

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 6 OCTOBER 1881

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 6 October, 1881.

Petition.—Formal Motions.—Exhibitions and Scholarships.—Hours of Sitting.—Survey of Railway from Gympie to Brisbane.—Gympie Agricultural, Mining, and Pastoral Society.—Wildash and Hutchison's Claim.—Case of Philip Bride.—Alleged Irregularity.—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PETITION.

Mr. GARRICK presented a petition from certain residents of Caboolture, asking that the Liquor Retailers Licensing Bill be so amended as to absolutely prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday.

Petition received.

FORMAL MOTIONS.

On the motion of Mr. FEEZ, it was resolved that there be laid upon the table of the House copies of all Correspondence and Papers relating to the dismissal of James Leivesley, Railway Station Master at Emerald.

On the motion of Mr. BLACK, it was resolved that there be laid upon the table of the House a Return of all Moneys received under the Polynesian Labourers Act of 1868, and the Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880, up to date; showing how expended, and balance to credit of fund.

On the motion of the Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH, it was resolved that there be laid on the table of the House copies of all Correspondence with the Department of Public Instruction, relating to the proposed establishment of a State School at Monckland, near Gympie, and all Reports of Inspectors relating to the same subject.

EXHIBITIONS AND SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. NORTON, in moving the motion standing in his name, said that, from the discussion which had taken place at different times when the Estimates for educational purposes had been before hon. members, there could be no doubt that, although a strong feeling existed with regard to the advantages of their education system, there were still many members of the House who disapproved of the increasing expenditure which had taken place in connection with the higher class of education given under that system. When the matter was before the Committee of Supply the other day, it was proposed, by an amendment, to test the feeling of the Committee with regard to this question; but it appeared to him and to others who were present at the time that an amendment of that kind could not really serve as a test. In fact, it was pointed out by the hon. Minister for Education that no amendment which might be carried on that occasion would be accepted by the Government as a test. At any rate, the same objection could not be made to the motion he had tabled that day; and, as it had been on the paper for ten days, every opportunity had been afforded members who understood the matter to be present if they wished to express their opinions on the subject. It had been made a common boast that they had a grand educational scheme here which was designed for the great benefit of the whole colony; and he believed that to a large extent that boast was justified. There was no doubt that the educational system was a great credit to the colony, but it had its defects, and he had tabled his motion that day for the purpose of pointing out what appeared to him to be a very important one. He

did not intend to refer to the religious aspect of the question—that was one he did not take part in—but he thought the system itself worked very unequally, and, it appeared to him, very unfairly. It was a matter of the very greatest importance that education should be spread amongst all classes of the people, and that it should be made as cheap as possible. Indeed, one of the greatest boasts of the supporters of the system had been that it brought the poor man up to the level of the rich, inasmuch as it enabled him to give a thoroughly good education to his child without being put to great expense. It might also be said that it had another effect—which was, that it brought the rich man down to the position of the poor one, by enabling him to educate his children—which he could afford to do at his own expense—at the smallest possible cost, and at the same time give them a good education. That was one of the defects which would exist in connection with every system of the kind, and which he supposed could not be obviated. It was in the interest of numbers of his constituents and all the large body of people in the colony who were situated in the same way that he had tabled this motion. Although large provisions had been made to extend the advantages of education to all people, it was a well-known fact—to anyone who looked beyond the towns and thickly settled districts of the colony—that large numbers of people were denied the advantages in every possible way; in fact, the education system was not of the slightest benefit to them. The education system might be compared to a tree of knowledge, the branches of which were laden with its fruit displayed very temptingly before those who wished to partake of it; but in many instances, though it was near enough to show the whole of its attractions to a large number of persons, it was so far away as to be entirely out of their reach. To great numbers of the people of this colony who had families to bring up it was impossible for them to avail themselves of the means afforded by the present educational system to benefit their children. They were entitled to consideration because they contributed as much as any others to the fund from which this system was provided, and they alone were utterly cut off from all the advantages which the system supplied. To make himself more clear he would point out what he dared say all hon. members ought to know—and what, at any rate, most hon. members did know—and he would refer by way of illustration to his own district, because that simply was an example of what took place elsewhere. He was travelling through his district in the beginning of the present year. There was at Gladstone and everywhere else where there was any number of people collected together a State school; but if they followed any road through that district they would find scattered along it selections and stations, on almost every one of which there were children whose parents had to educate them themselves, having no possibility of getting them to any State school. Only that morning he was carelessly thinking over the people he knew within twenty miles of Gladstone, and who lived at a distance greater than five miles from any public school, and in a few minutes he was able to count up ten families, in all of which there were children growing up, and all of them just too far away to benefit by the existence of the State school in the neighbourhood. Following along the road to Wide Bay, on almost every station there were one or more families, and on the greater number of the selections there were also a number of children, but they were all so far apart, and the selections were so scattered, that in no place was there a sufficient number of children of school age to

enable them to start even a provisional school in the neighbourhood. He travelled almost through the whole district while he was up there, and he believed that if all the children were counted in that district alone there would be found more than 100 who were of that age that entitled them to be placed in schools—or, rather, which rendered it necessary that they should be placed at school if possible—but whose parents were unable to send them because the schools were too far distant, and they could not afford the expense of supporting them, which they would have to do either at the school or in the immediate neighbourhood, during the time they were there. He was not going to complain in any way of the general principles of the Schools Act, but he contended that when that state of things existed, not merely in one district but in every district in the colony, it was time for hon. members to consider whether they were justified in giving those sums for the higher branches of education which had been given during the last few years. At the present time there was, he thought, £900 voted annually for exhibitions to universities. It was said the other night that it was only a small amount, and that there were only three exhibitions each year. But, although three was the present limit, it did not follow that that limit would be adhered to. There might be nine, or even twenty, or fifty; and unless some step was taken to show the unfairness of the system they were likely to go on increasing the expenditure, not merely with regard to general education, but also with regard to the higher branches. It was utterly impossible for many persons to make use of these scholarships, even if their children were in a position to gain them. There were many families who lived within such a distance that they could send their children to grammar schools; but when those children arrived at an age when they would have to leave school the parents might not be in a position to help them, and they had to provide for themselves. He believed many of the scholarships were won by the children of parents who were not in a position to send them to grammar schools unless by means of these scholarships; but at the same time it enabled many who were in as good a position as anyone in the country to educate their children by that means. And was it fair to those who lived at so great a distance, that if their own children won scholarships but could not avail themselves of them, they should be compelled as taxpayers to contribute to the rest as they had to do under the present system? Was it not grossly unfair to hundreds and, he believed, thousands of people whose children received no education whatever, and could receive no education whatever under the present circumstances of the colony, that they should be taxed not merely for the general education fund, but to supply this fund which enabled others who were in an infinitely better position than themselves—many of them rich men—to provide for their children the higher branches of education, while they themselves were denied any education whatever? Those exhibitions and scholarships were for the benefit of those whose position enabled them to avail themselves of them like a rich feast which was spread out for them; while to those whose cause he advocated even the very crumbs of the educational system were denied. That was the manner in which he regarded the question. There was much about the system which, as he had said before, he admired, but the unfairness and irregularities were so very many that he thought no one who knew the circumstances of the colony would for one moment say that in justice to their constituents country members should not come forward and speak their feelings with regard to the matter as

plainly and as fully as they could. He did not intend to dwell at length upon the subject, because he thought the few words he had said already made manifest the most marked irregularities of the system, and he believed there were members present who would have more to say on the subject than he had. As he had said before, the religious aspect of the system was one that he did not pretend to say anything of, and with which he would not for one moment interfere. There were a large number who felt as strongly on the question as he did, and many much more strongly. He made up his mind, after the discussion the other night, that if no one else did so he would take an early opportunity of bringing the whole matter fairly and fully before the House, that it might be argued when there were no objections to be raised as to its being a test question. He presumed that if a majority of the House agreed with the motion he was about to propose, the carrying of that motion might be regarded as some indication of what would take place next year when the Estimates were brought before the House, and when there would be no excuse by saying that the country had been taken unprepared. He did not know how many members present would vote with him, as he had not gone so far into the matter, but he was certain there were a great many. He would not detain the House longer with regard to the matter, because he thought it was only fair that what one had to say should be said in as few words and with as little beating about the bush as possible. He therefore moved—

That the House is of opinion that, so long as the means of providing elementary education for their children is unattainable by a large number of parents who reside in the country districts, the annual grant for exhibitions and scholarships is inequitable, and should be discontinued.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Sir Arthur Palmer) said that, so far as he could follow the hon. member (Mr. Norton), the principal argument that hon. member had brought to bear against the vote for scholarships and exhibitions to universities was the amount of them, as he had called it a very large grant for the purpose of secondary education. He hardly thought the hon. gentleman could have looked at the Estimates when he made that speech—

Mr. NORTON: I did not say a very large grant.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had taken down the words at the time, and they were—"a very large grant for the purpose of secondary education." But what was the fact? The total vote for education this year was £129,893; the total vote for grammar school scholarships and exhibitions to universities being £2,850, off which was to come £375 for the Brisbane Grammar School, so that really the vote for scholarships and exhibitions to universities would be this year some £2,300 in round numbers. The proportion was, therefore, about one fifty-fifth of the whole vote, and he thought with that proportion very little fault could be found. He believed that those exhibitions to universities and scholarships had done a great deal of good. They had not only done good to the young men who had been able to join them and take advantage of them, but they had done a great deal of good to the other scholars—scholars who had tried to join them, and those who had the same goal before them, which they might have endeavoured to attain; and he believed that the very fact of those exhibitions to universities being within the grasp of grammar school boys had done a great deal of good to secondary education in the colony. He thought that the very fact that grammar

1881—3 H

school scholarships would be given to so many pupils per annum, taken from all the schools in the colony—not from any particular school, but from the whole of them—had also done a vast deal of good. It must be remembered that whatever the vote—and he did not admit the right of that House, by its vote, to say that these scholarships should cease because they were not embodied in any Act of Parliament, and were supported by the annual vote of the House—whatever the vote might be on this subject, the House was bound in honour to continue to grant the necessary funds for two years longer. He was perfectly sure that the sense of justice prevailing in that House would never allow a breach of faith to be committed towards the boys who had done their best to gain these scholarships. He considered that these exhibitions and scholarships had done a very great deal of good. Nothing had been advanced against them by the hon. member, except the fact that bush children were excluded from obtaining them. If parents chose to go straggling off to isolated places in the bush, he did not know how their children were to be educated, except by the system of provisional schools. As he had explained the other night, wherever twelve or fourteen children could be got together, and the parents would put up some kind of school and a shed to cover the head of the master, there provisional schools would be established. He did not know how it was within the power of any educational system to go further than that, unless the State provided a private tutor for every family in the colony. He did not think there was any necessity for detaining the House by going more fully into this question; the whole thing was on the surface, and he hoped that hon. members by their votes would not sustain the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. STEVENSON said he could not agree with the Colonial Secretary. He had told the House that wherever fourteen children could be got together a provisional school would be opened; but that was no reply to the arguments of the hon. member for Port Curtis. They were not discussing primary education. It was the higher branches of education that they objected to, on the ground that so many people could not take advantage of the system, and yet they had to pay taxation to keep it up. Those were the grounds of the hon. member for Port Curtis' arguments, as he (Mr. Stevenson) understood them. The hon. member's constituency stood very much in the same position as his own. There were a great number of selectors with families who were not able to take advantage of these grants; and hon. members knew perfectly well, and the Colonial Secretary knew, that even supposing these children were able to compete, and were successful, their parents could not afford to keep them in town to take advantage of the scholarships. In a scattered population like that of Queensland, the greater amount of taxation was raised in the country and not in the town, and these people ought to have more consideration shown to them. He objected to the country districts paying for the education of the town people's children. The Colonial Secretary had said if people chose to isolate themselves in the bush he could not help them: what was the use of forwarding an argument like that? Had not the country to be settled, selections taken up, and people to reside on them? The Colonial Secretary had said also that the amount was small—only £2,300; but it was not because of the expense that this motion was brought forward, although on that ground as well it might be stopped. The expense was £2,300 now, but what it might be in a few years' time no one knew. The education vote was increasing every year.

He hoped hon. members representing country constituencies would take the matter into consideration. This education vote was increasing year by year, and was likely to increase more and more to an extent of which they had no idea at present. He would support the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. ARCHER said he did not intend to give a silent vote on this question, but should support it on very different grounds to those of the hon. member for Port Curtis. The principal objection he had to the motion was that he did not believe in interfering with our education system in a piecemeal way. The Colonial Secretary had informed them of the immense advantages that had been derived from this small grant, and that might be very true. The clever boys had been able to gain the scholarships, and the dull ones had no doubt been stimulated to do better work. So far that was an advantage, but none of the disadvantages had been mentioned by the hon. gentleman. He had not said anything about the fact that when boys had the brains they would probably find their own way without any of this assistance. He had been misunderstood the other night when he said he would be prepared to support any system of education better than the present one, and which would supplement the present Act. He was unwilling to abandon our system of education until a better system was suggested. The system of education in Queensland, he thought, compared with other systems, was admirable. He was not going to find fault with the system as a whole, but he would say it was not by any means perfect. One remedy he could suggest was making people pay for the education of their children who could afford to do so. He believed there was nothing which lowered a man's independence more than educating his children at the expense of the State instead of leaving him to perform his own duties. This was one of the great disadvantages; and although the hon. member for Port Curtis had not struck at the root of the system, still he had attacked some of its disadvantages. He did not doubt that these scholarships stimulated boys to action, but they knew that in the most democratic country in the world—America—a system of State education existed; but they saw also that the men who came to the front in that country came there by their own exertions. President Garfield, who unfortunately was now no longer alive, worked as a carpenter while studying at the university; and they could not do better than encourage the youth of the colony to take up trades such as carpentering, blacksmithing, and engineering, which were all honourable means of earning a living. He had indicated the change he thought it advisable to make instead of encouraging parents who were able to afford to educate their children to look for aid to the State. The system of granting exhibitions for the purpose of keeping wealthy or even poor men's children at universities was a mistake, and he should vote for the resolution of the hon. member for Port Curtis.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the main argument of the hon. member who introduced this motion was that there were many people who were unable to take advantage of these scholarships and exhibitions, as they lived so far distant that they were not within reach of them. Of course there were many people who were unable to take advantage of the seaside, of railway travelling, and of many other things that everybody would like if they could get it; but they had gone into the interior because they thought the advantages to be gained there compensated them for not being able to take advantage of higher civilisation. Because some people in the remote interior could not have the same

advantages as citizens of municipalities, was that any reason why there should be no municipalities, streets, roads, or bridges? The argument was precisely the same. The proportion of people who got the advantage of these scholarships was something like 90 per cent., and it was perfectly ridiculous to suggest that these advantages were not equally distributed. They were equal, and the reason of the children of some people of the colony being unable to reap the advantages of these scholarships was simply owing to their geographical position. It was absurd to suppose that everybody could be put on an equal footing, but legislation must be for the majority. The observations of the hon. member for Blackall apparently went to show that higher education was a mistake and a thing to be deplored and discouraged. He (Mr. Griffith) differed very strongly from him on this point. The only justification for these scholarships and exhibitions was that higher education was an advantage to the public. That was the only reason. It was considered advantageous that boys should have, if possible, the opportunity of attaining a higher education. Some people seemed to think that higher education was a disadvantage, and the greater obstacles thrown in the way of it the better; but he (Mr. Griffith) held an entirely opposite opinion. Higher culture was of great importance. It was of great importance to members of that House, and he hoped some day, and before many years were over, to see the majority of members in that House men who had received their education in the colony. The hon. member for Blackall had referred to exceptional cases—of men who, having obstacles before them, had surmounted those obstacles and risen to fame; but it was most likely that if they had had better opportunities for higher education they would have been more distinguished. He should have thought it was too late in the history of the world to have gone into such arguments as that. He believed that it was admitted by a large majority of all civilised countries that a higher education was an advantage, and that it was the duty of the State to provide means for attaining it—not because they wanted to assist rich people to get their children educated, but because it was an advantage that higher education should be encouraged. Some years ago a large proportion of the people here thought it was time to establish a university. He was one of those who thought the time had not then arrived for the establishment of a university, but for all that he saw no reason why lads should be deprived of the opportunity of obtaining a university education. There were few countries where deserving lads could not obtain assistance in the higher branches of education, and were they to stand out alone amongst the civilised portions of the world as the only place where such facilities were not afforded? With respect to the scholarships, he did not remember when they were first started, but knew it was before the Board of Education ceased to exist. At one time they took the form of what appeared to him to be a luxury, being scholarships of £50 a year. That he thought too much. All that should be provided was the mere tuition; beyond that the State should not go in making provision for higher education. It was idle to say that the children who got the advantage of these scholarships and universities were the children of rich people. He knew they were not. He had had experience as head of the Department of Public Instruction and as a trustee of the Brisbane Grammar School, and knew that a large majority were children of poor people. They were children and young men who but for these facilities would have to go without a higher education. Whether it was an advantage or not

that they should have that education was for the House to say; he thought it was. The advantage of these scholarships was not confined to the boys who got them; it permeated the whole of the State schools. The examinations for them were attended by a great number of candidates—in fact, it was with a view to those examinations that they worked. Was it not ridiculous in these days to deprive the scholars of the advantage of this stimulus? Was there any country in the world where such prizes were not held out as inducements? What better inducement could be held out to the children of both sexes to do their best and to take advantage of the education placed within their reach than the offer of some prizes? The number of those who did the work was very much greater than the number of those who got the prizes. The last report of the Secretary for Public Instruction showed that last December 140 candidates came up, of whom only 36 passed; and that in 1879 121 candidates came up, of whom 32 passed; showing that the number of children who had the advantage of the stimulus was four times the number of those who took the scholarships. That advantage extended to all the different State schools. Turning to the grammar schools, he could say on the highest authority that the energy and intelligence of the holders of these scholarships had completely altered the standard of the school teaching. Was it nothing to have a class of boys in the schools working for work's sake? Not because their parents had sent them there to get an ornamental education, but because they were receiving the reward of their own previous exertions. Their energy brought them those prizes, and they were induced by them to go on further. He might inform the House that the system adopted in this colony was vastly admired in the neighbouring colonies. He had had communications from the other colonies desiring to know the details of the system, with a view to introducing a similar system into the other colonies. And it was no wonder, seeing that they found that in the university examinations New South Wales had now hard work to hold her own. The boys from the grammar schools of this colony had invariably taken high places, and in almost every instance they had been State school scholars. The prize-list for last year of the Brisbane Grammar School showed that in the honour-list of the previous examination 62½ per cent. of the names in the classes which included scholarship boys were holders of scholarships from the State schools. The proportion of such holders in the school was not much more than one-third of that—at most 25 per cent., while the percentage of honours was 62½ per cent. In the girls' school, where scholarships were established more recently, and there were in the higher classes fewer holders of scholarships, the proportion of honours obtained by holders of scholarships from the State schools was 55 per cent. He believed the proportion of scholarship holders in the school was something under 20 per cent. He found also that amongst the regular prizes 70 per cent were taken by scholars from the State schools. Of the university prizes offered to all competitors from schools in New South Wales and Queensland, out of seven university prizes obtained by Queensland boys five were won by holders of State school scholarships. Of course they were selected boys; but they were selected, not according to favour or wealth, but according to their own energy and exertion. They had commenced early in life, and been induced to work for themselves; and their reward was to have the opportunity of learning more. The result had been that the Brisbane Grammar School had acquired the reputation of being about the best school in Australia. That,

no doubt, was not entirely due to the boys. The colony had been fortunate in getting good masters, but the masters themselves said that the standard had been changed and raised to a great extent by the energy and intelligence of this class of boys. In the higher school, in the 6th form, out of five boys who obtained honours in Latin four were holders of these scholarships. In the lower school, in set A, out of eleven who obtained honours in English ten were holders of these scholarships. Throughout the whole list it appeared that with a few exceptions the boys who had done best were the holders of these scholarships, and in most cases they were not the children of wealthy parents. As far as statistics and the testimony of independent witnesses could show it, this system was shown to be of great advantage to general education. He would pass now to the exhibitions to universities. The system of exhibitions had been in force for three years, and nine exhibitions had been granted. The desire to obtain these exhibitions also permeated through the grammar schools and the lower schools. It was an incentive to a boy to know that if he worked hard enough and had the necessary ability he would have the opportunity of acquiring all the knowledge that could be acquired at the present time. For this advantage the colony was expending a reasonable amount of money. The mover of the resolution said, "If three why not thirty or fifty?" The answer was, "Simply because the colony could not afford it, and that there would not be the demand for that number." Under the instructions to the Sydney University these exhibitions were not awarded unless the candidates appeared to the examiners to be deserving of a university examination and likely to distinguish themselves if they obtained it.

Mr. FEEZ: There's a great deal of favouritism.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he did not see how there could be. The examinations were conducted by the University of Sydney, the institution selected as being more likely to be impartial than any other body; but, if it were so, that would be a reason for selecting another examining body, and not for discontinuing the system. Of the exhibitions, nine had been granted since they were established; and he found, according to the report of the Secretary of Public Instruction, that in 1878, of the three which were granted in that year two were taken by holders of State school scholarships. The first of these had been first scholar in 1873, and had come from the State school at Bowen; and he (Mr. Griffith) ventured to say that without the system that lad would never have come from Bowen to the grammar school, and certainly would never have gone from the grammar school to the university. At the Melbourne University he had since gained the open exhibition for English and history against all competitors, and a classical exhibition of £50. Without mentioning names he would simply say that the lad, who was the son of a poor widow, would never have had a chance of going to the University but for this system. The next on the list for that year was not a State school scholar; but he had, on entering at Balliol College—one of the best colleges at Oxford—obtained, in open competition, an exhibition of £40 a year for four years. He was the son of an officer in the Government Service, whose salary would have been quite inadequate to the expense of sending his son to the University. The third in that year was also a State school scholar, the son of a clergyman who, though highly respected, was not in a position to give his son that education. Of the exhibitions for the next year—December, 1879—two of the three who obtained them were also State school scholars, and in no case were the parents able to afford to

give their children a university examination. Possibly in one case the parents might have been, but he did not think so. Of those three, the first was at the head of the list at the examination for scholarships at Sydney, at the matriculation examination; the second obtained a Bursary at the Edinburgh University on entering; and the third took a scholarship on matriculation at Sydney. These boys had showed themselves worthy by holding their own in competition against all comers, and, should they return at some future time, the colony would no doubt be proud of having assisted them to obtain their education. Of the three who obtained exhibitions in 1880, two were State school scholars who held scholarships, and one he knew was the son of parents who would not have been able to give their son even a grammar school education. And now he would consider what the system had cost. At first it had cost less than £900 a year; but now, while it was in full swing, the cost was £900 a year, or perhaps £1,000, including travelling expenses. The objections raised against it were that the colony could not afford it, and that some people in the remote parts of the interior could not take advantage of it. The latter was no argument; the objection was a geographical one. It would be as reasonable to object to the establishment of a university anywhere because everybody could not go to it. When he (Mr. Griffith) went to the University at Sydney, it might have been objected that the expense was not justified, because everybody could not go.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Who paid?

Mr. GRIFFITH said the State did, to a great extent. At that time there were rarely more than thirty students in attendance; but if anyone had suggested in New South Wales that the State was wasting its money in maintaining the University, he would have found very few people to agree with him. Some hon. members spoke of this education as an education by way of alms, but he did not consider it was. He had derived advantage from exhibitions and scholarships—some the result of private beneficence, and some of endowments by the State—and he had been proud to get them, and was now proud to have held them, and should be proud to see his own children do the same. He saw no shame in any lad earning by competition any prize that might be offered to him. It was simply a question whether the advantages resulting to the whole community were worth the small expenditure. The advantages of the scholarship system, which had been in operation a long time, and of the exhibition system which was just coming into force, had been very great. They had raised entirely the tone of education in the colony, and the expense had been trifling. If anyone wished to deal a severe blow to the system of education in the colony—not only the grammar school and the higher education, but also the State school education—he could not do better than support this motion. The plain effect of the resolution, if carried, would be to discourage emulation and study, and to nearly break the hearts of many children who had been working for years in the hope of obtaining these prizes. He sincerely hoped, for the credit of this House and of the colony, that this motion would not pass.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Macrossan) said that, among all the many advantages of education which the hon. gentleman had told the House this evening, there was one which he had missed, and of which the hon. gentleman was himself a living proof—that was the power of misrepresenting the arguments of his adversary. That advantage of education the hon. gen-

tleman exhibited in a most super-eminent degree. Who would have imagined for a single moment, in listening to the arguments used by the hon. member for Blackall, that he was opposed to education because it was good? No other hon. member than the hon. member for North Brisbane could have taken such a sting out of the simple words uttered by the hon. member for Blackall. It was a great pity that a question of this kind could not be decided upon principle without any resort to misrepresentation and arguments baseless and without foundation. The hon. gentleman told the House when he got up that the question as brought forward by the hon. member for Port Curtis was one of distance, and he ended by saying it was one of geographical position. In support of that argument the hon. gentleman said that a number of people wished to go to the seaside. But the Government did not make the seaside—God made it; it cost nothing, and anyone who had the means could go to it. The hon. gentleman also said that the people liked to use the streets; but the people paid for the making of the streets. The hon. gentleman also said that people wished to use the railways; but surely the people who used the railways had to pay for them.

Mr. ARCHER: Except members of Parliament.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he stood corrected; except members of Parliament and a few privileged persons who got free passes occasionally. There was no argument in that against the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Port Curtis, or against the arguments of the hon. member for Blackall. The argument of the hon. member for Blackall was plain and distinct, and one which no one could get over. It was that giving education for nothing pauperised and demoralised the public mind. That was the argument, and it was an argument he believed in; and for that reason he should vote upon this question, and not because he thought education was not good in itself. He hoped that he valued education as highly as any hon. member in the House; the hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith) could not value it more highly than he did, and he believed that every member of this House valued it highly. The education of which hon. members were now speaking was an education given at the expense of those who profited least by it, and who could profit least by it. It was very well for the hon. gentleman to read a list of candidates from a document published by the State, and to tell the House that certain honours had been gained by boys who had previously gained scholarships. What was the wonder in that? The boys who gained the scholarships were the best from all the State schools of the colony; and it was no wonder that the best of the best should take the honours. The hon. gentleman also said that other countries had established universities and systems of education. They had done so, it was true, but not at the expense of the State. The systems in the best educated countries in the world were established by private benevolence. He did not think that any individual in this House could for a single moment begrudge the education given in the primary schools; but he agreed with the hon. member for Blackall that education given in the primary schools should be paid for by those who were able to pay, and that those who were unable should be educated free. He had never heard an argument worth listening to advanced against that position. The only one he had heard worth considering was that giving a free education to the poorest of the poor offended their feelings; but what was that against the pauperisation of

the whole population? Why, for the sake of the feelings of a few, should the State offend the feelings of the whole? He honoured the hon. gentleman for having obtained honours and scholarships, and did not think he had any cause to be ashamed of them. The day would, he hoped, come when the hon. gentleman, having made a great fortune—as he no doubt would—would himself establish scholarships and exhibitions out of the abundance of his riches. That was the way in which scholarships and exhibitions were established elsewhere. It was not by taxing those who were scarcely able to pay for their own education, and those who derived the least benefit, that scholarships and exhibitions should be established. If it was a good thing to have them furnished by the State, let the State impose a special tax on those who wished to take advantage of them. That could be done easily enough. It was objected that if the State did not do it it could not be done any other way. The State then might take the matter into their own hands, and by means of the combination of powers at their command carry it out successfully—not at the expense of the whole population, but at the expense of the few who wished to take advantage of the system. There was not a man in the colony—and that was a big word—he was going to say in the House—who did not admit that for the good government of the colony it was necessary that every individual in it should be so educated as to be able to look after himself, and to decide on the affairs of the country when they came before him. To that extent he said the State was bound to educate, but to do so was it necessary to establish scholarships, exhibitions, or universities? He said “No.” It was not necessary for that purpose at all. They had a proof of this in America. The eminent President Garfield, and the majority of the presidents during the last fifty years had raised themselves by their own exertions, working with their hands and becoming men of noble minds, not pauperised by the State. The character of the late President Garfield was ennobled by the position he was placed in—having to acquire education by his own toil and industry. If he had been pampered by the assistance of the State he would not have been the man he was. And so with Abraham Lincoln—one of the greatest presidents since the days of Washington that America had known. His education was not commenced till he was sixteen years of age, and yet he became one of the first men in his country. It was idle to say that the boys of this colony could not go forward without the aid of the State. They were not allowed to. The State pauperised and demoralised the boys, and led them to believe that the education given in schools was something superior to that given in the workshop, at the carpenter’s bench, on the farm. The boys were carefully taught that, and it was the worst kind of education they could give their boys. He remembered the late Inspector-General of Schools, Mr. Randal Macdonnell, telling a story of forty boys who were asked to write an essay on the choice of an education. They were all the sons of working men—carpenters, blacksmiths, and so on—and only one boy out of the whole forty preferred a profession which was not one by which he would not have to soil his hands. Thirty-nine wished to become lawyers, doctors, and parsons. One of the forty wished to become a carpenter, and he was the only honest boy of the lot. If there was any necessity for the State to educate boys no man in the House would, he was sure, object to it. If there was any necessity for them to be parsons or doctors he was sure that no one would object to it; but there was no such necessity.

People who knew well they would never have to pay for the education of their children were very well able to pay for it themselves; and those who had the ambition to see their sons employed in those professions objected to them being brought up to toil. What was the result? They had lawyers in Queen street as thick as blackberries. It would be better for many of them if they had received an education to fit them for going into the bush, stock-riding, farming, or working at some honest trade instead of wasting their time dissipating—dissipating their minds at all events—by their excessive toils, attending the Supreme Court and listening to one barrister pleading against another. It was the same way with doctors and parsons; they sprang up in every direction like weeds all over the country. He said that any man who wished well to the country would try to give that tone to the education that it would be known that there was nothing degrading—nothing to make anyone blush—in working for their living by toiling with their hands.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he did not wish to give a silent vote upon this subject, more especially as he was held up the other day in an evening paper, which had a pretty large circulation in this city, as one of those who were willing to give a free education to a limited extent only to those who could not afford to pay for it. He went quite as far as the hon. member who had just sat down in wishing to give free education to every child, whether the parents could or could not afford to pay for it—a free education up to a certain extent. He went as far as the Hon. John Bright went, and considered that every child should be educated up to the three R’s; but he said that further than that the State had no right to go, and in that he fully agreed with what had fallen from the hon. the Minister for Works, who had put it in better words than he could, about the inadvisability of taking from the parents the responsibility and habits of self reliance which were entailed upon them by nature, by usage, and by custom of their ancestors—the responsibility of educating their own children. Here, however, it was carried to such an extent by the encroachments of the State that the parents were actually compelled to avail themselves of State aid, because by the competition of the State it had driven out other means of education. He said that this was monstrous, and that it was monstrous also that persons who, as it had been expressed by one hon. member, chose to straggle off into the bush, and who had no opportunity of availing themselves of these things should be obliged to join in paying for them. He objected very strongly to the way these people had been spoken of, for they were the most useful colonists they had. They were the working bees in the hive, bringing the country into civilisation, opening it up and making it available for posterity. He said again that it was monstrous that these people should be taxed to confer these higher branches of education on other people. He would go further than what had been alluded to at present by any hon. gentleman who had spoken, and he would say that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred this sapping and striving to attain these scholarships caused boys to strain their intellects to attain what would probably be of very little use to them after all. It was ruin to many boys. He had seen it himself, and he knew therefore that it was true. Of course there were shining lights and exceptions, but in nine cases out of ten these boys whose intellects were strained in this precocious manner were, after they had grown into men, of no use whatever. They generally became fit to be a sort of mad professor or something of that sort. They were not wanted in the colony. The

colony wanted men like General Garfield and Abraham Lincoln, who educated themselves and worked at the same time to enable themselves to educate themselves. The exercise made them as much and more than the education did of itself, and those were the things they ought to encourage here instead of making men dependent on the State for their education. What possibility was there of their encouraging benefactions from private means, when the whole was dependent on the State? At home, so far as he knew, they were founded by private individuals; but were they likely to come forward here, either during their lifetime, or in their wills, if the scholarships were provided by the State? He did not think so; the State did not encourage them to do it.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it was done elsewhere—in New Zealand.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it had been done in the other colonies. He granted that; but he could say that the time was drawing very close when the burden of the cost of education in the other colonies—New Zealand and Victoria were the two colonies he knew the best—would be felt to be a burden greater than could be borne by the people. An outcry was being made against it, and he was sure it required no prophet to see that it would end in a very material change in the system in these colonies. In New South Wales the people had to pay something. Here in Queensland they were just as well able to do it as in New South Wales, and they should have to pay. It was not only the charitable education that was derived by pupils at the State schools in New South Wales. The people were not wholly dependent on the taxpayers of the colony there. They paid themselves, and that was what he contended should be done here, and what he hoped before many years to see the law of the land. He did not himself believe in forcing the intellects of the growing youths of the colony to an extent which he maintained was for practical purposes utterly useless to them in their future life, and which was also to the detriment of their constitutions and their strength, and that, too, at the expense of the taxpayer. From his own experience—and it was some time since he left school and the university, and he went through the curriculum—he could say that the boys who worked for scholarships were very well known. So far as the assertion of the hon. the leader of the Opposition as to the scholarships permeating through the school was concerned, unless boys were very much changed since his time, they did nothing of the kind. Everybody knew whom the scholarships were among. They never were among him, and he was never among them.

Mr. GRIFFITH: No?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that he never wanted to be, and he did not think he was any the worse for not getting them. Some boys who did were in a better position than he, and perhaps some were in a worse. At all events, he entirely disagreed with the hon. member in his assertion that the scholarships permeated the school.

Mr. GRIFFITH: They do.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that he asserted that they did not, unless boys were very much changed during the last twenty years.

Mr. FEEZ said he would like to say a little on this question, which was one which had been discussed throughout the length and breadth of the colony. The idea which was prevalent everywhere was that the poor man had to pay for the rich man's education. He had heard nothing in this debate to convince him to the contrary. It was felt to be a burden, because

they had so many single men in the colony on whom the heavy taxation was a great injustice, as they received no benefit from it whatsoever. He endorsed the statement made by several speakers, that it was the duty of the State to give a sound and practical education to all children—to teach them to read, write, and to know the first principles of arithmetic. But that was all, unless the parent had an ambition for the boy's advancement to the higher branches of learning. The benefits of all these large expenditures were almost exclusively for Brisbane. What was it to him, living at Rockhampton? The expense was so great that he might just as well send his boy to Melbourne or Sydney, where he would have better advantages and better climate than if he sent him here. The whole system, he asserted, was rotten to the core. They lived in a country where children ought to be brought up in a practical way, and the attempts at high education led them away from this great object. The system which ought to have been introduced by the Government was a system of technical practical education. A committee of the ablest men in the colony ought to be appointed to frame a system by which boys could have a practical instead of a theoretical education. The State could not find a place for the many young lawyers and doctors who were growing up. There was nothing for them to do. He himself had given his sons a high degree of education, and his belief was that if they had stuck to his store, or gone to a trade, or become engineers, their prospects in life would have been much better. As it was, their prospect was a very bad one. It was not the duty of the State to waste money on scholarships. He should like to see a little more of the Indian-caste system prevalent, where the son followed his father's trade; and then the colony would not be as wanting, as it now was, in good tradesmen and labouring men. It was their duty to check the present system of too high education to the utmost of their ability, and when that was done the colony would show a healthier state of things than at present prevailed. If every man who had made a little money brought his children up to a profession, what would the colony come to? There was no room for them in a population of only 220,000, and the consequence would be that most of them would have to seek out influential persons to get Government billets for them. He should like to see mining schools and farming schools formed in Brisbane, and one or two other towns of the colony, and that would result in a blessing to the colony which nothing could take away. For those reasons he should vote for the motion.

Mr. DE SATGE said that, before giving his vote against the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis, he should like to give his reason for doing so. Although he sympathised entirely with the arguments of the Minister for Works and the plausible speech of the hon. member for Blackall, he thought that in voting for the continuance of the scholarships he was not running counter to the views he had previously expressed on the general system of education. Those scholarships were held out as the crown of the edifice of our educational system, and it was useless to attack it and leave the system alone. There were three things to be attacked in the educational system. The first was its abnormal expense as compared with the colony's means. The second was to remove from parents their dependence on the assistance of the State in the education of their children; and that was not to be obtained by abolishing the scholarships. He was as desirous as anybody that the dependence of parents on the State should cease as soon as possible by a general revision of the educational system; but the abolition of scholarships did not

affect that at all. The third point wanted was to disseminate in the outside bush districts the benefits of education as far as it was possible to go—he would even go the length of appointing travelling schoolmasters, if that could be done. From the nature of the colony the population of Queensland must always be more scattered than in the other colonies; and, therefore, they must go out of their way to give to those who settled the country, and without whom they could not do, the benefits of education, although it might be at a greater cost than would be entailed if the population were denser. It was not every boy who was able to compete for a scholarship; they were prizes offered only to the cleverest amongst them. While willing to attack to the utmost of his power the enormous development of the education vote, and to see that people with ample means should pay for the education of their own children, he failed to see that the abolition of the scholarships would affect that in any way whatever; and they would be taking away the only means that existed which could bring Queensland boys into a distinguished position both here and in the other colonies. As the motion did not touch the general educational system of the colony, he should vote against it, although he would willingly support any attack upon the system itself.

Mr. PERSSE said the arguments of the hon. member for Mitchell would not bear analysing, for by carrying the motion they would be showing that the general feeling of the House was no longer in favour of the overgrowth of education in the colony. After the able speeches of the Minister for Works and the hon. members for Blackall and Leichhardt, it would be a waste of time to say much on the subject, and he would content himself by doing little more than endorse their opinions. They were pauperising the inhabitants of the colony by allowing the State to take upon itself the education of children. The greatest kindness that could be done to parents was to make them contribute towards the education of their families; for not only would the children receive a better education, but they would be made to attend school with greater regularity. At present, as had been once pointed out by the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. O'Sullivan), children were kept at home on the slightest pretences, whereas, if a small fee of 1d. were charged the mother would take care that the child had its pennyworth of education. As to the scholarships, he for one got a very high-class education—far better than ever he deserved, and far more than had been of any advantage to him. He always had a leaning for country pursuits, and yet, because he showed some aptitude at learning, he was encouraged and crammed to go in for every prize that offered. He wanted to lead an honest working man's life; but he was compelled by his parents to enter Trinity College, and go in for a degree. Having got the degree, what did he do? The very first moment he was at liberty he left home, came to Queensland, and engaged in farming pursuits. It would have been far better for him had he been allowed, in the first instance, to follow his natural bent, for he could handle a plough, mow, and do all ordinary things on a farm. It would have been far better for him if he had been taught how to build a house or drain a field than to be crammed with all that high-flown education. The present system of education was teaching children to hate all those employments which were the mainstay of the colony. What was wanted was practical education. At the present moment men were wanted all over the colony, who knew how to get water, to drain land, and so forth, and they were utterly unobtainable. Another result was to teach children to look down upon their fathers, who were good,

straightforward, honest working men. The best thing that could be done for the welfare of the colony was to give the death-blow to that high-class State education, and to teach children only its plain rudiments.

Mr. DICKSON said that anyone listening to the speeches of the supporters of the motion would imagine that higher education injured a man and made him a worse citizen. He could not for a moment assent to the statement that, because a boy had sufficient ability and intellect to gain a scholarship from a primary school to a grammar school, therefore the education he received there made him a worse member of the community. Nor could he see that that would prevent a boy from ultimately acquiring technical knowledge. Neither could he assent to the extreme views enunciated by the hon. member for Leichhardt—that a boy should necessarily follow in the occupation of his father—that he must aspire to nothing higher, whatever his intellectual ability might be. Such a system would completely bar all progress. They had to look to the future, and, especially in a young colony, the best gift a father could bequeath to his son—far better than silver or gold—was a good sound education to qualify him for that higher position in life which every father would desire to see his son obtain. Therefore, on this question he was entirely opposed to the views of the hon. members who had spoken in favour of the motion. He looked upon it as an attempt to subvert the system of education—that behind the cancellation of the exhibitions and scholarships there was the deeper motive of bringing about an entire revision of the system, with a view to restrict education, and prevent the masses of the people from enjoying the benefits of that system which the colony, in its wisdom, had established. He saw no humiliation in any man, whatever his position, taking advantage of an institution provided by the State, and sending his children to the National schools, even although he might have nothing to pay for it. To argue the reverse was a mere sentimental absurdity, and he was surprised that it had not been protested against on previous occasions. It was far better for even wealthy parents to send their children to the State schools than to schools where a much worse education was imparted. And if he sent his children to a school provided by the State, why should not means also be provided enabling him to educate them up to a higher standard? He was amused at the story told by the Minister for Works about the forty boys who were asked what they wished their future career to be, and of whom only one determined to adopt a handicraft; and especially at his remark that that was the only honest boy in the number. Perhaps the hon. gentleman was only joking, for it was certainly no sign of dishonesty in a boy to determine to avail himself of the openings in life, which could only be obtained through prosecuting a higher education than could be received at a primary school. He should deeply regret to see the scholarships abolished. They had been a strong incentive to boys, and also to their parents, to endeavour to obtain the superior education which grammar schools provided. He should be glad if a university were established in this colony. He considered that the educational system was incomplete without a university, and he should like to see youths of ability in this colony retained here. They ought not now to deprive the system of these exhibitions, and thus withdraw an avenue for the future advancement of boys. When they considered that in New South Wales there was an annual endowment of £5,000 for the maintenance of the university, and that in Victoria there was an annual endowment of £9,000 for the same purpose, he thought they had not very much to

boast of in the facilities they gave to higher education in this colony. It must be admitted that the £900 per annum given for the establishment of three exhibitions, tenable for three years, was not of an overwhelming character. He should be sorry to see this motion carried. When exhibitions were first proposed he received the matter with great caution, and he believed he opposed the measure; but now that exhibitions had been established, and with very beneficial results, he should be sorry indeed to see them done away with simply through some sentimental objections that the system was demoralising and pauperising. He could hardly imagine that the hon. member for Port Curtis expected to carry this motion; it had occupied a considerable portion of private members' day, and the matter was of such importance that it certainly demanded much greater consideration than it was likely to receive now. Reverting to his starting point, he contended that any person who read the debate of this evening, and what had fallen from hon. members who supported the resolution, would at once consider that they desired to subvert the educational system of this colony. He hoped that object would never be accomplished; though he should be glad to see any defects in the system amended. Neither the speech of the hon. member for Port Curtis nor that of any other hon. member who supported the resolution, had tended to show that the present limited amount for scholarships and exhibitions had been a blot on the system, or that its withdrawal would improve the system.

Mr. SIMPSON said he could say a very great deal on this question, but he would not detain the House long. He should vote for the motion because he thought it was a step in the right direction; and he would vote to subvert the whole of the present system of education, and do it willingly. He would not deprive any child of education; he would willingly give every child a reasonably good education, but he would go no further. If he had his way he would make all parents who could afford it pay for the education of their children. He would also make education compulsory. Parents who said they could not afford to pay should be allowed to send their children to school free; but those who could afford to pay he would make them pay. That was the system of education he would introduce.

Mr. KELLETT said he had not much to say, but he thought that every hon. member who intended to vote on the resolution should express his opinion. Since the present educational system was introduced he had objected to it. He thought they were going a great deal too far. He believed that in a country like this, where the population was scattered, a large number of children were not educated at all; and he thought that under a State system every child should at least receive the simple rudiments of an education. He went no farther than that, because he believed that every man who could pay for the education of his children should do it. A man showed a very poor spirit in taking advantage of free education when he could afford to pay for it. No man should be allowed to send his children to a free school unless he first made a declaration that he could not afford to pay. What had the present system done, to his knowledge? In many towns it had stopped private enterprise. Small schools for both boys and girls had been closed because those who conducted them could not get a living; and now persons who wished to pay for the education of their children could not get anyone to teach them. But the system took the independence out of most people, and now they preferred to send their children to schools where they could get them taught for

nothing. He objected to anything of the kind. He believed the sooner these exhibitions and scholarships were done away with the better; and if a good practical education were given it would be far better. If girls, for instance, instead of being taught music and dancing, were taught how to cook a dinner, as their mothers had done before them, they would be far better off.

Mr. NORTON said that in introducing this motion he had said as little as possible, and had avoided all reference to the general principles of State schools here. He confined himself as much as possible to this one branch of State schools, if they could be called a branch—scholarships and exhibitions. He did so purposely, because he felt that if he entered into the general principles of the State schools he should have to say a great deal which he did not think it desirable to say on the present occasion. He thought it better on a private members' day—and such a matter could not be brought forward by him except on a private members' day—to take up the time of the House as little as possible. But, as such strong opinions had been expressed on the question, he must say that if the question came up again he would not vote for a purely free system of education. He thought that those who were in a position to pay ought to pay. He did not think the amount should be large, but it should be enough to let parents feel that they were doing something for the education of their children. At the same time, those who could not afford to pay should be allowed to have their children educated free. That was his opinion in a few words. His object in bringing forward this resolution had either been misunderstood by those who opposed it or else it had been deliberately misrepresented. He had been rather surprised to find that both the Minister for Public Instruction and the leader of the Opposition had carefully avoided noticing the arguments that he had adduced. It seemed to be supposed that he had spoken against the advantages of higher education. He had done nothing of the kind.

Mr. GRIFFITH: The member for Blackall did that.

Mr. NORTON said he appreciated higher education as much as any man did; and he believed that every hon. member who had spoken in favour of the resolution regarded the matter in the same light. He did not think any hon. member deprecated the advantages of a higher education. He did not bring forward as his chief argument that because people in the outside districts could not avail themselves of these exhibitions, therefore they should not be granted. The argument he made use of was that there were many children in the outside districts who could not avail themselves even of the advantages of the general system of education, whose parents could not send their children to any school whatever. The teaching those children received had either to be given by the parents themselves or else by someone paid by the parents. That was where the inequality of the system came in. He felt bound to go into this matter, because from the discussions that had taken place it was evident that many members besides himself disapproved of the unnecessary expense to the State of providing the higher branches of education for the children of parents who could, in many instances, afford to pay for it. He did not care whether the vote was £50 or £15,000. The vote for scholarships was £1,286; for university exhibitions £900; and travelling expenses, £190; making £2,356 altogether. Now, he did not care whether the vote was £2,300 or the odd £56; the principle was the same. What he said was that

people who could not get any advantages in the education of their children, and who had to provide that education for themselves, had to contribute to this sum. They necessarily contributed to the large sum provided for the ordinary education in the primary schools and the grammar schools as well, and derived no benefit therefrom, but they were obliged also to contribute to this vote; and he hoped that the fathers of those children who benefited by the vote, if they ever thought on the question at all, would blush to think that their children were being educated at the expense of men who in a great many instances were poor, and who could not get any education whatever for their children. That was the position. He did not come there to represent part of his constituents only; but he was bound to represent those who could not get any education whatever for their children. The Minister for Education had spoken of people isolating themselves in the bush. Why should not people isolate themselves in the bush? If they could benefit themselves and were trying to benefit their children, they were also benefiting the State. Where would the country be if all the selectors and squatters simply took up their residence around the suburbs of a town? How on earth was the country to be developed by such means? He did not condemn exhibitions; but while he dared say there was no likelihood of private people giving benefactions or scholarships, it did not follow that the State should do so. If the people throughout the whole colony benefited as much as could be wished by the general system he would say nothing about this, but in many districts a large number did not benefit at all; it would be generally admitted that at least 10 per cent. of the parents derived no benefit whatever from the present State school system. And if such was the case, was the State justified in asking those people to contribute to a small fund, he admitted—but which might be increased every year—for the purpose of giving advantages to those children whose parents were in a position to give them a first-class education? The leader of the Opposition said they could not annihilate distance; but any fool could make that remark—it did not take a clever lawyer to find out that they could not annihilate distance, and it did not follow that, therefore, they should tax the people whose cause he advocated for the benefit of those who lived in the towns. He believed exhibitions did a vast amount of good; but they did some harm, too, in forcing on some an education which they were not in a position to fully appreciate. How was it that at the present time so many looked on manual labour as a disgrace, and considered it derogatory to undertake any task by which they might incur the term “labourer” or “working man”? They looked for employment as clerks in banks; they wanted a profession, and would do anything rather than work in the field, or turn their hand to honest labour such as tradesmen’s sons ought never to be ashamed of. He (Mr. Norton) would not be ashamed to put his son to any sort of labour. He had been obliged in his time to turn his hand to many kinds of dirty work, and men situated as he had been in the bush had often to do work which would rather surprise some hon. members. But why should they be ashamed of their business? He did not say that all this was necessarily the result of a high education; but it was the result of giving that education to people who were not able to appreciate its full advantage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The lower orders.

Mr. NORTON said he did not know who the lower orders were. In this country they were all equal: they were all workers, if not in one

way, then in another; and men who were considered to occupy a higher position than others had over and over again done work which had been done by the lowest of the lower orders. He did not recognise such distinctions. Whatever was a man’s occupation or position, if he did his work faithfully, he honoured that man as well as a man occupying the highest position in the land. He hoped there would be no misconception in regard to the vote. It was not directed against the educational system, but against what had grown out of that system. He did not consider himself in a position to bring forward a motion directed against the whole system; but after the strong expression of opinion they had heard some other hon. member might do so, and he (Mr. Norton) would feel called upon to support him. But the matter before the House was one of the simplest nature—whether those who derived no advantages whatever from the tax they were called upon to pay ought to pay an increased tax for the special benefit of those who got all the advantages of the general system as well.

Question put, and the House divided:—

AYES, 18.

Messrs. Mellwraith, Macrossan, Feez, Norton, Archer, Lumley Hill, O’Sullivan, Black, F. A. Cooper, Simpson, Weld-Blundell, Persse, Kellett, Lalor, Stevens, Stevenson, Baynes, and Low.

NOES, 21.

Sir Arthur Palmer, Messrs. Griffith, Pope Cooper, Foote, Dickson, Macfarlane, Francis, Grimes, Fraser, Bailey, De Satgé, McLean, Scott, Groom, De Poix-Tyrrel, Beattie, Kingsford, Kates, Miles, Aland, and Garrick.

Question resolved in the negative.

HOURS OF SITTING.

Mr. GRIFFITH, without notice, asked the Premier what his proposals were with regard to to-morrow. He had heard it was the intention of the Government to sit in the afternoon.

The PREMIER said he had given notice of motion on the subject, with the object of allowing private members to get through their business. He proposed that the House should adjourn at 10 o’clock and meet again at 7; but, if it was more convenient to hon. members, he would alter the motion so as to make 3 o’clock the hour of meeting.

SURVEY OF RAILWAY FROM GYMPIE TO BRISBANE.

Mr. HAMILTON, in moving—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates of this year, a sum sufficient to defray the expenses of an immediate survey of the following line of railway—Extension of Gympie and Maryborough line of Railway to Brisbane from Gympie—

said he did not intend to base his request for a survey on the ground that the construction of this railway should immediately follow, because, if he did so, the reason that would be urged against it by the Government would be that the granting of this survey would be an expression of opinion on their part that the railway should be constructed at once. He would simply show that there was a practicable route, and that it was desirable in the interests of economy that a survey should be made without delay, in order that the Government might reserve land along the course which the survey would indicate the railway would take. The survey had already been made of about thirty miles from Brisbane—namely, as far as Caboolture. From thence for the next ten miles the best course would be parallel to the Gympie road, but about two or three miles east of it. That portion of the country

was rather barren and rugged, but afterwards it improved, from an agricultural point of view, and for the next fourteen miles was fairly level. That would bring the line to Maroochie River, the cost of a bridge over which would be small. On getting over that river the line would traverse a barren plain. Mountain Creek would then be reached within a few miles of the coast. Between Mountain Creek and Maroochie River there would be three creeks to cross within a distance of ten miles, but none of them presented any great engineering difficulties. There would be a little cost in crossing Ugo Creek on account of the length of the bridge required. After getting over that country the Nindrie Range would be struck, which ran in a northerly and southerly direction. The best course then would be to skirt the western side of the Nindrie Range for about ten miles, which would bring the line to a low part of the range which formed the eastern watershed of the Mary River. From thence there was a spur of eight or nine miles, fairly level, running to the Six-mile Creek, and, having thus reached the Six-mile Creek, the line would cross fairly level country into Gympie. Captain Whish, who was no mean authority, considered that more level country would be found by taking a point from the low part of the range he had referred to, and going north for two or three miles to get to the head of the Six-mile Creek, and then running down the other side, getting from there to Gympie. He might state here that this Six-mile Creek ran east and west. This route had been described to him as practicable by men whose names were familiar to most hon. members. Mr. Pettigrew, of the Upper House, was one; Captain Whish another; and Messrs. McGhie and Goodchap, who were residents in the district, had also been over the whole ground. All those gentlemen agreed that the route presented very few engineering difficulties; in fact, it was only those who had not been over the ground who imagined that the cost of construction by that route would be great. Having shown that there was a practicable route, he should endeavour to show that it was desirable to make a survey without delay. A survey had already been made to Caboolture, and most persons were of opinion that the Sandgate Railway would be continued to that place. The railway would for a few miles skirt along the coast, and it would be a great boon to the citizens of Brisbane to have easy access to an eligible site for marine residences. The whole of the country between Caboolture and Pine River was thickly settled with farmers, and it was a picture to the eye to look down the rich valley of the South Pine River. About Caboolture there were hundreds of miles of Crown lands of great value; and Mr. Pettigrew, who was a judge equal to any in the colony, stated that there were twenty miles of timber country skirting the road, covered with valuable timbers equal to any in the colony. On the Blackall Range there was fine agricultural country, and a run had been taken up there, but had been given up in consequence of reserves being made. In the vicinity of Mooloolah twenty or thirty miles of country had been taken up, and were being successfully cultivated by small farmers; and every successive year land was taken up there in increasing quantities. Proceeding in the direction of Gympie and past the range, the route would next go through eight to ten square miles of very valuable scrub land. Then the head of the Mary River was reached, and the line continued through magnificent scrub country of red and black soil, equal to any in the colony. In many places the cultivation of sugar had commenced. As the land about there was being taken up in increasing quantities every year, any delay in deciding upon the survey and reserving

the necessary land would be attended with greatly increased expense to the colony when the time came for the construction of a line of railway. In advocating this survey he had not spoken of the great advantages which would accrue to both Gympie and Brisbane by connecting a large mineral district with the commercial centres of the colonies. Capital would be introduced from the South to be employed in the large mineral district of Gympie; and Gympie, Brisbane, and the Southern colonies would all be benefited. He had simply gone on the principle enunciated by hon. members on both sides of the House, that whenever a railway would possibly or probably be made a survey should be ordered without delay, in order that the Government might reserve the necessary land from sale.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said the hon. member for Gympie had given just such a description of the country he wanted surveyed as he (Mr. Macrossan) would give if about to propose plans of a railway which he wished the House to adopt; but, while feeling great respect for the gentlemen mentioned by the hon. member, he was not prepared to accept them as authorities on railway surveys. One thing was certain—that no matter what route might be taken the line must be carried to a great elevation to reach Gympie; and the hon. member had not shown how the jump was to be made from the low coast lands to the high land near Gympie. The hon. member would like the House to understand that the whole route was easy, plain, and very practicable, and the reason put forth by him for the survey was that land likely to be required might be reserved before it was alienated. If the motion were simply for a survey with no prospect of further expenditure for a number of years there would not be so much objection to it, but he (Mr. Macrossan) had never known a motion of that kind to stop there. The first step towards making a railway was to get a sum voted for a survey; then, sometimes before the survey was made, another sum was asked for, either by an hon. member or by the Government of the day, to make the railway itself. He objected to railways being obtained by surreptitious means of that kind; if they were to be had, let them be obtained fairly and openly. At the present time there was a very good railway to Gympie; in fact, Gympie was the better off in the way of communication than any other goldfield in the colony. To make a railway now, in the other direction, to Brisbane would be to simply destroy, to some extent, the utility of the one made at present; and he did not mean for a single moment to consent to the railway being made to bring Brisbane into competition with Maryborough. The plan as sketched out in the *Telegraph*, in the interests of the city of Brisbane, was evidently intended to destroy the trade which Maryborough naturally expected and should expect, and transfer it to Brisbane. When something had been done by the Maryborough and Gympie line towards developing a paying traffic between those two towns, it would be quite time to make a survey with the ultimate intention of making a railway to Brisbane. He had promised the House on two occasions to make a survey from some point on the Maryborough and Gympie line to Gayndah, and also a survey from the Mount Perry line to Gayndah, in order to determine the best route to reach Gayndah. Two railway surveys in the Wide Bay and Burnett district, he thought, were quite sufficient at a time, especially while there were many other districts requiring surveys much more. He thought it would be premature at the present time to make this survey. The hon. member must have had a very green eye when he imagined the marine

residences along the shores between Sandgate and Caboolture, Caboolture and Mooloolah, and between Mooloolah and some scrub. The marine residences spoken of by the hon. gentleman were not likely to spring up on the low-lying swamps that skirted the sea-coast from Sandgate along to the foot of the Mooloolah Range. He hoped, therefore, that the House would not agree to this, but that it would protect the Supplementary Estimates. The least sum that would be required would be £20 a mile. He did not know the distance of the line.

Mr. HAMILTON: About 120 miles.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that, then the sum of £2,400 would be required to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates, and it was too much to ask for after the Government placing £2,500 on the Loan Estimates for railway surveys. He hoped the House would not assent to it. He did not intend to assent to it, and it would perhaps be as well if the hon. member, having fulfilled his duty to his constituents, some of whom were desirous of having the survey made, would withdraw the motion and wait until the other surveys had been made to Gayndah. Until then the Government would not be justified in making the expenditure.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said that he hoped the hon. gentleman would not withdraw the motion. With reference to the other surveys mentioned by the Minister, this one stood on higher ground than they did, and should take the first place. It had been the policy of this colony hitherto to run lines westward—with what success hon. gentlemen might judge for themselves. In the Southern colonies—New South Wales and Victoria—they had pursued a different policy, and had endeavoured to connect the capitals with the great centres of population and the mining industry. New South Wales, for example, began two great lines running almost parallel with the coast—one from Newcastle to the north, and the other to Wagga Wagga. Victoria, on the other hand, which had so compact a little country, hardly to be compared to New South Wales, ran her railways off in every direction—Queenstown and Warrnambool, and another to meet the New South Wales railway, and so forth. In the country between Brisbane and Gympie there was a great deal of very valuable Crown land which would be greatly improved in value if this survey were granted. In a very few years Brisbane would be connected by railway with all the Southern colonies; and it was very desirable that the visitors from the South to Queensland should be able to visit Gympie, the goldfield of Southern Queensland. A great increase of capital would result from such facilities; and with regard to such a railway affecting Maryborough, he did not think it would touch the goods traffic there. Gympie would not be supplied with goods from Brisbane by rail. The heavy things would still go by sea to Maryborough, and thence to Gympie. There would be the local traffic, which would pay for the interest on the cost of construction. There was a large quantity of Crown land suitable for agricultural and pastoral purposes on the line of route, and there was also good timber. It was one of the best watered districts in the colony, and would carry a large population. It only required to be opened up to secure numerous applicants and give a large revenue to the country. The mere survey of the line would effect this. The Minister for Works had spoken of the difficulty of the route, and he (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) imagined that the hon. gentleman gave that as a reason why the survey should be deferred. He (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) thought this was the reason why the survey should be precipitated. That there was lots of room for the surveyors

might be considered a reason for delay, but if they waited until these Crown lands were alienated the railway engineers would be restricted in respect to country through which they might consider a practicable route could be obtained. If they desired an economical line it should be surveyed at once, and the best thing they could do would be to let the surveyors into the country as early as possible. He did not agree with the route pointed out by the hon. member for Gympie. He thought that it should go more to the west, and not so near the coast. He was inclined to think this from a personal inspection of the country. The seaside residences which the hon. gentleman spoke of were not likely to be carried into effect. There was no hope of it. They might expect plenty of traffic to result from agricultural occupation and the sending of produce to Brisbane. The hon. member only asked for a survey, and he should vote for the motion.

Mr. GARRICK said he was glad that this motion had been brought forward, and he hoped the hon. member for Gympie would persevere in the matter. He was very much surprised indeed that the hon. member did not ask for a sum of money to be placed on the next Loan Estimates for the construction of a line from Sandgate to Caboolture. He did not know whether this could be discussed within the terms of the motion, but he was sure that no branch line of railway would better pay than that one. As stated by the hon. member there were thousands of acres alienated, and the produce raised and the passenger traffic would amply repay the sum of money required for the construction of the line. The present hardships of the farmers were very well known to members of that House and to people outside. It was found very difficult to get their produce to market—so difficult that by the time it got to town the cost of conveyance had very much eaten up the actual profit. In consequence of the intimation given by the Premier that there would be no further railways constructed until the determination of the land-grant principle, he had taken no action in the matter, but he thought that this particular survey might be granted. He did not think the line would be so long as stated by the hon. member for Gympie; but with respect to the route he had selected he (Mr. Garrick) considered it a very good one. He had heard that from persons who knew the district very well. There was some of the richest timber on the coast in this district. He had been told that by persons who had settled in the scrub and had large parties at work. There were also excellent sugar lands about the Blackall Range which were lately dealt with by the Minister for Lands, and first-rate agricultural land lying on the coast. There were at least two sugar-mills, and the country was almost entirely free from frost. The survey might be made to secure from purchase the land along which the line would go. He hoped hon. members on the other side would see the fairness of the vote asked for by the hon. member for Gympie.

The PREMIER said the Government had put down a sum of £25,000 on the Loan Estimates for railway surveys in the various parts of the colony—a very large sum, considering the position of the colony, but sufficient to defray the expenses of the railway surveys which would be wanted before another Loan Estimate was brought forward. Having put down that, the hon. member for Gympie seemed to have assumed that this railway would not be included in that amount, and had asked for a sum on the Supplementary Estimates of this year for the line from Gympie to Brisbane. If they considered the expense of the surveys of the three

lines—Maryborough and Gympie to Brisbane, Maryborough and Gympie to Gayndah, and Bundaberg and Mount Perry to Gayndah—they would find it would swallow up at least one-half of the whole amount that was likely to be granted for railway surveys. The fact that such a proposition could be entertained by the House was an indication of the overwhelming interest which the metropolitan district had in that Chamber. The arguments brought forward in favour of the motion seemed to confute each other. The hon. member for Rockhampton tried to soothe the hon. members for Maryborough and Wide Bay by saying that after all the line would not take any traffic from Maryborough. If it did not, what was the use of making the railway at all? The Maryborough and Gympie line was made on the principle of giving railway communication somewhat fairly to the different districts of the colony, and it was made in order that the Wide Bay district should get the traffic from the Gympie Gold Field. That was fair and reasonable. To try now to take away that benefit by making a useless line was more than the House could stand. The revenue certainly would not stand a drain of the sort asked for—at least, he could not provide it; and the district was asking a great deal more than it was entitled to out of the £25,000. As there was a large amount of business on the paper he did not object to allow the matter to go into committee, but in committee he should most certainly oppose it.

Mr. DICKSON said the objection of the Premier was more plausible than real, for, no doubt, the hon. member would accept the money whether it came out of revenue or loan. If the House affirmed the desirability, the Treasurer could easily indicate that it was one of the services which the £25,000 was intended to cover. As to the expenditure being very large in one district, the three surveys would not cost more than £2,000 each, and that was not so very large a portion of the £25,000 to be provided for railway surveys. He trusted the survey asked for would be proceeded with as speedily as possible. As to the direction it should take, that was a matter on which he did not intend at present to enter. There was some magnificent country there which it was most desirable should be opened up; and the line would be the complement of the one already constructed. He should like to see the severances between the railways filled up, for it would result not only in increased settlement, but also in the more profitable working of the railways. The proposed line would greatly assist in developing the Gympie Gold Field. Investments in that goldfield were comparatively nothing to what they would be if there was more easy access between it and the metropolis. While the line would not militate against the traffic running along the Maryborough portion of the line, it would largely tend to open up new country, and to encourage mining enterprise on our oldest and best developed goldfield. He trusted the hon. member would so amend his motion as to ask that the money be provided out of the £25,000 placed on the Loan Estimates for railway surveys.

Mr. FEEZ said it was delightful to listen to the arguments of hon. members whose interests were concentrated in Queen street. A more cruel attempt had never been made to take away the trade of a place which had been working for many years to obtain it, and which had nothing else to fall back upon but its own limited resources. Brisbane had at present more than it was fairly entitled to. Considering that £200,000 of the public money was every year expended in Brisbane, it was a very serious matter to insert the

thin end of the wedge and divert to it the trade which Maryborough had worked so hard to gain. The existing railway fulfilled all the conditions and requirements of the district. The country between Gympie and Brisbane was some of the most difficult in Queensland, and he knew it well, having travelled over it many times. A line could not be carried over it without many bridges, and there was also a difficult mountain range to cross. When the Maryborough and Gympie Railway was made, it was prophesied that an attempt would soon be made to divert the Gympie trade to Brisbane; and the prophecy was about to be fulfilled. He sincerely trusted the House would not permit such a thing to be done.

Mr. PRICE said he believed the hon. member for Gympie was trying to benefit his district; but the hon. member for Rockhampton knew nothing about it. They had heard enough of the connecting link between Brisbane and Gympie, but he was interested in the whole district, and he considered that it was too much to ask for two surveys at the same time. He knew his hon. colleague would dare him to vote against the motion; but if that hon. member voted like a man, according to his conscience, he also would vote against it. Wide Bay was a large district, and Brisbane would like to tap the southern end of that district, no matter what it cost the country. He knew he was in a difficult position; but, whether he pleased his constituents or not, he did not consider it right to ask for another survey. It was, no doubt, an electioneering question; but he would stick honestly to his opinion that the country did not require this survey. He had been all over the district, and knew its requirements; but he would not vote in compliance with a political cry. He knew the hon. member for Gympie was pressed to bring the motion forward, and he had told the hon. member that he had done so in deference to the pressure brought upon him by Queen street and by his own constituency. He (Mr. Price) did not believe in damaging the Maryborough and Gympie Railway for the sake of Brisbane, and would vote against the motion.

Mr. BAILEY said the motion was not for the construction of a railway, but for the survey of a line which might not be made for many years. When the construction was required it would be quite time to discuss the probable results. The member of a district had a right to consider the interests of every portion of that district; but during the time he had been in the House, from certain circumstances, the inhabitants of the southern portion had been neglected. During the last few years settlement had increased between Gympie and Brisbane, but the inhabitants were almost cut off from communication with either one end or the other; and, if that was the only reason, it was sufficient reason why they should grant the survey. A line in the direction proposed would open up an immense timber district, and, considering the increasing scarcity of hardwood timbers in the South, the inhabitants would be glad to have the line. He hoped, when the hon. member went into committee with the resolution, he would be able to carry it through, as he was almost certain to carry it through the House.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he understood the Minister for Works to say that part of the £25,000 on the Loan Estimates for surveys would be appropriated for this survey.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: No.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if that was to be done the hon. member for Gympie had better withdraw his motion, otherwise he was determined to divide on the question. The various interests

of the capital and of Maryborough and Gympie never struck him; and he did not think any colony should have only one capital. It was as sure as that to-morrow's sun would rise, that a railway would ultimately be made from Gympie to Brisbane, notwithstanding the hon. member for Rockhampton's knowledge of the country. He did not think there was any engineering difficulty; and the country crossed would embrace an immense amount of the finest country in the colony on which people were already settled. If he went to Gympie he wanted to go in a few hours, and not to occupy a long time in going by sea and getting sea-sick. Speed was the order of the day; and he did not see why he should not assist in forming tributaries to the capital, as in New South Wales. If the Minister for Works surveyed a line from any part of the Maryborough and Gympie line to Gayndah, he would be injuring the southern part of the colony. The line to Gayndah should go from Mount Perry. There was no engineering difficulty in the way, and it would not interfere with the lines already surveyed, nor with a branch line intended to be constructed as an artery to the metropolis—the Mount Esk line. The line from Mount Esk to Nanango would take the head of the Burnett, and would go very near Gympie and the Copper Mines, and all that traffic would come to the capital of the colony. He would not be in favour of a coast line, but a line up the Mary and across to Gympie, or along a bone of a ridge between the Mary and the Gympie road. Such a line would go through well-timbered country. The better plan for the Government would be to accept the survey proposed and include it in the surveys provided for on the schedule to the loan vote of £25,000, and prevent the hon. member going into committee. If the motion went into committee it would be carried. The survey should be made; the country was rough, and the sooner the work was done the better, for it would be done some day.

MR. DE SATGE said he recollected the strenuous endeavours made by the Government of the day to have the present Gympie road constructed. Under pressure from Brisbane a large sum of money was at once devoted to the formation of that road. But the work had gone back, and the traffic had almost entirely ceased—even to the extent of the stoppage of Cobb's coaches. It had taken its natural course—by the Maryborough and Gympie line—and it was but fair to give that line a fair trial before trying to divert the traffic. If the survey of the line carried with it any great public object he should certainly vote for it to save the expense of buying up the land in the future. This line would in course of time be carried out, and he thought the Government were taking the most straightforward view of the case in face of the non-success of the original road, which was a very costly one. It would be too much to ask for this survey when the success of the Maryborough and Gympie line was not yet decided upon.

MR. HAMILTON said the Premier assumed that he considered no money would be provided for this survey, and that that was the reason of the motion. Certainly it was in consequence of that assumption that the motion was tabled. The Premier's argument that if this line were constructed it would be useless, would not carry much weight, because, with the experience of some of their railways, and the Maryborough and Gympie line more especially, which was already paying, it was fair to assume this line would pay. The hon. member for Gladstone had said he could easily understand any railway being constructed along the coast, and he probably saw

looming in the distance a line between Rockhampton and Gladstone, and the trade being diverted to Gladstone. As for the junior member for Wide Bay's statements, they were simply revelations to him (Mr. Hamilton). The Minister for Works gave as a reason why this survey should not be made that Gympie was about 1,000 feet high; but he could tell him that Caledonia Hill, which was the highest point, was only 450 feet high. That argument fell through, therefore. He also stated that he (Mr. Hamilton) might have other motives than the prevention of the land being alienated. It did not matter, however, what his motives were. That was no argument against the survey. Between Caboolture and Gympie, where the line had already been surveyed, the land was becoming very valuable. The land was rich, and was being very quickly taken up. About thirty square miles of that land had been taken up near Mooloolah, and so valuable was it that land sold for 8s. and 10s. per acre now would not be sold for £10 per acre. As another instance of what was thought of the land he might state that Mr. Gulland, only yesterday, took up 1,600 acres. He now wished to refer to some previous speeches of the Minister for Works on railway surveys. When the railway survey from Gladstone to Rockhampton was brought on by Mr. Palmer, on the ground that it would save the country a considerable amount of money hereafter, Mr. Macrossan then said that—

"He should support the motion quite irrespective of the interests of Gladstone and Rockhampton, on the ground that it would probably save the country a considerable sum of money at some future time."

Then again he stated on another occasion—

"Without making reference to the question of making railways and the quality of land referred to, he considered it the duty of the Government to have a survey made when there was any probability of the line ever being required."

Now, he (Mr. Hamilton) maintained that there was a probability of this line being required, and he agreed with that statement as laid down by the Minister for Works, that it was the duty of the Government to make surveys when there was a probability of the land being required. That was his reason for bringing forward this motion.

Question then put and passed.

GYMPIE AGRICULTURAL, MINING, AND PASTORAL SOCIETY.

MR. HAMILTON, in moving—

That the House will, on Friday, the 7th October, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed on the Supplementary Estimates for this year a sum not exceeding £1,200 sterling, as compensation to the Gympie Agricultural, Mining, and Pastoral Society, for losses incurred by them through the destruction of their buildings and the appropriation of their ground by the Government—

said it appeared that in May, 1871, an application was made for the site of this land, and permission was then given by the then Minister for Lands to proceed with the erection of buildings thereon. Permission was also given for the land being vested in trustees. Since then application had been made that the trustees might be gazetted, and the permission he had referred to was repeated to a deputation of citizens of Gympie, who waited on the Minister for Lands. The Mayor of Gympie informed him (Mr. Hamilton) that he was one of the deputation, and distinctly recollected the permission being given. The society, relying on that permission, erected expensive buildings amounting to about £1,500; and, in addition to that, they expended about £200 in stumping and

clearing the land of undergrowth. They calculated they had lost about £200 a year by subscriptions—the building having been removed—and £180 “take” money. He, however, had only put in a claim for £1,200, because he did not care about claiming more money than he thought the society was justly entitled to, and he considered the items of £180 and £200 for subscriptions and “take” money might be questioned. It was evident that the Government had broken faith with the Society. In a letter dated 9th December, the Commissioner for Railways wrote as follows:—

“I am instructed by the Secretary for Public Works to inform you that on reference to the Public Lands Department it would appear the society can substantiate no claim, inasmuch as the society were informed in June, 1878, that, pending the survey of the railway, it was decided to defer dealing with the society's application for a reserve for the Agricultural and Mining Society, Gympie.”

That was the sole reason for refusing the claim—namely, that in 1878 the society were informed that the Government would not be able to carry out the promise they had made. The society, in a subsequent letter dated December 31st, 1880, said:—

“I have been instructed to inform you that the tenders for the first of the Agricultural Society's buildings were accepted in May, 1877, including fencing, clearing, etc., with erection of outbuildings.

“A second building was erected in the following year, all on the good faith of a promise from the then Minister for Lands that the ground should be vested in trustees, free permission being given to go on with building.”

Another letter stating the facts of the case was sent to the Government, and a copy of it was sent to Mr. Douglas, who, in replying, said:—

“My attention having been called to the copy of a letter addressed to you by Messrs. Benson, Mellor, and Kidgell, in reference to the contemplated grant of a portion of land at Gympie, on behalf of the Agricultural Society, I have now to say that I believe the representations made in that letter are correct. It was at one time intended to make the grant referred to; subsequently it was found necessary to reconsider the question of the railway terminus. The Society, no doubt, erected their buildings believing that the grant would be made. The grant was not made. This is a case, I think, for some compensation.”

Those were, briefly stated, the grounds upon which the Society based their claim for the compensation asked for in the motion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said this was a claim put in by the Society to cover some real damage they had sustained, and some consequential damages which they thought they should be compensated for. The hon. member (Mr. Hamilton) quoted the authority of a letter from Mr. Douglas, in which that gentleman said that he thought the statement by the Society was correct, and he thought there was some claim for compensation. He (Mr. Macrossan) thought there was some claim, but he did not think the House would admit a claim for £1,200. The claim was originally £1,500, and though £300 had been knocked off there still remained some fancy items, which he could not understand. It appeared that, on the application of some gentlemen belonging to Gympie, Mr. Douglas had promised that certain land should be vested in trustees for the Society. The trustees were named but they were never gazetted, and the land was never vested. Therefore the land did not belong to the Society, as it would appear to have done from the terms of the motion. The Society had, therefore, no claim under the Railway Act for compensation, and he had told the people of Gympie three months ago that the only way of getting their claim was through their member. The hon. member, having that information, should have moved

in the matter early in the session, when a select committee might have been appointed to investigate the claim and draw up a report. The session was now nearly at an end, and it was very unfair of the member to ask the Government to either grant this claim or positively refuse it. He was not inclined to refuse it, but he could not grant the claim without knowing what the Government would have to pay. As the matter stood, he did not see how it could be settled this session with justice to the Government or to the Society. He thought the Society were entitled to compensation enough to enable them to replace their building and get another site. Further than that the Government should not go. The consequential damages, which were of a nature similar to the consequential damages claimed in the “Alabama” case, were claims which could not be admitted by any Government.

Mr. BAILEY said the Minister for Works was told about this matter three months ago, but instead of taking the grievance into consideration he told the Society they must arrange the matter through their member, and now he told the hon. member that he should have moved for a select committee. The Minister for Works had the power of arranging the matter in his own hands. Through his department the injury or injustice had been done, and he should have made inquiries as to the amount of damage done, and put the amount on the Estimates. As to the exact amount of damage sustained he could say nothing, but he was surprised at the way in which the Minister for Works had treated the matter.

The PREMIER said if the hon. member who had just spoken had known more about the case he would not have said what he did. The Minister for Works had no more business than the hon. member to put money on the Estimates. The fact was that the Society had put up a building on land which did not belong to them, and when the railway went through the land the building had to come down. In equity they had some claim, but the Minister for Works had no power to grant the claim. It was not the proper way to get the claim settled to bring it on in this form at the tail-end of the session. He had admitted the equity of the case as soon as he heard the claim; but how could the House come to a right conclusion when hon. members who were most interested in the district knew nothing whatever about the matter?

Mr. HAMILTON said he had anticipated that the Minister for Works would interpret the letter from Mr. Douglas as he had done, and he had therefore written some weeks ago requesting the Society to obtain from Mr. Douglas a direct affirmative or negative answer to questions upon which this claim chiefly rested. Had he obtained those replies as he expected, the matter would have been brought forward a fortnight sooner, and there would have been no difficulty in getting a select committee to inquire into the matter. It would only have been necessary to examine the books and records of the Society, and that could have been done in three-quarters of an hour. The Minister for Works did not interpret the statement of Mr. Douglas as the Society had done. The Society had claimed compensation on the ground that the land had been granted by the Government, and the Minister for Works did not deny that, but gave as a reason for not allowing the claim that the Society had erected the buildings after they had been warned not to do so. That was the reason the hon. gentleman gave for not giving compensation; but he (Mr. Hamilton) had proved that such a reason had not existed, as he had shown that the buildings

were erected before the warning took place. However, he did not suppose, as he had not sufficient evidence in his possession to support the motion, that there was any good going on with it now. He should, therefore, withdraw it, intending, however, to bring it on again next session.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

WILDASH AND HUTCHISON'S CLAIM.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN moved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the following resolutions, namely:—

1. That in view of the circumstances disclosed by the evidence taken before the Select Committee which sat last session on the petition of Messrs. Wildash and Hutchison, and in terms of the recommendation embodied in the Report of that Committee, the House is of opinion that a grant of _____ acres of land should be given to the Petitioners.

2. That an Address be presented to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to take the necessary measures to give effect to the foregoing resolution.

He said that at that late hour of the night, and in the exhausted and thin state of the House, coupled with the fact that they debated these resolutions for two hours and a-half last Friday, he should beg of the House that, in order to hurry on the business, these resolutions might be allowed to go into committee. Any further debate that would be likely to take place on them could take place better in committee, and he was sure that, considering the obstacles which had been thrown in his way, this much would be granted him by the Opposition. Otherwise he should have a good deal to say on the resolutions.

The PREMIER said that for the reason given by the hon. member—namely, to expedite the other business on the notice-paper—he should offer no objection to these resolutions going into committee. He should offer, however, the most strenuous opposition to the grant when they got there.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it would be only a waste of time going into committee.

The PREMIER said that he should offer no objection, but he did not mind what other hon. members might do.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that if this matter went into committee it would simply block the whole of the private business to-morrow, and the hon. member knew that it would do so. He hoped the House, therefore, would put its foot down at once and prevent it going into committee. It would be a disgrace to Parliament if this motion were allowed to pass. The claim was that of a man who attempted to acquire land by evading the law, and who carried on that scheme for years, hoping eventually to get it in defiance of the law. But he did not get the land. His nefarious schemes met with the fate they deserved, and, because other people did succeed where he did not, the House was asked to put this man on an equal footing with them. It was as if, in the case of a lot of smugglers, some of whom were caught and punished and some were not, those who were punished were to claim to be placed on the same footing as those who were not and to have their share of profit and of the goods which had been seized. It was all very well to say that subsequently some of the people got their land, but Mr. Wildash ought not, therefore, to be allowed to succeed in—not a fair enterprise, in which case he might have deserved some redress—but what was simply a failure to carry out a systematic attempt to defraud the country. The country had lost by it. The lands had to be given away for nothing. Mr. Wildash had not only attempted to defraud the

country, but he actually boasted of having done so in a letter which was produced before the Select Committee, in which he said—

"I have yet to learn that there is anything morally wrong in a person having the means of acquiring land doing so, notwithstanding laws passed hedging around the mode of acquisition, all sorts of obstacles and restrictions. Ever since the various Legislatures of these colonies deviated from the natural law of supply and demand by attempting to prevent persons with money to purchase what is for sale, there has been a continual fight between the law and the persons wishing to acquire land by paying for it, and in which in most cases the purchaser has come off victorious."

That amounted to this—that he had been engaged for a series of years evading the law; and so he was. The land laws made by the Legislature were made with the most stringent provisions for procuring settlement upon the land, and allowed the land to be acquired in 320-acre lots only, and insisted on cultivation. This gentleman and some others took up some of the most valuable land on the Darling Downs by dummies—by their sisters, and their cousins, and their aunts—by their attorney in Sydney, and his sisters, and his cousins, and his aunts, and so on. He (Mr. Griffith) had seen the list. In every possible way the law was defied, and that magnificent tract of country, through which they were going to make a railway a few evenings ago, was locked up through the nefarious scheme of this individual. He had no sympathy with such a person. It was a very fortunate thing for him that he did not suffer in a more serious way than by not getting the land. The country had paid heavily for his scheming, not only in losing the land but in losing settlement, and, still more, by the odium cast upon it by such schemes as this. This gentleman must be considered the prototype of dummynism. He was the arch-dummier of the colony, and because other dummies had been successful they were asked to reward him for his schemes. By the steps he (Mr. Griffith) took in 1874 thousands of acres were recovered for the colony. Were they to compensate the owner of those lands? Because some people succeeded in getting their lands and this gentleman did not, were they to give him two acres instead of every one he lost, and so put everyone on an equal footing? If there was anything exceptional in his case, it was that it was the very worst one of them all, and that less consideration was therefore due to Mr. Wildash than to any other person. The case of Mr. Hutchison was very different. Mr. Hutchison had been very unfortunate, and he (Mr. Griffith) did not think he was a party to any of the schemes. Mr. Hutchison, however, chose to go into partnership, and lost. He did not know how many other people had gone into speculations unsuccessfully, and the House was not asked to give them redress. It was suggested that all this trouble arose in consequence of his action in 1874, when proceedings were taken at his instance to recover some of these lands. But the question arose long before that, and he might say that if these gentlemen had not been satisfied of the weakness of their case they would have had the matter settled long before 1876 or 1877. The fact was that they dared not go on, and that was why they did not get their land. The question arose in December, 1869, when the then Attorney-General, Mr. Pring—now Mr. Justice Pring—was called upon to give an opinion to the Secretary of Public Lands as to these leases, the conditions of which had not been and could never be complied with. After pointing out that the conditions of the law were not altered, and that the improvements must be made within the twelve months, the last question asked Mr. Pring was this:—

"In the event of the Government demanding and receiving rents on forfeited selections, would such action

have the effect of remitting the penalty of forfeiture, or would it preclude the Government from making a re-entry on the land and dealing with it in the usual way? I think not. The forfeiture takes place absolutely upon non-compliance with the conditions. The interest of the selector then ceases and determines, and the forfeiture cannot in law be waived by acceptance of rent subsequent to such forfeiture."

Upon that, one of these gentlemen, Mr. Smith, he believed—Mr. Smith was one of the family—one of the dummies—commenced proceedings in the Supreme Court, and he dared not go on. He was acting in the interests of Mr. Wildash. That action was brought in July, 1870, when the Crown put in a defence, and they simply dared not go on with it. They practically abandoned their claim, knowing they could not get a title. Then they complained some years afterwards that the land was sold by the mortgagees. If they thought they had an honest, *bond fide* claim why did not they enforce it? They dared not. They looked to some friendly Government coming into power to give them their grants, and they looked in vain. The matter stood over till 1874, and to settle the question he (Mr. Griffith) commenced adverse proceedings against gentlemen in the same position; and the courts of the colony were of opinion that Mr. Pring's opinion was right, and he was of that opinion still, though the Privy Council decided differently. Some time afterwards the mortgagees took possession of the land, and the country was compelled to part with it to the purchaser from them. Mr. Wildash had no merits whatever, except that he was personally unsuccessful in an attempt to evade the law and defraud the country of one of the finest estates in the territory. He did not get the advantage, and now he asked the country to give him the advantage. He hoped most sincerely that attempts of that kind would not succeed. It was a perfectly shocking claim. As to Mr. Hutchison, he was very sorry for him. He could not understand how the motion was brought before the House. A thing of that kind must be done by a Bill. He supposed an attempt would be made to bring it under the Act of 1876, but that Act only authorised the grant of land in trust for any special purpose approved by resolution of Parliament. It provided for vesting land in trustees for public purposes. If the motion was carried, and the House in Committee resolved to assist in carrying out what he called that nefarious attempt to plunder the country afresh, it would all fail, unless a Bill was brought in, which would have to pass through the ordeal of both Houses before it became law; and no such Bill was likely to pass this session. He had thought it right to speak out plainly on that matter. He had done his best, not only to discourage these practices, but to punish people who engaged in it, and that he had not been more successful he very much regretted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said that when the Premier stated his willingness to allow the matter to go into committee it was with the object of allowing other motions on the paper to get a hearing that night. It would certainly be better if the matter could be disposed of after a short debate, especially as it had been so well debated last Friday. The question he wished to ask was whether all the evidence had been obtained that could be obtained? He thought Mr. Macansh ought to have been summoned, for he could have thrown light upon it. He heard Mr. Macansh say in the precincts of the House, at a select committee on some selections in the Warwick district, presided over by the Hon. Mr. Graham, M.L.C.—although it was not on record—that Mr. Wildash made an offer to him to assist him in getting those lands

from the Government, and that when Mr. Macansh refused to accept the offer he turned round and threatened him that he would do his best to prevent him from getting the lands, by proving that they were obtained in the first instance by fraud and perjury. A gentleman who could make a statement of that kind should certainly have been summoned before the Select Committee. Since the matter was last before the House, a letter had been received from Mr. Macansh which he would read, and from which the House might draw its own conclusions. The letter was as follows:—

"Canning Downs,
"3rd October, 1881.

"Sir,—I have the honour to address you respecting a claim which has been set up by Messrs. Wildash and Hutchison for compensation for the withholding, by Government, of certain deeds of land on Canning Downs, and to bring under your notice the following facts:—When I purchased Canning Downs from Wildash and Hutchison's mortgagees, certain portions of land were held by Mr. Wildash, Kenneth Hutchison, and George Hutchison, that had been taken up by them under the 1868 Act. As those lands could not legally be mortgaged, the abovenamed gentlemen gave the mortgagees a joint 'declaration of trust' that they held them as part of the mortgaged Canning Downs Estate. That document was legally made over to me, and when I asked Mr. Wildash and the Messrs. Hutchison to transfer the lands to me—which they could have done after I purchased the property—they all refused to do so. In fact, those gentlemen who now ask Parliament to give them a grant of land on account of alleged losses at Canning Downs actually retained possession of a portion of that estate which they declared they held in trust, simply because the law was such that the 'declaration of trust' was only binding on their honour.

"Within the last three months I have purchased part of the same lands from the Hutchison family for over £4,000.

"Shortly after I purchased the property Mr. Wildash offered for a consideration to assist in obtaining the deeds that had not been issued for the Canning Downs 1866 lands, and, on my refusing his assistance in any way or on any consideration, he threatened to volunteer evidence to Government to show that the said lands had been acquired by fraud and perjury.

"I am prepared to substantiate all I have stated herein.

"I have, etc.,
"JOHN D. MACANSH.

"The Honourable Thomas McIlwraith, Colonial Treasurer, Brisbane."

Mr. Macansh had volunteered to give evidence. When he saw that the country was about to be defrauded of 30,000 acres of land he thought it time to come forward and volunteer the information. Until that time it was not his duty to come forward and volunteer evidence. After hearing that letter read he thought that some hon. members who might have given a sort of half-promise to support the motion would think seriously before doing so.

Mr. DE SATGE said the letter just read put a very different construction on the question, and he thought the best thing to be done now would be to recommit the question in order to bring the fresh evidence forward. They could not set the report of the Select Committee at complete defiance. He had listened carefully to the speech of the hon. member for North Brisbane, and admired the determined stand he had taken against dummyism. That was all very well in its place; but the question was not based on the frauds by which Canning Downs was acquired, but upon the breach of promise made by a Minister. Had that breach of faith not taken place the frauds would never have occurred. Had the promised lease been ratified the lands would never have been alienated in the way they were, but would have been gradually withdrawn and gradually sold; and, instead of this man being driven to utter ruin, the land would probably have been settled by *bond fide* selectors. The land was secured by the assistance and

agency of the very mortgagees who lent Mr. Wildash the money, and who sold Canning Downs to the present proprietor. He granted that the letter read to the House contained some very weighty matters; but they should not ignore the decision of the Committee that sat on the question, the report of which recommended a grant of land. He deprecated fully the action of Mr. Wildash in acquiring the land in the way he did; but the breach of faith on the part of the Government drove him to it. With the view of enabling the House to get the evidence of Mr. Macansh, he moved the adjournment of the debate.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he did not know whether Mr. Macansh told the truth in the letter they had just heard, but he had the opportunity of telling the story when the Committee sat, and carefully kept away. He had had some public business with Mr. Macansh, and found him very unwilling to tell the truth. He was invited to do so in the usual way, but returned impertinent and offensive answers. He would not say how he negotiated the purchase of the property, but Mr. Wildash's status in society was quite as good as Mr. Macansh's; and the way Mr. Macansh managed to get Canning Downs was anything but honourable. He, whilst on a visit to Mr. Wildash, spied out the land with Mr. Smith, of Smith and Macdonnell, and, with the appearance of being a friend, took notice of all the particulars; and the next thing that was heard after the extension of time was the pretended sale, which happened afterwards to be an accomplished fact, and which, through the efforts of the late Mr. Davenport, realised a great deal more than he expected. The case was not put fairly. If Mr. Macansh was genuine he would have sent the letter to the Committee. He believed he was asked by the Committee to give evidence, but declined;—the hon. member for Stanley could correct him if he was wrong. It was a strange thing to send the letter at this period mentioning the nefarious offer made to him. If the offers were made, he knew enough on the other side of the question to say what Mr. Macansh was ready to do. He held that a wrong was done by the State, whether to Mr. Wildash or anyone else, though he did not sympathise with the course of conduct Mr. Wildash adopted. Deeds under similar circumstances were handed to other individuals without let or hindrance; but Mr. Wildash was singled out because he entered into the business in a wholesale fashion. The outlook was very bright—there was a prospect of a number of law cases; and the country knew how much success had attended the leader of the Opposition in those cases. He believed the hon. member lamentably failed in every case he undertook—he was bound to say—in the interests of the country. It was a wrong to deny the man what the highest authorities in the realm had decided he was entitled to. But, owing to perverseness or unwillingness, the deeds were delayed—for what purpose he would not say, but it was not in the interests of the country. The man had no other court of appeal but the House; and, without indicating what compensation he was ready to give, he was willing to go into committee to consider the matter.

Mr. GARRICK said the adjournment of the debate might have been allowed without the speech of the Minister for Lands. When the hon. member read that speech to-morrow he would regret having uttered it. It was not fair to a gentleman who was not able to defend himself to make the charge the Minister for Lands had just made.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Has he not got you here?

Mr. GARRICK said Mr. Macansh was as well known in this colony and the adjoining 1881—3 I

colonies, and better known, than the Minister for Lands, and he had no hesitation in saying that what the hon. member had just said would not have the slightest effect. He had known Mr. Macansh for a long time, and believed him perfectly incapable—as did all who knew him—of having said, or done, or thought anything like the Minister for Lands had described.

Mr. SCOTT said the letter read by the Minister for Works was one of the strangest he had heard in the House, but he did not think they were bound to accept it as gospel until they heard the other side of the question. The letter bore internal evidence that Mr. Macansh and Mr. Wildash were not on good terms. This was shown by the fact of Mr. Macansh refusing to accept Mr. Wildash's assistance in getting the titles of the lands. Mr. Macansh might or might not be honourable—he did not know that gentleman—but it was not right or proper that any letter of that kind should be taken to condemn a man unheard.

Mr. SIMPSON said the sending of the letter under the present circumstances was very extraordinary, and strengthened him in favour of Mr. Wildash. He had the pleasure of knowing that gentleman, of whom he held the highest opinion. It seemed, according to the letter, that Messrs. Hutchison got £4,000 out of Mr. Macansh. If that was the case, the member who had charge of the motion would have heard of it. He did not believe they would receive £4,000 so recently without informing the hon. member. If they had accepted the money, and allowed the hon. member for Stanley to bring the matter forward without that knowledge, they were very much to blame. It would be better to have some further explanation, as he felt doubtful which way he ought to record his vote. It was a matter that might or might not be taken as a precedent. Mr. Wildash was not the only sufferer, though he was the most severe sufferer under the 1866 Land Act; and it would be better to postpone the matter and find out the merits of the case.

Mr. GROOM said there was one statement in Mr. Macansh's letter which might lead hon. members a little astray. The Mr. Hutchison mentioned in the letter was not the Hutchison who petitioned the House, but a younger brother. There were three brothers, and this one, fortunately for himself, did not go into the affair with his brothers, but invested his money in another direction.

Mr. KELLETT said he was sorry he had only heard the latter part of the letter read, but from what he had heard he thought it a most extraordinary thing. It showed animus of the worst description, and although he might say he had known Mr. Macansh for some time as an honourable man he thought a great deal less of him now. Knowing that these things had been going on, it was his duty, and he would have been justified in reporting them and bringing them under the notice of the House. It was a low, mean way at this time of letting the House know of these things. The report of the Select Committee that had gone into this matter, and which report was borne out by the evidence, showed that a great injustice had been done to Mr. Wildash. It had been argued by the leader of the Opposition that the land was acquired by fraud, and he had stated that he had always been anxious to put down frauds, and that he was the great opponent of dummying. Did anyone believe that? Instead of being the opponent of dummying he fostered it. He did that to make money, and sent cases to England, at the expense of the country, well knowing that they must be lost.

Mr. DICKSON rose to a point of order. The hon. member was imputing motives.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member for Enoggera is quite right. The hon. member for Stanley must not impute motives.

Mr. KELLETT said he was sorry he could not say all that he wanted to, but he was certain hon. members believed what he said. In this report of the Committee he read an extract from the opinion of a much abler man than the leader of the Opposition—a man whose evidence carried more weight—it was that of Chief Justice Cockle; and his opinion was that the statement contained within the written petition disclosed a *prima facie* case for inquiry before a court of equity. That House was a court of equity, and they were arguing this, he hoped, before a court of equity. A distinct promise had been given by the Minister of the day that Mr. Wildash's rights would be secure for five years, and yet immediately after that the country was thrown open. The rents had been received and conditions fulfilled; and it had been decided in the other cases sent home, by the Privy Council, that the Government had no alternative but to grant the deeds when they continued to receive the rents. Could a greater injustice be done by a Minister than to act fair by one man and foul by another? And yet this had been proved. Anyone who read the evidence of Messrs. Gregory and Tully would see that there was a promise of these deeds, and after the promise they were refused, the mortgagees foreclosed, and the property was sold. There was no doubt that ill-feeling existed between the two parties all along, and it had now culminated in this ill-written, ill-devised, paltry, spiteful letter. He did not think they should take any notice of it; but, in any case, the other side must be allowed to refute the letter. In the meantime, Mr. Wildash could rest satisfied that the letter would be taken for what it was worth only. He agreed to the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. GRIMES said he had expressed his opinion before, but would like to call the attention of the House to one portion of the evidence. The hon. member for Stanley said that the conditions were fulfilled. If he would look at question 186, in the evidence of Mr. Gregory, he would find this question put:—

"Can you say whether the cultivation clause was fulfilled?"

And the answer was—

"I can say that it was not."

And again, in question 996—

"The cultivation clause in this case was really not fulfilled? It was not."

That was pretty plain, and should show to the House that these conditions were not fulfilled on that land.

Mr. LOW said, as one who had known Mr. Macansh for a great number of years, he simply rose to say that a more honourable or truthful man did not exist in the district or in the colony.

Mr. PERSSE said he should like to say a few words on this subject, as, unfortunately, he had not an opportunity of saying anything last Friday. He would let the House and the country know his views on the matter. He must say he had been surprised to hear the letter read by the Minister for Lands. He had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Macansh, and had no reason to think him anything but an upright and straightforward man; but he also had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Wildash for a much longer period, and he could say that his sympathies were with him. He had been harshly dealt with from the very first—from the very moment he set foot in Queensland, as the hon. member for Stanley had said. He was allowed to buy this property in the first instance under false pretences. He believed he would get his

five years' lease, and he did not get it. He believed he would get his deeds, but he never got them, and the mortgagees closed on him. But for that he would have been at this time a wealthy man. He could not understand that letter coming from Mr. Macansh. Young Hutchison had some land adjoining Canning Downs, which Mr. Macansh thought he had a right to get too. The only thing that now remained to the Hutchison family was the property to the amount of about £4,000, represented by this land. Was the report of a select committee to be ignored because of this letter that had nothing to do with the question? Mr. Macansh had had years to consider this matter, and he was in duty bound to give any information he possessed to the Committee. He said nothing, however, till the eleventh hour, when he wrote this letter. Before any decision was arrived at, he thought Mr. Macansh should be brought forward to substantiate what he had said.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said if the leader of the Opposition and he were out of the House he would say that the way in which that hon. gentleman had attacked him on Friday and to-night was mean and paltry. The hon. gentleman waited until the matter was thoroughly debated and then he came forward in a disingenuous manner, and said there was a letter or an ungrammatical construction or something else to upset the motion. The hon. gentleman could see anything through a gimlet-hole, and he was so used to swindles that he saw them in the air, and dreamt of them. He had dreamt in the same way about the Darling Downs, and the mansion he now lived in was called dummy hall, because he built it out of dummy money. The hon. gentleman started that night with a false statement, for he said if the motion was not disposed of that night the business of the session would be retarded; but he would find that not pushing it on had retarded the business. The hon. gentleman said also that the case was a nefarious one; and that was a false statement, logically speaking. The hon. gentleman was a dexterous pleader, and he began in the middle of the subject, and, like a man swimming, beat the water on both sides of him. The beginning of the subject was that a promise was made to Mr. Wildash, and on the faith of that promise he forfeited his whole property. Why could not the hon. gentleman have the manliness and honesty to state that?

Mr. GRIFFITH: I don't believe a word of it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that was according to the petition which came before the Committee, and the evidence taken had borne it out to the letter. He could not state whether the Chairman sent for Mr. Macansh, but he was quite certain that Mr. Macansh knew the Committee was sitting. It had been stated that Mr. Macansh was an honourable man—Brutus was an honourable man, and no doubt all men were honourable until they were found out. He believed that letter branded Mr. Macansh as being what he could not express in parliamentary language; no honest man would have sent such a letter at the eleventh hour. Nothing could be more fair than a request for time to ascertain whether the statements in that letter were true. The letter bore the brand of falsehood. The writer coupled Mr. Wildash and the two Hutchison, together as a company, but no such company ever came before the Committee for examination. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Griffith) had handled him (Mr. O'Sullivan) that night in a way that he was not likely to forget, and he would handle the hon. gentleman for it, or if he did not do so it would be through want of ability and not through want of will. If he had had the same advantages in youth as the hon. gentleman had enjoyed he might have been able to compete with him. Mr.

Wildash and Mr. Hutchison came before the Committee, but George Hutchison did not come before them. He was a boy not known in the matter, and not belonging to the firm. It appeared that he had the option of joining the firm, but he never became a partner. The hon. gentleman said he was very sorry for these two young men; but what did the hon. gentleman know about sorrow? It was a figure of speech with him, and he had no more feeling than a cockroach, and no blood in his heart. He believed the hon. gentleman understood no more the feelings of a man than a pig did. What a respectable, manly way the hon. gentleman took to show his sorrow—saying that this gentleman not only defrauded the country, but also boasted of it. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) maintained he did nothing of the sort. Surely the hon. gentleman did not need to be told what the meaning of "Government" was. A short definition, he supposed, would be, "a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants;" but had the Government of the day provided for the wants of these people after taking their money? Another hon. member had said that the House would be turned into a relief board. Of course it was a relief board. The Government had power over everything, and it took the management of lunatic asylums, penal settlements, and everything else. The individuals gave up part of their liberty in order to secure the whole. Was he now to be told by a constitutional lawyer that individuals had no rights? Was it right when a private individual had been robbed of his property, and had not a shilling in his pocket, that a constitutional lawyer should boast that such a person was not game to go to law with the Government? He hoped the hon. gentleman would dream of the way he had triumphed, and perhaps add another room to dummy hall. He thought that, taking it all in all, if they were entitled to any fair play at all the debate ought to be adjourned until they were able to get a proper reply to this letter. It was certainly a very strong letter, and if he thought it was true he would throw the whole thing up altogether. He had been in the House for years, but he had never put his finger in the mud or dirt or anything filthy. This matter had been thrust upon him. He was no friend of dummyism. He had had a sort of objection to this dummy king, as he was called, though it was never proved—and there was no proof that Mr. Wildash was a dummer. The hon. member for Oxley had made a wonderful discovery that night—taking his cue, no doubt, from the leader of the Opposition. The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Gregory stated in the evidence that it was clearly proved that in a certain year the conditions were not complied with. But what did that amount to? A certain amount of cultivation had to be made in one year. There was not a single instance in the colony of this being complied with. There was not a single instance where forfeiture took place for non-fulfilment of conditions. He found that there were several cases where forfeiture took place for non-payment of rents, bearing out the evidence of the Hon. Mr. Taylor—that they wanted the money in the Treasury, and nothing else. They had it in evidence that Mr. Wildash demanded either forfeiture or the deeds, and he was refused either the one or the other. They had it also in evidence that £3,044 more was paid on these selections in improvements than was necessary under the Act. They had it also in evidence that improvements were an utter farce, and that the Government of the day never intended that anything of the kind should take place at all. They had it on the evidence of a very able man—the first Surveyor-General of the colony—that when he came to examine

improvements one gentleman came up to him and told him that he insisted that he had made the proper improvements because he had sown four pumpkins to the acre. They called that cultivation. Was anything ever heard of so absurd as that! They had it also in evidence that the Surveyor-General of the day demanded that the lands should be forfeited, and made out the schedule of forfeiture. In the face of that the Minister of the day stopped him and told him to do nothing of the kind. So, could anything be more absurd than the talk of the hon. gentleman for Oxley, who triumphantly told the House that he found from the evidence that the conditions were not complied with! The hon. gentleman knew nothing at all about the matter. He (Mr. O'Sullivan) did not know whether he ought to carry this matter on now. He promised the hon. member at the head of the Opposition that he would be better prepared with it next time. The hon. member stated in his speech that forfeiture took place; but he (Mr. O'Sullivan) said that it did not do so, and, as he had already stated before, nothing of the kind took place. He was sorry there was no truth in the statement of so high an authority as the leader of the Opposition. What was the good, he would ask, of requesting certain members of the House to investigate the case, and after that was done and they brought up a unanimous report, the House said it would pay no respect at all to the views of the members of the Committee. He was beginning to lose confidence in reports of either commissions, boards, or select committees. He had never seen a shadow of respect shown to them in the House, and if he was much longer in the House he should refuse in the future to go on any committee at all, because it was really a waste of time, and he could be doing something at home in his garden instead of it. Was it not a gross disrespect to hon. members when they brought up a report to have it disregarded? He should go with the hon. member's motion for the adjournment of the debate, and he thought it was only fair that an opportunity should be given to reply to this letter, which would appear in *Hansard* to-morrow. It would go in uncontradicted. On the impulse of the moment, it had its influence on the House, and hon. members ought to be allowed to come to a calm decision upon it. He thought, therefore, that it was only common justice to adjourn the debate.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he was not going to reply to the attack made upon him by the hon. member, because he was quite satisfied that before the hon. member was very much older he would be much more sorry for it than anybody else. The attack was entirely unjustifiable, but he only wanted to correct one point, and that was with respect to the discussion of the previous Friday. The hon. gentleman was, perhaps, not aware that he (Mr. Griffith) was absent from the House until within five minutes of the time that the motion was ruled out of order.

Question of adjournment put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. O'SULLIVAN, the resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Thursday next.

CASE OF PHILIP BRIDE.

Mr. KINGSFORD, in moving—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of an Address to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be placed upon the Supplementary Estimates of 1881-2 the sum of £150, as a gratuity to the Widow and Orphans of the late Philip Bride, who lost his life while in the service of the Government—

said the motion was one which he was sure would commend itself to the consideration of the House.

It was unnecessary to make any lengthy remarks about the case. Philip Bride had been for twelve or fourteen years in the service of the Government, connected with the Harbours and Rivers Department. He met with an accident while assisting to remove a buoy in the river, or the harbour, which necessitated his being removed to the hospital; and while undergoing an operation there, or immediately afterwards, he died, leaving behind him a widow and six children; and another child had been born since his death. The widow and seven orphans had been left without means of support, and had, of course, been plunged into the deepest poverty. It was a case of real distress, which would commend itself not only to the Government but to every member of the House. It was an appeal that could not be well resisted by anyone who had a feeling for those in trouble; and he thought it was the duty of the House and the country, as far as practicable, to assist those families who sustained the severest loss that could possibly be sustained—namely, their bread-winner—when that loss was occasioned whilst in the service of the Government. The man had always borne a very excellent character. During the whole period of his service under the Government, and also during three previous years when he was under the Imperial Government, not a single complaint had been made against him. He trusted the House would accede to the motion, and grant the small gratuity for which he asked.

The PREMIER said the wording of the motion was misleading. The man Bride, no doubt, died at the hospital, but he did not lose his life while in the service of the Government. He had never been able to find out the cause of Bride's death, but he did not think it was attributable to the performance of his duties under the Government. All the other facts were as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Kingsford). All he could ascertain from the department was that Bride was first appointed to the department in May, 1869; that he paid his contribution to the superannuation fund for some time; that the amount so paid was subsequently refunded to him; and that a sum was subscribed by friends to pay his funeral expenses. A request was made to him (the Premier) to put a small gratuity for the widow on the Estimates, but that was beyond his power, as there was no legal claim on the department. The only claim there was was that, if the Civil Service Act had not been repealed, the amount accruing to the widow on his death would have been £106. The amount refunded to Bride on the repeal of the Act was £22. If the House thought proper to give the widow the difference—namely, £84—he should offer no objection.

Mr. McLEAN said that, although the man did not actually die while in the service of the Government, he received injuries which resulted in his death.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he believed the case to be one of real distress. He had been informed that Bride received the injury which caused his death while doing something to a buoy in the harbour. It was a similar case to that for which the hon. member for Fortitude Valley got a gratuity of £100 last session. They ought to be satisfied with the proposition of the Premier, and whatever the widow got she would no doubt be very thankful for.

Question put and passed.

ALLEGED IRREGULARITY.

Mr. BAILEY moved—

That an Address be presented to the Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid upon the table of the House, copies of all Corres-

pondence relating to the alleged irregularity in the introduction of the Appropriation Bill No. 1 of this year; together with all minutes of the Executive Council and all documents relating thereto.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER, in moving the adjournment of the House, said that with regard to the extra sitting to-morrow he had consulted with several hon. members, and found that the most convenient plan was to meet as usual at half-past 10 in the morning, sit till 1 o'clock, and then meet again at half-past 3.

The House adjourned at half-past 10 o'clock.