—cattle-stations especially—would see how the children were being brought up; they would see the desirability of having some system for the education of those children, especially when it was taken into consideration that those people had to pay their share of the general taxation. He did not wish the parents of those children to be treated as paupers—they were willing to pay, but unless the Government took up the matter, and provision was made for boarding-houses, there would be no means of educating bush children.

That was one great want in the Bill. He objected to the way in which the non-vested schools were to be put down; but he complained principally that the Bill had utterly ignored those children who ought to receive the greatest attention. He was confident that no honorable member could consistently support the Bill unless some such provision was made in it. If the Bill was passed, it would probably be a long time before another one was introduced; and what, he would ask, were the children in his district to do in the meantime? Nothing would be gained from it by the people in the country constituencies, except having to pay heavy taxes; they would say, "We have to pay a great deal of money for education in the towns, but we have no guarantee that our own children will be educated." Unless some provision was made for the children in the bush, he should oppose the Bill in the most strenuous way.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that if the honorable member who had just spoken would submit some feasible proposition, he was sure it would receive every attention both from the Government and the committee. He must confess that at present he was perfectly unaware of what the honorable member required, but the honorable member could introduce an amendment when they came to the twenty-first clause.

Mr. McILWRAITH thought that during the ten minutes or so that he had been speaking, the honorable member might have gathered a sort of notion of what he wanted; he thought honorable members generally had done so. What he wanted was, to make some addition to clause 1, that provision should be made for the education of children in the bush, and he considered that the present was the most appropriate time to bring the matter forward. What he complained of was, that the principal part of the Bill, or what would be to his constituents the principal part of it, had been omitted. If the honorable member would mention it in the clause, he should withdraw all opposition until they arrived at that part of the Bill where provision could be made to supply the want of which he complained.

Mr. WALSH thought it was extraordinary that such an important suggestion as that which had been made by the honorable member for Maranoa should not receive any attention except from the youngest member of the Government; it was strange that the honorable Colonial Secretary should have taken no notice of it. That honorable member seemed to have abandoned all his feelings of nationality, and as a Queenslander, in giving up the Bill as he had done to the youngest member of the Ministry. Last year, when the honorable the Attorney-General had, as a private member, introduced his Non-vested Schools Abolition Bill, he and the honorable Premier were daggers drawn on the question, but now they found that the honorable gentleman had abandoned the

pledges he had given to his constituents, and had utterly given himself over to his young *aide-de-camp*, the Attorney-General. That was not the position for the honorable member at the head of the Government to occupy, and he (Mr. Walsh) would be unworthy of his position as a member of that committee if he allowed such conduct to pass without notice. He found that the honorable members opposite, who were as well able to discuss the question before them as the honorable the Attorney-General, were perfectly mute. They were so, because that honorable gentleman was determined to be the great educational exponent of the colony. He was really sorry to see those honorable members so quiet. He trusted that the honorable Premier would, however, get up and tell the committee what were his grounds for believing that the system proposed by the Bill was a better one than that in existence, and which was all-sufficient for the requirements of the colony. In the electorate he represented, there was not a single school, and yet he was supposed to sit there and assent to a measure which would doubly increase the taxation of his constituents, which would aggravate ill-feeling between classes, which would cause a disruption of classes, and which would create a lasting discord, which happily the present system had tended to remove.

Mr. MOREHEAD quite agreed with every word which had fallen from the honorable member for Maranoa, and, as a member representing an outside constituency, he was of opinion, that if the Bill became law in its present shape, it would commit a gross injustice on the people in the outside districts. They were already sufficiently heavily taxed, but if the Bill became the law of the land, they would be doubly taxed, simply to educate the children living in the towns; that being so, they would have good cause for complaint. No provision had been made in the Bill for giving education in the outside districts, for the honorable Attorney-General must be aware that the twenty-first clause would not have that effect. He contended that the children in the bush required education more than the children in the towns, as they never saw any ministers of religion, but were brought up amongst cattle, sheep, and horses, and were living in the most depraved way amongst people who were as ignorant as people could be. Still, many of those persons, although so ignorant themselves, would be willing to give their children education, but by the Bill they would not have an opportunity of doing so: notwithstanding which the Government took very good care that they should be taxed for the education of others. The honorable Attorney-General had stated that the honorable member for Maranoa could introduce an amendment after the twenty-first clause, but by that time the main principles of the Bill would have been carried. They all knew what mercy a mouse might expect at the hands of a cat, and he

contended that if the main principles of the Bill were passed, there would be very little chance of getting anything out of the honorable Attorney-General afterwards. The system of itinerant teachers would be a perfect farce, but if the idea of the honorable member for Maranoa was put into shape at all by the honorable Attorney-General, and a system of boarding-houses was established in the centres of population in the outside districts, it would be a great boon, and would alleviate the wrongs under which the people in those districts thought they suffered at the present time—that of being taxed for the education of the children in the towns. The want of such a provision had been one reason for his opposing the Bill, and another was, that it would do a great wrong towards a large section of the community who had his sympathy. He should do all he could, both directly and indirectly, and in every way, to prevent the passing of the Bill, and should use every form permitted by the House to prevent its becoming law in its present shape.

Mr. DOUGLAS thought it would be a subject for regret if honorable members opposite should decide upon the course of action which had been threatened by the honorable member for the Mitchell. The Government, having passed the Bill through its second reading, were bound to go on farther, and pass it, even if the session was thereby prolonged. Nothing had been gained by the action which had been taken by the honorable gentlemen opposite that night, and seeing that, they surely might allow the Bill to go on. The honorable member for Maranoa had certainly introduced a very interesting portion of the subject, and one which could very properly be discussed when the committee came to the 20th and 21st clauses of the Bill. That suggestion might be carried out by the Government, and would, perhaps, have been provided for them had they not been afraid of the expense; there were other matters which, perhaps, had not been introduced for the same reason. He had no doubt, that if the honorable member would introduce his suggestion in some form, the honorable Attorney-General would consider it, and give some assistance. He thought that the tactics adopted by many honorable gentlemen opposite were very much to be regretted, as the Government were bound in honor not to prorogue the Parliament until they had carried the Bill through its various stages, as it was considered to be the most important question of the session; therefore, the mode of treatment adopted by honorable members was futile. Even if they were really acting for the good of the country—even if the contingency they talked of was likely to be attained—namely, a dissolution—it would be different; but the Bill had gone so far, that there could be no ground for, or prospect of, a dissolution. On that ground, the tactics of the Opposition were bad; they had discharged their consciences by op-

posing the second reading, and would appear before their constituents in a better light than in dealing with the Bill as they were now doing—which was a manner that could not satisfy them. It would be far better if they would let the Bill go on until their points of difference were reached, and take divisions on them; and, if they were thinking of a dissolution, they were bound to play the best hands they could, instead of, as they were now doing, playing into the hands of the Government.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he was glad that he could calculate upon the support of the honorable member for Maryborough in what he had brought forward—namely, making provision for the education of children in the bush; but he must correct the honorable member in one respect. The honorable gentleman seemed to think that the plan he advocated would be attended with very great expense; but he would not have advocated it if he thought that the parents of the children to whom he referred would be indebted to the country: he knew that they would be able and willing to pay. At present, although all the people were taxed, the schools were confined to the towns, and it was the duty of the Government to provide some system for extending the benefits of education to children in the bush. The system of itinerant teachers would not meet that want at all, and, therefore he had recommended a system which, he thought, would meet it; at the same time, he must be understood as objecting to anything approaching to the children being treated as paupers. With regard to the other part of the honorable member's speech, he would remind him that it had been as much as the Government could do, early in the evening, to form a quorum, which showed that there was not sufficient interest taken in the question by their own party to make a House. Then, again, he would refer to the way in which two or three very good speeches delivered on his side of the committee had been received by the Government, one honorable member of which was reading, another lying down, and another sleeping—at least, apparently so. That was not, he thought, the proper way to treat honorable members; moreover, honorable members on his side had particular reasons for opposing the progress of the Bill that evening. For himself, he did not intend to oppose it until he came to a particular clause, when his side would have to collect their forces and make a stand. He was quite willing to agree to the postponement of the clause, and to go on to the next.

Mr. WALSH pointed out that there were only two honorable members on the Treasury benches, which he thought was a matter of which the committee had a right to complain when so important a question was being discussed. He thought the honorable Premier, of all others, should not have absented himself

from the Chamber, leaving the whole management of the Bill to his young colleague, the honorable Attorney-General. There was no question which should so much demand the careful watching of the honorable Premier of the colony as the one before them; more especially as the honorable gentleman, who was the veteran politician of the colony, had been made to change his opinions on the question, in opposition to promises which he had given to other honorable members as well as himself (Mr. Walsh), that he would protect the present system. He trusted that honorable members would see the necessity of compelling the whole Government to show that their hearts were in the Bill. The only support the Bill had received, up to the present time, was from the honorable Attorney-General, who had moved the postponement of the first clause.

Mr. DOUGLAS: We have already discussed the Bill.

Mr. WALSH: He would beg the honorable member's pardon: the Bill was never really discussed on the second reading; there were assertions made which were altogether beside it, but even the honorable gentleman himself did not discuss the vital parts of it. He had no doubt the honorable gentleman discussed the Bill when he was a member of the Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS: The Commission had nothing to do with it.

Mr. WALSH was very glad they had not. The Bill had not been discussed, it was a foregone conclusion, and he contended now, that in the absence of the honorable Premier, they had no right to go on with it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: As regarded the statement of the honorable member for the Warrego that there was no interest taken in the Bill, he thought it was quite the reverse, as thirty-six members had taken their seats during the evening. It had occurred to him, on looking at "May," that it was a very uncommon thing for an honorable Speaker to take a prominent part in debates in committee. "May" said:—

"But while in the chair, the Speaker is thus restrained by usage in the exercise of his independent judgment, in a Committee of the whole House he is entitled to speak and vote like any other member. Of late years, however, he has generally abstained from the exercise of his right."

And then followed a list of instances in which the Speakers had exercised their right.

Mr. WALSH said he did not suppose that "May" had ever heard of a Speaker being elected to the chair in order to gag him. It should be remembered that he had never been a willing occupant of the chair, and if he occupied the position of Speaker, it was because he had been placed in it against his will. He would state, however, that so long

as he considered it his duty to his country or to his constituents to take part in debates in committee, he should do so, and should show that he had never given up his independence as a member of that House.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the honorable Colonial Secretary thought he had done a masterly stroke when he put the honorable member for Warrego into the chair against that honorable gentleman's wishes; but he had found that he had made a mistake; and now the honorable member's lieutenant came down and read an extract from "May" to show that it was not customary for Speakers to speak in committee; the honorable member ought to be ashamed of himself. He thought the honorable member and the honorable Colonial Treasurer should be driven in a curriole together, as they had both made a most unwarrantable attack upon the honorable member for the Warrego. The honorable Attorney-General should be ashamed of himself for ransacking "May" to find something by which he might try and traduce the character of the honorable member for the Warrego, simply because that honorable member held different views from himself on the subject of education. He thought, if the honorable gentleman in charge of the Bill would introduce some system of local taxation, so that those who benefited by the schools would pay for them, it would disarm opposition in some quarters, at all events. It was manifestly unfair that the inhabitants of the outside districts should have to pay for that from which they derived no benefit whatever. He commended this to the serious attention of the honorable gentleman, and hoped it would induce him to consent to some amendment which would relieve the people of the interior of taxation for the benefit of large centres of population.

Mr. MACROSSAN thought the honorable the Attorney-General had proved himself a very young man, and even worse than a young man. He professed to be extremely anxious to get on with the Bill, and yet he got up and quoted "May," and threw down a bone of contention, and insulted the honorable the Speaker. He (Mr. Macrossan) contended the position of the Speaker of that House was not analogous to that of any Speaker who had ever occupied the chair in the House of Commons. No Speaker had ever before been compelled to take the chair against his will; and he maintained the honorable the Speaker had a perfect right to stand on the floor of that House and defend his opinions and the interests of his constituents in committee. The Government, by a party vote, placed him in that position, because they knew he would be a sting in their sides, and they thought, by putting him in the chair, they would silence him for ever. But he was not to be silenced. He had the strength and the moral courage to defend his opinions; and he (Mr. Macrossan) hoped the House

would protect the dignity of the chair by not allowing the occupant of it to be offended by any member of the Ministry, young or old.

Mr. McILWRAITH also condemned the conduct of the honorable Attorney-General in introducing this subject when there was a prospect of being able to get on with the Bill. He argued that the honorable the Speaker was not to be gagged because he had been placed in the chair. He was placed there against his will, and he was perfectly justified in advocating the claims of the large and important constituency he represented. They had had the pleasure of hearing that honorable gentleman on several occasions, and the Government might have saved him from rising by doing for his constituents what they ought to have done before. They had neglected his constituents; they had put him in a position where he could not fully attend to the requirements of his constituents, and when he got up to advocate their claims, the honorable the Attorney-General rose and said so and so had been done by the Speaker of the House of Commons. He certainly thought, before doing that, the Government ought to have acknowledged the justice of his claims, on behalf of his constituents, when the Estimates were before the House.

Mr. MILES complained of the great waste of time there had been throughout the session, and attributed it solely to the action of the Government. In this instance, it had arisen from the action of the honorable the Attorney-General, which he thought most unjustifiable. He had one great objection to the Bill, and that was, that it provided to create a Minister of Education. He thought they had Ministers enough already, and he should never lend his assistance to saddling the country with another thousand a-year for that purpose. He maintained that when education was made free in this colony it was done so unconstitutionally, by the insertion of a paragraph in the Governor's Speech, and the honorable gentleman now at the head of the Government was a consenting party to it. And now they found this Bill was tried to be passed unconstitutionally. There were five or six members on the other side who had given a pledge to support the present system, and they had gone over and sold their constituents; and he said the passing of this Bill would not settle the question. The honorable member for Stanley had given a pledge, and so had the honorable the Premier; and the fact was, if the Bill passed, it would have been passed under false pretences. The Government had appointed a packed Commission to bring up a report for the purpose of passing this Bill, and he hoped it would not become the law of the land—at all events, until the feeling of the country was taken upon the question. If he were then in a minority, he would submit, but until then he should

not. He thought they had discussed the Bill long enough, and he now moved

That the Chairman do now leave the chair.

Mr. PETTIGREW said the honorable member for Carnarvon had accused him of breaking a pledge he had given to his constituents. He denied it *in toto*; he had never broken a pledge. If the honorable member referred to some letter he (Mr. Pettigrew) had written, let him produce the letter. He had heard about this letter-writing before, and the letter referred to had been shown round amongst certain honorable members privately, and he said again, let the honorable member produce it, and he (Mr. Pettigrew) would show who was the best man of the two. He would show who was the man of honor; he would show who was the man of principle, and the honorable member should never say another word about it unless he was prepared to produce the letter. But that was not to the point; and he really thought it was time they went on with business. It was no use delaying it, because the Bill would have to be passed. He knew the opinion of the country, and it was real civil and religious liberty they wanted, not the "brummagem" article. He thought it was a mistake to discuss the merits of the Bill. The question had been discussed over and over again, until they were perfectly tired of it, and the sooner they got to actual business the better.

Mr. WALSH said, so that they might know who were the supporters of the Bill, and the position they should occupy in regard to the question, he should read a letter signed by one of those honorable members, and he should do so in support of the statement he made in the early part of the evening—that neither the honorable the Premier, nor other honorable members who were supporting the Bill, were representing their constituents on this question, but that, in fact, they were misrepresenting them; and that they were acting in direct violation of their pledges. He said the honorable member for Stanley had given a distinct pledge, and he (Mr. Walsh) called upon the country to record the fact that this Bill was being passed, thrust, as it were, through that Assembly, in violation of pledges made by important members like the honorable the Premier of this colony, and the honorable member for Stanley.

Mr. PETTIGREW: No, no. Read it.

Mr. WALSH: He would read it. He said this was a most important matter. How could they expect their educational system to flourish when it was based upon false promises and broken pledges? He asked honorable members, who were as right-minded and better minded than he was, in that phalanx—that stony phalanx—if they considered the Bill dealing with the education of the colony should be based upon such support as that? He asked them if they could reconcile the position they occupied

with this one fact—that the Bill was to be carried by a majority, that majority having broken their pledges—written and implied pledges—to their constituents? When he saw an evil like this being inflicted upon the colony, he cared not for any position; he regarded his first and highest duty to be to the colony, and he would perform that duty. If the Bill were ever so good—if it provided for the promulgation of every desirable description of education, he should protest against it if it were founded upon fraud—if its basis were broken pledges. The honorable member for Stanley had called upon him to read this letter. He did not know the individual to whom it was addressed, but it was to Mr. John McGrath.

Mr. FOOTE rose to order. He wished to know if the honorable member was in order in reading the letter? That honorable gentleman had ruled that he could not read a letter unless it were to become a record of the House.

Mr. PETTIGREW said he should be very much pleased if the honorable gentleman was allowed to read it.

Mr. WALSH said he was not infringing any rule of the House by reading the letter. It did not animadvert upon any debate that had taken place in the House.

Mr. FOOTE said, if it were the wish of the committee, he should withdraw his objection; but it appeared to him to stand in the same position as the case he had referred to.

Mr. WALSH said he preferred that it should not be read.

Mr. PETTIGREW insisted that, in justice to himself, the letter should be read. If the honorable member would give it to him, he would read it.

After some discussion,—

Mr. WALSH said, as it appeared to be the desire of the committee that the letter should be read, he would do so:—

"Ipswich, Nov. 17th, 1873.

"Mr. John McGrath.

"DEAR SIR,—I am in receipt of your favor of this day's date, in reference to my views on the Education question in connection with my candidature for the electorate of Stanley.

"I can add nothing further than what is stated in my printed address to the electors, which has been before the country since September 12th; but if, as you state, my opponents are questioning or attempting to mislead the electors, I beg to assure you that I see no good objection to the present system of education."

He quite agreed with the honorable member; he saw no objection, and for the life of him he could not understand why they should come down and endeavor to upset that system.

AN HONORABLE MEMBER: Read it without comment.

Mr. WALSH (reading)—

"It has worked well in this part, and by some modification in the Board of Management, promises fair to continue so."

That was exactly what the opponents of the Bill said.

"And besides, I see no objection to any denomination who wish to erect a school and maintain it in an efficient state, giving the time required by the Board to purely secular education, *being allowed to give such additional instruction as the parents of the children may see fit.*

"I remain,

"Yours truly,

"JOHN PETTIGREW."

He endorsed every word of that letter. It was a credit to the honorable member. It was in accordance with the wishes of his constituents; but it was entirely antagonistic to the principles of this Bill. He would make the honorable member a present of the letter. On the faith of that letter he had been returned to that House; and he would ask, was he justified in now voting for the present Bill? He maintained that that constituency had been misled by that gentleman when he wrote that letter.

Mr. PETTIGREW said, at last the letter was out; and like a great many things they were fighting for for a long time, when it did appear, there was really very little in it. He had no hesitation in stating that his letter was simply an exposition of the Bill under which the Board of Education administered its affairs—neither more nor less. He had been accused of making and breaking a pledge—with being a pledge-breaker, and all sorts of things; but the man who gave that letter to another party had broken a far more serious and important pledge. The very man who handed over that letter—and it was handed over long before the debate took place on the Bill—what did that man say with respect to the correspondence? He said this, "No public use shall be made of them." The letter containing those words was signed by Andrew Horan. Andrew Horan stood at the altar as a priest, and he went and broke his word. And he was one of the denominational teachers, and what was bad at the root must be bad in the branch. He tried to bring him (Mr. Pettigrew) into the bull-ring about broken pledges, but he had broken his own pledge; he had done so deliberately, and without a thought upon it. Now, he had a letter, bearing the same date as that which had been read by the honorable member for Warrego, and he should read it:—

"St. Mary's, Ipswich,

"17th November, 1873.

"(1.) That the present system of education, if fairly carried out, would meet the requirements of the times.

"(2.) That four hours of secular instruction being given each day in non-vested schools, the school building and teacher shall be entirely from under the control of the Board, &c., &c.

"(3.) That successful pupils for Grammar School scholarships shall be awarded the value of the scholarship in money, and be allowed to complete their education where they please, should they object to attending a Grammar School.

"(4.) That a reasonable average attendance of, say, 40, 50, or 60 pupils shall entitle a non-vested school to State aid, independently of a vested school in the same locality.

"(5.) That ships shall sail periodically from England, Ireland, and Scotland.

"(6.) That the people shall have an opportunity of purchasing the lands of the country.

"N.B.—If you can adopt the foregoing points, I should feel obliged to you if you would write them out, and return them to me as soon as possible. No public use shall be made of them.

"ANDREW HORAN."

And here was a public use made of them. They had been hawked about, and he had heard of them ever since he had come down to the House this session. And what was there in them? His reply was dated November 18th, 1873, and was to the following effect:—

"DEAR SIR,

"In reply to your queries as contained in your memo. of yesterday's date, I beg to inform you that I have already replied to questions 1, 2, 5, and 6 in my printed address, and further elucidated them in my letter to you of yesterday's date.

"The 3rd query respecting the Grammar School scholarships is provided for by statute. See Education Act of 1860, clause 9.

"The 4th query respecting non-vested schools, I shall always deem it my duty as well as a privilege to present any memorial from any portion of my constituents, to advance their interests.

"I trust that the above explanation will satisfy you.

"J. P.

"Mr. John McGrath."

Now, what was there in all that in the shape of a pledge or promise, that he could not come to the House and do his duty? The only man who had broken a pledge was that clergyman. He (Mr. Pettigrew) had broken none; and, although the honorable gentleman who read it had cleared out since he commenced to speak, he was evidently ashamed to read a letter of that sort. Where had he (Mr. Pettigrew) given a special pledge in that? He said, in his published address to his constituents, that he was in favor of the present system of national education, as established in the colony. He believed those were the words he had used. He had always been in favor of national education, and there had been no doubt in the world about his views. He lost an election twelve years ago on the same question, and he had never had any doubt as to what was the right system for this colony. But the present system was in existence, and it was not made a question with any portion of the community except the Roman Catholic portion. And was it likely he would satisfy any party by saying that he had come to a foregone conclusion to leave things as they were? Was it to be supposed, that an honorable member was never to advance to something better, more especially when a Bill came on which positively met the require-

ments of his constituents, and the colony generally? He had no hesitation in saying, it did meet the requirements of his constituents—Catholic and Protestant; and there was no section of his constituents suffering from education, because they were united, and went hand-in-hand to get schools established. They saw the necessity for unity in country places, and they worked heartily together for the erection of schools. If the clergy had objections, it did not follow that laymen were to hold the same objections. It came home much more to a man, he did not care to what denomination he belonged, to see his children growing up in ignorance, than to the clergymen. He was very glad the letter had been read; and as for breaking any pledge, his constituents were perfectly satisfied with him; and if any gentleman felt anxious to take his place, he would give him a run at any time, for the electorate of Stanley.

MR. MACROSSAN said the honorable member for Stanley had made a very serious charge, which he thought he had not substantiated in the speech he had just made. He had accused a reverend gentleman named Andrew Horan of breaking a pledge not to make public a certain statement, but where was the proof that the pledge had been broken? The letter read by the honorable member for the Warrego was not addressed to Andrew Horan, but to some other gentleman named McGrath, and how did these things agree? Could the honorable member for Stanley give any proof that the gentleman he had accused of pledge-breaking had done so?

MR. PETTIGREW: Yes.

MR. MACROSSAN: The honorable member had not done so yet, and he thought they were bound to have some explanation of the discrepancy between the statement of the honorable member and the correspondence read by himself and the honorable member for the Warrego.

MR. PETTIGREW said he did not want to bring up parties' names in that House, but he had been forced to do so. The Rev. Mr. Horan called upon him at his own house on the evening of the 16th November, and a conversation took place. That reverend gentleman was not an elector of Stanley, and it was an understood fact that he (Mr. Pettigrew) refused to enter into correspondence upon educational matters with any person who was not an elector. Mr. McGrath was therefore suggested as the proper medium for such correspondence, and he (Mr. Pettigrew) delivered the letter to Mr. McGrath, and he delivered it into Mr. Horan's hands. He (Mr. McGrath) told him so, and he (Mr. Pettigrew) saw him leave his house to take it.

MR. BAILEY was pleased to have at last got to the bottom of a little of this priestly electioneering. It had long been the opinion of a particular body of men that there was a

deal of that sort of thing carried on, and now had burst upon them the sly and malicious way in which this business was practised. Here was a clergyman going into an electorate in which he (Mr. Bailey) believed he did not even reside, and putting pledges to a candidate for that electorate, which pledges were required to be answered; and he could not for shame demand the answer to be sent to himself, but required a third person through whom they should be answered. This was a system he was sorry to say they had known for a long time, but they had never been able to bring it to book yet, and he was very glad that this *exposé* had taken place. He was also glad that the discussion had taken place for another reason, which was that the question of education seemed to have become narrowed down to a dispute between two parties in the colony. It was simply this: A certain church declared that their existence depended upon the continuance of the present system of education, and those who formed the large majority, said they would not be taxed for the support of that system, nor for the carrying on of it. He was very pleased to find the question was so narrowed, because now they could know exactly upon what footing they stood, and they would be able to vote not only conscientiously, but straightly on this question. They had conceded in this much:—As Protestants they had conceded that their Protestant religion should not be taught in schools, so that the opposing church should have nothing to complain of. They had given way as much as they could, and now that church wished to force upon them that they should not only dispense with their teaching their religion in schools, but that they should support the teaching of their peculiar dogmas. He was also glad that the question was narrowed, for another reason, and that was, that it had been declared in the House that evening that there should be but two systems in existence—either Atheism or Roman Catholicism; that they would finally drift into one or the other. If that was to be the effect of the system of education contended for by the opponents of the Bill, he for one would stand up against it. They, as Protestants, had existed for 300 or 400 years or more, and they were prepared, as Protestants, to say, they would exist for many hundred years to come. They were not prepared to drift into Atheism, nor were they prepared to support any system of education which would drift them into Roman Catholicism.

MR. PECHY fully endorsed the opinion of the honorable member for Wide Bay. He thought the remarks made by the honorable member for Kennedy at one certain hour of the evening were calculated to divert the attention of the committee from the real question at issue, and to introduce a religious bias into the discussion; but at the same time, he thought the arguments adduced by that honorable member were the strongest

that could possibly be brought forward in favor of the Bill.

Mr. MOREHEAD called attention to the state of the committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, in regard to the remarks which had been made by the honorable member for Wide Bay, about priestly influence being brought to bear upon elections, that there were other influences used—the Orange influence, for instance. He believed that honorable member knew of cases where that influence had been very strongly brought to bear on an election not very far away from the town of Brisbane. Every honorable member must have seen, from the action taken by the honorable member for Wide Bay, that he was a strong advocate of Orange views. He considered that there was more bigotry in the way in which Orange associations brought influence to bear upon elections than in the influence said to be brought to bear by Roman Catholics, so that the remarks of the honorable member had come with very bad grace from him. He had spoken of the bigotry of the so-called liberal section of the community—the Nonconformists—and he would again say that there was no class who took such narrow views as they took; the more liberal they called themselves the more narrow-minded were they. He would appeal to any honorable member, who knew the action taken by Orange associations, to say whether he was right or wrong, and he contended that the action taken by them during elections was far greater than any taken by Roman Catholics.

Mr. PECHAY said he had listened to the remarks of the honorable member for the Mitchell with more coincidence with them than was usual, and he thought that honorable member had very nearly hit at the root of the cause with regard to the differences between different sects. It might have been his misfortune, or his good fortune, to have been brought up amongst people who held very peculiar views on religious subjects—people who believed that the Church should be altogether separated from the State; and those were the opinions he now entertained, and to which he should adhere.

Mr. BAILEY objected to the honorable member for the Mitchell talking about Orange associations, or even about Nonconformists, as he had done, that evening, as the honorable member knew nothing about either.

Mr. MOREHEAD said if the honorable member would give him leave to use a piece of information he had himself given him about the Orange influence that was used at a late election, he would enlighten the committee by repeating it. What he had pointed out was the gross impropriety of the honorable member representing to the committee that there was priestly interference on the part of Roman Catholics during the elections, when

the honorable member himself lived in a glass house.

Mr. WALSH said it was of importance that the honorable Premier should give some expression of opinion regarding the Bill before the committee, which was a most important measure, and one that would change—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY rose to a point of order. Were they to continue discussing the conduct of the leader of the Government, or to discuss the question before the committee—namely, the postponement of clause 1 of the Bill?

Mr. WALSH said it was evident that the honorable member was not attending to what was going on, or he would have known that the question was, that the Chairman leave the chair. It was a most important measure, and it was of no use for the honorable Premier to try and shelve the matter at all. It was the most important question that could be brought before Parliament, and one upon which the honorable Premier of the colony had given a distinct pledge to his constituents, upon which alone he had been returned to that House and had taken his position as Premier. Yet they found that the present moment that honorable gentleman had overthrown his constituents on the question.

Mr. PETTIGREW: No.

Mr. WALSH: They all knew the influence the honorable member for Stanley had over the honorable Premier; they knew the disastrous influence he had over the honorable member at the head of the Government, but he trusted that the destinies of the colony were in better hands than those of the honorable member for Stanley. The honorable Premier had no heart in the Bill, and he knew that his constituents had no confidence in the Bill. He would ask the honorable member again, whether he did not honestly think that the present education system was all that was required by the colony? He believed that honorable gentleman thought so, and yet he had, at the dictation of the youngest member of the Ministry, allowed the present Bill to be brought forward. He much regretted that he had to take such a position that evening, but it was due to the last member who had forced himself into the Cabinet for the purpose of passing the Bill before them. That honorable member thought that such a measure should become the law of the colony; but he did not, and his Parliamentary experience was much longer than that of the honorable member. He was not going to be put down by him, and neglect what he considered to be his sacred duty to the country, namely, to endeavor to prevent a pernicious system of education being passed at the dictation of the youngest member of the Cabinet, and against the wish of the honorable the Premier; at any rate, he was perfectly sure it would be against the opinions of the constituencies generally. Rather than he would sell his

constituents on such an important subject, he would cease to be a member of the House; nay, he would sooner leave the country. He was sorry to see the honorable member for Maryborough, who represented one of the worthiest constituencies in the colony—a constituency which had never been trifled with before—he was sorry to see that honorable member elect to sit beside honorable members who were known to be misrepresenting their constituencies on the very important subject of education.

The amendment, That the Chairman leave the chair, was put and negatived.

The question was put and passed.

On clause 2, as follows.

"In this Act the following terms shall unless the contrary appears from the context have the meanings next hereinafter assigned to them that is to say—

'The Minister' shall mean the responsible Minister of the Crown who shall be at the head of the Education Department hereby established

'The Corporation' shall mean the corporation sole hereinafter established and consisting of the Minister for the time being.

'The Board' shall mean the Board of General Education established under '*The Education Act of 1860*'

'State School' shall mean and include any school conducted in a building erected upon land vested in the corporation in fee or for any lesser estate and shall include grammar schools primary schools training schools rural schools night schools and any other schools for which special regulations may be made

'Parent' shall mean and include parent guardian and any person who is liable to maintain or has the actual custody of any child

'Standard of Education' shall mean a competent knowledge of reading writing and arithmetic to the satisfaction of an inspector of schools

'Teacher' shall include assistant-teacher pupil-teacher sewing-mistress and every person who forms part of the educational staff of any State school

'Regulations' shall mean the regulations made and promulgated by the Governor with the advice of the Executive Council under the authority of this Act."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had an amendment to propose in the clause, in order to meet an objection which had been raised on the second reading of the Bill, namely—that, by an ingenious scheme, it might be practicable to use provisional schools for other purposes than those intended. To meet the difficulty, he had prepared the following amendment, to be inserted after line 17:—

"'Provisional school' shall mean any school to be hereafter established by the Minister in which temporary provision is made for the primary instruction of children, and not being a State school."

Mr. McILWRAITH wished to know whether agreeing to the first sub-section of the clause would bind honorable members to anything contained in clause No. 3, which referred to the appointment of a Minister of Instruction.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No. It would leave the question entirely open.

Mr. WALSH must really express his surprise that the honorable Premier did not give his opinion on the clause before them.

Mr. McILWRAITH said that before he consented to the amendment of the honorable Attorney-General, he should like to know whether the definition of "State school" would bind honorable members in any way as regarded the abolition of the non-vested system when the discussion of that part of the Bill came on.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there was no intention whatever that the definition of "State school" should affect clause 15; in fact, he had endeavored to frame the measure in such a way as to avoid that. If he found afterwards that it did affect the matter, he should consider himself bound to ask to have the Bill recommitted so as to correct the definition.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he was quite satisfied, so long as he had had that expression of opinion from the honorable member, that the definition would not bind them to anything respecting the non-vested schools.

The question, That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted, was put and agreed to.

The clause, as amended, was passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that clause 3, as follows, stand part of the Bill:—

"It shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint from time to time some fit person to be Secretary for Public Instruction who shall be a responsible Minister of the Crown and shall notwithstanding any previous statute to the contrary be eligible to be elected to and to sit and vote in the Legislative Assembly in addition to the Ministers of the Crown now so eligible.

"The Secretary for Public Instruction shall in addition to the duties imposed upon him by this Act have and perform such further and other duties (if any) as may be assigned to him by the Governor.

"And there shall be payable to Her Majesty her heirs and successors out of the consolidated revenue for the salary of such Secretary for Public Instruction the annual sum of one thousand pounds."

He thought that all honorable members would agree that there must be a responsible head to the Department of Education, and that that head should be a Minister of the Crown; but two questions had been suggested—whether there should be a new Minister created, or whether one of the present Ministers should undertake the responsibility, and be assisted by a Board. As the clause had been drawn, whatever decision the committee arrived at would not affect the other parts of the Bill. He would

revert to the opinion given by the honorable member for Port Curtis at Rockhampton, when that honorable member brought forward his Bill, which he (the Attorney-General) confessed he had used to assist him in drafting the present measure. The opinion then expressed by the honorable member was that there should be a Minister of Education either in the Assembly or in the Council, and that although some people had objected, that an additional Minister would give a Government too much power, he thought a bad Minister would be better than an irresponsible Board.

Mr. McILWRAITH called attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum was formed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thought he had said enough on the subject, and he trusted the committee would agree with the clause.

Mr. DICKSON thought the clause was a very important one, and it was the first to which he had to offer any objection. He hoped honorable members would give their attention to the question of the appointment of an extra Minister, and would divest their deliberations of all the factious opposition which had been shown that evening. He might say that he was strongly opposed to the appointment of another Minister, and he thought the present Education Department would be equal to the administration of the duties of it if it was presided over by one of the responsible Ministers of the Crown. It was with a view of eliciting an expression of opinion on the subject that he would move as an amendment—

That the words "some fit person," in line 32 of the clause, be omitted, with the view of inserting the words "one of the responsible Ministers of the Crown for the time being."

He would not take up the time of the committee by arguing why he considered it was desirable that the duties should be performed by one of the present responsible Ministers; but he had no doubt that before the clause was carried in the form he suggested a considerable amount of information would be given on both sides.

Mr. WALSH wished to know if the amendment was to prevent the creation of another Minister of the Crown as Minister for Instruction?

Mr. DICKSON said he moved the amendment in consequence of his opinion being that it was undesirable to increase the present number of Ministers of the Crown. His object was to make one of the present Ministers perform the duties, so that the number of the Executive should not be increased.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said, personally he was glad the honorable member for Enoggera had brought the question forward, but he was sorry they should not have an opportunity of seeing the vote of the honorable member for Port Curtis upon it. It would be in the recollection of honorable members

that, shortly before that honorable member left office, he expressed a strong opinion, in addressing his constituents at Rockhampton, that in a House of forty-two members they should have six responsible Ministers; but during the present session he had expressed an opinion that six were quite unnecessary. It appeared that when that honorable member was in office six were a necessity, but when he was out five were sufficient; and no doubt when he was in office again six would be necessary. He thought it desirable that they should have his vote on the question.

Mr. McILWRAITH thought the honorable the Colonial Treasurer might have deferred his remarks until the honorable member for Port Curtis was in his place, and no doubt that honorable member would be quite able to answer him. He thought it said very little for the Ministry that the only justification they could show for the appointment of another Minister was that the honorable member for Port Curtis suggested such an appointment some years ago. The honorable the Attorney-General got up and quoted the speech of that honorable member at Rockhampton; and the honorable the Treasurer, perfectly ignorant of what had gone before, rose and reiterated it. If the Ministry would give their own opinions in justification of the course they had taken, it might lead a great deal more to the elucidation of the subject before them. The honorable member for Port Curtis would be perfectly able to justify himself; and whether he had been right or wrong, what had that to do with the opinions of members who were either supporting or opposing the Bill? It showed what importance the Ministry attached to the opinion of that honorable member, when the only thing they could say in defence of the clause was that he held that opinion three years ago.

Mr. MILES said this gave him a grand opportunity of moving the Chairman out of the chair, in order that the honorable member for Port Curtis might have an opportunity of expressing his opinion on this question. He thought they ought to have his views, and the only way it could be done was by moving the Chairman out of the chair.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, if the honorable member for Port Curtis had been present, he should have claimed his vote on this question; but, as he was not, he had merely referred to his argument in support of the appointment of an additional Minister, which he thought should have some weight with honorable members opposite. He understood the business of the Board was constantly increasing, and that as it was thought that mode of conducting the business was not satisfactory, it was desirable that it should be under the immediate supervision of a Minister of the Crown. If that were conceded, he did not see how one of the present Ministers could do the work. It was the fashion for honorable members to laugh at the work Ministers had to do, but if they considered it

for a moment they would see a Minister had a great deal of work to do, and if any one of them had the additional work of this department to perform, he would be over-worked. He did not think it had been contended that a Minister was to devote the whole of his time to his department, and it was clear to him that, if one of the present Ministers had to perform the duty of superintending the Education Department, he would not only have to work from morning till night, but a good deal of the night as well. He did not think it would be contended that the remuneration Ministers received was intended as sufficient to expect them to devote their whole time, morning and night, to the duties of the office. It was not supposed, four or five years ago, that Ministers were under-worked or over-paid, and he was sure their duties had very much increased during that time. He thought that was a strong reason why there should be another Minister, and he had stopped at the assumption that the House unanimously agreed that there should be a Minister, and the only question was whether there was to be a new one or not. He thought honorable members were almost unanimous that there should be a Minister of Education, and the argument seemed to preponderate that there should be a new one.

Mr. WALSH thought the honorable the Attorney-General was not justified in starting with any such assumption. That honorable gentleman not only performed his public duties, but he had plenty of time to carry on private practice as well; and he (Mr. Walsh) would go so far as to say that the office of Minister for Education should be attached to that of Attorney-General, or the Minister for Justice. It would be a good combination, and he hoped the office of Attorney-General would cease to be a political office. They knew that half the time of the Attorney-General was taken up in carrying on private prosecutions or actions, and in defending the Crown, or proceeding with actions commenced by the Crown; and knowing that, they were justified in thinking he would have plenty of time to discharge the duties of Minister of Education as well. He had no hesitation in saying that he could find a dozen gentlemen—not more efficient than the honorable Attorney-General—for they could hardly find one—but he could find a dozen, who, for the pay he was receiving, would be glad to undertake the combined duties of Attorney-General and Minister for Education. He did not hesitate to say that he should like to see the honorable the Premier in that position. No one could be better suited for it; he believed he would do good service; and he only hoped the honorable gentleman's aspirations were in that direction, because he knew how well he could perform the duties. It was not necessary that the Attorney-General should be a barrister, and he was perfectly satisfied, if the honorable the Pre-

mier undertook the double duties of Minister for Education and Attorney-General, he would perform them to the satisfaction of the country. Certainly, they did not want an other Minister in the House. The observations made respecting the absence of the honorable member for Port Curtis only went to strengthen the argument that they should adjourn. If the Government relied so much on the opinion of that honorable member at a former time, then he said, seeing that it was late, they ought to adjourn until that honorable gentleman could be present. He (Mr. Walsh) had tried to induce the honorable the Premier to give some opinion as to the value of the Bill; but he had tried in vain, and he regretted it, because he would rather have one ounce of the opinion of that honorable gentleman, with all his experience on this question, than he would have pounds or hundredweights of the opinions of the gentlemen who were connected with him. He thought it was a matter of regret that, on this most momentous question, that honorable gentleman was totally silent, and they could not get his opinion whether he was in favor of the Bill or not, or whether he could justify his position in regard to it. He did not hesitate to say that the honorable gentleman himself assisted him to come to a conclusion as to the proper system of education for the people of this colony. They confided together, and they agreed that there should be certain justice done to the different parties in the colony; and now, without rhyme or reason, he had bartered himself away—he said without hesitation, he had bartered himself away—sold himself to this young Attorney-General of the colony—repudiated promises made to his constituents, and broken the pledge he made to him (Mr. Walsh), and for what?—Had the country demanded this Bill?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: Yes.

Mr. WALSH: Who said so?

The COLONIAL TREASURER: I do.

Mr. WALSH: Was it the honorable member for Bandanba?

Mr. FRASER: No.

Mr. WALSH: What he said was, why on earth was this question brought before them—the most malicious, obnoxious, unnecessary question that had ever been unnecessarily brought—injudiciously brought before them, and by the youngest member of the Ministry. He implored the honorable the Premier, and he was sure if he took his advice he would never be led into these mistakes, and he believed he would have a long and successful reign. At the end of the session, on the last day of the week, when nobody expected important matters to be brought forward, the honorable gentleman tried to force through the House a Bill of this kind, which showed that he was not being guided by his own good sense, but that he was allowing some strong-minded member to command him. No argument had been brought forward in

support of this clause of the Bill; and he said the Government were placed in a very perilous position through this worrying Bill, and for no object except to carry out the rash promise the honorable the Attorney-General had made to his constituents, that any Government he belonged to would bring forward a Bill of this kind.

Mr. PETTIGREW did not think it was a foregone conclusion that they were to have a Minister for Education, and unless he heard much better reasons than those given by the honorable the Attorney-General he certainly would not support it. They had five Ministers at present, and if there were six they would never get them turned out—they would be too many for them. He did not see the necessity for another Minister, and he thought, as the honorable the Attorney-General had brought in the Bill, and from the manner in which he had studied the question, he ought to administer the Act. If the present Board could manage to work the affairs of the Education Department at the present time, by devoting two or three hours a week to it, surely one man could do it in exactly the same time, because he would only have to consult himself and have his own ideas carried out; whereas, if they had half a dozen gentlemen they always wasted a great deal of time talking before they could come to a vote. He should like to have a stronger reason than the opinion of the honorable member for Port Curtis with respect to a sixth Minister. It was quite possible when he was in office he was anxious to strengthen his hands by having an additional Minister, and he (Mr. Pettigrew) could quite understand, when he was in opposition he did not wish to see another appointed, and if he got into office again, no doubt his former opinion would return. He (Mr. Pettigrew) was not aware that the Government side of the House were in favor of another Minister; and he was afraid it was a little too fast. If they went on at that rate they would have nothing left for roads, unless they went in for borrowing money; and he should like to hear what the honorable member in charge of the Bill had to say about the question. Did he mean to say he was overworked? The honorable gentleman had talked about the money consideration, and he (Mr. Pettigrew) considered he worked quite as hard as that honorable member did, in coming down there to attend to public business. That honorable gentleman went to his office at ten o'clock and left at three, and he had a holiday whenever he pleased; and, really, those men who were best paid, and had least to do, were always complaining. If he were a Minister he would be prepared to work from eight to eight, for a thousand a year, and probably he would be able to attend to his own business as well, without killing himself. And when it took three or four men only two hours a week to manage the Education Department, he would undertake to do the whole himself

in three, and he would not kill himself either. In fact, he would take a contract to govern the colony, and he would do the work quite as well and efficiently as it was done at the present moment. He thought the honorable the Attorney-General might try how he could manage the two departments for a year, and if his health failed him they could think about another Minister afterwards.

Mr. FRASER thought the amendment proposed by the honorable member for Enoggera went a long way to meet the objection raised against an additional Minister; but, at the same time, he considered it failed to meet the case. It might be true that the honorable the Attorney-General, or any other Minister, might undertake the duties in addition to their present duties; but it must be borne in mind that in this measure they had an important change in their educational system, and it was a measure which ought not to be tampered with continually. Provision should be made for the constantly increasing business connected with the department; and he was persuaded any Minister would find that, in addition to his present duties, the sole charge of the department could not be very well undertaken. He thought the case might be met by providing for the appointment of a Minister of Instruction, who should be assisted by a paid council of three members. There was an additional reason for such a proposal as this:—They were constantly liable to a change of Ministry, and it would take a Minister some time before he could get thoroughly into the groove of working the department, which was widely different from other Government departments; and, in order that it should work efficiently and harmoniously, it was very desirable that there should be connected with it some individuals who were thoroughly conversant with the condition, history, and character of almost all the teachers and the schools under the Board. Otherwise he was persuaded there would be great difficulty in working the department satisfactorily, unless they threw the whole responsibilities into the hands of a secretary, which he thought would not be desirable. Another reason was that there was connected with Ministerial administration a strong feeling of jealousy and a suspicion of political influence, which would be neutralised by having a Council; because, whatever Minister took office, he would be directed and governed to a great extent by such a body. By that means, they would also avoid the necessity of appointing an additional Minister; and he thought, by adopting such a course, they would accomplish all they really desired at present. He merely threw out the suggestion, and should be prepared to defend it at greater length, if necessary.

Mr. DOUGLAS said, in reference to the proposal made by the honorable member for Bandanba, he should like to remind the committee that the same opinion was entertained

by the Vice-president of the Board, Mr. Stephens. That gentleman was of the opinion that the Board would be more effectually worked by three paid members—not paid for the whole of their time, but in proportion to the time they devoted to their duties; but whether it would be still better done by a Minister, was for the House to consider. He thought it would eventually be necessary to bring the Education Department under the control of a responsible Minister; but he did not think the House was quite in a temper to sanction the appointment of a sixth Minister, and probably the arrangement they were more inclined to carry into effect was to combine the office of Minister for Justice with Education, and to create a new office as permanent Attorney-General. He thought placing the department under the control of a Minister, with a Board to assist him, would lead to a divided responsibility, which would probably be very unsatisfactory. Although there might be something in favor of having a paid Board, he thought the same efficiency was likely to arise from placing a Minister at the head of the department.

Mr. PALMER said he had been informed some capital had been attempted to be made out of the speech he had made at Rockhampton as to his views on this subject. Well, the first time he addressed the House this session on the Bill, he mentioned that he had, some three years since, introduced a Bill prepared by Mr. Lilley, and since that he had had one prepared under his own instruction; and he also stated that he had learned a great deal since then. Amongst other things, he had learned, what he believed to be perfectly correct, that it was not advisable to have a Minister solely for Education. He had expressed the opinion to his colleagues before he left office,—that there was no necessity for an additional Minister. Some Ministers had very little work to do, and by dividing the labor more equally amongst them, one of them could easily perform the duties of the Education Department. The Treasurer had absolutely nothing, or next to nothing, to do, and the duties of the different departments could be so arranged as to give the Attorney-General a great deal more to do, and any one of the other Ministers could take that department. He was not fond of speaking of himself, but when he was a member of the Mackenzie Ministry he did the duty of two offices—Colonial Secretary and Minister for Lands or Works—and did it easily, and he thought he did it quite as well as it had been done either before or since. He had heard no complaints; none of his decisions had been reversed, and he did not find the work hard. It came a little hard during the session, but at other times throughout the year there was plenty of leisure. He did not believe, from the information he had received, that the honorable the Attorney-General wished to force this Minister on the House. It was the only part

of the Bill he (Mr. Palmer) was much opposed to, because there was no necessity for it, and it would be much better if the duties were confided to one of the present Ministers. He did not like the wording of the amendment much, and he had marked on his copy of the Bill, an amendment—he did not mean to move it—to this effect:—The clause would read—"It shall be lawful for the Governor to appoint, from time to time, some person to be Secretary for Public Instruction, who shall be one of the Responsible Ministers of the Crown," leaving out all the words after that down to the forty-second line. He could venture to say, for himself, that he had thought as much on the subject as any member of the House, and he had had various ideas floating through his brain about a Board to assist the Minister, and he confessed he had failed in every instance to arrive at anything practicable in that respect. In matters of administration they could not divide the responsibility. They must have a Minister responsible to the House, or a Board responsible to the House; and they could not have a Board in the House. He should really like to have some check upon the Minister, and he had tried seriously and quietly to work it out for himself, but he was afraid any division of the responsibility would be a dead failure. He thought the clause might be passed with the amendment such as he had suggested, and it would then rest with the Ministers to divide the duties amongst them. If the honorable member for Dalby were present he would back him (Mr. Palmer) up in saying the Treasurer had really nothing to do. In fact the honorable member for Dalby had often told him he was ashamed to take his salary, he had so little to do. He believed half an hour, or at the outside, an hour a day, or three or four hours a week, was sufficient to do the whole of the work. The Treasurer had a little work once a year in preparing his financial statement, and that was all he had to do, and, as the honorable member for Carnarvon said, was not all prepared by him. The material was prepared for him, but any Treasurer who knew his duty would put it into shape. He thought an additional Minister would be a weakness instead of strength to a Government, because if they had too much voting power on the Ministerial benches they were likely to drive members into opposition. He would not vote for an additional Minister, and he thought the honorable the Attorney-General would accept an amendment such as he had sketched out.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL pointed out that the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera raised exactly the same question as that suggested by the honorable member for Port Curtis. When the honorable member told him (the Attorney-General) he was going to move an amendment, he suggested that that would be the most convenient form to adopt. With regard to the proposed Board,

he, like the honorable member for Port Curtis, had tried all he could to frame some provision of that kind, so that the question might be fairly raised, but he found he could not.

Mr. WALSH thought the object of the committee was that the amendment should be so worded as not to give power to increase the number of the Executive. The clause as it stood provided for an alteration of the constitution, for the appointment of a fresh Minister. Here, by a side wind in this wretched Education Bill, which was to disturb all their present amicable arrangements in the colony, the Government were trying to get one more to their number—one more to their voting power. Honorable members did not appear to consider that. Again he repeated, and as long as he was a member of that House, he would warn honorable members against the effects of this Bill. Under an apparent discussion of the education question, they were raking up the seed of future hostilities amongst their fellow-colonists, when they were all working harmoniously together. They were introducing a measure which would sow the most violent dissension throughout the length and breadth of the colony, and he hoped honorable members would see the dangers and difficulties and the disturbances that were likely to arise from this most unnecessary measure.

Mr. MOREHEAD should oppose the original clause and the amendment, because he thought education ought to be taken outside the realm of politics altogether. He thought it was a most dangerous thing to make the head of the Education Department a member of the Ministry. The chief reason he had for the objection was, that the different Ministers of Education might hold views directly opposite to each other; and as they would have the framing of regulations and the direction of the system, it would lead to the utmost confusion. He thought a properly constituted Board, responsible to the Colonial Secretary, who was *ex officio* a member of the Board, would be the best way of meeting the difficulty. There could be no argument set up against that with regard to political influence; but if they had a Minister for Education, they must mix education up with politics, which he thought would be a fatal error, and he hoped the committee would never consent to it. He trusted the honorable the Attorney-General would see his way to the appointment of a Board that would be responsible to Parliament, through the Colonial Secretary, for its action. If there should be any neglect or misconduct on the part of the Board the members could be removed, as they had been in New South Wales. He believed the department would be better managed in that way than if it were under the charge of a Minister.

Mr. MACROSSAN thought they ought to have the opinion of the honorable the Colonial Secretary on a clause of so much importance as this. Although he had great

respect for the opinions of the honorable member for Port Curtis, he thought the honorable the Premier had had more experience—there was scarcely a politician in the House who had had so much, and they ought, therefore, to have his opinion on the question. He (Mr. Macrossan) would remove education as far as possible from the sphere of politics. They talked a great deal about the responsibilities attached to a Minister, but when they came to examine into the history of responsible government in Queensland and elsewhere, they found that responsibility, such as they understood it, was a mere farce. Ministers did just as they pleased, as long as they had a majority at their back to support them through thick and thin. He thought, when they looked to Governments where education was more immediately into the sphere of politics, they would find that every one of them was in possession of a system of government which was not what they regarded as a constitutional system; in fact, it was more of a despotic system. He thought a paid Board would be more likely to carry out whatever system of education was adopted, because there would be no break in the traditions; but, under a Minister, whenever there was a change in the Ministry, a change would take place in education, and in the traditions attached to it. He would ask the honorable the Premier his opinion with regard to a small Board, say of three, with himself, or one of the present Ministers, at its head, as chairman; but, at the same time, leaving the appointments in the hands of the Board, and making the Minister responsible to the House for the financial affairs of the department. The great objection to the present Board was not to the way in which the work was being done, but to their irresponsibility, as far as regarded money. He thought, if the Board had been looked upon as responsible in money matters, very little objection would have been taken. He believed that the Board of Education, which had been constituted from the beginning of responsible government in the colony, had done more to further the cause of education than any other system in the Australian colonies. They had now a splendid system, and he thought it would be a pity to jeopardise it in any way, by bringing it into contact with politics.

Mr. THOMPSON said he should support the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera, in preference to the original clause, but, as he had intimated in his speech on the second reading of the Bill, he should much prefer the existence of a Board. He looked upon it, that there ought to be as little interference as possible with education by Ministers, or by responsible politicians acting as such. The present Board, however, had one great defect, namely, that it was not a representative Board—it did not represent the whole of the colony, but merely the neighborhood of the metropolis. Now, if the Board

represented the whole of the colony, having one member from the North, another from the West, another from Brisbane proper, or rather the district around it, and one from the Downs, there would, probably, be less dissatisfaction as to the way in which the education vote was administered. As it was, the charges made against it of favoritism in distributing the vote were notorious—for whilst the Board required contributions towards erecting schools in the poorer districts they demanded none for the erection of schools in the wealthy metropolis—that was all owing to the constitution of the Board. He thought men should be appointed from all parts of the colony, so as to get as nearly as possible men free from any political bias, and men as nearly independent as possible. There had been for a long time a smouldering dissatisfaction with the present Board, whether rightly or wrongly he could not say; and it was thought that there had been a great amount of political pressure brought to bear upon it, not only in regard to the distribution of the vote, but also as regarded the appointment of the masters. He had known many persons to grumble, but still he did not mean to say that he should not even prefer a defective Board than the proposition made in the Bill. Supposing, for instance, the present Government went out of office, and, say, the honorable member for Stanley was one of a new Government, that honorable member would think, with his ideas of economy, that the whole system was too expensive, and would consider it his duty to go in for rigid economy. That was always the first idea of a Minister on taking office—it was his first idea, and supposing it was the idea of a future Minister of Education, the whole system would be disturbed. In the words of the honorable member for the Kennedy, there would be a change of tradition. The great benefit of the present system of having permanent Under Secretaries was that traditions were preserved, and the more they were preserved the smoother the Government would work. If there was a Minister for Education who considered that it was part of his duties to interfere, he would be constantly meddling and introducing some crotchets of his own, and the consequence would be that he would upset all that had been done, and, in fact, everything would lead to disorganization, which in the matter of education was very undesirable. However, if there were no hopes of having a Board, as hitherto had been the case, he should support the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he agreed with the honorable member for the Bremer that there had been a certain amount of grumbling, as far as regarded the Board of Education; but he believed that there would always be some persons found to express dissatisfaction as long as a Board existed. The question was, who was responsible? The chairman of the Board, who was a Minister

of the Crown, had no vote except a casting vote, and, therefore, he could not be held responsible; but it would always be the case with an unpaid Board that it would give dissatisfaction to some persons. At the same time, he did not agree with the plan proposed by the honorable member of having representatives from various parts of the country; because, as there was work for the Board to do every week, it was necessary that the members of it should reside in Brisbane. If they had a Board, it must be a paid Board, and he saw great difficulties in the way of getting such a Board unless it was elected from gentlemen residing in Brisbane. It also seemed to him that if they were not to be paid, the only person who would be responsible would be the Minister. The views he held were, that notwithstanding the present Board had done their work remarkably well, it would be good policy to have one of the Ministers as a responsible Minister for Education. At any rate, the plan was worthy of a trial—although he did not say that it would be a success; and with that view, he would recommend his honorable colleague, the Attorney-General, to accept the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera; there could be no harm in trying it.

Mr. WALSH would recommend the Government to withdraw the Bill altogether; it was not called for, and now it was found that there was a clause in it which the honorable Premier was himself willing to have withdrawn, although it was one which contained two of the most vital principles of the Bill; namely, the management of the whole education of the colony, and the creation of another Minister of the Crown. They now found that the honorable Premier abandoned those two great principles at the suggestion of an honorable member sitting behind him. That showed that the Bill had not really the hearty support of the honorable member at the head of the Government, and he would say again that the Bill was not wanted, and that nothing had been adduced to show that it was.

Mr. PALMER said he could not agree with the honorable member for the Warrego, that it was a vital principle of the Bill, as it was more a matter of detail. As he had stated before that evening, when the late honorable member for Fortitude Valley drafted the first Education Bill, which he (Mr. Palmer) introduced to the House, the principle of having a Minister of Education was embodied in it, and when he drafted the second Bill he also embodied the same principle, but he had lived to see that it was not necessary to have another Minister; and he thought that the honorable Attorney-General, since they had had a conversation on the subject, agreed with him on that point. There was no new principle incurred in making one of the present Ministers responsible; but if he was responsible, he must have power, for if he was thwarted by the Board, the whole thing would come to

nothing. As to the traditions of the department being preserved, he would like to know in what department a change of Ministry made any difference. Taking the Colonial Secretary's department, for instance, there were a number of clerks there, and they were not turned out with every change of Government; and in the case of schoolmasters it would be the same—in fact, it would be more difficult to replace them. The unpaid Board had done a great deal—of that there was no doubt: but, confined to Brisbane as they were, and being many of them political supporters of the present Government, it was not likely they could carry out the business of the department so well as they otherwise might do. Every appointment to the Board the Ministry had had to make, they had given to one of their political supporters; whilst if they wanted the Board to be independent, its members should be entirely free from any political bias. But when they appointed gentlemen who, as a rule, were disappointed aspirants for office, the character of the Board for independence with the country had gone at once. He did not say that the present Board had been influenced by political considerations, but still the country believed that it had been. No member of that House ought to be on the Board; and the very fact of his going into that House should render him incompetent to be a member of the Board. The honorable Colonial Secretary had stated that the Chairman had no vote, except a casting vote; but the honorable member must know that he could influence the actions of the Board to the extent that he could turn out all the members of it, if he chose to do so; and he (Mr. Palmer) had no hesitation in saying that if the Board had attempted to thwart any thing that he had introduced when Colonial Secretary he should have taken good care that they had no votes twenty-four hours afterwards.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the honorable member for Port Curtis had very much shaken his confidence in a Board; and he saw that the same objection would arise from having a political Board as from having a political Minister of Instruction. At the same time, a Board would not be so responsible to Parliament as a Minister would be. He should support the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera.

Mr. MACROSSAN said that a suggestion had occurred to him that might perhaps appear fanciful to some honorable members. It was admitted that, under the constitution of the colony, every office under the Crown should be open to any individual, no matter what his creed might be. Now, supposing a Minister were to have the sole charge of the education of the colony—whether a separate Minister or not, mattered not—would any honorable member believe that any Roman Catholic member of that House would, or could, be asked to accept the office of Minister of Education? He ventured to

say that, however pure his character might be, no Ministry would ask a Roman Catholic to accept that office. Therefore every Roman Catholic must be absolutely excluded from holding it; no matter how liberal honorable members might be, they must take into consideration the prejudices that existed, and he supposed would exist, against Roman Catholics.

Mr. PETTIGREW would point out that there always had been a gentleman connected with the Board who was a Roman Catholic, and who, in fact, at one time was almost looked upon as the Board, but he did not think it was necessary to bring up the question of Roman Catholics at all. If those remarks were made, however, he would ask if there was a single Protestant teacher employed in any Roman Catholic non-vested school in the colony? He thought it was better to leave that subject, and get on with the Bill.

Mr. STEWART said he should oppose the appointment of an additional Minister, as he had said he should do on the occasion of the second reading of the Bill. He thought that the office might be very well filled by one of the present Ministers, with the assistance of an Under Secretary.

Mr. WALSH said the honorable member for Stanley seemed to forget that there were such persons in the colony as Orangemen and Roman Catholics; but there were such men, many of whom were valuable colonists; and so long as there were, they were bound to treat them as fellow colonists, and not to despise them. They could not get rid of either so long as they were brought to the colony by the public funds; and so long as they were in the colony they were entitled to respect, no matter what their peculiarities might be. Again, he must call attention to the fact that the honorable Premier had given them no advice on the Bill before them, and had not shown, as a great politician and the leader of that committee should have done, that the Bill was absolutely wanted by the country; there had been no reason whatever advanced to show that. He believed that the only reason that the Bill was introduced was owing to a foolish pledge which had been given by the honorable Attorney-General. He was sure that honorable gentleman's constituents had not demanded it, but that he had invoked them to let him give them a pledge that such a Bill should be introduced. He would call upon that honorable member to name any constituency in that colony that had demanded that such a Bill should become the law of the land. It was really time the honorable Premier said to his young colleague, "So far shall thou go, and no farther."

Mr. MACROSSAN was sorry that the honorable member for Stanley should have imagined that he was at all illiberal in the remarks he had made; but as the honorable member for the Warrego had stated, it was

impossible to ignore the existence of persons, or to ignore their prejudices. He had so much regard for prejudices that he should certainly not support the appointment of the honorable member for Stanley as a Minister of Education, even if he had an opportunity of so doing.

Mr. McILWRAITH said he should like to hear what response the honorable Attorney-General had to make to the appeal of the honorable member at the head of the Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he was not in the Chamber when his honorable colleague was speaking, but he was glad to have an opportunity of replying to what the honorable member for Port Curtis had said about the conversation they had had. The honorable member had not repeated what he had said quite accurately; which was, that personally he did not attach much importance to the matter, but he did not know what his colleagues might do. He thought that the committee had expressed a voice in favor of the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera, and he would give his voice also for it.

The question, That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the Bill, was put and negatived.

The question was put, That the words proposed to be inserted, be so inserted, and agreed to.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved—

That all the words after "instruction" in line 23 to the end of the clause be struck out.

Mr. WALSH would like, before going any further, to know from the honorable Premier who was the particular Minister of the Crown who would have charge of the Education Department.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Pass the Bill first.

Mr. McILWRAITH certainly thought that the question put by the honorable member for the Warrego was deserving of an answer from the honorable member at the head of the Government. He thought that, unless the Government were prepared to give an answer, they should not have accepted the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera so readily. He thought that the answer given might have an important effect upon the rest of the Bill.

Mr. WALSH thought it should be a matter of consideration with the committee whether they would go on any further with the Bill until they knew who was to be the Minister for Education. He should object particularly if the office was to be conferred on the honorable Minister for Lands. They should have some promise from the honorable Premier to the effect that it was to be attached to either the honorable Colonial Treasurer or the honorable Attorney-General.

Mr. PALMER was understood to say that he could not see how the honorable Colonial Secretary could answer the question, which was one that would require discussion among the Ministers themselves.

Mr. MILES did not see why the Government should not give the information: he presumed it would lie between the honorable Colonial Treasurer and the honorable Attorney-General.

Mr. MOREHEAD thought they should have some expression of opinion. For his own part, he considered that the honorable Attorney-General would be able to combine the two offices.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not see any necessity for having a discussion on the question, as any arrangements made one day might be changed the next; besides the Bill would not come into operation until January, 1876.

Mr. DOUGLAS thought it really could not be of any importance to know which of the Ministers would take the office, as one Minister might be appointed now and perhaps in six months time another might be.

Mr. MILES thought that as the honorable Attorney-General had taken such interest in the Bill, had in fact fathered it, and was also the least worked of any of the Ministers, he should take the office. He should like to have some assurance that the duty would devolve upon that honorable member of carrying out the Bill, as it would help him to assist in passing it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL thought that as it had only been decided five minutes previously that there was to be a Minister for Education, it was rather soon for honorable members to ask who was to be the Minister; he might resign or refuse to take the office, or many other things might happen.

Mr. McILWRAITH said that it was only the alacrity of the Government in accepting the amendment that had suggested the question at all. They had seemed to be quite prepared for the amendment of the honorable member for Enoggera, and, therefore, it was only natural for honorable members to want to know who would have the administration of the Bill.

The question, That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the Bill, was put and negatived.

The clause as amended was passed.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved—

That clause 4, as follows, form part of the Bill:—

"4. The Governor in Council may from time to time make and promulgate regulations not being contrary to the provisions of this Act for the due and effectual execution of this Act and the objects thereof and respecting any matters or things neces-

sary to give effect to such objects and such regulations may from time to time revoke and alter.

"All such regulations shall be proclaimed in the *Gazette* and when so proclaimed shall have the force of law and shall be judicially noticed by all courts."

Question put and passed.

The House resumed. The Chairman reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday, the 17th August.