

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 1884**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Wednesday, 26 November, 1884.*

Questions.—Petition.—Questions without Notice.—  
 Formal Motion.—Annexation of New Guinea.—  
 Message from the Legislative Council.—Supply—  
 resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

## QUESTIONS.

Mr. ANNEAR asked the Minister for Works—

Were there any real or supposed informalities in any of the tenders received for the Brisbane Valley Railway Extension; if so, in whose tender did such occur, and what did they consist of?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) replied—

Doubts existed as to the formality of the lowest tender in consequence of the total amount not being inserted on the form of tender; but as it was for a schedule contract, and the schedule was properly prepared, the tender was, after consideration, declared formal in accordance with the condition of tendering.

Mr. LISSNER asked the Minister for Works—

1. Is Cairns to be the terminus of the proposed railway from Herberton to the coast?

2. If so, when will the Government call for tenders for its construction?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. W. Miles) replied—

1. It is intended that Cairns shall be the terminus.

2. As soon as the plans are approved by Parliament, permanent surveys completed, and the working plans sufficiently forward.

## PETITION.

Mr. STEVENSON presented a petition from Mr. John Sanderson Lyster, respecting certain selections on the Daintree River, and moved that the petition be read.

Question put and passed, and petition read by the Clerk.

On the motion of Mr. STEVENSON, the petition was received.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Has the Premier considered when it is likely we shall have the papers connected with the late accident on the Southern and Western Railway printed and put before hon. members? There appears to be a large mass of papers, and if there is any delay in the printing the object of having the papers laid upon the table will be defeated. There is a lot of rubbish, no doubt, amongst them, and although I do not believe in omitting papers, I believe in getting them quickly before the House. I wish also to ask when we shall have the railway map showing the projected railways. I thought it would have been in the hands of members before this time. It ought certainly to be before hon. members as soon as possible.

The PREMIER: I will give instructions for the papers to be printed as quickly as possible, and they ought to be ready in a day or two. With respect to the maps, my hon. colleague the Minister for Works hopes to be able to lay the larger lithograph upon the table to-morrow, and the others will be printed in a few days. I expected that they would have been done sooner, but it appears that it was not possible.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: These papers can be printed very quickly if the Government choose to go to the expense. It is simply a matter of expense.

The PREMIER: Yes, that is all.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I may explain to the hon. member for Mulgrave, with

reference to the maps, that one was prepared by Mr. Stanley, but I did not think the scale was large enough. I expect the larger map to be ready to-morrow, and I will get a sufficient number to issue to hon. members on a much smaller scale as soon as possible.

#### FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to :—

By Mr. ANNEAR—

That there be laid on the table of this House, a Return showing,—

1. Total expenditure incurred in surveying the railway line from Maryborough to Gympie, and length of line so surveyed.

2. Names of surveyors employed and amount paid to each surveyor; time each surveyor was employed and work done; distinguishing between trial and permanent surveys.

#### ANNEXATION OF NEW GUINEA.

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of bringing up a subject to which I called the attention of hon. members a few days ago; that is, the protectorate over, or annexation of, New Guinea. You will remember, sir, that when I brought it before the House the other day I pointed out that, so far as we knew then of the intentions of Her Majesty's Government at home, as shown in the instructions that were given to the commander of H.M.S. "Nelson" here, the English Government were not carrying out the wishes of the colonies, nor were they carrying out the intentions of the Parliaments which had legislated to pay a certain amount of the expenses connected with the working of the protectorate, annually. At that time, having pointed out these matters, I do not now wish to draw the attention of the House to them further. I think I proved my case very clearly, that the British Government had certainly not done what we expected they were going to do—that they had not done what we had contracted with them, in a way, to do; and that, so far as these proceedings were concerned, the money that we had voted should certainly not be devoted to such an object. To that the Government replied that they were not in a position to discuss the matter, because the only information that they had was in the telegrams to the Imperial authorities here, but that no doubt they would have further information when the protectorate was proclaimed in a formal manner. We have that further information now, and it is on account of that information that I want to say a few more words on the subject. Curiously enough, owing to what seems to have been a mistake on the part of some of the Imperial authorities, the proclamation of the annexation of New Guinea took place twice, to say nothing of the informal annexation which had taken place before. First, it was done at Port Moresby, by Hugh Hastings Romilly. Of course, all hon. members have read the account that appeared in the *Courier* of the proceedings in New Guinea—reported at greater length in some of the southern papers—but, with regard to material points, I will take what I have to say from the *Courier* of November 15. Mr. Romilly, acting upon instructions received from home, proceeded to New Guinea, and, on the 23rd October, landed with part of the crew of H.M.S. "Harrier," and issued the following proclamation :—

"I, Hugh Hastings Romilly, Deputy Commissioner for the Western Pacific, acting under the authority and command of Her Majesty's Imperial Government, do hereby proclaim that part of this island of New Guinea from the Dutch boundary—namely, the 141st meridian of east longitude to the East Cape, and also the islands adjacent to it, eastward to Kosmann Island—to be from this day, the 23rd October, under British protectorate, and I further proclaim that all purchase of land from the natives by white men is absolutely prohibited.

"God Save the Queen."

A few days afterwards, H.M.S. "Nelson" arrived, bringing the Admiral, who had received instructions to proceed to New Guinea and proclaim a protectorate. In what form he had received instructions, I do not exactly know; but, at all events, it justified him in considering as null and void the proceedings of Deputy Commissioner Hugh Hastings Romilly, and issuing the following proclamation on his own account. This was issued on the 6th November :—

"Proclamation on the behalf of Her Most Gracious Majesty Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, Empress of India, establishing a protectorate of Her Most Gracious Majesty over a portion of New Guinea and the islands adjacent thereto. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting :

"Whereas it has become essential for the protection of the lives and properties of the native inhabitants of New Guinea, and for the purpose of preventing the occupation of portions of that country by persons whose proceedings, unsanctioned by any lawful authority, might tend to injustice, strife, and bloodshed, and who, under the pretence of legitimate trade and intercourse, might endanger the liberties and possess themselves of the land of such native inhabitants, that a British protectorate should be established over a certain portion of such country, and the islands adjacent thereto: And whereas Her Majesty, having taken into her gracious consideration the urgent necessity of her protection to such inhabitants, has directed me to proclaim such protection in a formal manner at this place :

"Now, I, James Elphinstone Erskine, Captain in the Royal Navy, and Commodore of the Australian station, one of Her Majesty's naval Aides-de-Camp, do hereby, in the name of Her Most Gracious Majesty, declare and proclaim the establishment of such protectorate over such portions of the coast and the adjacent islands as are more particularly described in the schedule hereunto annexed; and I hereby proclaim and declare that no acquisition of land, whensoever or howsoever acquired, within the limits of the protectorate hereby established will be recognised by Her Majesty; and I do hereby, on behalf of Her Majesty, command and enjoin all persons whom it may concern to take notice of this proclamation and its schedule—that is to say, all that portion of the southern shores of New Guinea, commencing from the boundary of that portion of the island claimed by the Government of the Netherlands, on the 141st meridian of east longitude, to East Cape, with all the islands adjacent thereto, south of East Cape to Kosmann Island inclusive, together with islands in the Goschen Straits.

"Given at the harbour of Port Moresby, on the 6th day of November, 1884.

"(Signed) JAMES ELPHINSTONE ERSKINE, "Commodore.

"God Save the Queen."

Which of those gentlemen issued the legal proclamation I do not know. At all events, acting under the same instructions, they both issued perfectly different proclamations. They have established a protectorate over quite different land. The proclamation that will satisfy the British community in the Australian colonies a great deal the best will be the annexation made by Hugh Hastings Romilly, because he really annexed within the boundaries agreed to by the various colonies. Mr. Romilly annexed the land which it was supposed would be annexed. Commodore Erskine, however, has stood literally word by word and accurately to the answer given by Mr. Gladstone to a question asked in August last by the member for Lambeth, where he pointed out that it was proposed simply to annex the southern shores of New Guinea. Those words were telegraphed out to the Commodore, and he has stood faithfully to the words. However, we disagree entirely, of course, with the amount of land over which the protectorate extends. As far as the protectorate itself is concerned, it is absurd, because it is impossible that one line can enclose space, so long as it continues to meander in the same direction. This line is an easterly line from the 141st meridian, going constantly east, and yet it assumes to enclose a certain space.

Of course, neither can two straight lines enclose a space, nor a crooked line if it continues to go in one direction. This protectorate, therefore, established by Commodore Erskine, is a geographical absurdity. The protectorate established by Mr. Romilly is not open to that objection, for it actually annexes the whole of the land east of the 141st meridian to East Cape. That was the land agreed upon to be annexed by the Convention in Sydney, but we find now what I pointed out the other day, that were Commodore Erskine to follow the instructions he would not annex that portion of New Guinea that would free us from the dangers to which we considered this colony was liable were it not annexed. We have seen that Commodore Erskine, in carrying out his instructions, has left us in the position I predicted we would be left in when I last drew attention to this subject. I have to call the attention of the House to another part of the proclamation, to show how utterly Commodore Erskine has ignored the reasons why we required annexation, and I wish to show how he has confined himself within one point. The proclamation says:—

“Whereas it has become essential for the protection of the lives and properties of the native inhabitants of New Guinea, and for the purpose of preventing the occupation of portions of that country by persons whose proceedings are unsanctioned by law.”

And so on. He says that the protectorate has been established for the protection of the lives of the natives. Now, I do not believe in hypocrisy in any way. That is not the reason why we want a protectorate established. It is not for the protection of the natives. They must, of course, be taken into consideration by every civilised nation undertaking responsibilities of this kind; but that is not the reason why we ask the Imperial Government to establish a protectorate, and that is not among the reasons given by the gentlemen assembled in Sydney. They are entirely ignored, and I do not see how we can expect anything satisfactory in the shape of annexation by the British Government unless their wishes are respected. We find New Guinea a country adjoining our shores on the main road to England. Any ship being wrecked there is exposed to the inhabitants of the islands, and the lives of her people are endangered, from the fact that the shores are inhabited by cannibals of the very worst description. It is something horrible to contemplate the fate of the crew and passengers of one of those ships if they did become wrecked on any of the islands. Well, that was one of the reasons, and the Government were asked to offer us some kind of protection that would put down this cannibalism, and render our main road to England reasonably safe. Then there was another reason, and that was, that any portion of New Guinea so close to our own shores being taken possession of by any other nation endangered our position in case of England being at war. They were good reasons, and no doubt they were the reasons that have continually influenced us to press the annexation of New Guinea in the way we have done. The protection of the islanders was certainly an additional reason for annexing New Guinea, but to put it forward as the only reason does not meet the difficulties of the Australian people, and certainly does not meet the views expressed by the Convention in Sydney in December last. I think we have good reason to complain of the way in which we have been met by the English Government in this matter throughout. I have pointed out before that the Premier of this colony, and it seems the Premiers of the other colonies, have fallen into the mistake that Earl Derby really contemplated annexation or a protectorate, and it was that fact that induced this Parliament to liberally grant their portion of

the subsidy that Earl Derby asked from the colonies. It was on that consideration alone, and I think it is time we realised our position, and realised that a great deal less has been done than was asked for and expected. Our position with regard to New Guinea is this: Supposing the Australian colonies to be a separate nation—as it is possible they may be some day; supposing they joined together as a separate nation, independent altogether of Great Britain, the first act they would do as a nation would undoubtedly be to assume authority over the islands on our coasts—that is, New Britain, New Ireland, and New Guinea. Those islands would form part of the Australian nation, and form a part of it in the right judgment of all the European nations. I do not think any European nation would question for a moment our right to make those islands part of the Australian nation. We think it is necessary that they should form part of the Australian nation; and therefore, how is it that we, forseeing the future and saying that it is actually necessary for our national life that we should acquire these islands, cannot get possession of them? Simply because of the timidity of the English nation, which fancies she is going to be embroiled in a quarrel with European nations. It is admitted that we ourselves would have a right to acquire these islands; no nation would think for a moment of quarrelling with us because we took them; but England declines to take possession of them simply on the ground that she would perhaps embroil herself with some European nation. We are, therefore, prevented from doing what is right for our national life by the timidity of England. There is no question that Lord Derby has, in a most disagreeable way, admitted that the acquisition of those islands is necessary to our national life. He was kind enough to tell the nation sometime ago, in the House of Lords, that the annexation of the islands I have referred to—New Britain, New Ireland, and New Guinea—by a foreign nation would be considered an unfriendly act; meaning, I suppose, that England would resent them being taken in a way that a nation had power to prevent an unfriendly act. We were forced to be satisfied with that assurance at the time. Lord Derby at that time denied that there was the slightest intention on the part of any European nation to take over any of the islands in the South Pacific, and he referred in his despatches to the friendly relations with both France and Germany; and from the fact that both had disclaimed in their negotiations any desire to annex any of those islands, he assumed that it was true. But I think affairs have altered very considerably since. I did not believe at the time that Lord Derby ought to have rested quiet with the assurance that neither France nor Germany wished to annex. But what has happened since? Two contracts have been let to German firms to have coaling stations actually on the ground annexed by Mr. Chester in 1882.

The PREMIER: Where?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: In New Ireland. Actually two contracts for coaling stations have been let by the German Empire to German subjects on the land that was annexed by Queensland, and where we thought the danger was most imminent. We recognised that as a great danger to Australia, no matter how friendly the relations might be; coaling stations in close proximity to ourselves must constantly be a danger, and that would have been avoided had Lord Derby taken action at the proper time. There are several other acts I could point to as showing the desire of other countries for annexation in the South Seas; but, at all events, I may say that there is an evident intention on

the part of Germany and France to acquire land down here as close as they possibly can to the Australian colonies. That, I think, ought to be prevented, and can be prevented if the English Government will take active steps to comply with the wishes of the colony. We have heard a good deal with regard to the claims of the Dutch to that part of New Guinea east of the 141st meridian. We have had Admiral Erskine in his proclamation acknowledging the right of the Dutch to that part of the island; and I hope our claims will ultimately be acknowledged as well as the Dutch claims have been recognised. From a very able paper, read before the Royal Geographical Society last March, I find that the Dutch have very insignificant claims to the western portion of New Guinea, and that those claims are such that they have been getting weaker by time, and also weaker by the kind of administration that the Dutch have exercised, and the kind of trade they have carried on there. We have assumed too much that the Dutch have this right. The paper is—"New Guinea: a summary of our present knowledge with regard to the island"—and it is by Mr. Coutts Trotter. I will just read a little of what he says about it:—

"A good deal of misconception pervades as to the claims over New Guinea, asserted in former times by certain Malay Sultans, and recently by the Dutch. The earlier claims date from the spread of Islam in the Archipelago, and were put forward by the Sultans of Batchuan and Gêbé, and latterly Tidore, whose first Mahometan Sultan conquered Gêbé and succeeded to his rights late in the 14th century."

All the islands mentioned are small islands—perfect dots on a map on the scale of the map before me—some of them being four square miles in diameter—

"And with a single exception, to be mentioned afterwards, any action which the Dutch have taken has been solely in the capacity of suzerain of the Sultan of Tidore. The claims of these little islands—mere specks on the map—over such a territory as New Guinea seem at first sight—though, perhaps, it does not become an inhabitant of Great Britain to make such invidious comparisons—rather absurd; but they admit of a simple explanation. Our geography books talk of Papua or New Guinea; but the Papua or Tuna, Papua of these Malays merely meant the islands in their immediate neighbourhood, inhabited by the dark, frizzly race, and had probably little or no reference to the great continental island beyond. \* \* \* \* \*

The Dutch seem to have first asserted, and finally assumed as their own, the claims of their old ally and rival, the Sultan of Tidore, in accordance with the system long practised by them in their dealings with the native rulers in the Archipelago; their only direct act of annexation in New Guinea, sanctioned or ordered by the Home Government, was in August, 1828, when Commissary Van Welden, by proclamation, fixed the limits of Dutch territory on the south coast at 141 deg. 1 min. E. long., the line running thence westward round the coast to the Cape of Good Hope in 132 deg. 45 min., reservation being made of the rights of Tidore to the four districts—Mausurax, Karonglifer, Amberpura, and Amberpon. These same districts, it may be mentioned, were confirmed to the Sultan of Tidore, as constituting his possessions in New Guinea, during our temporary occupation of the Moluccas in 1814. This at first sight seems conclusive as to the rights of Tidore over part of the mainland of New Guinea, but on examining the maps, it appears that the said 'districts' are not on the mainland but on adjacent islands. The Dutch proclamation contains besides a curious informality."

And this is exactly the same as Admiral Erskine's—

"It takes possession of the coast of New Guinea between the two points above specified, 'and of the lands lying within,' but it does not say how far inland the annexation is to extend; it could hardly, from the formation of the land, be intended to join the two points named by a straight line. Curiously enough, in Van der Goes's report of the Dutch Commission which visited New Guinea in 1858, the proclamation is alluded to in a slightly satirical tone, and the writer declares he could not find a copy of it in the archives of Amboyna! For the line now popularly considered to be the Dutch frontier line, and which traverses New Guinea

on the 141st meridian, the only foundation appears to be a mere rescript of the Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies in 1818. Van Rochussen, who defines, *proprio motu*, the rights of the Sultan of Tidore as extending along the north coast to 140 degrees 47 minutes E.; and an enterprising map-maker must then have stepped in and completed the arrangement, by drawing a line from that point to meet the limit laid down in 1828 on the south coast; for it cannot be supposed that so scientific a frontier was drawn by so unscientific a potentate as the Sultan of Tidore. It is not very clear on what grounds our Government, in defining the jurisdiction of the High Commissioner of the Western Pacific over British subjects in islands not held by any civilised power, fixed its western limit at 141 degrees east; at all events it is clear that no valid act of annexation was performed by Van Rochussen in 1848, nor probably was any such act intended. It is true the rights of Holland are declared (by this local authority) to extend to this point on the north coast, in her capacity as suzerain of Tidore; but her right to interfere directly in the administration is distinctly stated to derive its validity solely from the connection with Tidore; and even the lesser rajahs along the coast, with whom the Dutch have made agreements, consider these to exist only in virtue of the same relationship. Now, first, there is abundant evidence that to the east of Geelvink Bay the natives either repudiate the rights of Tidore, or are ignorant of his existence; and, secondly, his rights, which never extended far inland, could hardly be the basis for the annexation of an inland territory, 400 miles across; besides which the definition of his rights above quoted deals expressly and exclusively with the coasts, from the point mentioned on the north coast westward, and round to that named on the south. A small coaling depot exists at Doreh, and poles supporting the Netherlands arms have been erected along the coast, but the only serious act of occupation was the erection of 'Fort Du Ifus' at Triton Bay; this, however, was abandoned in 1835, *i.e.* fifty years ago, and could hardly, therefore, be held to constitute possession at the present day. Dr. A. B. Meyer, in 1873, before starting on his journey, applied for protection, while in New Guinea, to the Resident of Ternate. He, however, replied that he could give him none; that there were no Dutch officials anywhere on New Guinea, and that even the missionaries were independent of the Dutch Government, and not protected by it; and he added that Dr. Meyer would have the right of life and death both over the natives and over his own attendants. It seems probable that the slight show of possession hitherto kept up by Holland may, except perhaps as regards the western peninsula, be read as signifying no definite annexation, but merely a provisional claim in case of her becoming able, which she probably at one time contemplated, to undertake the development of this vast region."

Now we have the annexation made by the Dutch reduced to very small dimensions. They annexed from the 141st meridian on the south coast round the south-west coast to the northern side at a place called the Cape of Good Hope, on the 126th meridian. That line does not join at all; it starts in the sea on the north side, and comes out to the sea again on the south side; so that no annexation has ever taken place at all except in the office of the Dutch Governor. The idea of the Dutch having any claim over New Guinea because of their suzerainty over a little island, a few miles in diameter, lying several hundred miles away, is simply absurd. The Dutch at that time annexed the shores only, and for a very good reason. The only things of any value there were the *bêche-de-mer* fishery and the slave trade. When the slave trade ceased, the Dutch do not seem to have had any more connection with the place at all. Considering the character of the trade they have held there, the fact that they only formally annexed it, that they have had it fifty-six years, and have never done anything to advance either their own interests, the interests of civilisation, or the interests of the natives, we may estimate with very little trouble what claims they have established. Of course we should look upon it as an absolute advantage in some respects were the Dutch to make an actual settlement; but they are not at all likely to do that; whereas we

have the constant danger before us of the certainty of a largely increased naval and military expenditure in case of any part of that territory being annexed by some foreign country. I see that the Commissioner has left England on his way out; but I do not exactly understand what he is going to do to expend this £15,000 or £30,000. There will be excessively little for him to do, and I think our interest in this matter becomes very small also. I wish the Australian people thoroughly to understand how little the English Government have actually done in the way of annexation. They have made a formal claim to a certain part of the shores of New Guinea—about a fourth part of the whole—but they have made no actual annexation of territory. Now, what the Convention agreed to was, that on consideration of the English Government annexing a certain portion of New Guinea they would bear a part of the expense. It was the idea that the step for which instructions were given by Lord Derby amounted to annexation that induced the Premier to urge the Victorian Government to contribute along with this Government the amount of the subsidy asked for, and that induced this House to vote the money. When it is now understood that no annexation has really taken place, that this protectorate is a mere sham, and that we are liable to the same dangers as before, it should spur us on to urge the English Government to rescue us from those dangers. Almost all the English people except the Government seem to recognise that the longer the matter is delayed the more difficulties arise. Annexations that would have been perfectly safe and unnoticed by other countries a few years ago, are rendered much more difficult now by the diplomatic arrangements at home. If we take the Press of England as a guide, we may safely say that the English people believe that annexation should take place, and that effectual steps should be taken to relieve the colonies from the embarrassment, danger, and expense of providing against future hostile attacks by foreign nations planted near our shores. I move the adjournment of the House.

The PREMIER: Sir, I have attentively listened to the hon. gentleman, but I confess I do not quite apprehend what object he proposed to himself in making the speech he has just concluded. It is now just four weeks since he brought this question before the House. On that occasion I remarked that we had not sufficient information to discuss it thoroughly; that we did not exactly know what was the view the Imperial Government took of the matter, or what it was that they proposed to do with respect to New Guinea. We now know no more, except that Her Majesty has declared that she will exercise jurisdiction over the southern shores of New Guinea from the Dutch boundary, 141st parallel, to East Cape, with all adjacent islands south of East Cape to Kosmann Island, inclusive. To what extent the jurisdiction extends in the interior we do not know; nor do we know the particular mode in which it is to be exercised in giving effect to that declaration. The hon. member seemed to imagine that the Convention had agreed to ask Her Majesty's Government to take possession, at once, of all that part of New Guinea not claimed by the Dutch, and of New Britain, New Ireland, and all the adjacent islands; but the Convention never agreed to anything of the kind. The hon. member seems to be dissatisfied with what the Imperial Government have done. I say we do not know what the Imperial Government have done, and when we know exactly what they have done it will be time enough to express our satisfaction or dissatisfaction with them. The Convention did not ask the Imperial Government, or press

the Imperial Government, to at once annex New Guinea. What they did was to express their opinion that such steps—

“Should be immediately taken as will most conveniently and effectively secure the incorporation with the British Empire of so much of New Guinea, and the small adjacent islands thereto, as is not claimed by the Government of the Netherlands.”

That is what we asked the Imperial Government to do, and we undertook to assist in defraying the expense of doing so. But we left it to them to determine what would be the most convenient time and the most effective way of giving effect to that wish; and whether the step they have taken is the most convenient and effective is a matter which we shall discover hereafter. At the present time we cannot tell. We know nothing except what has been told us by telegraph. It appears to me absurd to condemn the Imperial Government under circumstances like these. The hon. member says that this action is owing to the timidity of the Imperial Government, who allow themselves to be influenced by diplomatic considerations and their relations with other Powers. He objects to giving effect to diplomatic considerations; but that is one of the disadvantages which we labour under in not being a sovereign nation. Diplomatic considerations do exist, and the Imperial Government cannot give effect to our wishes without having regard to diplomatic considerations. Surely they are bound to take diplomatic difficulties into consideration! We do not know what diplomatic difficulties there are. There may be none, but if there are surely we must give the Imperial Government credit for knowing their own business. The hon. member seems to think that the Imperial Government have no sympathy with the colonies of Australia. I do not assume that. I hold the contrary assumption. I assume that they are desirous of assisting the colonies, and I shall maintain that opinion until the contrary is shown. We know that, shortly, General Scratchley will be here, and he will be in a position to inform us of the full opinions of the Imperial Government, whose instructions he bears with him. We have been invited to form a council of advice to consult with him as to the exercise of his functions as High Commissioner of New Guinea. On his arrival I have no doubt the different Governments of Australia will consult with him, and we shall know exactly what the Imperial Government propose. I am quite sure any communications we desire to make will be not only received but considered by the Imperial Government, and given effect to as far as can be done without embroiling the Empire in foreign troubles. As to whether the proclamation made by the Dutch as to exercising jurisdiction over the western part of New Guinea was a formal one, or is not formally valid, that is not a matter with which we can deal. If we were an independent nation and had a desire to annex that portion of New Guinea, that question of course it would be for us to consider. But as we are not an independent nation it seems to be premature to discuss the right of the Dutch to the western half of New Guinea.

Mr. ARCHER said: The leader of the Opposition has said that he thought the Imperial Government does not show very great respect for the wishes of the Australian colonies, but the Premier has denied that that is the case, and maintained that the Imperial Government have shown great respect for the colonies. I believe that the present Government of England—the party at present in power—have invariably shown that they care very little indeed for the colonies. Some of them have expressed very plainly that they would not care how soon the colonies were parted from England,

It is well known that there are gentlemen at the Colonial Office in England who have given expression to the sentiment that the colonies were of no great moment to Great Britain. We also know that there is a strong party on the other side who look upon the colonies as of very great importance to England, and as an integral part of the Empire, and it was only lately that a society was formed at home purposely to combat that feeling. The manner in which the Imperial Government have gone about this annexation in New Guinea shows that they care very little about it. This was seen by their annexing the country by drawing a straight line from west to east—a line which never returned westward. There is, in fact, no such thing as annexation accomplished, or even protection given to the inhabitants of New Guinea. How far did the protection extend inland? Or can we protect people three miles from the deep sea? Three miles is the distance that a nation has the command of the sea from the shore. Is that to be the measure of this annexation? If so, it seems particularly disingenuous, after having asked the colonies to join them for the purpose of bearing the expense of it. Earl Derby has pretended all along that he was anxious to do what we wanted him to do; and he has simply established a protectorate over a coast-line of which all we know is that it may be one, two, or three miles in depth. If the English Government had been in favour of carrying out the wishes of the colonies on this question, they would have done so in a more full and decisive manner.

MR. PALMER: Mr. Speaker,—Since this question of the annexation of New Guinea was raised I have taken great interest in it, both as an Australian born and as a Queenslander. Looking to the probable future that this country will have, I can see that our possession of New Guinea will become a matter of the utmost importance. I cannot help contrasting the annexation we witnessed the other day with the annexations of the great discoverer whom we were discussing yesterday—Captain Cook. In the latter, everything was done quietly and effectually, while in the former five men-of-war take part in it, much bombast is spoken, there is a great flourish of trumpets, and the thing is not half done after all. One result of Captain Cook's annexations is that we have here a vast continent being peopled by the English race. As to the result of the other—well, one hardly knows yet what the result will be. Native chiefs have been feasted with rice, and one of them has been presented with a stick with a silver top; and there were five men-of-war present; but in my opinion the action taken by the leader of the Opposition, with only a police magistrate, a flag, and a schooner, seems to have been nearer the mark, than all this mumble-jumble pantomime business we had the other day. All we know is, that we have to pay a certain sum of money, and that the occupation of the island is really prohibited. The English Government spent millions of money in opening the ports of Japan and China to English trade and commerce, and now they are going to a vast amount of trouble to prohibit settlement in a country which we know to be full of natural resources—a country with large rivers, and mountains covered with perpetual snow—a country the future trade of which would be of vast importance to Australia. With the question of New Guinea is bound up the question of New Caledonia. What makes the latter island valuable to France would make it equally valuable to Australia. When Sir George Grey was first sent to New Zealand, New Caledonia was included in his commission. It was then a British possession, and the cession of it to France was a

strong proof of the indifference the English Government then had to the probable future of this vast continent. Seeing the way in which the people and statesmen at home view the interests of Australia at the present day, I do not think that indifference has been lessened. I am much surprised at the indifference shown to this matter even by hon. members of the House. Perhaps they are satisfied to leave it in the able hands of the Premier, who has taken a great interest in it, and shown by his conduct at the Convention and ever since that he is on what I may call our side in this question of the annexation of New Guinea. But he does not seem to receive much support from hon. members, and I am certain the question will come up some day in a manner which will make the people regret their present apathy. In the Earl of Derby—I say it with all due deference—the colonies have a very insincere or lukewarm friend. In one telegram he is said to have stated in the House of Lords that it would be far better for the British Government to incur the jealousy of foreign powers than to risk the resentment of the Australian colonies in this matter; and in a later telegram we are told that negotiations are pending between Germany, France, and England with regard to New Britain and New Ireland—two islands which are of as much importance to Australia, nearly as New Guinea. The Australians have the first claim not only to New Guinea, but to all the islands in the South Pacific, including New Britain, New Ireland, and the New Hebrides. We have already established trading stations in those islands, and as to our capacity for settling colonies there can be no doubt. I only hope that such an earnest protest will go from these colonies as will convince the Earl of Derby that what we want with regard to New Guinea is not merely protection along the coast, but annexation pure and simple. The sooner he understands that the interests of these colonies demand annexation, the sooner shall we have a satisfactory settlement of this question.

MR. FERGUSON: Mr. Speaker,—I am rather surprised that so few hon. members seem inclined to discuss such an important question as this. I consider it to be one of the most important matters that has ever been brought before us—at least as far as the future of Australia is concerned. When we consider the cold and half-hearted manner in which the Home Government has treated the wishes of the colonies with regard to this question, it is time hon. members, not only of this but of other Parliaments, should speak out their minds about it. We stated our views to the Home Government very plainly, and in a very reasonable manner, and they treated us as I have stated. During the present session this Parliament agreed to pay our share of the £15,000 required for establishing a protectorate over New Guinea. I agreed to that vote because I believed that the annexation would be carried out in accordance with the wishes of the people of Australia. We are now asked to double that amount; but I, for one, will not agree to it unless the Home Government decides to act more in accordance with our desires. I, for one, will pass no further increase of money towards the sham annexation we saw the other day. I look upon it as nothing else but a sham affair; in fact, I consider that the colonies have a right to withdraw what they have already voted until the Home Government show that they are prepared to carry out as nearly as possible the wishes of the Australian colonies. It is not the wish of Queensland alone, but of the whole of the colonies. It is perhaps more interesting to Queensland than to any other of the colonies, and we have a right to express our views. The people of Australia are as loyal as in any

part of the British Empire; but the action of the Secretary of State for the Colonies is likely to make them far less so. If the English Government wishes to get rid of us let them say so. They might as well do it at once, and they do not seem to care whether we clear away from them or not. That seems to be their opinion. I consider myself that the Pacific Islands are the birthright of the Australian colonies. When we look forward to the future of the colonies, I consider that, with the position we hold on the map of the world, and the enormous amount of territory we have, we shall be a powerful nation; even if we still form part of the British Empire, we shall form a powerful portion of that Empire. So that I consider the Pacific Islands as the birthright of the people of the Australasian colonies; they have a right that they should be annexed to Australia. The proposal of the French Government to bring the refuse of their gaoles into the Pacific Islands is another matter, and the people of Australia ought to realise their position with regard to it. We have gone on very quietly in regard to our relations with the mother-country for some time; but now we are awakening, and can see the matter in a different light. The matter that first aroused the people of the colonies was the action taken by Sir T. McIlwraith on 4th April, 1883, in annexing New Guinea. That was the first act that aroused the people of Australia to a sense of the position they were in. I was reading an article in the *London Times* the other day, which said that that act was the first that set light to the train that produced the scheme for the annexation of the Pacific Islands and federation. There is no doubt it was that act which aroused the people from their slumber, and had Lord Derby allowed it there would have been no trouble over the matter now. It would have saved expense and it would have given satisfaction to the people of the colonies, who were prepared to pay whatever reasonable amount was asked towards the expense. Instead of that Lord Derby disallowed it, and the excuse that he gave for doing so was a very paltry one. He told the colonies to federate. "If you federate I will listen to your representations; but until you have your views in a combined request, I will not listen to you." He knew perfectly well that such a thing as federation would take years to accomplish, even if all the colonies were agreeable. It will take some time; and in such a question as the annexation of New Guinea we cannot lose time. It should be taken in hand at once; and Lord Derby has simply given an excuse, instead of acting straightforwardly; he has delayed the matter, and we see the result. If any change takes place, it will be the confederation of the whole empire, or dismemberment. It cannot be expected that the people of Australia are going to be ruled in their foreign relations by a power so far removed from us. Even Sir Henry Parkes, writing to the *Nineteenth Century*, says that a change will have to take place—that the state of affairs in the colonies was unsatisfactory, and that a change must take place in a few years. There are several other hon. members who ought to speak upon this question. It is a most important one, and should not be allowed to sleep in silence as it has done.

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think for one moment that the silence of hon. members can be attributed to any apathy or want of interest in a matter of such great importance as this is. I think it is the ordinary sign that men of prudence would make, when they are imperfectly acquainted with the circumstances they are called upon to discuss. I have not received any more information than that

which was submitted to the House last time the subject was under discussion, and I do not think we are in a position to pronounce in such unmeasured terms upon the action of the Imperial authorities. We are doing so without any foundation for our expostulations at present; therefore, I take it that, while the people of Australia generally are naturally interested in this very large and important question, yet they are exhibiting very good sense, and I do not blame them for apathy or want of appreciation of the position. I do not think they would be displaying very good judgment if they acted otherwise; certainly not until the whole circumstances were before them; especially as the whole action of the Imperial authorities will be more fully understood upon the arrival of the High Commissioner. In common decency we might wait until he has arrived at the place where he is to administer the duties of his office. I feel unable to say a great deal more upon the subject; but I have my own opinion as to the action of the Imperial authorities as pronounced at the present time. I intend to accept what we have as an instalment of what is to follow, and I shall withhold my censure at the present time, or any expression denouncing the home authorities for not meeting out a fuller measure of justice to the colonies, or not acting to the full extent that some hon. members think they should have done in compliance with the opinions or views of the colonies. So far I think they have shown a desire to meet the views of the Australian colonies, and though it might not have been prudent to show their hand all at once, or too openly, that the annexation of New Guinea was made for the protection of the Australian colonies I cannot doubt. It has been said that the protectorate has been established in the interests of the natives; but I think it is decidedly in the interests and for the protection of British and colonial interests. I think it would be travelling over a large question to discuss the matter of Australian federation, or the probability and propriety of Australia being in possession of New Britain, New Ireland, and the other islands of the Pacific. It partakes a little of "high-falutin" to say that a handful of people should take possession of those islands, which I trust in time will be fully inhabited by people of our own nationality, but not necessarily by the people of Australia. They may be separate and independent States, peopled, I hope, from the Anglo-Saxon race, and importing our national institutions; but I do not feel inclined to express an opinion on the question of whether we should be one family, and that there should not be national divisions and demarcations between us. I do not rise to speak on such a large subject, which can be better and more ably discussed by-and-by, when the annexation of New Guinea will doubtless attract our attention, and which will have to be spoken upon at greater length. I hold that at the present time so little is known that we are really placing ourselves in a very false position in debating the subject when we are in possession of such very imperfect information—information which I hope will be largely supplemented on the arrival of the High Commissioner at the seat of his duty. I enter my protest against it being assumed from my silence or from the few remarks I have offered that this is a question I take no interest in. But I feel that I shall be able to consider the matter more fully and with more intelligence when we have more information to hand.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said: I have no desire to impute any motives of the kind to the hon. gentleman, who denies that his colleague



and himself have not been energetic in the cause of Australia; but I am only judging of their action as I judge of the action of the English Government, and that is by what they have done. Now, I think that since this question has arisen—I do not allude to what took place in Sydney—but since the question of annexation has been raised in this House, the Premier and his colleague the Colonial Treasurer, the only two gentlemen who spoke on the other side, have taken up a too apologetic tone entirely on behalf of the Imperial Government. They seem to me to be afraid to embarrass the Imperial Government. They seem to be more afraid of that than they are in earnest as regards the future of the Australian colonies. What is it to us that Lord Derby has entered into diplomatic arrangements since the formal annexation which took place at the instigation of the leader of the Opposition? What is that to us? We know there were no embarrassments at that time; and no diplomatic arrangements in regard to New Guinea had been entered upon. We know also that the Convention asked for certain things to be done—that the whole of New Guinea east of the Dutch possession should be taken possession of for the purpose of protecting Australian interests.

THE PREMIER: That is not what they asked.

THE HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: The hon. gentleman read what the Convention asked. The whole of New Guinea east of the Dutch possessions was asked for, yet the hon. gentleman has the audacity to stand up and tell us that he believed Earl Derby was quite willing to meet the Australian colonies in their wishes. What has he done to carry out their wishes? Has he proclaimed the protectorate which the Australian colonies asked for? He has done nothing of the kind. In fact, it is very hard to say what he has done; but we know what he has not done. It is difficult to say what he has done, on account of the way in which it has been done; but he has not annexed that which was asked for, and he has left a large portion of New Guinea open to any power that chooses to take possession of it to-morrow. It is folly to tell us to wait until the arrival of the High Commissioner. The High Commissioner cannot exceed his powers, and can only apply them to the country that has been annexed by Commodore Erskine. He can know no more than we know now, and I say, if the Premier is as energetic as the Colonial Treasurer would lead us to believe from what he said just now, he will take a different course than the apologetic one which he has taken twice in this House. Now, we have heard something from the hon. gentleman who represents the Burke, about the future of Australia, and that has been deprecated by the Colonial Treasurer, who designated it as "high-falutin." Well, I do not think that the application of the Monroe doctrine to Australia is at all "high-falutin." One century ago the United States were not greater in population and actual strength than the Australian continent is now, and to-day they have 60,000,000 of people, and can defy the world to touch them. I hope the day will come when we shall be, if not as strong as they are, at least able to defend ourselves against any country, even Great Britain itself. We have heard a great deal about the loyalty of the people of Australia. We are loyal, but we are loyal in the wrong direction. The people are loyal to the English Government, but that is not the loyalty which we want. We want to be loyal to our own kith and kin, and not to Lord Derby or Mr. Gladstone. I would like hon. members to remember this one fact in history, which every person in this House knows. There were no more loyal people than the American

colonists at the beginning of 1774, and to the middle of 1775, yet in 1776 they declared their independence. Their loyalty was strained too far, in the same way as the loyalty of Australia is being strained too far by the action of the present Imperial Government. Now, the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has taken too much of an example from New South Wales. I do not altogether approve of what has been said by the Premier of Victoria; he has sometimes allowed his discretion to run wild by saying more than a man in his position ought to say; but his actions have been very different—they are such that they can be approved of. In season and out of season he has been urging the English Government to do what the Convention asked to be done, but what the Imperial Government has refused to do, and which we now know they will not do. I think, therefore, that this discussion is not at all out of place. The only chance we have of getting what the people of Australia want is by keeping this question constantly before the mass of the people of Australia, and also before the mass of the people of Great Britain. I do not believe the present Imperial Government represent the opinions of the people of Great Britain on this subject. I believe the English people are entirely in accord with the people of Australia in trying to obtain possession of New Guinea, or any other portion of the Pacific which might be a source of danger in the future if it were taken possession of by a foreign power. I do not look upon Germany as being the only foreign power from which there is any great danger. I think Italy is as dangerous as Germany. France at present has her hands full, and therefore there is very little danger from her, though there may be in a year or two hence. I believe the real danger is in both Italy and Germany. We find that both those countries have for the last two or three years been showing an anxiety to acquire colonies in different parts of the world, not only to extend their commerce, but also as outlets for their superabundant population. I believe myself it would be far better if the Premier, occupying the position he does in this House, would table a resolution affirming the desirability of the English Government approving of annexation, and instead of annexing that portion of New Guinea from the Dutch colony to the southern coast, taking the whole country right round—the whole of the island to across the line that the Dutch annexed; so that there would be no chance of any foreign power coming between us and the present Dutch possession. At present that is entirely open. It is open to Germany or Italy to come and take possession of the other side of the island. Whether they do it or not depends entirely upon themselves. As we are at present, we have no alternative but to agitate in such a way as to keep the matter constantly before the English public, and by the force of public opinion compel Lord Derby to comply with the wishes of the Australian people.

MR. MACFARLANE said: The hon. member for Rockhampton, in his short speech, accused this side of the House—and, in fact, the whole House—of apathy in reference to the question now before the House. Now, I do not think it is apathy so much as want of information, and of knowledge of what to address the House upon. I feel very warmly on this subject. I have always admired the action of the leader of the Opposition in reference to the annexation of New Guinea, but I do not deny that it is very difficult for us to say sometimes what ought to be done by the old country. It takes a great number of years to move it in any matter for the welfare of the people; and New Guinea being such a distance away, it is perhaps harder to move it in this question

than on most questions. At the same time, if the discussion of the question in this House will forward the annexation of New Guinea in any way, then I say let us discuss it. My difficulty is that there is very little to discuss. We do not know the intentions of Lord Derby. If we knew something of what the English Government intended, certainly we should have something to discuss. I do not give them credit for anything they have done—in fact, they have done nothing; but, as mentioned by the hon. member for Rockhampton, if something is not done in a year or two to satisfy these colonies, then they will be perfectly justified in raising such a storm as will show the English Government that something must be done.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: I do not know that I should have troubled the House with any remarks had it not been that the Colonial Treasurer, informed the House—certainly to my astonishment, and not a little to my amusement—that it was not decent to discuss this subject until the arrival of High Commissioner Scratchley. Why it should not be decent I do not know. The hon. gentleman did not attempt to show that this House would derive any information from Major-General Scratchley, or that it would be in any better position to discuss the question when he arrives. All he said was that it was not decent to discuss it until he did arrive. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that it was very decent on the part of the Imperial Government to ask this House to pledge itself, as it has done morally, to contribute its quota of the £15,000 per annum towards the expenses of keeping the High Commissioner at New Guinea, when this House—which pledged itself morally, and only morally—did so on the understanding that all that portion of New Guinea to the east of that believed to be held by the Dutch was to be annexed? What does the hon. gentleman think of the trick that has been played on these colonies by the Colonial Minister, Lord Derby? I repeat that this House voted its quota on the distinct understanding that that portion of New Guinea to the eastward of that annexed by the Dutch would be annexed by Great Britain. I think the Colonial Treasurer ought to be more guarded when he asks this House to give way still further, and wait for information from the Imperial authorities. I agree with almost every word that has fallen from the hon. member for Townsville, with regard to the position of Australia as compared with that of the United States in 1774. The Colonial Treasurer tells us in so many words that it is very kind of the Imperial Government to take this shadowy action, and that they have only annexed the island so far at the present time for the purpose of protecting Australia. If Australia had been left to herself we should have had a great deal more than this shadowy protectorate. We should have had that portion of New Guinea which now remains untouched, and we should have done a great deal better than has been done by the action of the Imperial Government—action which has done more to loosen the bands between us and the mother-country than anything that has been done since these colonies were founded. We asked for bread and we have got a stone. The Government are looking at this from only one point of view—judging from the speeches made by the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Colonial Treasurer—and that is from the Imperial point of view. I join issue with the Government on that point. We have to look at it from an Australian point of view, as well as from an Imperial point of view. We are better judges of what is best for the Australian colonies than any Minister sitting in Downing street; and I maintain that our joint representations have not received due consideration at the hands of the Imperial Gov-

ernment. Instead of the Government taking that stand, they say, "We must bow to the Imperial authorities; and we must be thankful for mercies, however small." I take exception to that: I say that, as a collection of colonies that must be a great nation in the future—the immediate future—we have a right to have our demands treated in a very different way by the Colonial Office and the Government of England; and we have a right here to raise our voice against the way in which we have been treated. England has no doubt done a great deal for us, but so have we done a great deal for England. I speak as a native of Australia, and I appeal to the hon. Minister for Lands whether his sympathies are not rather with the sentiments expressed on this side of the House, than those expressed by the two Englishmen who have spoken on that side, and who are members of the Ministry to which he belongs. And then, most contemptible of all, after all the work that has been done and all the trouble that has been taken by the leading politicians in the different colonies for the purpose of acquiring the possession of New Guinea, which we regard as of vital importance to the whole Australian group, we find that the English Government have extended their protectorate over part of New Guinea, not on their own responsibility, not as English territory used to be acquired in the old times, but after consultation with the foreign powers. The other nations of Europe throw this bone to England, "Take that; you are not going to have any more." It is well known, or at any rate it is an open secret, that the German vessel, the "Elizabethe," left Port Jackson a few days before the "Nelson" sailed, not with the intention of annexing New Guinea, but of annexing New Britain or New Ireland, or both. There is no question about that; I heard it on the highest authority. That is the result of these miserable terms the Imperial Government have entered into, not on behalf of Australia, but of Great Britain. Had we been an independent power—which, please God, we shall be before many years are over—no foreign power, small as our population is, would have dared to interfere with those islands adjacent to our coasts. The Government are very much to blame for having pandered to the miserable timidity and vacillation of the present Secretary for the Colonies, and the Government of which he is a member. I think, with all due deference to the Premier, that these questions cannot be raised too often, to show the people at home that we are alive to our own interests, which are Imperial interests too—interests about which they apparently know little and care less. I do hope that all the colonies will speak on this matter with a united voice, and insist on a natural annexation of New Guinea—and the other islands too, but New Guinea at any rate—to the Australian group. One more word. I see by the Press that the Government have consented to join in the Council of Advice to this High Commissioner who is to be sent out. Perhaps later on we shall hear from some member of the Ministry—they have been pretty reticent so far—what our duties will be as regards the High Commissioner, and whether we shall have anything to do with the control of this portion of New Guinea. That is a point I should have thought the hon. the Premier might have dealt with; but he did not deign to give us any information. He simply tells us that the matter is not yet ripe for discussion. The matter will never be ripe for discussion so long as the hon. gentleman thinks it is not. Until he sees that the force of public opinion puts him in such a position that he is bound to say something definite, he will not say anything definite. That we are

quite aware of; but we should be failing in our duty if we did not insist as far as possible that the Government should give us some information as to the *modus operandi* by which they are apparently to have some control over New Guinea; and also that we should have from them, if we can get it, an expression of opinion as regards the conduct of the British Government towards the colonies, and this colony in particular, in this question, which is so intimately bound up with the future, not only of Queensland but of the whole Australian group.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Mr. Speaker,—I am at a loss to understand what is to be the result of all this fume and fury. I should not have said anything on the subject but for the remarks of the hon. member for Balonne. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that, whilst that hon. member was Postmaster-General, he sent a manifesto home to the Imperial Postmaster-General threatening that, unless certain regulations were modified to suit his views, something very serious would take place. Why does the hon. member not move a vote of censure on Lord Derby? What good result is to come from all this scolding? The Government is not in possession of any information with which they can furnish this House, and they will have to wait, I suppose, until the High Commissioner arrives. When the proper time arrives the Government will be prepared to take action. The Imperial Government are perfectly aware that this outcry about New Guinea and the despatch of the Police Magistrate from Thursday Island, all had for their object the helping of the sugar-planters in the North. The Imperial Government knew all that, and they were very guarded when proclaiming the protectorate, in protecting the island from the raids of the sugar-planters. The only way that I can see of bringing about any good result from this debate would be by passing a vote of censure on the Imperial Government for their action in regard to New Guinea.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. B. Dutton) said: Sir, one would have thought that we had been dispossessed of some territory rather than that we had been enabled to take possession of foreign territory, to judge from the tone of the discussion initiated by the leader of the Opposition. It has been said by two or three speakers on the other side that the people of Australia are particularly desirous of having New Guinea annexed to Australia. I maintain that with the exception of a small knot of people here, especially in Queensland, and of probably one or two members of the Government of Victoria, the people of Australia are absolutely indifferent to the whole thing. The hon. member alluded to me as one anxious for it. I am not anxious for it, and never was. I am perfectly indifferent to the annexation of New Guinea, as I do not consider it at all necessary nor conducive to the future welfare of Australia; and I never did at any time. It may be interesting to look back to the origin of this question, and discover why it has been taken up so strenuously by a few people in this colony, and especially by a few members of this House. Everyone knows how the attempt at annexation was made by the present leader of the Opposition, who no doubt believes very thoroughly in the object he had in view, looking to it as a necessity and a safeguard for Australia. That may be the case; I do not say it is not; but the annexation was generally looked upon at the time as an extraordinary undertaking, and one which brought down a great deal of ridicule on the gentleman who had attempted it. Now I maintain that those who attempted to carry out the annexation

showed an earnestness that I do not believe they felt or actually feel now. It was said at the time, perhaps with some truth, that the purpose of that annexation was to divert attention from more important matters nearer home; and I am of opinion that that had something to do with it. The annexation of New Guinea was a very small matter even in the opinion of the hon. gentleman who attempted it, or of the Government of that day. Why the possession of New Guinea by a European Government, such as Germany, or France, or Holland, should be a danger to Australia surpasses my comprehension to conceive. I cannot imagine anything more conducive to the welfare of Australia than to have the people of any of these three great countries I have named occupying New Guinea.

Mr. NORTON: Convicts.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Well, I do not suppose it would be desirable to have convicts there. I should be very sorry indeed to see our own people attempting to colonise New Guinea. From all I have heard of its climate, and from its geographical position on the globe, it must be an excessively unhealthy place, and never likely to be made healthy though our people went there. Some people might be able to carry on agriculture with the assistance of black labour; but that they would ever be a serious danger to Australia seems to me a preposterous assumption. The manner in which the action of the English Government has been attacked by hon. members seems to savour more of claptrap than anything I ever heard in this House, politically or otherwise. And it has a political significance. Why should we assume that the British Government are unable to judge whether or not the European powers will never make any real and determined opposition to the annexation of New Guinea? There may be difficulties of that kind, as has been pointed out by the Premier; and difficulties that may be of much greater moment to the peaceful relations of Europe than we have any chance of knowing at all. I believe difficulties have been thrown in the way of the British Government by the extraordinary language used in Australia in reference to the conduct of England neglecting to annex, or refusing to assume a protectorate over, the whole of the remaining portions of New Guinea, and in reference to the supposed action of the European powers. Such language has no doubt excited the feeling of the great powers and induced them to interpose and say—“We will have a say in this matter; the whole Southern Hemisphere is not necessarily to be held by Anglo-Saxons, or by Englishmen. We have as good a right as Englishmen to be there.” To assume that the Southern Hemisphere should be held by Anglo-Saxons is an assumption that is very likely to excite the spirit of opposition in the European powers, and I am not at all surprised at it. I have no doubt that that has had something to do with the difficulties that have arisen; as also, perhaps, the tone that has been taken here on many occasions, and in the Parliament of Victoria. In New South Wales they had taken up a much more sensible position. There they did not attach so much importance to the question of annexation. They say that if England will take New Guinea and protect the native inhabitants and guard them from dangers in the future, let England do so, but that they are not going to talk out of all bounds about it. I think the position of New South Wales has been a very sensible one indeed. It entirely accords with my own feeling—a feeling not formed now or hurriedly, but ever since the question of annexation of New Guinea has been before the country.

Mr. NORTON: I do not wish to say more than a few words on this subject, though I think it is desirable that more of us than the leaders should take some slight part in the debate this afternoon. The hon. member who has just sat down, when he spoke of the absurd manner in which New Guinea had been annexed, was somewhat at fault. I presume he referred to the first annexation, because New Guinea had been annexed previously to the time at which it was annexed at the instance of the Government of Queensland. To a certain extent I agree with what has fallen from the Minister for Lands with regard to the feeling that exists in this country. I believe a great many people do not care whether New Guinea is annexed or not, because they have not gone into the matter thoroughly and have not given it proper consideration. But when you turn from that view of the question to the other—namely, whether they will object to New Guinea being formed into a convict settlement—I think, a very strong feeling indeed will be aroused on the part of the people to prevent anything of the kind being allowed; and that is really and truly where the importance of the question comes in, and where the feeling comes in. I cannot view this matter as one of sentiment, and I do not think the Minister for Lands views it so either, because we all know that the French nation have seriously taken it into consideration whether or not a convict settlement shall be formed in the southern seas—a settlement, to which the very worst convicts shall be sent and turned adrift on some island. For as long as the convicts do not go back to France, the French Government do not bother much about them. We know that this subject has been seriously discussed; it has not merely been brought up and discussed once and then laid aside, but has been under discussion for months, and a committee of one branch of the Legislature has actually recommended that such a project should be carried out. I ask if, under the circumstances, but for the interference of the colonies, there was no danger that France might have selected New Guinea as the island in which a convict settlement should be formed? I speak of it as a convict settlement as a matter of form, because I do not think there would be any settlement about it. A few of those sent out might possibly remain there, but the chances are that the great bulk of them would be tempted to come over to Australia, and they would form a very undesirable sort of colonists to have. That, to my mind, is really the greatest source of danger in connection with New Guinea being unoccupied; and it is a matter which deserves to be taken into most serious consideration. I am not one of those who feel at all rabid on this subject. I simply try to take a mere common-sense view of the case. As far as territory is concerned, everyone will admit that we have enough of our own to take us a very long time to fill up; and when we speak of annexing New Guinea, it does not mean that we wish to annex it merely for the sake of adding so much more to the area of the land we occupy, but that it is a matter of serious importance to us that if New Guinea is to be occupied at all it should be occupied by a race of people as creditable as ourselves, and who shall be subjects of the British Empire. Then there is that other question which may arise at some future day, that the non-occupation of New Guinea would, in the event of war, place the colonies in an unenviable position. If Germany, or France, or any other European power went to war with England, and if they had settlements in New Guinea, they could make raids on the coast towns of Australia, and cut off our trade to any extent they pleased. That has caused the movement in Victoria for the annexa-

tion of all the islands in the Southern Pacific by Great Britain. The people of Victoria do not care for the acquisition of those islands simply for the sake of enlarging their territory, but to avoid a possible danger in the event of a war breaking out. It is material to secure as far as possible the trade which exists, and which is likely to increase to a large extent, in connection with the whole of those islands; but that is a secondary consideration compared with the danger to be apprehended from a hostile power using the islands as a basis from which to make raids on the colonies. With regard to the action of the British Government, a very different course might have been followed. Indeed I might almost say it would have been followed, but for the action of the Government of Victoria before the first question as to the annexation of New Guinea had been decided. I have no doubt that if the Victorian Government had not, just at that time, urged the annexation of the rest of the islands in the South Pacific, the British Government would have annexed the unoccupied portion of New Guinea as requested by the people here. Sufficient facts, at all events, have come to light to lead us to that conclusion. When the Victorian Government urged the annexation of the whole of the South Pacific Islands, anybody can see that Great Britain was placed in a position of much greater difficulty than when New Guinea alone was concerned. There was an understanding, I believe, between Great Britain and France, that a number of those islands should not be occupied by either power, and therefore, when the Victorian Government urged the annexation of those islands, it brought us into difficulties with France at once. The subject of loyalty has been mentioned, and it is one which it is desirable not to overlook. As a native-born Australian, I claim for the Australians that they are as loyal as the native-born of Great Britain; but our loyalty extends to the Queen—not to whatever British Government may happen to be in office. It does not follow that because we disapprove of any particular act of Earl Derby or Mr. Gladstone, therefore we are disloyal to the Queen of Great Britain. The whole of the people of these colonies are as loyal as any other subjects of Her Majesty, but it does not follow that we are bound therefore to express our approval of everything the British Government may do. And on this question we say they have acted in a most vacillating and unwise way. If they had said at first whether they would or would not do what they were asked to do, there very probably would have been little more about it. But when we see them in a state of indecision and influenced by the pressure which we can bring to bear upon them, it is our duty as members of Parliament to express our opinion on the subject as clearly and as strongly as we can, so that extra pressure may be brought to bear upon them in order to carry out our views and desires. That is the justification for the action taken by the leader of the Opposition. The members of the Government were prepared to acquiesce in anything which Earl Derby or Mr. Gladstone may do; but all I can say is that if the discussion is not to take place in this House until the Commissioner has been sent out we may just as well leave it alone altogether. When the matter has been finally decided, what will be the use of expressing our opinions against it? If we have any expectation that our opinions will be taken into consideration, we must express them before the whole matter is finally dealt with. In regard to the £15,000, if we take a common-sense view of the action of the British Government in connection with that, we can only come to the conclusion that they asked for the £15,000 because they thought they could not get more; but when they found that the Australian people

were so ready to contribute that sum, they thought they had made a mistake, and had not asked enough. That was the feeling that their action created here. We were led to believe—I will not say the present Government led us to believe, or any member of the present Government—but there were some circumstances, which were not expressed perhaps, that led us to believe that if the colonies contributed that £15,000 a British protectorate would be exercised over the whole portion of New Guinea not occupied by the Dutch. That was my own opinion at the time the matter was discussed here, and I am sure it was the opinion of hon. members on this side of the House. If it had not been so they would never have been so ready to acquiesce in the proposal of the British Government. But since the whole of the colonies have promised that £15,000 should be contributed, we find that the country unoccupied is not to be all occupied by the British Government, but only a portion of the coast. Comparatively a small portion of the whole of the unoccupied part of New Guinea is to be taken under that protectorate, and what that protection is we do not know. The mere fact that we do not know the whole of the Imperial manifesto is not a sufficient reason why we should not discuss the subject now. I had hardly made up my mind to speak on the subject at all; but I consider that those members who think that an expression of opinion is desirable, in the hope of influencing the Government, ought to express themselves as clearly as they can, in order that, if their feelings are regarded at all, the legislation that takes place may possibly influence the British Government to take a more decided action than they seem disposed to do up to the present time.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH, in reply, said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Ipswich said his difficulty in speaking to the subject at the present time was that he did not actually know what the English Government had done. The very fact of his bringing forward an excuse of that kind is the best proof that I was right in bringing forward the matter. It is because the British Government have done actually nothing that I rose to move the adjournment of the House to-day. Hon. members, when they put forward a plea of that kind, forget this position: that the action of the British Government in proclaiming a protectorate over the southern shores of New Guinea is a practical answer to a Bill passed this session for appropriating a certain portion of the revenue of this colony towards the expense of governing that country. This is the practical response. The other day, when I brought the matter forward, the Premier tried to confuse it by putting a wrong issue entirely before the House. He said the English Government had not misconstrued what the Convention had desired, nor did the Convention desire what I said. I hope there will be no misunderstanding about what the Convention actually did do. I will read their resolution—a resolution that actually formed the preamble of the Bill upon which the money was granted. It is this:—

“That further acquisition of dominion in the Pacific south of the equator by any foreign power would be highly detrimental to the safety and well-being of the British possessions in Australasia, and injurious to the interests of the Empire;

“That, having regard to the geographical position of the island of New Guinea, the rapid extension of British trade and enterprise in Torres Straits, the certainty that the island will shortly be the resort of many adventurous subjects of Great Britain and other nations, and the absence or inadequacy of any existing laws for regulating their relations with the native tribes, this Convention, while fully recognising that the responsibility of extending the boundaries of the Empire belongs to the

Imperial Government, is emphatically of opinion that such steps should be immediately taken as will most conveniently and effectively secure the incorporation with the British Empire of so much of New Guinea and the small islands adjacent thereto as is not claimed by the Government of the Netherlands.”

That is, in fact, the preamble of the Bill. The reason given in the preamble, why we passed a Bill granting so much revenue to join the British Government in a certain enterprise, was the future good government of New Guinea. It did not say “annexation” or “protectorate”; but the reason was that it was left to the British Government to say whether a protectorate or an annexation should take place. It was assumed that either one or the other would take place, and it was on that ground that the money was voted. What was the practical reply of the English Government? The English Government proclaimed a protectorate over a certain small portion of the shore only. Hon. members must remember this: that if they made a protectorate over the whole part that was asked by the Convention—namely, all east of the 141st meridian—we should have secured what we required and prevented the liability we are under at the present time, of foreigners coming to these shores. Taking simply the southern shore does not give a single iota of advantage to Queensland or any of the Australian colonies, because a great bulk of the country will be subject to the same danger still; so that simply to have a protectorate over one part is not meeting the colonists in any way whatever. It is simply denying their request; and what I blame the English Government for—and I do not wish to measure the words in which I do blame them—is, that this is their action after we have passed the money on the supposition that they would do certain things. It was put down clearly what they were expected to do; they agreed to a bargain; and the protectorate that has taken place is nothing like what is described in such plain language in the resolution of the Convention in Sydney, and in the preamble of the Bill which I now hold in my hand. I do not think there are many members of the Government who will at all sympathise with the very unpatriotic sentiment expressed by the Minister for Lands. I believe that if our forefathers had been actuated by such mean motives we should not have been citizens of Queensland at present. It is simply because we have been men of enterprise looking after our own interests that we are here to-day. Those sentiments are not in the minds of the natives of the colony, and only in those of very few others. It throws some light upon the very little interest that the Government seem to take in the question at the present time. How the hon. member could conscientiously help his colleagues to pass a Bill to make provision for the payment of £15,000, and hold the sentiments he does, is difficult for me to understand. Now, the Premier said I assumed that Lord Derby had acted all through in a manner inimical to the interests of the colony. I did not assume that at all. I say that the facts of the case are that he has not studied the interests of the colony sufficiently. I say that, taking his action all through, he has not acted in the interests of the colony, but simply from his own narrow-minded views of English interests alone. That was the position I took up, and when I referred to the timidity of England I did so advisedly. I say that timidity with regard to English interests has characterised every action of Lord Derby. The Premier looks at it in this way: he says, “Why, when we know nothing of the diplomatic relations between England and foreign nations, should we not leave the matter in the hands of England? They are the best

judges, and we should not question their actions." Now, the English people ought to know, and do know, the diplomatic relations between England and foreign countries. It is the duty of statesmen to let them know, and that they do know I have no doubt whatever. I never dreamt of giving Lord Derby credit for any exclusive knowledge with regard to the relations between England and any foreign nation. That is known to all men who read the newspapers, and there is no one who has an exclusive knowledge of what goes on in the Colonial Office. The point I tried to put clearly before the Committee was, that through timidity Lord Derby was doing a great wrong to this colony. English statesmen have a duty to perform to the colonies. They must not be content with saying this is an Imperial question, and we must do with it as we like. It is their duty to accept a little danger in order to protect us from a great danger; and I say if Lord Derby had exercised some judgment and had been free from that timidity that he ought to be free from, he would have at once acceded to the request of the colony, and he would then have been acting in accordance with the wishes of the English people. If he had done so he would have freed us from a great many dangers, and he would have satisfied every man in the colony. I say now, in regard to the Act that we have passed, that it is a perfect sham. I do not look at the paltry £15,000 at all; but there is a principle involved in the question. We are perfectly willing to undertake a certain portion of expenditure connected with the government of the islands adjacent to Queensland, which, being in the hands of foreign powers, would jeopardise our interests; we are prepared to advance the money just in the same way as we expend money in our naval and military defences, but we want something for our money, and we want what was promised. So far as we have gone at present we have not got our part of the bargain. We have said to the Imperial Government we will grant all the money you ask. We have done a great deal more than that in fact, for we have guaranteed all that is due by other colonies. We have performed our share of the bargain, but the English Government have not performed any part of theirs, because we are still liable to the same danger of a foreign power annexing New Guinea. The very timidity of the policy of Great Britain has actually invited our enemies—not our enemies, for we have none, but the enemies of England—to take possession of a part of that island. A clearer invitation than that proclamation cannot possibly be given to any nation. That proclamation said, "We have taken the south, you can take the north if you like;" but if the north is taken, we are in as great danger from invasion by a foreign nation as we ever were before. One of the Ministers, the Minister for Works, told us that it was pretty well known that the reason why New Guinea was annexed by the late Government was the desire to find cheap labour for the planters. There is not one word of truth in that. I can produce facts to answer him just in a few words. While the late Government remained in power there was not one single vessel allowed to leave Queensland to recruit natives at New Guinea. Permanent orders were given that that trade should not exist, as far as that island was concerned.

The PREMIER: No such instructions can be found.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I do not know what the hon. gentleman has done since he came into office, but in my time no vessel went to New Guinea, and no vessel was allowed to engage in any way in New Guinea trade, and as a matter of fact no vessel had gone there.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I say that no vessel went to New Guinea; and by imperative instructions given by me, which are, or were, on record, no vessel was allowed to trade for labour to New Guinea.

The PREMIER: No such instructions are recorded.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: They were in the office, and they can be clearly seen in the despatch I wrote to Lord Derby. There I pointed out as clearly as possible that it was against our policy.

The PREMIER: There was no power to give any such instructions.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The hon. member may argue, and interject as he likes that we had no such power. I am saying what I did.

The PREMIER: Where is it to be found?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: In the Colonial Secretary's Office.

The PREMIER: No, it is not.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I say it is. The instructions were there at the time I left office.

Question put and negatived.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER reported the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, returning the Jury Bill with amendments.

On the motion of Mr. CHUBB, the consideration of the message was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee further to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £5,100 be granted for inspection and contingencies in connection with State Schools. He asked in that vote to make considerable changes. It was proposed to increase the salaries of five inspectors to the extent of £50 each, and also to appoint two new inspectors. At present there were a senior inspector and five other inspectors, besides the general inspector. The number of schools had increased so much that, as he had said on the previous night, during the present year several schools had had to go entirely without inspection. That was a very unfortunate thing; but it was simply impossible with the present number of inspectors to inspect all the schools. It was the rule for a good many years, as far as practicable, to have each school inspected twice every year—that was a detailed inspection and a sort of general inspection; but that had had to be given up for some time. No appointments had been made up to the present time; but they were necessary because the present inspectors were unable to do all the work, and by keeping at it continually they were being overworked. He had noticed that during the year, and he was convinced that if the efficiency of the schools was to be kept up there must be additional inspectors. With respect to the additional salaries, he might say that the salaries of those inspectors who were receiving £350 had never been raised since they were first appointed, and some of them were appointed a good many years ago. They were the only public officers who had remained at the same rate of salary

for many years. He thought, therefore, that an increase was due to them. The increase of travelling expenses was due to an additional amount of travelling.

Mr. ARCHER asked whether the hon. gentleman could mention the names of the four inspectors—not the senior inspector?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mr. Caine, Mr. McGrouarty, Mr. Shirley, and Mr. Kilham.

Mr. ARCHER: Not Mr. Ross?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said Mr. Ross had only been appointed within the last twelve months. All those four were appointed by himself when Minister for Public Instruction over six years ago.

Mr. ARCHER said that when he administered the department for a short time he found there was a very great difference in the manner in which the inspectors did their work; and he would have liked to have seen a distinction made between those who did their work well—whether they had been long in the service or not—and those whose work was not satisfactory. He thought an opportunity had been lost of singling out those who really deserved the increase.

Mr. PALMER said he gathered, from the Report on Education for 1883, that through the lack of inspectors it was impossible to inspect schools in the far northern part of the colony. Was it to be understood that the appointment of the new inspectors would enable the schools in the Burke district, for instance, to be examined?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the schools in the Burke district had been inspected during the present year. Of course, the inspection of a school, say at Normanton, took up the time which would suffice for the inspection of several schools in more accessible districts.

Mr. BAILEY said the hon. member for Rosewood had commented the other evening upon a paragraph in the Education Report which stated—

“It became manifest towards the close of the year that the number of teachers trained in the colony was not sufficient to supply the requirements of the State schools in course of erection.”

It complained further that the teachers were not up to the mark, and that teachers had to be imported at considerable expense from the old country. He quite agreed with the hon. member that the colony was quite able to produce men and women capable of doing the work they were required to perform, though they might not be qualified to pass an examination as B.A. or M.A. In consequence of what the hon. member had said, he had looked over the examinations to which it was proposed to subject the teachers, and every page surprised him more and more. He was informed on good authority that one examination paper in mathematics, not for first-class teachers either, was such that the first mathematician in Queensland had openly acknowledged that he could not go through in six hours the papers those boys and girls were expected to go through in four hours. If hon. members would turn to the report of the Secretary for Public Instruction, bearing in mind that they were training teachers for children, and not raising up a class of uselessly learned people, he would ask them why a pupil teacher of the third class should be required to give the dates of each of the following events:—

“Death of Constantius at York: Romans abandoned Britain: arrival of the Saxons under Hengist: introduction of Christianity to the Saxons; first invasion of the

Danes; second invasion of the Danes; third invasion of the Danes; accession of Ethelred the Unready; death of Canute; banishment of Earl Godwin.”

Was it really necessary that a pupil teacher in the national schools should be required to give those dates? A pupil teacher in the fourth class was required to give the dates of the following events:—

“Crusades commenced: Westminster Hall built: Justices in Eyre first appointed; Magna Charta obtained: first House of Commons; invention of gunpowder; Wales annexed.”

Not New Guinea—

“Battle of Bannockburn; paper first made from rags.”

It might also have added, when the rags became newspapers. There was also the date of the Treaty of Bretigny. Were not those absurd things to require pupil teachers to cram themselves with? Going a little further, they would find that pupil teachers were examined in Latin. He was not a Latin scholar himself—he was afraid his Latin was rusty; but he was of opinion that few, even classical men, would pass a *bonâ fide* examination of the kind given. The questions were not fair questions—they were trick questions:—

“Translate into English:—(1) Vincit (two meanings); (2) Vincet; (3) Vincat; (4) Vinciat; (5) Viceris; (6) Vinxere; (7) Vincitur; (8) Victi sumus; (9) Vincibamini.”

The pupil teacher of the third class was required to give the meanings of each one of those words. It was a trick question, because a boy or girl going up for examination became very naturally confused with a number of words apparently somewhat similar, but really dissimilar in meaning. Going on again, the pupil teacher of the fourth class was required to—

“Decline:—Filia, deus, pulvis, caro, lepus, mare, as, passus, domus, iugerum.”

Each of those words would take a considerable time to decline, and the time given to those who were up for examination was not nearly sufficient, even if they were perfectly acquainted with the Latin language. But when he came to the admission as a teacher of the second class he found a most curious thing. Not content with puzzling candidates in an ordinary fair examination—or even with trick questions—they had actually imported an absurd form of Latin, which very few Latin scholars were acquainted with—what was called archaic Latin. Many of the words he would not have recognised as Latin, and they were as much like Latin as the Lancashire dialect was like English. But, more than that, they spelt the words wrongly, for he found “*fortissimi*” spelt with a *u* in the middle.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is a clerical error.

Mr. BAILEY: What had those poor wretched boys who went up for examination to do with a clerical error? But, coming to page 83, he found what was the most absurd thing in the whole examination paper. They knew what “temporary teachers” were; how they were half starved, and put on a most miserable pittance of a salary, without board or residence, or allowances, and with a salary of an ordinary day labourer. The question put to them was:—

“As specimens of copy-setting write in text-hand the word ‘University,’ and in small hand”—

And in very small hand it should be—

“the sentence ‘Half-a-loaf is better than no bread.’”

What a satire on their system of education! In his own district he knew a poor fellow who had lately died, leaving a wife and children, and who for ten or twelve years had been a good and faithful servant of the department, on a pittance of £70 or £80 a year. His wife and children had been left destitute, because

every shilling went to keep them in clothes and food; and yet he supposed the first question put to that man was to write, "Half-a-loaf is better than no bread." That poor man was now dead; better off, perhaps, than ever before; but his wife and children were destitute. That was the result of the working of the department.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You do not blame the department for that, do you?

Mr. BAILEY said he did blame the department for keeping out boys and girls who were able to do the work, and importing men from home because they were able to pass a sham and cram examination of the kind mentioned. He would say a word or two about the inspectors. A very interesting article had appeared in the *Courier* a few days ago, which he advised every member of the Committee to read, as it would give them a very good idea of the system to which their teachers were tied. The article was entitled, "A School Board Idyll, by an Elementary Teacher." He was sure there was a great deal of truth in it, and that what they called inspection of schools was anything but what they expected it to be. A great deal depended on the prejudices of the inspector. More than all, he objected to the cramming of all children alike, when all were not of equal ability; and to the attempt to "put a quart into a pint-pot." And schoolmasters were sometimes condemned because the pint-pots did not hold quarts. It was a system of cram, and not of real instruction. They were wasting their power and money on it. Education could be given far more simply, and with more benefit, if they had less grammar and more common sense. They had heard a great deal lately of the effects of over-pressure in English schools. There was a great deal of the same thing here, and the children were not able to bear the amount of cramming which it was considered necessary for the teachers to cram into them. The teachers occupied a most unenviable position, unless they brought up the children to a certain standard, and crammed into them knowledge, which was not real knowledge. They had to learn lots of things which were of no use, and carefully did not learn things which would be of use to them. He hoped that the Minister for Public Instruction would in some way make inquiry into the present system of education for he firmly believed it was radically wrong. The more he saw of it the less content he was with it. The children were not taught to read and write, but a lot of grammar and useless geography. If hon. members would only look at the examination papers, they would see that they were training teachers to acquire a kind of knowledge which was perfectly useless for the purpose for which they employed them, and which they could never use as teachers in their schools. He hoped they would have a commission of some kind to inquire into the system, which ought to be carried out at much less expense, and with far more benefit to the children.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not see how, at the same time, the salaries paid were entirely inadequate and that the system was carried out at too great expense. He had read all the reports of the inspectors, and had exercised an independent judgment in every case. In no single instance had any remonstrance been made to teachers on the recommendation of an inspector, without his having revised it himself, and approved of the language himself. And in no single instance had any complaint of injustice being done to a teacher been made without it being at once attended to by himself, and, if injustice had been done, its being redressed. As to the interest-

ing story which appeared in the *Courier*, called "A School Board Idyll," it had been laid before him at the Education Office. He had read it with great interest and great regret, and had expressed the hope that nothing of that kind had ever occurred in Queensland. He did not think it had. The examination of teachers was surely not unnecessary. Hon. members knew that they did not examine teachers simply on the subjects they wished taught to the children. They must have teachers who knew more than the children; otherwise the children of the third form might teach those of the second form. That would be starving the department indeed. Surely the hon. member knew that the object of examination was to ascertain whether the teacher had received a certain amount of culture and instruction; for unless a teacher had a general knowledge of a good many things he was unfit to give instruction to children. There was no more difficult task than to give instruction to young children, and the idea of limiting the capacity of the instructors of young children to the dimensions suggested by the hon. member would be a very absurd one. As to the complaint about "catch" papers, he did not think there was any foundation for it.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that, with regard to the question he raised on the previous evening, he was not induced to do so by the representations of any teacher. But when he read through the report his feelings revolted at the way in which young men and women, whom they asked to devote their lives to the noble art of teaching, were treated. How much valuable material was thus wasted? No severer censure could be passed on the General Inspector than in the words of his own officer, Mr. Kilham, at page 54 of the report:—

"Pupil teachers are employed in State schools only, and under classified head teachers who are responsible for their training. With a few exceptions the head teachers realise this responsibility, and endeavour to the best of their abilities to discharge the duties imposed upon them by the department; but owing to their multifarious duties of class teaching, examining, planning work-books, keeping registers, making out returns, etc., the practical instruction which a pupil teacher receives is very inadequate, and should be supplemented by a couple of years' training in a model school specially devoted to such work."

There, was clearly indicated the shortcomings of a system by which the pupil teachers were wronged. Let the head teacher be ever so good, he only excelled in certain parts; but with a training college the best abilities would be entrusted to the training of the young teachers. There was teaching and teaching. One man possessed the art of tuition in a far higher degree than another; he could teach with less severity, with less taxing of the strength of the pupil, and yet impart a far higher degree of instruction than the most learned professor could do without that special gift. A professor might be worth thousands a year to his university, and not be worth his salt as a teacher of children; whereas a man possessing the gift of tuition in a high degree would be worth his weight in gold. Those benefits were withheld from the pupil teachers; they did not get their proper training; and then they were heartlessly set aside. It appeared from the report that there were in the department 330 pupil teachers. What an immense benefit it would be to the colony to qualify those pupil teachers, by proper training, to teach the young! The benefit would be lasting; and from a humanitarian and a statesmanlike point of view, the ten-million loan for railways was a mere trifle to it. His contention was still further strengthened by the report, on page 50, of Mr. Inspector Platt, who wrote:—

"Order and Discipline.—Order was reported excellent in one school (Copperfield), very good in ten schools,



good in eight, very fair in five, fair in seventeen, moderate in seven, indifferent in four, very indifferent in one, and bad in one school (Watsonville)."

He said on the previous day that the examination of the inspectors varied one from the other. Mr. Platt was the only one who made any mention of order and discipline, and he commended him very highly for doing so. Discipline and order were of far more value than all the cram which could be forced into a scholar. Mr. Platt went on to say :—

"In one school only the discipline erred on the side of severity. Few teachers appear to appreciate the supreme importance of good discipline either as a means or as an end; if they did they would study it more than they do. At present many seem to ignore it for mere attainments obtained in any fashion. Perhaps the best discipline in the district I found at Callopie, of which school I was able to write in my report.—The discipline is excellent in character; it is not a mere name, but a series of devices, laws, and exercises carefully adapted to establish and foster certain habits, moral and intellectual. Already the result is most gratifying—self-control, thoughtful answers, and order without effort were marked features."

If that report was correct that man would be worth his weight in gold, as a professor in the training college, to teach pupil teachers the difficult art of enforcing discipline without severity. The great fault of their present system was with regard to discipline, and it was a common complaint that the teachers dared not call their souls their own. If pupil teachers were taught to enforce discipline the General Inspector would not have been able to cast such a slur on the pupil teachers as he did on page 44. Mr. Platt was not alone in that view. It seemed that their inspectors viewed the matter of education from a higher standpoint than the General Inspector. On page 58 they found :—

"The pupil teachers serve an apprenticeship of four years at most. Although in most instances they receive efficient instruction which enables them to pass their annual examinations, they do not always receive regular and methodical training in the art of teaching, and in more than one large school last year where this essential part of a pupil teacher's education had been omitted the evil effects were very noticeable."

It was also pointed out that a training college for pupil teachers was absolutely necessary. Mr. District Inspector Ross, on page 68, said :—

"While testifying to the zeal and faithfulness with which the head teachers of this district discharge their duties, there are one or two matters in the larger schools that seem to demand observation. In the first place, there is not always that cordial relation between the head teachers and their subordinates that is desirable. Assistants and pupil teachers may sometimes do their work inefficiently or occasionally give unnecessary trouble; but head teachers should bear in mind the difficulties and petty annoyances these young teachers meet with in the discharge of their irksome duties, and should seek to make their work as pleasant as possible. Sarcasm and ridicule do not win loyal service, neither do they promote the best interests of the school. No large school can be really well conducted without the hearty co-operation of the various members of the school staff, and this is best secured by those teachers who temper firmness with kindness in their administration."

Those inspectors recognised the difficulty that existed in acquiring the art of teaching. A school-teacher might be all kindness of heart and enforce a loving discipline which was cheerfully complied with by a love of order, while another who forced discipline with the spirit of a martinet, caused only rebellion, and drove many a pupil teacher from the service; and the department had the assurance to say they could not get teachers enough. How could they, when the teachers were treated like that, and crammed and overtaxed, as the hon. member for Wide Bay had described, while the higher art of the pedagogue was neglected? Further on Mr. Ross said :—

"A matter of graver importance is the training of the pupil teachers: as pupils, in too many instances, they are burdened with lessons and exercises of preposterous length; and as teachers, they are left to blunder through their wearisome duties with little of either direction or encouragement. They should be judiciously directed, and should have more frequent opportunities of hearing model lessons given by the head teacher. This is, perhaps, the best of all training within the reach of our pupil teachers. Above all, the home work should be reduced to more moderate and sensible proportions."

The General Inspector had not paid the slightest attention to the most valuable reports of his sub-inspectors, and they must not wonder if the department was short of teachers. He contended in the name of common sense, and in the interest of the people of the colony, and for the future greatness of the colony, that the establishment of a training college was a matter of greater importance than the establishment of a defence force. When the second reading of that Bill was before the House he hinted that the school children were subjected to too much cramming, about one-quarter of which could be dispensed with, and that instead of it, a thorough training in gymnastic exercises should be instituted, which would prepare them for order and discipline; and if the Government would encourage that they would prepare their youths, so that in a future time they should rise like one man, and be able to defend themselves. The Defence Bill could not be treated except as a school for providing officers. The objects of the Defence Bill, and the objects aimed at in their educational system, should be coeval. The educational system was to fit them to fight with the duties of life, and the Defence Bill was to teach them to fight an enemy in defence of their country. He wished he possessed the ability necessary to put that important question before the Committee in the manner it deserved to be, and he hoped that when the next Minister for Education was appointed he would be able to devote the whole of his time to that most important branch of the Civil Service, as the teachers would benefit by it. He did not make those remarks with a view of censuring the present Secretary for Public Instruction. He always had his ears open, and he heard that since that hon. gentleman took office a considerable amount of improvement had taken place, and that the teachers were treated more considerately; but it could not be expected that he, overburdened by the duties of State and office, could devote that time to the subject which it required. Since religious instruction had been eliminated from the schools, it was all the more important that the teachers should get the highest moral training that they possibly could, so that the rising youth of the colony might be inspired with that love of law and obedience which was so essential; so that they might be inspired with that fire which made the richest man willing and patriotic enough to lay down his life should danger threaten the land of his birth. He should like to see the noble art of teaching raised, as it deserved to be, because he considered teaching the most noble calling known in life. Since religion had been eliminated from the State schools, the teachers occupied a far higher position, and a more important position than ministers of religion themselves; and he was truly glad that the teachers had been freed from the tyrannical clutches of such despots. Having been liberated from the despotism of clerical men, it was unnecessary that they should be subjected to official and departmental tyranny. On the Continent the teachers were as badly treated as they were here, but when, in 1848, the spirit of emancipation showed itself they formed themselves into societies. At first the Government

tried to crush them down, but when they found they could not crush them out of existence, then they made use of them for a good purpose. When an important question of school reform had to be decided and considered, the Government submitted those important questions to the teachers' societies, and frequently the young wisdom of the teachers, who were actually engaged in the cause of education, was far superior to the fossilised knowledge of superior officers. He had been told that a teachers' society was started here, but it was about as much as a man's position was worth to join it, and it had become a dead-letter. The Government did not encourage it as they should do; but he hoped when reform was decided upon, if such societies were in existence, that all important questions would be submitted to them. They could discuss them and give their opinions, and he was sure that, far from being inimical to the interests of the State, the societies he had mentioned would prove mighty handmaidens on all questions of school reform.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had not the least doubt the hon. member for Rosewood was terribly in earnest; and he was perfectly sure the hon. member believed everything he had said. He was certain also that the bulk of the members of the Committee would agree with him if he had only admitted them into his confidence. So far he had not done so, and therefore, to a certain extent, they might pass by what the hon. member had said. He thought they might possibly get back to a broader question, and he used the word comparatively, because he did not know how broad the question raised by the hon. member for Rosewood might be; his speech seemed to be mixed up with the question of the Defence Bill—a Bill he (Mr. Morehead) was sorry he was not in his place to discuss, as possibly it might not then have got as far as it had already done; at any rate he hoped it would not have. He had risen to point out that almost every year since the present Education Act became law the cost of their Education system had increased enormously, and to point out that he did not think there was contained in the reports of the various inspectors anything that showed them that they were getting sufficient value for their money. He maintained that when they saw, year after year, that Education vote increasing and swelling in a way that under the present Act it could not help swelling, it was about time for them to consider how far that monstrous system of popular education should be continued, and for how long—a similar burden was breaking the backs of the taxpayers in the adjoining colonies—that reckless squandering of the money of the people in giving an excessive free education was to continue. A system of free education out of which the large centres of population almost entirely got the greater advantage must eventually curtail the resources of the State. He said it advisedly that the great bulk of the money was spent in the large centres of population, whereas the taxation was spread over every individual in the colony. He maintained that the time must soon come when the same justice would have to be dealt out to the outside districts that was given to large towns, such as Brisbane. Surely the Minister for Public Instruction might have given them some statistics showing, as he ought to show, how the vote had grown! They could see it had grown from £142,000 to £163,000. There was a jump of £21,000—an increase that was not paralleled in any other department except those that dealt with the material development of the colony. He maintained that, great as were the advantages of education—he might say, great as was the necessity for education—the people were in a position to pay for it; and more especially

were the people, situated in places such as Brisbane, able to pay for the education of their children. If any hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to read the proceedings of the British Association, which met in Montreal this year, and had read an address given by Sir Richard Temple, they would see that the richest country in the world, so far as bread-winners were concerned, was Australia, and next to it came either the United States or Canada; and yet they were to be taxed to the extent of £163,000 a year for education. He considered the thing ought to be abolished.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No.

Mr. MOREHEAD: An hon. member said, no. He said, yes. He had the courage of his convictions, which he had arrived at after long and careful thought, and he said they were paying too much for the education of their people—paying too much for a system which was unfair and unjust, inasmuch as it applied chiefly to the large centres of population, and placed those who were situated in the outside districts at a great disadvantage. He did not wish to raise a sectarian cry in that Committee, but he maintained that there was a large section in the community who were taxed to assist what were called secular schools, from which they derived no benefit, and who had to pay a double tax because they had to provide for the education of their children.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is their own fault.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was not their own fault, and he was ashamed to hear the hon. gentleman say so. It was their virtue. They paid for the education of their own children besides being taxed for the public schools. Was that a crime on their part? He said it was all the more credit to those people. He might fairly say that one-third of the whole community was taxed to support a system which they did not believe in, and who had also to pay for the teaching of their children out of their pockets. He again, on behalf of the taxpayers of the colony, protested against that swelling of the Education vote. Year after year it was gathering; it was like a snowball. He should like the Minister for Public Instruction to say what great benefit the colony had derived from the Act. He admitted that it was passed by a large majority of the House, and by a combination of the leaders on both sides; but he opposed it then, and he disbelieved in it now. The Premier was kind enough to tell him last night that he (Mr. Morehead) was not an æsthetic man, and therefore, assuming that he must be a practical man, he should like the hon. gentleman to say what were the results of the Act—what benefits it had conferred, whether crime had been diminished; and how it was that the enormous expenditure increased year by year. That increase was so great that he had no hesitation in saying that it would eventually lead to a serious modification, if not the entire repeal, of the system. An agitation had been commenced in Victoria. The strain on the finances of that colony was so great, owing to the operation of the education system, that the revenue would not stand it. There were complaints in the same direction in New South Wales. He thought some satisfactory reasons should be given—apart from the reason that the population was increasing—which would no doubt be the point taken by the Minister for Public Instruction for the large increase. They ought to have from the hon. gentleman some statistics showing the number of pupils, the increase in the number of those pupils, and what was the cost per head.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That has been fully explained,

Mr. MOREHEAD said it had not been fully explained. He did not think any full explanation had been given to the Committee by the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Morehead) had the courage of his opinions. He did not care whether he was charged with being an opponent of secular education or an opponent of the Act as it stood. So long as he had a seat in that House he should protest against the Education Act as a blot on the Statute-book, and as a great injustice to a large section of the community—not his co-religionists, but his fellow-colonists. Justice ought to be done to that section of the community, either by an alteration of the Act, or by Parliament giving them a grant of money in order that they might carry out the education of their children in their own way. He cared not how the majority of the public might view his opinion. As an honest member of the community, and as a member of that Committee, he desired to see equal justice done to all.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. gentleman had asked him whether he thought the Act had been a benefit to the colony. He did think so, certainly. He had no statistics to prove it, but he did not think statistics proved anything as to moral results. He believed there was no part of the world where the advantages of education were more evident than in Queensland. The hon. gentleman said the greatest advantage was in the large towns. Of course there were a great many more children in the towns; but, so far as he knew, there was no place in the colony where there were twelve children who had not got a school.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Nonsense!

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said if they applied for schools they got them. The hon. gentleman said the expenditure was increasing. There was a considerable increase during the present year, the reasons for which he would give afterwards; but, as he had said on the previous night, it was proposed to increase the salaries of the teachers, which would account for a large increase in the expenditure. There was an increased expenditure for new school buildings; but, so far as the actual expense per head was concerned—he could not give the amount for the present year, because the returns were not complete—but last year, leaving out the expense for buildings, which was unusually heavy, the expense for teaching, taken on any basis, had considerably diminished. There had been an increase, to some extent, for a year or two before. He had not the statistics before him, but he could say that, considering the different circumstances here, owing to the large number of small schools, the expenditure in proportion was considerably less than in the other colonies.

Mr. ISAMBERT said the hon. member for Balonne complained that the expenditure on education was breaking the back of the people. If he did not know the hon. member had occupied the position of a Minister of the Crown, he should not have believed it. The sentiments he had expressed showed that he was quite unfit to grapple with the question. Frederick the Great said once, "A good poet, a bad soldier."

Mr. MOREHEAD: Was he an Englishman?

Mr. ISAMBERT: He was not. What he (Mr. Isambert) would say was—a good shopkeeper, a bad statesman. Every penny that education cost was spent in the colony, and he ventured to say that it did not cost the country a single sixpence. The importation of a single shipload of steel rails was more expensive to the colony than the whole Education Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the only thing he could understand of the hon. member's speech was that he bawled out something about steel rails and Frederick the Great. He did not know whether Frederick the Great was connected with the steel rails. It did not seem to him that the hon. member had really given them any information, and he was sorry that the hon. member should be annoyed. He assumed the hon. member was annoyed from the attitudes he struck, as he could not understand his language.

Mr. PALMER said the report showed that the number of children on the rolls was 46,000, while the average daily attendance was 24,000, showing a falling-off of nearly 50 per cent.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do not call it a falling-off.

Mr. PALMER said he noticed that the teachers of 114 schools reported 943 children within two miles of State schools who were not attending. He thought that, as they voted so much money for education, the circumstance of so many children not attending school afforded a good reason for enforcing the compulsory clause of the Act. The hon. member for Wide Bay had expressed his opinion that only useful subjects should be taught in the schools. The hon. member had dissented from some questions in English history, but they were questions the most ordinary schoolboy could answer. The study of English history should be the foundation of all their education. There was no doubt from the reports of all the inspectors that there was great need for a training school to teach those who were to teach the children. As the hon. member for Rosewood had said, it was a knowledge that had to be taught. However well educated a man might be, he might fail in the qualification of being able to impart his knowledge.

Mr. ARCHER said that, while not agreeing with the exaggerations of the hon. member for Wide Bay with regard to the difficulties of the examinations, still he would point out that the general inspector himself said in his report, on page 46:—

"From my own observation, and the reports of the examiners, I believe it would have been well if the papers had been made easier in some branches."

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No doubt it will be seen they are so next time.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would ask whether the compulsory clauses of the Education Act had been brought into force by the Government who passed the Act, or whether it was intended to bring them into force?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said no steps had yet been taken to bring them into operation. The figures showed a wonderfully large attendance, and that a very small number indeed absented themselves as compared with other places. The clauses had not been brought into operation, and the matter had not been pressed on his notice sufficiently for him to consider the matter.

Mr. MOREHEAD: If the matter is pressed on the hon. member's notice, will the clauses be brought into operation?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that if the matter was pressed on his notice he would take it into consideration, and if he thought the step necessary it should be taken. He believed in enforcing the clauses if circumstances required it, but he should require to devote considerable attention to the matter first.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that not only most of the teachers, but also most of the sensible members of the school committees were anxious to see the compulsory clauses enforced to some extent. The labours of the teachers were much increased by irregular attendance, and the children who attended regularly were the sufferers, because the teachers had to pay so much attention to the stragglers. He was glad to see that so few were neglecting to take advantage of free education; but the majority should not be sufferers through the faults of the few negligent ones. The laws were made for those who were imbued with a disregard for law to compel them to conform to the regulations of society. Education cost the State a large amount of money, and penalties were specially necessary for those who did not attend to their duties. He believed if the Minister for Education would to some extent, but not too severely at first, enforce the compulsory clauses and then gradually tighten the reins, he would be largely assisted by the advice of the teachers and the school committees.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the hon. the Minister for Public Instruction had, in answer to some members, stated that their education system cost less than those of the other colonies, but that he had not the statistics beside him. He (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) was not going to contest that question with him, but he would say that it was not a very good comparison to make, either with New South Wales or Victoria, for everybody knew that those colonies were extremely extravagant in that respect. Did the hon. gentleman mean by that the cost of education per head? Taking the average attendance at 24,247, the education in Queensland cost £5 6s. 11½d. per head. That was an enormous sum per head.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is including buildings.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: No; it did not include buildings; it included administration and inspection. Paragraph 42, page 8, said:—

"The expenditure on State schools, exclusive of administration and inspection, was £113,020 15s. 2d.; and on provisional schools, £8,806 9s. 2d.; and with proportionate cost of administration and inspection, £119,871 18s. 1d. and £9,785 6s. 9d. respectively."

Now, if they added £119,871 and £9,785 they got £129,656, which sum divided by the 24,247 children in average attendance amounted to £5 7s. all but 3d. It did not include buildings at all. The buildings cost £19,000 in addition last year. Paragraph 47 said:—

"The value of the school property of the department at the end of 1883, exclusive of the value of the sites granted by the Government, is estimated at £177,000. If to the actual expenditure for the year an allowance for interest on this sum is added, the above figures will be proportionately increased."

In calculating the cost of education, State school buildings were never included—the interest only was included. In the present case the interest was not included, but simply the cost of teaching, administration, and inspection. Now, admitting for the sake of argument that their educational system cost less than that of New South Wales or Victoria—which he was not prepared to say—how was that object attained? Was it by efficiency in the administration of the department? Was it not rather by the miserable pittance given to the teachers and inspectors? He could prove to the hon. gentleman that he was thoroughly right. If they took New South Wales and compared it with Queensland, Queensland education cost somewhat less; but the difference was in the salaries paid. Take inspection. By the vote under discussion nine inspec-

tors were asked for the present year. A general inspector had £600 a year. Now he could not exactly say whether that corresponded to the Inspector-General of Schools in New South Wales, or to the Chief Inspector. But he took it to mean the Inspector-General, because the General Inspector under the Queensland system was the officer next to the Under Secretary, and the Inspector-General in New South Wales held a similar position. That gentleman's salary was £100 more, as he got £700 a year in New South Wales. The Chief Inspector, who ranked below, got the same salary as the General Inspector received here. Then there was one metropolitan district inspector at £600, and eight district inspectors at £550 a year in New South Wales. In Queensland one inspector got £400, and three others were asked to begin at £350. Now the only officers in the inspector's department in New South Wales who got £350 a year were assistant inspectors of the second class. If the teacher's salaries were examined the same disproportion was seen right through. When the hon. gentleman said then that our system cost less than those of the neighbouring colonies, it was because the teachers were ground down to the lowest pittance. It was not through any economy or efficiency in the working of the administration, because he (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) found, by reading the New South Wales statistics through, that the teachers' salaries—many of them, at least—were actually higher than the inspectors' in Queensland. There were twenty-four first-class teachers, with salaries of £400 a year; and here they had three inspectors for whom they asked £350 a year. And the other teachers according to classification had salaries higher than any teachers in Queensland. The hon. member for Balonne complained that their system of education was carried on at the expense of the people in the country for the benefit of people in the towns. In reply to that, the hon. gentleman said a school was established at every place where it was asked for. But that answer must be taken with a qualification. He had received a letter bearing on that point from one of his constituents, and as the subject had been brought forward he would mention it now instead of waiting till the proper vote was moved. His informant stated that at Cardwell there was a provisional school, the teacher of which was allowed to be also the clerk of the divisional board, which interfered with his teaching—he was taken away at certain times when he was wanted by the divisional board. In addition to that, and in spite of complaints made to the department, he had been gazetted as land agent. The result was that the children were neglected and were being taken from the school. If that was not benefiting the children in towns at the expense of the people in the country he did not know what was. That provisional school teacher was allowed to eke out his salary by being clerk to the divisional board and land agent; but if the people of the country were dealt fairly by he would be paid a salary large enough to allow him to perform the work of a schoolmaster without combining it with other offices. A teacher should be kept at his work during working hours; if he could do other work outside the school hours, well and good, nor would the parents of the children object; but he should be compelled to do that work outside school hours.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was no pleasing the hon. member who had just sat down. The hon. member first contended that the expense of the schools was too great, and then that the amount expended was too small. How could they give larger salaries to the teachers without increasing the expenditure?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I did not say you could.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had already stated that he thought the salaries were too small, and he proposed in the next vote to ask for an increase to them. That would increase the expenditure, but still the amount was less, or not more than in the other colonies. But, as he had before pointed out, the circumstances of the colony necessitated a larger proportionate expenditure than in any of the others. With reference to the complaint from Cardwell, he was aware of the circumstances of the case. The amount available for the salary of the provisional school teacher there was £70, and a man could scarcely be expected to live at Cardwell on £70 a year. The teacher applied for permission to act as land agent for some trifling remuneration, and as there was no one else there to do the work, he, after some hesitation, consented, on a distinct promise that it should not interfere with the work of the school. Subsequently the teacher applied to be allowed to act as divisional board clerk, saying that the only time the office would be open would be on Saturdays. Since then complaint had been made to him that on one or two days the teacher had neglected his school for the purpose of attending the land office. The result was that he was warned and fined for his absence; and since then there had been no further complaint. The colony could not afford to pay £200 for a provisional school teacher at Cardwell, to teach ten or twelve children. The Committee would never sanction such extravagant expenditure. They were in the difficult position of having to provide instruction where there were very few children, and at the same time to keep down the expense. To pay £80 for teaching twelve children was over £6 10s. per head for instruction alone, while the average was not more than £3 15s.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the complaint from Cardwell to which he referred was dated November 14, so that it must have been very recently that the teacher was censured and fined.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Somewhere about that time, I fancy.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not complain about the expenditure, nor did he assert that the system was not worked cheaper than in New South Wales. He believed it was, but, as he had pointed out, it was at the expense of the teachers, and not by good administration—at the expense of men like the one to whom they had just been referring who was sent up to Cardwell, one of the oldest towns in the North, to teach a school on £70 a year. He did not know whether that man had a wife and family or not, but if he had they must very often go on short commons. When the hon. gentleman could show that the excess of cost per head in New South Wales was owing to better administration here, he would have something to talk about.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the Minister for Public Instruction had made a great mistake, or probably he had made one of those reckless assertions which he thought would be swallowed by the Committee without further inquiry. The hon. gentleman stated that the cost of education per head was less in Queensland than in Victoria or New South Wales. He held in his hand the report of the Minister for Public Instruction in Victoria for the present year, from which he would read a few figures. The cost of instruction, calculated on the amount spent under heads 1 and 3, was £4 0s. 3½d., and amounted in all to 87 per cent. of the whole expenditure. Therefore, if they added 10s. per

head, they would be adding a little too much; so that they might make it £4 10s. per head. But it was put down at £5 per head; and, therefore, the statement of the hon. gentleman was an error. When the hon. gentleman congratulated himself on the admirable way in which the children were attending school, he would find in a return he held in his hand that, taking the colonies of New Zealand, South Australia, and Victoria, the average attendance in New Zealand was 52·93; South Australia, 52·53; Victoria, 52·19. So that Queensland was the lowest. The cost of education, instead of being lower in Queensland, as they had been led to believe, was a great deal in excess of Victoria. The hon. gentleman could see for himself.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the hon. gentleman should not get up and characterise his statements as reckless assertions, when he made still more reckless ones himself. He was speaking from recollection of a return lately laid upon the table of the House of Representatives in New Zealand, on the motion of Mr. Montgomery. He was not speaking of the cost of buildings, as he did not think they ought to be taken into consideration. He had now in his hand the return, from which he found that the cost per scholar in average daily attendance, for the year 1882, was—New Zealand, £4 3s. 6½d.; Queensland, £4 3s. 3½d.; New South Wales, £4 5s.; Victoria, £4 18s. 10d.; South Australia, £4 4s. 4d.; England, £2 3s. 9d.; New York £3 18s.; Massachusetts, £4 6s. 2d.; and California £5 5s. 3d. So that Queensland was the lowest, except England and New York. The actual cost last year, on the same basis, was £3 15s. 10d. That was from a comparative table which, he presumed, had been carefully prepared.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had quoted from the Victorian report, and it was a pity the hon. gentleman had not seen it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that on looking at the report he found that the amount of £4 0s. 3½d. per head included teachers' salaries, books, singing, drawing, requisites, and exhibitions. The whole expenditure under those heads here came to be considerably less than £3 15s. per head.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the hon. gentleman was right when he said that £129,000, which was expended, included the actual cost of buildings and furniture; but he could not blame hon. members for not having expected that the department would have put the matter in a way that it had never been put before. Paragraph 46 professed to give the cost of education. Taking the average attendance at 24,000, in Table C the average cost of primary education was £5 6s. 11d. One would fancy that was the cost of education in addition to the cost of buildings for that year, especially when they came to paragraph 47. The way in which the department had managed in those two paragraphs to calculate the cost of instruction was this: They took the whole cost of primary education—teachers and everything. Then they added the actual cost of buildings and repairs for that year, and the interest on buildings that had been erected in previous years. The department was very much to blame for putting the accounts in such an unbusiness-like way before the Committee. He did not know where the hon. gentleman got the amount of £3 15s. The cost of education, including buildings, would make it a great deal more.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he found that amount in paragraph 44. He did not suppose hon. members would argue on the basis that paragraph 46 was all

there was in the report upon the subject. He pointed out the distinction between the gross expenditure and the net expenditure in the preceding paragraphs, 42 and 43, the latter of which said the expenditure, excluding cost of administration, inspection, special instructions, and buildings, was £81,310 14s. 4d.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, with regard to what the hon. gentleman had said in reference to the cost of education in Victoria, he admitted at once that he had never seen that report until it was handed to him, and he immediately got up and stated that the cost was £3 15s. per head. If the hon. gentleman would only take the trouble to read and digest the items he would see that he was in error. Any intelligent or unprejudiced man would see it. Eighty-seven per cent. of the expenditure was for instruction, teachers' salaries, exhibitions, etc.; exhibitions being a very large item. The proportion of expenditure in connection with the compulsory clauses was 1.43 per cent. The travelling expenses of inspectors were 3 per cent. The others were all small items of under  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The cost of the management of the schools, he saw, was much greater than in Victoria, yet the hon. gentleman told them it was a great deal less. Whether the report was true or false, he did not know. It was put there as a record that the attendance at schools was less in this colony than in the four colonies mentioned. He would give the hon. gentleman everything in, and let him calculate as he liked, still education in this colony cost 10s. a head, or probably 15s. a head, more than it did in Victoria. He could take everything contained in the figures that had been read, and no different result could be arrived at. If the hon. member could refute what he said he should be glad to listen to him.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it was a simple sum in arithmetic. He assumed as correct what was stated in the report, that the cost of instruction in Melbourne was calculated on the amount spent under the heads 1 and 3, and dividing that by the average attendance the amount came to £4 0s. 3½d. The heads of 1 and 3 comprised the whole of the expenditure which, in his report, paragraph 43, was described as teachers' salaries and allowances and incidental expenditure. Therefore they had the same basis to go upon. The two items were exactly the same for the purposes of comparison, and dividing the amount expended here by the average attendance, it came to £3 15s. 10d. per head. That was the sum, and he made £4 0s. 3½d. more than £3 15s. 10d.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it might be a simple sum in arithmetic, but how did the hon. gentleman know that the classification was the same in the two departments? He still maintained that the cost of education in this colony was 10s. per head more than it was in Victoria.

Mr. JORDAN said he thought they had reason to be proud of the system of education in this colony, inasmuch as all children could avail themselves of the advantages of the system and get a good English education. The advantages were incalculable, and the provision which they made for country schools was very liberal indeed. He did not think that the hon. member for Balonne had made out his case that the ratepayers were made to pay for the education of children in the towns at the expense of children in the country. As the Minister for Instruction had pointed out, the education of the children in the country was much more costly than in the towns; but in a colony like this, of 600,000 square miles or more, the cost must be great. But he thought it had been shown that whenever applications were made, that there were a sufficient number of children in a place a provisional school

was started. He thought the system too costly, and he went with the hon. member for Balonne in that respect—£160,000 a year for education for a colony that contained less than 300,000 persons was a great deal too much. He thought the system too good, and that they were making a mistake in teaching the children of the labouring class, by giving them an education which unfitted them for labour in the ordinary sense of the word. They spent £120,000 a year in bringing out the lowest class of people in Great Britain as immigrants; and they had been doing that for many years. They took the children of those people, who were themselves uneducated, and unfitted them for the occupations of their fathers and mothers. Instead of teaching the children to read and write, as he would do, they gave them too high an education. They were then too proud to follow the occupation of their fathers, and the girls despised domestic service. He thought the system a grand mistake. If persons wanted to have their children taught German, French, and Latin, it was a fair thing that they should pay for it; but he should like to see a system adopted which would give to children a plain English education; and if they wanted more let them pay for it. The system was bad, also, in that it was purely secular, and they had made a great mistake in excluding the reading of the Scriptures from the schools. He was on the first board of education, and had assisted to pass the original Primary Schools Act; and he did not hesitate to say that two clauses spoiled that measure and made it denominational. They at that time wanted to make it national, and if that had been done much difficulty would have been saved. It was provided in the original Act that the system should be purely national, and that Scripture lessons should be read without note or comment by the masters. In addition to that, every school building had to have a separate class-room, in which ministers of the different denominations could instruct the pupils in religious matters. He did not wonder that, the system being exclusively secular or irreligious, one-third of the population were not able to avail themselves of it. They could not send their children to the schools under such a system. He did not think it was fair to tax the Catholic community for a system which they could not avail themselves of, and therefore he went that far with the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member seemed to think that in the State schools French, German, and Latin were taught. Nothing of the kind; only elementary instruction was given. No money had been wasted in teaching higher subjects since the Act of 1875 came into operation. In the third class in schools not much more than a rudimentary instruction was given. How many children did hon. members think were there above the third class in the schools? The percentage in the fourth class last year was 6.9, and in the fifth class, which was the highest, it was 0.8, so that in the two classes together the percentage was 7.7. Those were the facts. He did not intend to discuss the question of religious instruction in State schools, which he did not think it was convenient to discuss on the Estimates.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. member for South Brisbane had referred to the allegation made by the hon. member for Balonne against the education system, because the country did not benefit in an equal manner with the towns. He himself objected to the system on the same ground. It was no doubt true, as the Minister for Public Instruction had said, that wherever there was a number of children a school was

granted; but he thought there was an inclination to give every luxury and extravagance to the towns, while parsimony was exercised with regard to country schools. He knew one instance of a school where the average number of children was over thirty. From circumstances over which the people had no control, the attendance fell off, and the people had to be content with a provisional school. He thought that was very hard. Having had a school, he did not think it ought to have been taken from them in that way. The average attendance fell to about 28, and he thought it was rather hard that the people should be deprived of the advantages they had enjoyed for some time. He knew that repeated application had been made to have the school reinstated, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would see his way to do it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the case had not come under his notice. He found that the school the hon. member referred to was a provisional school at the end of last year, and there were thirty-three children on the roll. He presumed the reason why the change was made was that the average attendance had fallen very low. Whenever a case of that kind came under his notice he generally exercised great long-suffering before taking any action of that kind. Not until he saw that the parents were determined not to send their children, or that there was an absolute certainty that the number would remain below the proper number, was such a step taken.

Mr. BLACK said he did not quite agree with the way in which the Minister for Public Instruction handled that vote. He did not see what was to be gained by trying to make it less than it really was. He did not see why the cost of buildings should be excluded from the cost of education to the colony. The buildings were of a perishable nature; and every year saw the necessity for additional buildings. Last year they had £18,000 on the vote for buildings; and now it was increased to £25,000. Although the cost last year of the system was put down at £142,539, the actual cost, he found, was £161,197; that was taking the cost for the year from January to December; but, taking the financial year, the cost was £158,344. It was evident that last year there was an expenditure of £15,652 in addition to the money voted by that House, and it was not at all improbable that the vote this year would be exceeded in the same way. The public generally did not care about minute details of what each child cost the colony to educate; they wanted to know what the system as a whole cost. It was very likely that there would be an excess this year, especially as the Minister for Public Instruction proposed to increase the salaries of the teachers, and that the total expenditure would reach about £180,000. He maintained that the cost of education last year, taking as a basis the £161,197 which was actually expended, was about £3 10s. per head on the number of the children enrolled, and on the actual attendance it was something like £6 13s. That was what they had to consider. It was quite evident that one-half the children, although they were enrolled, were not educated; they did not attend at all. Those who did attend, numbering 24,247, cost about £6 13s. per head. He was not prepared to object to the system of education, which he believed had been fraught with great good to the colony; but he endorsed, to a very great extent, the remarks made by the hon. member for South Brisbane, except where the hon. gentleman suggested that religious instruction of some description should be introduced. On that point he differed from the hon. member; but he

agreed entirely with him that they were educating the children of the colony beyond their natural status in life. As the hon. member remarked, they found that the native-born children, and even the children who came to the colony, after they had had three or four years of State school education, rarely followed the occupations of their parents. It was a most unusual thing for girls to accept domestic service; they all flocked to the towns; and it was very seldom that agricultural labourers could be recruited from the young men of the colony. He could only account for that by supposing that it was because the children received an education beyond what the State might reasonably be expected to provide. He went so far as to consider that the endowment of grammar schools was a matter which did not properly belong to the State. He saw no reason why parents who could afford to give their children an education beyond that provided by the State schools should not bear the cost of it themselves, more especially as the numbers who availed themselves of the grammar school education were necessarily limited. The hon. gentleman was to a certain extent correct when he said the State education embraced only the primary branches, but he had left out of view the very heavy expense of endowing the grammar schools—£20,000 he thought, last year—which he considered went beyond the intention of the Education Act when it was first framed. He thought it was a pity something could not be done to increase the attendance at the schools, though the average was equal to that of the other colonies. He was surprised to learn that in Victoria, where the compulsory provisions of the Act had been put in force, the attendance was not much higher than in Queensland; but he thought they should not always be content to follow the example of the other colonies; they ought to try and increase their average and set the example. He saw no reason why in the large centres of population—such as Brisbane, Maryborough, Rockhampton, or Toowoomba, or wherever there was a population numbering anything like 10,000—the compulsory clauses should not be put into operation. He took it for granted that the average cost of education would not be materially increased by insisting that a larger proportion of the children should attend the schools. He agreed with the hon. member for Rosewood that something might be done in the way of training the youth at the State schools in military exercises. In almost all the large towns they had a volunteer corps, and he believed it was usual to have a drill sergeant attached to each corps; and he was certain it would be money well invested if the drill sergeants received some small additional emolument for training the lads at the schools. It was a description of work which the youth of the colony would very heartily enter into. Even if they made the drilling compulsory, it would be very little to ask in return for the great boon the lads received in the way of absolutely free education. The result would be that in the course of a few years a great proportion of the youthful population would have been trained to the necessities of military service, and should occasion ever arise they would form a nucleus which would be far preferable to the attempted system of organising a defence force entirely from volunteers. He hoped the hon. the Minister for Public Instruction would take the matter into consideration. Considering the enormous and ever-increasing cost of the education system, which he believed would not be less than £180,000 this year, he thought they should get all the benefit they possibly could out of the system. He should like to have an assurance from the hon. gentleman that he would give the matter his favourable consideration, or

at all events he would like to have an expression of opinion from the hon. gentleman as to whether he thought the scheme would not be beneficial to the colony.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he supposed the hon. member knew that the arguments he used against the standard of instruction in the State schools were the stock arguments that had been used for the last hundred years against giving any instruction to the poorer classes at all, so he would not trouble to combat them. With regard to the question of expense, he found that last year the amount on the Estimates was insufficient to cover the actual expenditure; and he thought it best to put down at once what would probably be required for the expenditure of the year. The Estimates for the present year were prepared with much more care than he had been able to devote to the last ones, and he believed the amount now put down would not require to be exceeded at all. He believed it would cover the actual expenditure for the financial year. With respect to the question of drill, he entirely agreed with the hon. member; and he thought he had already expressed his intention to make arrangements for giving such drill in State schools as would be of service to the boys when they grew up and were old enough to become volunteers.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had not done yet with the hon. gentleman with regard to the respective cost per head in Victoria and this colony. If the hon. member had dealt with it in a straightforward way the matter would have been settled long ago; but he tried to bamboozle hon. members on that side of the Committee, saying that when he (Mr. Morehead) had pointed out that the cost under heads 2 and 3 amounted to £4 10s. 3d., the cost really was only £3 15s. He wanted to impress on the Committee that, under the heads 2 and 3, which composed nearly 87 per cent. of the whole expenditure on which the calculation of expenditure in Victoria was based, and then added 10s., the expenditure in Victoria was £4 10s. 3d. He was determined that the hon. gentleman should not shuffle out of it, as he had done, by making a stream of muddy eloquence. He would give him details. The heads were:—

Teachers for salaries, results, bonuses, etc.	...	87.12
Books and requisites, etc.	...	6.61
Office staff and temporary clerical assistance	...	3.15
Inspectors and travelling expenses of inspectors	...	2.85
Training	...	1.20
Miscellaneous	...	.56
Retiring allowances	...	1.55
Compensation to officers dispensed with	...	.14
Gratuities to widows and families of deceased officers	...	.12
School of design	...	.21

He had omitted, as not applicable to Queensland, the percentage of payments made for buildings and repairs, boards of advice, compulsory clause, sums paid in accordance with recommendation of Parliamentary Board of Inquiry, the School of Mines, and Melbourne University. He might have made the case very much blacker against the assertion of the Minister for Public Instruction, but he gave him those figures, and the hon. gentleman could not controvert the statement he made that the expenditure under those heads in the colony of Queensland was nearly £1 per head more than in Victoria.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could only draw the conclusion he had done. In Victoria they spent a great deal of money on things on which they did not spend money here at all. He said that they spent here per head, on education, the sum of £3 15s. 10d.,

and that they spent in Victoria, for exactly the same subjects, £4 0s. 3d. He did not care what the percentage was.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You spent £5 12s.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said if hon. members would take the trouble to look at the items they would see that what was spent was £3 15s. 10d. on education. The £5 12s. included other items of all sorts.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said there were one or two matters connected with the internal administration of the Education Department, to which he thought it his duty to call attention. They had been comparing the relative cost of education in Queensland and Victoria and New South Wales; but he wished to refer to the comparative cost of education in different schools in the colony. He found, taking only the salaries of the teachers, that the cost fluctuated from £10 per head of the children educated to £2 18s. Possibly the case where the cost was £10 per head was exceptional; but in one school in the suburbs of Brisbane—Petrie terrace—the cost was £5 7s. per head, and in Gympie it was only £2 18s. Surely there must be something wrong, when the difference was so striking. In the Normal School, Brisbane, the cost was £4 13s. per head; and in Mount Perry, where the average attendance was about the same, the cost was only £3 2s. At Gympie, as he said, the cost in the central school was £2 18s. per head, and in the school a mile from that—One-Mile—it was £3 18s., or £1 per head difference. At Rockhampton—at Allenstown—the cost was £3 14s. per head, and at the central, not half-a-mile removed from it, the cost was £5 per head. Some explanation ought to be given of that matter. He knew from his own knowledge that that discrepancy as to the cost per head in different schools had been a serious grievance for many years. He did not know that the matter had ever been brought under the notice of the Minister before, but it was one to which he ought to give his attention. There was another matter in regard to internal administration which seemed a crying injustice. On turning to the regulations dealing with salaries, he found that the capitation grant for the first seventy pupils was, for the head teacher, £1 per head; for the first assistant, 10s. per head; while the second, third, and fourth assistants were paid in proportion. Any person reading that in the other colonies would say that if they took a situation in a large school here they would be entitled to receive the emoluments according to the attendance. But it was not always the case. The Minister for Public Instruction had appointed assistants to the different schools and then by a stroke of the pen had decided that, as the assistant was not graded to the post he filled, he should not receive his share of the allowance. He noticed in the return that no fewer than 111 persons had not received the money to which they were really entitled. At the very first school on the list—Allora—he found that the gentleman appointed as first assistant, and as such entitled to receive about £40, did not receive one penny because he was not rated as first assistant. That system had been followed throughout the department, and had caused a vast amount of dissatisfaction. There was an evident injustice done to a large class of persons, and he trusted the Minister would take the matter into consideration and remedy it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the discrepancies in the cost per head of education to which the hon. member had called attention could be easily accounted for. The teachers' salaries varied according to their capacity and classification, and the number of children in the schools. It might happen that the



head teacher of a not very large school was a highly classified teacher, and he might be receiving a salary amounting to nearly £400 a year, and it might also happen that he had a rather strong staff of teachers; in that case the average cost per head would be raised; under precisely the reverse conditions, the average cost would be reduced. The cases cited by the hon. member were in point. At the Petrie-terrace school, the head teacher got £380 a year, and it happened that the school had a rather strong staff. In the other case the salary of the head teacher was not more than £255, and he happened to have a rather weak staff under him. That of itself would account for the discrepancy. So long as there was gradation of payment depending upon status, service, and capitation, there must be some inequalities. It would be impossible to say that the cost of every school of 200 scholars should be exactly the same. As to the other complaint, his attention had lately been directed to it, but he was surprised to hear that there were upwards of a hundred cases where the allowance had not been given. His own opinion on the subject was that, as soon as they showed themselves fit for their positions, they ought to receive the allowance.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he was satisfied with the explanation, although it seemed to show that there was something wrong in the internal administration of the department. With regard to the two Gympie schools, one of which cost £3 18s. 6d. per head and the other £2 18s., surely the education given in the latter school could not be as good as that given in the former. The difference was not due to any merely temporary cause; there was more in it than the Minister had chosen to tell the Committee.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £200 be granted for Drawing Instructors. The item showed an increase of £70 for the appointment of an additional instructor.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked where it was proposed to employ the additional instructor?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION replied that he would be employed where there were most pupil teachers to be instructed, and that would be probably in Maryborough or Rockhampton.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not know why they should go in for those luxuries at all at the expense of the State. They had better sweep the item off the Estimates altogether. The vote had been protested against year after year by members on both sides of the Committee. They might as well teach the fiddle or the piano at the expense of the State.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that teachers could not properly teach object lessons without a knowledge of drawing.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was glad the hon. member had given that information. The thing was too absurd. They were told by the hon. gentleman that the money was required for Maryborough or Rockhampton.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I said "and."

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the hon. gentleman had said "or." But why should not Townsville or some other large centre of population have it?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Because the pupil teachers are not there to be taught.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he supposed they were not allowed to go there. He would move that the vote be reduced by £70.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the item had been discussed year after year, and each time it had been carried, and he thought the good sense of the Committee would always see the necessity for it. They had no training college for pupil teachers, and had to train them as best they could. It was extremely desirable that teachers should have some knowledge of drawing in order to use the blackboard properly. Drawing was not a thing that was picked up by intuition. He had an opportunity sometimes of seeing some of the examination papers, and saw that merely the rudiments of drawing were taught so that they might be able to convey to their pupils an idea of what they were teaching. It would be a mistake not to place a small amount of money like that upon the Estimates to give them a small knowledge, however elementary, of the art of drawing. He was rather ashamed of the small amount that was available for it; at present they spent about £100 for a very large number of pupil teachers in Brisbane, and £30 for a drawing master at Ipswich. No hon. gentleman who desired to see the teachers efficient should make any objection to giving that instruction.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was very glad to hear the hon. gentleman admit at last that he was ashamed of something. He would point out to the hon. gentleman that in 1883-4 the amount on the Estimates was £130, and for 1884-5 it was £200, while there were two persons in each case.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a mistake.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they were asked to vote an increase of £70 on what was voted last year.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not hold himself responsible for any clerical errors in connection with the Estimates. He did not know that all the additions were correct. It was not intended to give any extra pay to any of the drawing instructors.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that surely the hon. gentleman would not shelter himself behind the shield of an irresponsibility for the correctness of papers that were put into their hands. He allowed the Committee to believe that everything was correct, and when attention was called to the fact, it was hardly becoming to the dignity of his position to say that he was not responsible for those figures. Surely the inconsistency ought to have been found out by the hon. gentleman before he put the papers into the hands of members of the Committee.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there ought to be no numbers there at all. They were not persons regularly in the employment of the department; they merely came in once a week and gave instructions.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he had nothing to do with what ought to have been, but only with what was. The papers were handed to them by the Government, and they assumed that they were correct. If it was as the Premier said, the numbers ought to be struck out.

Mr. STEVENSON said that the reason given by the Premier why the amount should be voted was the very reason why it should be struck out altogether, and that was that it was too small. The difficulty could very soon be got over—next year there would be another increase, and the Government were now inserting the thin end of the wedge. Anything in the shape of extravagance was not only admitted, but welcomed by the Government. The hon. member

for South Brisbane had been told that there was nothing contemplated but primary instruction. Latin and classics were not taught, and drawing had no more right to be than either Latin or Greek.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it was too bad, after explaining the thing at length, for members to get up and revive the subject as if no explanation had been made. That vote had nothing to do with the instruction of the children, it was for teachers. According to the hon. gentleman, teachers should only learn reading, writing, and arithmetic. The drawing class, in the Normal School at Brisbane, was in connection with the only institution that could be called in any sense a training college. There were several other large schools in Brisbane, and it had been the practice for some years for the pupil teachers of those schools about Brisbane to attend weekly and receive instruction in drawing, and for that purpose £100 had been paid for several years. He failed to see why that advantage should be confined to the two towns of Brisbane and Ipswich, or why other pupil teachers should not, as far as practicable, also receive similar instruction, because it rendered them much more useful.

Mr. STEVENSON said he was not finding fault with the argument of the hon. member. He could not see why it should be necessary for the pupil teachers to be able to draw to enable them to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. The argument simply proved that the item would increase to dimensions they were not aware of at present. The hon. member said he could not see why other towns should not have the advantage, as well as Brisbane. It would be first extended to the Northern towns, and then to the inland towns.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was not going to oppose the vote any longer, but he would ask the Secretary for Public Instruction if he would bring home to the delinquent the blunders he had made in the Estimates? There had been errors pointed out before.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : Where are the others?

Mr. MOREHEAD said an error was pointed out last night. Although he did not blame the hon. gentleman himself so much, those who compiled the Estimates should be taught not to commit blunders. He hoped the hon. member would take steps to make an example of those who did their work in such a slovenly manner. He would withdraw his amendment.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, in moving that £95,600 be granted for school salaries, said the item involved a general increase in the salaries of the department. At the present time the fixed salaries were regulated on this principle :—The salaries consisted partly of a fixed salary and partly of a capitation allowance. The fixed salaries depended on the classification. There were three classes, promotion to which was determined by attainments, and three divisions in each class in which promotion was determined by good service. In the third class the salaries were, for male teachers £90, £100, and £110 respectively ; in the second class they were £130, £140, and £150 respectively ; and in the first class they were £170, £185, and £200 respectively. He thought it would be agreed that £90 was too little for a teacher. It was proposed to increase that to £102. In the third class he proposed that the salaries instead of being £90, £100, and £110, should be £102, £114, and £126 ; in the second class he proposed that the salaries, instead of being £130, £140, and £150, should be

£144, £156, and £168 ; and in the first class where the salaries were higher he proposed that, instead of their being £170, £185, and £200, they should be £180, £192, and £204. There would be a rise throughout of £12 for each grade, with one exception, and that was between the second and third classes, where the increase was £18. That was a step which teachers should be encouraged to attain. Of course those salaries were only a part of the remuneration. He did not propose to increase the higher salaries nearly so much as the lower ones, because the higher-classed teachers were in receipt of a large capitation allowance. In the case of females, the present salaries were £20 less than the males all round. He did not propose to increase them to the same extent, because it was not so difficult to obtain females as males. The salaries for those in the third class would be £72, £84, and £96 respectively ; and in the second class £114, £126, and £138 ; and the first class £156, £168, and £180 respectively. Those increases had been granted after comparison with the salaries paid in New South Wales, and although they were slightly less, they would be found to be a substantial increase. He proposed to ask for a similar increase in the case of provisional school teachers, who were probably worse paid than any others. Hon. members would observe that the total increase on the Estimates was £10,000 ; but they would also observe that there was an increase of 100 persons. Now the increased cost, by the increase of salaries on the whole, amounted to £4,500, and the difference of £5,500 was accounted for by the number of teachers.

Mr. ARCHER said he did not rise to object to the alteration of fees to teachers, because if he had remained in the department he would probably have taken similar action. He should, however, like to hear some reason given for the large increase in the number of teachers. An increase of 100 in 915 seemed very large. Was it caused by the number of new schools established?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said those were the actual numbers employed when the Estimates were framed. He presumed the schools must have been very much understaffed at the time the previous Estimates were prepared.

Mr. ARCHER said he thought some large increase in numbers might have been contemplated.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was an increase of forty in the number of pupil teachers.

Mr. ARCHER said there appeared to be no rise in the salaries of pupil teachers.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not propose to alter the salaries of pupil teachers.

Mr. ARCHER said that he was then afraid some difficulty would be found in getting suitable pupil teachers. In the best schools of the colony, all the best boys were able to get such good engagements in other walks of life that there was no chance of retaining them in the schools unless more encouragement was given in the way of salary.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he could hardly reconcile the statement made by the Minister for Public Instruction a few minutes ago—that he expected the amount he asked for would cover the actual expenditure—with the actual expenditure last year. Taking the year from January to December, the expenditure last year was £161,000 ; but taking the financial year it was £153,324 ; while the amount voted was £142,529. The hon. gentleman now asked for £163,000 for the present financial year—a differ-

ence of about £5,000. There was an actual increase this year in salaries alone of £12,000. How, therefore, did the hon. gentleman reconcile that with his statement that the amount he asked for would cover the expense? Besides that, there was the amount for buildings. He was sure that the hon. gentleman was deceiving himself, and in doing so he was deceiving the Committee, unless he could explain it in some way.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the Estimates were framed on what would probably be required, and it was expected that the amount would cover the actual expenditure. The actual amount for increase of salaries was £4,500, and for an increased number of teachers £5,500, making £10,000. Then last year the expenditure for buildings was very large, being £28,000, in consequence of the many contracts which were let at the beginning of the financial year.

(Question put and passed.)

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £26,975 be granted for Buildings and Supervision. He asked for an increase of £7,000. The actual expenditure for buildings last financial year was £28,000, and this year it was put down at £25,000. Of course, a considerable amount was contributed by local subscription.

Mr. MOREHEAD: How much?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Probably about £4,000. With respect to supervision, there was an additional foreman of works proposed, and two clerks were to get an increase of £10 each.

Mr. ARCHER said he hoped the hon. gentleman's estimates would be right. He would like to know what arrangements had been made about the school at Rockhampton.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the arrangements were not completed, and he could not get them completed. It took a long time to get an answer to any letter. There was a piece of land set apart for a site in the middle of Rockhampton, but it was not suitable for a school. There was another piece held by the agricultural society, who were willing to give it in exchange for a piece held by the corporation near the gaol, but they wanted £2,000 cash. He did not know what they wanted it for. If they got new buildings, of equal value to those they now had erected, on the new ground they ought to be satisfied. Then the corporation might give up that site for the piece near the town hall, and the Government would give up the piece near the town hall in exchange for what they got from the agricultural society. It would be a three-cornered exchange; but the proposition of the society to get £2,000 cash was not at all a reasonable one; and if the hon. member was connected with it, he hoped he would use his influence to induce them to make some more reasonable proposal.

Mr. ARCHER said he was connected with the society, but he had nothing to do with that arrangement. He thought the society's land was a very advantageous site, and he hoped the Government would try to bring the negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. FERGUSON said he would like to know what steps were to be taken to get the matter decided. He was one of the school committee, and they understood that they were to have a site for a school. There was no place in the colony where a school was so much required. The Government proclaimed a school site, and the school committee raised the required local contribution towards the school building in a very short time. The people at Rockhampton knew the necessity

of a new school, and he thought it was nearly twelve months since they raised the money required by the Act. The school was crowded every day, and he considered that the injury done to the teachers during the summer was of more consequence than £2,000, as they had to teach in every verandah attached to the building. He hoped the Government would decide one way or the other, and either complete their arrangements with the society, or allow the committee to commence building on the present site.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the cause of the delay was the length of time occupied by the correspondence. It took about a month to get an answer to any communication. He had done all he could to have the matter settled, and had hoped it would have been arranged within a month after he was in Rockhampton last June. Now there was some difficulty about the titles.

Mr. BAILEY said he would like to make a suggestion about the school buildings in the country. Some of them were little better than colonial ovens. He would very much like to see new plans with proper verandahs; he thought schools should have verandahs twelve or fourteen feet wide, as they formed the best class-rooms in the hot weather.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the difficulty was that they had to cut their schools according to their money. Nothing was so desirable as large verandahs if they had the money to construct them; but the law required that one-fifth of the cost should be raised by the residents, and the Government had to do the best thing they could with the money at their disposal. He thought the latest schools were very well constructed indeed.

Mr. BAILEY said he would like to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that there was something wrong about the way the specifications were drawn out, as he found that country contractors would not undertake the construction of school buildings except at an exorbitant price. They were bound to protect themselves against little technicalities, he supposed, and the cost of a school building was often 20 or 30 per cent. more than that of an ordinary building of a similar character.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that no doubt the cost of school buildings was very high, but the cost of repairs was correspondingly low. The amount that had to be spent in repairing the older school buildings was something enormous. The present buildings might sometimes seem very expensive, but they required very little in the way of repairs. On one or two occasions, when he thought that perhaps the extra cost was occasioned by the extra finish required, he had tenders called with the alternative of leaving out the special items supposed to be costly; but he found they did not add more than 1 per cent. to the cost, while the additional advantages were certainly apparent.

Mr. ARCHER said that the present buildings were put up in the best style, and built of the best kind of wood. They did not cost anything for repairs for years—in many cases they were less expensive in that way than brick buildings. The present Superintendent of Buildings was one of the best men in Queensland, and during the time he (Mr. Archer) was in charge of the department, on several occasions when tenders could not be got at the price named by the Superintendent, he directed that officer to put up the building himself at the price, which he invariably did. If they were going to build the old kind of schools, they would have to spend a thousand a year in repairs. The department

was now building schools that would last for years without repair, and to go back to the old style would simply be a waste of money.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked the Minister for Public Instruction whether the same rule was applied to Brisbane, Ipswich, Maryborough, and other such places in regard to additions to schools, as that applied to outside districts—that was to say, whether a proportion of the cost had to be subscribed by the people in the more populous places as in those which were less populous.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the same rule applied invariably throughout the colony. The system adopted since he had charge of the department was, that when additions to schools were rendered necessary by increased attendance no subscription was required.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked whether the same mode of construction was adopted in the outside districts as in Brisbane or Ipswich? Had enormous costly stone buildings been put up in the country districts?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could not answer for what had been done twenty-five years ago. He could not speak for the administration of the system before the present Act was in force. He knew nothing about stone buildings now.

Mr. JORDAN said that last session it was stated by some hon. member that the attendance in the country schools was very bad, because many of the schools were not lined, and were so cold in winter that the children could not stop in them without catching cold. Some suggestions were made that those schools should be lined, so as to avoid the risk of children taking cold. He was not quite sure that the Minister for Education did not say that the matter would be attended to. He knew that the buildings in many parts of the country were so very cold that the children could not attend without injury to their health.

Mr. SMYTH said that the last time the vote was under discussion, it was stated that the way the schools were built was to place the studs on the outside and the lining on the inside.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the practice varied in different parts of the country. Now they were all built with the boards on the outside. As to the lining, complaints had only come in from one or two schools during the last twelve months.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he still thought that populous centres like Brisbane had an undue advantage under this vote, and that the outside districts really suffered from the want of proper educational buildings, and did not have their wants attended to at all. They knew that Brisbane was specially well attended to all round. He did not suppose that with the present Administration they would have a better state of things, or that any place very far from Brisbane would receive attention at their hands. He did not believe that they would. But he certainly entered his protest against the outside public being enormously taxed—it would be £25,000 in the coming year—to provide educational establishments in the great towns of the colony where the bulk of the people were quite able to pay for that education themselves.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he would ask the Minister for Public Instruction what was his interpretation of clause 42 of the regulations under the Act. There was, he believed, a great deal of dissatisfaction at the way in which the clause was interpreted in the department, and he thought that a common sense construction of the

clause would not bear out the interpretation given to it by the department. The clause said that—

“Pupil teachers may be admitted to examination as of any class, provided they obtained over 60 per cent. of marks on all the examination papers for admission into that class.”

Suppose that a pupil teacher went in for examination for his first year and passed, and that being a clever boy he wished to go in for the third or fourth year's examination in the following year. In that case he was compelled to take 60 per cent. of marks on the papers all round, or he was rejected. But suppose that a boy passed as pupil teacher the first year, and was not employed on the staff of the school—which occurred often in country districts—and went in for a second examination afterwards, he was also bound to take 60 per cent. of marks all round, or was rejected. If that was the true construction of the regulation it was iniquitous, and he was quite sure that the framers of the clause never contemplated anything of the kind. He knew that pupil teachers in Roman Catholic schools found it a great grievance, and that that interpretation worked very unjustly in regard to them.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he was not aware that pupil-teachers who had passed their first examination, and who were not employed till the succeeding year, required to take 60 per cent. of marks all round in their second examination. The object of the clause was not only to secure a certain standard of knowledge among the pupil teachers, but also the advantage of training, which was counted the most valuable part of their instruction; otherwise, any person might come up and pass the examination and yet know nothing at all about teaching. It was usual in all academical institutions to insist that candidates without training should show greater knowledge than those who had been trained, in order to make up for the necessary deficiencies from want of training. But he was not before aware that the rule had been applied to pupil teachers.

Mr. BAILEY said there was another clause which provided that—

“Pupil teachers may be appointed by the Minister. They must be of the age of fourteen years, of good constitution, and free from any physical defect likely to impair their efficiency as teachers.”

Now he happened to know that that physical defect might happen to be that they were three or four years older than fourteen, although otherwise they might be efficient and with good qualifications. They wanted their children to be taught, and if they could get good pupil teachers to do so they should not allow that red tape to prevent them passing their examinations. He knew a case in point where an application of a pupil teacher to be exempted from the regulation of being fourteen years of age had been refused. The rule was absurd.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the hon. gentleman would see that unless there were some such rule they might have pupil teachers fifty years of age. Pupil teachers should be young people. He knew the case in point referred to by the hon. member. He did not see his way to authorise a young woman eighteen years of age to go in and be taught with girls under fourteen years. Besides, he had ascertained that the young woman was not competent, and not likely after all to make a good teacher.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he agreed with much that had fallen from the hon. member for Wide Bay. In one respect the Education Department and the Works Department ran side by side—it was hopeless to attempt to get any explanation

from either one or the other. Let any unfortunate teacher have a grievance against the Education Department, even if his case was attended to—which was very unlikely—he was a marked man—he was gone for ever. The Works Department, under the present *régime*, dealt with those things in a different way. Not having the opportunity, as with deputations, of getting his brusque insolence reported in the newspapers, the Minister for Works did not consider it necessary to answer letters of complaint, but preserved an absolute silence; no matter how many letters a man might write to the department, answer there came none. As to the Education Department, over and over again complaints had been made to him by schoolmasters as to the way in which they had been treated, and he always found when he got to the Under Secretary that that gentleman had put down his foot—or his hoof, cloven or otherwise—and beyond that would not move. No satisfaction, no information even, could be got from that officer; the applicant simply had to give it up. He was not alluding to the Minister who now controlled the department, because the same thing had happened ever since the present Under Secretary had occupied that position. With regard to complaints, the Under Secretary seemed to do exactly as he liked. The only resource left was to drag the name of the complaining individual before the House, and that it was in many cases inadvisable to do, because the man would be marked down as a malcontent. Men had therefore to suffer in silence what he knew in more than one case to be great injustice.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member had been extremely unjust both to the Under Secretary and to himself, and his predecessors in the office. As far as he himself was concerned the accusation against the department was entirely without foundation. Every letter to the department, complaining of any grievance, came under his own notice; nothing was kept back by the Under Secretary. He saw all the correspondence of that kind and dealt with it himself, and he felt sure his predecessors did the same. The statement that a teacher who dared to make a complaint had a black mark put against him, was entirely without foundation.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman had misunderstood him. He never said the Under Secretary prevented any correspondence from coming before the Minister, but that there were many teachers in the colony who were afraid to appeal either to the Under Secretary or to a member of Parliament, because they knew there would be a black mark put against them.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION repeated that that statement was entirely without foundation. All reasonable complaints were attended to, and complainants would get justice without attempting to bring political influence to bear in their behalf. Teachers were treated exactly as other Civil servants were, and any delusion that existed to the contrary was entirely without foundation.

Mr. FOOTE said he had a grievance against the department. A lady teacher in delicate health was appointed to Toowoomba, and for nearly two years he did all he could to try to get her removed to a warmer climate. He applied to the Under Secretary; but evidently that gentleman did not believe him. Finally the necessary permission was granted, after disrating her, and she was provided with another place. But it was too late. The disease had gained too firm a hold on her system, and she only went home to die. Although he felt greatly grieved over the matter, he should not have mentioned it had not the question been raised

by the hon. member for Balonne. That was his first correspondence with the Education Department, and it would be his last.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that as soon as ever he heard of the state of that young lady's health he ordered an immediate inquiry to be made as to why it had not been reported to him before; and the answer he received was that she had never complained of her health. No one in the department or in the school had any reason to believe that she was suffering.

Mr. T. CAMPBELL said he wanted some further explanation from the Minister with regard to clause 42. But, first, he might say a word about the Under Secretary for Public Instruction. There were not many members of the Committee who had had more experience of that gentleman than he had. He did not wish to flatter the Minister for Public Instruction upon his appointment; but most of the teachers said he was a gentleman who acted perfectly impartially in his office. Of course there might be some people who were not satisfied; but still, as far as his experience went, that gentleman acted very well. Coming to the 42nd clause of the regulations, he held that the interpretation put upon that clause by the General Inspector of the department was wholly at variance with the common-sense construction of the clause itself, and he would ask the Minister for Public Instruction to give effect to what he called the common-sense construction. According to the present interpretation, there was no doubt that if a pupil teacher, who was out of his first year, wanted to go for his third or fourth year, he could do so, but would have to take 60 per cent. of marks. If they took the case of a boy or a girl in a denominational school who had passed his or her first examination as P.T. 1, and that person wished to go in for the second year, either would be compelled to take 60 per cent.; while a boy in a State school, standing in the same position scholastically, had only to get 50 per cent. He thought he had brought the matter under the notice of the Minister before.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No, I never heard it before.

Mr. MOREHEAD: One of you is telling an untruth.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he would ask the hon. gentleman to give some information on the subject.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that had been the custom in the office for some time, and there was probably some reason for it. He could give no information upon the spur of the moment.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had brought the matter before the department more than once. He had brought it before the hon. member for Blackall and before his predecessor, the present President of the Legislative Council; but he could not get the department to move in the matter at all. They were as immovable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. The only reason given by the department was that the training counted for something, and that the extra 10 per cent. was put on because they were not sure whether they were properly trained or not. The pupil teachers were trained in the same school at present, and they were quite equal to those trained in State schools. That regulation had been in force from year to year in spite of representations made by several others besides himself, and to the great grievance of the pupil teachers in those schools. The hon. member for Blackall could tell the Committee that he had spoken to him on the matter more than once.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they had better postpone the vote until the Secretary for Public Instruction had read the regulations and knew something about them.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would have spoken to the present head of the Department of Public Instruction, but for the way in which he had been met by the department before. The Ministers were not in fault, because they were really under the control of the Under Secretary.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member had been a Minister himself, and perhaps had been under the control of an under secretary, but he (the Minister for Public Instruction) had never been under the control of an under secretary. He was not prepared to give any definite answer in that matter that evening. When the regulations were first framed he was Minister for Public Instruction, and at that time the denominational schools were under the department, and no such case as that referred to could have arisen. The regulations could not have contemplated anything of the kind. As he had said, he framed the regulations.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That accounts for it.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that five years after that a different state of things had set in, and apparently a different interpretation had been put upon the regulation.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if he was to understand the Secretary for Public Instruction to say that he had introduced the rule into the department that all additions and repairs were to be paid for, without the usual one-fifth being raised by the people in the different localities?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said there was no wonder, while such a rule as that held good, that there should be complaints such as those made by the hon. member for Wide Bay against the architect of the department. If the department undertook all the additions and repairs to schools, once the people in any district had a school started they would evade that part of the Act altogether. It was a bad piece of administration and had never existed before, and he did not see why it should be introduced now. There was no doubt that the Act did not provide for additions to schools, and it had always been acted upon up to the present time, and unless they did away with the necessity for the one-fifth contribution by the people altogether, they had better keep it up, or else they would drift into cheap schools, low contracts, and bad specifications, so that all the expenses would be thrown upon the Government. It was a rule that must give the Government an immense amount of trouble.

Mr. MOREHEAD said surely the hon. member would answer the objection raised by the leader of the Opposition. If the hon. gentleman wanted to facilitate the business he would give a straightforward answer to a straightforward question, and not sit quietly down and sulk and look angry. His looking angry always made him (Mr. Morehead) feel happier. The leader of the Opposition was entitled to an answer to the question he put to the hon. gentleman.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had already given the information, and he had no other information to give. The leader of the Opposition had expressed his opinion, and he (the Minister for Public Instruction) had expressed his. He thought the reasons given for requiring subscriptions for repairs were absurd. The schools

were public buildings, and were going into disrepair, and he could see no force in the argument that they should be allowed to continue in want of repair and become worse until and unless the people subscribed one-fifth of the cost of repairing them. In the case of additions, the health of the children might be in danger if a school was overcrowded, and it should not be kept in that state until the one-fifth was subscribed. He had not changed his opinion on the subject, and he had administered the department for three years in the same way that he was doing now.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would point out, with regard to the supervision of the buildings, that they found last year that two clerks were down at £120 and £160. Those had been increased to £140 and £180, but no explanation given.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They get an increase of £20 each.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he regretted he was not present at the discussion that took place on the subject he had referred to. He had heard for the first time that the Government had adopted quite a different system. The hon. gentleman said he had always held a different opinion, that the repairs should be paid for by the Government without making the people in the locality find the one-fifth provided for in the Act. That had not been the practice until the hon. gentleman took charge of the department.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: For the first three years.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said very few repairs were required at that time; and the hon. gentleman must see the fallacy of his system if he studied it. What the department had striven to do all through was to make the different localities subscribe funds for their own schools. If they subscribed £100 the Government subscribed £500; but the effect of the present system would be that cheap schools would be put up and the Government held responsible for all repairs—that would be the immediate result, and it had always been found that the system worked in that way.

Mr. BLACK said he noticed that where schools had insufficient accommodation the department was ready to provide additional buildings without the usual one-fifth being subscribed. He agreed with that to a certain extent, but the application of the rule was not universal. Some districts were more highly favoured than others, and he would mention Mackay as an instance, where the people had to subscribe £752 before the department would put up additional buildings, so that the boys and girls might be separated. Although the accommodation was quite insufficient, no action was taken until the inhabitants subscribed the whole fifth of the £3,760, which was required.

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. gentleman must see that he was blaming his successor and not him.

Mr. ARCHER said the same thing occurred in the case of the Rockhampton school. It had always been so when he was in office, and he would never consent to new schools being put up, or repairs being made unless the inhabitants of the district subscribed the full amount.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the Premier made a mistake in saying the late Minister for Education was to blame. That gentleman had worked out the spirit of the Act, and insisted that subscriptions should be forthcoming. The Minister for Instruction, in order to get some cheap popularity, had made the change, and gave an advantage to the people now which they had not enjoyed before. Within the last eighteen months Rockhampton and

Charters Towers had had to contribute the whole fifth, and now there was no rule in force by which the residents could be asked to subscribe at all.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said when the Act was first administered the principle was established. He thought the rule afterwards established an objectionable one, and had gone back to the principle originally adopted.

Mr. NORTON said he remembered that when the subject was under discussion last session it had been mentioned that the usual rule would be abolished, and it struck him as a very bad thing that the people of a locality should not be compelled to subscribe one-fifth of the cost of their school. It was specially unfair in those cases where the residents of a locality had been obliged to subscribe, as they were put on a different footing from those who wanted new buildings at the present time. The system would work badly, because the inclination now would be to go on continually increasing the accommodation of schools rather than put up new schools in more convenient localities. Instead of schools being multiplied, children would be compelled to walk long and inconvenient distances; whereas if the regulation were enforced, additional accommodation in new localities would be provided.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it had been stated by the Premier that when he administered the Education Act, from 1875 to 1878, he administered it in that way, relieving the different localities from the necessity of finding one-fifth of the cost of their schools, or the cost of repairs. He did not think that was the fact, and he was astonished to hear the hon. member make the statement.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The alteration was made by Sir Arthur Palmer, and I called attention to it myself in 1879.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that it was adopted in that House in 1875, and he never heard the hon. gentleman call attention to it. It might have happened in this way: that the hon. member found very few cases in which to apply the rule, and it was only when Sir Arthur Palmer began to administer the Act that the principle was applied. At all events if the alteration was made it was clear that the Government ought to reimburse those localities which had subscribed money. He knew that for a long time they tried to strike out Charters Towers, and they would not put up the additions until the money had been subscribed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That was a new school.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: It was not a new school, though he knew by some technical meaning it might be called one. The parties wanted additions to the school, and a new school was put up for the convenience of separating the children. According to the interpretation put upon the law by the Premier, that ought to have been done entirely at the cost of the Government. If so, then the people ought to be reimbursed the money they paid; in fact, all the districts that raised the one-third ought to have their money repaid so far as additions and repairs were concerned.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the system came into operation long before 1879. There were plenty of schools before 1876. One of the first things Sir Arthur Palmer did when he took charge of the department was to make the change; and as soon as it was made he called the attention of the House to the

change and condemned it. The idea of saying that a Government building was to go to ruin because the inhabitants could not raise subscriptions to mend it was perfectly absurd. That was in the case of repairs; and cases where additions were really necessary, and were unforeseen when the school started, came under the same category. If any Minister desired to discourage people from having schools he could do so by his mode of administering the Act. But that was not the principle on which he had administered the Act.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that no one ever questioned that the Government were responsible for repairs to buildings; but they were referring to additions.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You refused to make repairs until the money was subscribed.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Not one farthing had been refused by the late Government for repairs. That question was not brought before them at all; they only objected to additions. The hon. gentleman's system would bring on the evils adverted to by the hon. member for Wide Bay. People would build small and cheap schools, because the responsibility of putting additions rested with the Government. That was a bad system; and it would be far better to repeal the system of insisting upon the people showing their *bona fides* than to get them to do it in that way. He did not believe in getting people to trade on the Government like that.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that surely the Government might be given credit for having sense enough to deal with matters of that kind in a proper way. If application was made for a school for fifty children, where there would probably be 100, instructions were given to have one erected to accommodate 100. That was in the ordinary routine. Efforts might have been made to get a school too small, but it had not come under his notice that any attempt of that kind had been made.

Mr. BLACK said that, in connection with the Mackay school, he noticed that £500 was paid in cash, and £252 was guaranteed. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it was intended to enforce that guarantee?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not know how the case stood, but he would make inquiries.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked in what way that differed from ordinary additions to schools?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I do not know.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked why the rule was not applied in the cases of Mackay and Charters Towers?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They were exceptional cases.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: They were not exceptional cases. They were simply additions to schools through the increase of population. It would have been very different if they had been building new schools. If the system the hon. gentleman adopted was to be carried out, certainly the money raised for additions in different places ought to be reimbursed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it did not strike him in that way. Surely the Government were not called upon to inquire what money had been received from different localities during the last five years, and reimburse them.

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he thought it was the duty of the Government, if they had obtained money illegally from the people of the colony, to pay it back again. Why should they exact from the Mackay people money that they did not exact from the people of Brisbane now?

THE MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the matter was scarcely worth arguing. The hon. gentleman might just as well say that when the *ad valorem* duties were reduced from 10 to 5 per cent. the Government ought to have repaid 5 per cent. to those who had paid the larger amount. If the Government, after having administered a law for a certain time, saw fit to have it changed, that was no reason why they should refund payments made under the previous system.

THE HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said there was not the slightest analogy between the two cases; because in the one case the law was altered, and in the other case it was not. The law remained the same, but the system had been altered. If any districts had been made to pay illegally why should not they get their money back again? Had there been any alteration in the law would have been a different thing altogether.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER, in moving the adjournment of the House, said that the Government proposed to proceed with the Estimates to-morrow.

The House adjourned at twelve minutes past 11 o'clock.