

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER 1910

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

WEDNESDAY, 5 OCTOBER, 1910.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (W. D. Armstrong, Esq., *Lockyer*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Report of the Agent-General for the year 1909.

QUESTIONS.

DEAF AND DUMB AND BLIND INSTITUTION.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. How many blind workers, male and female, are employed in the Deaf and Dumb and Blind Institution?

2. What wages do the—

(a) Male inmates,

(b) Female inmates,

get, and what amounts respectively are stopped for board?

3. How many officials are there, and what are they paid respectively?

4. What is the total amount of the annual subsidy paid by the State?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*) replied—

1. On 30th June, 1910, sixty-two men, nineteen women.

2. (a) Minimum wages paid to men irrespective of earnings is 17s. 6d. per week.

(b) Minimum wages paid to women irrespective of earnings is 12s. 6d. per week.

Pieceworkers, both male and female, often make 100 per cent. more than the rates above. No amounts are stopped. All the workers board away from the institution. The total amounts paid in wages to men for year ended 30th June, 1910, £3,202 13s. 7d. The total amounts paid in wages to women for year ended 30th June, 1910, £548 7s. 10d.

3. Twelve officials.

Industrial Branch.

	Per Annum.	£	s.	d.	
Superintendent	...	275	0	0	} Office staff.
Accountant	...	140	10	0	
Assistant clerk	...	50	0	0	
Foreman basket-maker	...	169	0	0	
Assistant foreman basket-maker	...	91	0	0	
Foreman brushmaker	...	156	0	0	
Assistant foreman brushmaker	...	104	0	0	

	Per Annum.	£	s.	d.
Foreman broommaker	...	123	10	0
Storeman	...	114	1	8
Carter	...	105	7	6
Forewoman	...	65	15	0
Blind traveller (town)—salary and commission	...	107	3	9
Collector and traveller, salary (£78, balance commission)	...	354	14	2
Collector, deaf and dumb, salary (£52, balance commission)	...	136	0	3
Collector, lady, salary (£32 10s., balance commission)	...	86	2	7
Collector, blind (only part of year employed)	...	52	18	11

The salaries of the superintendent and office staff are allocated, one-half to the industrial branch, and the other half to the educational branch. The same arrangement applies to the collectors.

4. Subsidy received during the year ended 30th June, 1910—

	£	s.	d.
From Home Secretary's Department, endowment on subscriptions	...	3,428	15 8
From Education Department, endowment on subscriptions	...	200	0 0
Total	...	£3,628	15 8

The Education Department's contribution is £150 per annum.

BALANCE-SHEETS OF CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

Mr. LESINA asked the Home Secretary—

Has he any objection to place in the Parliamentary Library or on the table of the House, for the perusal of members before the Charitable Institutions and Benevolent Societies votes are passed, the balance-sheets of the following bodies:—Dental Hospital, Industrial Home (Brisbane), Institute of Social Service, Lady Chelmsford Milk Institute, Magdalen Asylum (Lutwyche), Maternity Home, Brisbane and Rockhampton branches of the Salvation Army Rescue Homes for Discharged Prisoners, St. Mary's Home (Rockhampton) and St. Mary's Rescue Home (Brisbane), the Charity Organisation Society (Brisbane), Ipswich Ladies' and St. Mary's Societies, Mackay Benevolent Society, and any other benevolent societies throughout the State which receive sums of the taxpayers' money from the consolidated revenue towards subsidising the distribution of clothing and food?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

No. The balance-sheets will be obtained and laid on the library table as soon as possible.

POLICE STATION AT TALLEBUDGERA.

Mr. LAND (*Balonne*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. In view of the previous building having been removed to Coolangatta, why was the new police station erected at Tallebudgera?

2. What was the cost of this building?

3. What is the yearly cost of maintenance?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

1. Because a police station was necessary at that place.

2. £735 8s. 6d.

	Per Annum.	£	s.	d.
3. Constable's pay	...	134	0	0
Forage	...	24	0	0
Lighting	...	0	12	0
Total	...	£158	12	0

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER FOR NORTHERN RAILWAYS.

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to establish the position of a deputy commissioner for the Northern system of railways at Townsville?

2. If not, why not?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. T. Paget, *Mackay*) replied—

The matter is receiving due consideration.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION FUND.

Mr. MAY asked the Home Secretary—

1. Under what section of the Police Act of 1863, or by what legal authority, was 4 per cent. deducted from the salaries, and paid into the superannuation fund, of the eighty-seven men who joined the Police Force between the dates in question (1st August, 1889, and 13th November, 1891)?

2. Seeing that these eighty-seven men were sworn in as members of the Police Force under the Police Act of 1863, and before the amending Act was heard of or became law, and claim to be legally entitled to the benefits and privileges or provisions of that Act, will the Minister obtain the

opinion of the Attorney-General as to the legal standing of these men in respect thereto, and lay same on table of this House?

The HOME SECRETARY replied—

1. The deduction of 4 per cent. from the salaries of these men was and is being made in pursuance of the provisions of sections 2 and 3 of the Police Act of 1863 Amendment Act of 1891.

2. No. The law is quite clear on the subject.

MACKAY SCHOOL OF ARTS LAND SALE BILL.

REFERRED TO SELECT COMMITTEE.

On the motion of Mr. SWAYNE (*Mackay*), it was formally resolved—

1. That the Mackay School of Arts Land Sale Bill be referred for the consideration and report of a Select Committee.

2. That such committee have power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House; and that it consist of the following members:—Mr. Murphy, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Gunn, Mr. D. Hunter, and the mover.

STATE EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): It is some considerable time since this matter was before the House, and I have almost forgotten what reasons the Minister gave why the Bill should be read a second time. There are some Bills on the main features of which hon. members can pretty well agree, but on this measure there has been, and I presume will be—whether the Bill is passed or not—the most divergent ideas and the strongest feeling manifested that could possibly exist in connection with any measure brought before the House. If I were a prophet or the son of a prophet, I should feel strongly inclined to predict that this Bill for altering the present system of State education in Queensland will mar or destroy the political careers of more hon. members of this Assembly than any other Bill that I can think of. I have strongly opposed this measure since an attempt was made to introduce it in 1906. In company with a considerable number of members of the party to which I have the honour to belong, I have put up a pretty strong opposition to the measure. At the general elections held since 1906 this question has been more or less prominently before the public of Queensland. Having opposed the measure, not merely on sentimental or sectarian grounds, but from a lifelong conviction—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Didn't you promise to vote for it?

Mr. BARBER: You will hear about that later on. My opposition to this measure arises from a lifelong conviction that religious instruction should not be given in State schools. I may say that the matter has been somewhat prominently before the electors of Bundaberg during the last three or four elections. At the last general election, in common with other parliamentary candidates, whether Labour or Ministerial, I received a communication asking me whether, in the event of the referendum being carried, I would support this measure. I replied that I would.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: I have here a copy of the letter I sent in answer to the communication received from the organising secretary of the

[*Mr. Barber.*]

Bible in State Schools League. It is dated the 8th September, 1909, and reads as follows:—

Bundaberg, 8th September, 1909.

Dear Sir,—Your circular letter received, in which you desire me to answer the question relative to the referendum to be taken at the approaching election.

Permit me to state that, having opposed the measure during its passage through the Assembly, I shall speak against it during the campaign and vote against it at the poll, and do my best to defeat it; but in the event of the referendum being in its favour, I shall be prepared to bow to the will of the people.

Respectfully yours,
GEO. P. BARBER.

The Organising Secretary,
Bible in State Schools League.

That was my reply. In my speech on the Address in Reply I intimated that I intended to carry out that promise. Since then the Workers' Political Organisation in Bundaberg, which represents a very large majority of electors in that constituency, have requested me to vote against the Bill. They hold that the pledge which I signed, in common with other Labour members, prior to being selected as a Labour candidate, has priority over the promise I gave to the organising secretary of the Bible in State Schools League. I discussed the matter with them some few weeks ago at considerable length, and I have been instructed to vote against this measure.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Instructed!

Mr. BARBER: Yes; I have been instructed to vote against this measure.

Mr. WHITE: The caucus is stronger than duty.

Mr. BARBER: When it comes to a question of the opinion of a Labour organisation and my individual opinion, I bow to the Labour organisation every time.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FORSYTH: The caucus is not in it.

Mr. BARBER: The caucus is not in it. I may say that that organisation represent 1,633 votes of the 2,887 votes polled at last general election.

Mr. HAMILTON: And all the intelligence of Bundaberg.

Mr. BARBER: And all the intelligence of Bundaberg, as the hon. member for Gregory says. As I intimated just now, this Bill—whether carried or not—will probably be responsible for the wrecking of a good many political careers. It is quite possible that it may wreck mine, but I accept the responsibility, quite apart from my organisation, for the action I intend to take in voting against the Bill. It seems rather a peculiar thing that a man who has fought against this proposed alteration in our education system and in favour of the principle that only secular education shall be given in State schools should make a promise to support this Bill. At any rate, I admit that I did give that promise, and in my opinion I made a very great mistake in doing so. I have looked at this matter from many different points. Looking at it from the standpoint of a Labour man, it has seemed to me, ever since this matter was introduced in Parliament, that the influence at the back of the Bible in State schools movement is capitalism.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Oh! Bah!

Mr. CORSER: Rot!

Mr. BARBER: The hon. member may say "Bah!" But capitalism has recognised for years the growing power of the Labour movement, and the powers of capital and of conservatism have become alarmed, and hence they saw an opportunity of splitting the Labour vote on this question. Every hon. member knows that there is nothing on which men can be brought to feel so keenly as on the question of religion. Probably I am one of the broad-minded fellows on religious matters; and I contend that the enemies of Labour and of democracy know very well that, if they can only insert this wedge of sectarianism at an election, it will tend to split the Labour movement. There are instances of this in dozens of cases. One need only look at the last two general elections in the old country to recognise that the question of sectarianism, which was introduced, had the effect of splitting up, to a great extent, the Labour and democratic forces there. The annual Trade Union Congress, sitting in Great Britain last year, passed a resolution confirming the resolution that has been passed for several years in succession. The cablegram referring to it read—

The Trade Union Congress yesterday, by votes representing 1,433,000 against 131,000, passed a resolution recommending national free and secular education, under popular control, from the primary school to the University; also secondary technical education for all children, and scientifically organised open-air recovery schools.

That is the attitude that those actively connected with the Labour movement have always taken up in connection with education in the old country; not because trades unions are non-religious bodies, or because they are indifferent to religion, any more than I am myself, or the Labour party in Queensland, but because they assert as a principle that the State has no right to impart religious instruction in the State schools. As I have contended on different occasions when this matter has been before the House, once we introduce the principle of religious instruction in our State schools we are going to create a very strong sectarian feeling.

Mr. HAMILTON: We have it now.

Mr. BARBER: For the last seven or eight years in all the States where their educational system is practically on a par with ours—that is, New Zealand, Victoria, and South Australia—there has been an organised effort made by bodies of men and women—like the Bible in State Schools League here—to have religious teaching introduced into the State schools. Hon. members will probably remember that away back in 1896 the matter was brought before the people in South Australia by referendum, and a three-to-one vote was cast against any religious teaching being given in the State schools. Still the agitation is going on. It is significant that in Queensland even the churches and the clergy are not at all in agreement on this question. At the recent Anglican Synod meetings in Brisbane, after Archdeacon Garland, the organiser of the Bible in State Schools League, had delivered a very strong address in favour of certain steps being taken to bring influence to bear upon members of Parliament—which, as the *Telegraph* pointed out, was simply threatening members of Parliament—the Anglican clergyman in Bundaberg—a man who is strongly opposed to the proposal—followed Archdeacon Garland, and, in a very able and instructive speech, announced his opposition in the strongest possible terms to the proposal. Yet, somehow or other—whether

it was done intentionally, as I am rather inclined to assume it was—not one solitary word of that speech was published in any of the Brisbane papers.

Mr. LESINA: Conspiracy.

Mr. BARBER: It was a conspiracy. I contend that, if these clergymen are unable to agree among themselves on this matter, it will be a very difficult thing to get the people to agree about it. The very fact of introducing this thing into our State schools will be decidedly unchristian. Some time ago, in one of the American States, the question was brought before the Supreme Court whether it was right for Bible teaching to be given in the State schools; and Judge Welch pointed out how unfair it would be to compel the teachers to give religious instruction, and how eminently unfair it would be to compel the children to accept such instruction. In summing up he used these words—

It is not just for the State to extend the hand of favouritism to any religion. It knows men only as citizens. It is not just to tax and compel Protestants to support the teaching of Catholicism in the public schools. Neither is it right for the Catholics to be forced to support the teaching of Protestantism. Religious matters must be left for the church to teach. The freedom for each church to teach their youth at their own expense should be granted by the State, but nothing more. Such teaching should be done, however, in places erected and supported by the church, and not in State buildings or institutions supported by common taxation.

Judge Welch, of America, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of one of the States, said on this point: "If it be true that our law enjoins the teaching of the Christian religion in the schools, surely then all teachers should be Christians. Were I such a teacher, while I should instruct the pupils that the Christian religion was true and all other religions false, I should tell them that the law itself was an unchristian law. One of my first lessons to the pupils would show it to be unchristian. That lesson would be, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.' I could not look the veriest infidel or heathen in the face and say that such a law was just, but that it was an outgrowth of false Christianity, and not one of the lights which Christians are commanded to shed upon an unbelieving world." No one who will look at this question candidly can maintain that any religious régime in the public school can be put into practice in this country of diverse religious beliefs without violating the fundamental rule of the Christian religion itself: "Whatsoever things ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." The State possesses no right to discriminate as to the religious faith of its citizens, or to tax all to propagate or support one of the forms of such faith. There are no rights more sacred than those which relate to one's religious faith, and there is no injustice more unrighteous than that of compelling a man to aid in the support or propaganda of another sect.

That is exactly the opinion that I entertain on this matter. I hold that, under the present system, where children belonging to parents representing practically every creed or sect in this State, meet together in the classroom or school, and without any bitterness existing, they learn to love and respect each other.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: As a lad I received my education in the church schools of the old country, and I know from sad experience that instead of an amicable feeling existing there, it was quite the reverse—especially towards the children of parents who were conscientious enough to withdraw their children while religious instruction was being given, and I have no desire to see such a state of things

Mr. Barber.]

operating in Queensland. There are one or two other matters I wish to refer to. While the polls show, no doubt, a very considerable majority in favour of this measure, I would like to point out that there were some thousands of people in Queensland who were prevented from expressing their opinion on this question on the 13th of April last. From a paper which has been tabled by the Home Secretary, on the motion of the hon. member for Carpentaria, I find that at the State election in 1909 there were 1,186 polling-places. At the last Federal election, the date on which this referendum was taken, there were only 979, or 210 less polling-places than there were at the previous general election.

Mr. D. HUNTER: How many votes were cast at the previous election?

Mr. BARBER: The number of votes cast at those places were 8,976. I contend that the referendum does not give the correct expression of opinion of the electors of Queensland. In addition to the figures shown by that return, I wish to say that at the Federal poll there were a large number of places at which there was absolutely an insufficient number of ballot-papers provided for the use of the electors. Take Bundaberg, for instance. At a general election at Bundaberg some 300 to 350 Musgrave electors vote at the polling-booth established in Bundaberg for their electorate. At the polling-place for the Musgrave, at the Federal election, there were only about thirty or thirty-five ballot-papers provided, and during the poll, after these papers had run out, Mr. White, the hon. member for Musgrave, asked me if I would join with him in a wire to the Home Department, asking whether it would be possible to supply a further number of ballot-papers, or whether we would be allowed to write them up. A wire came back in the afternoon that nothing could be done in the matter. Practically, at every polling-booth round about the electorate, which I know intimately, there was an insufficient number of ballot-papers provided, and I contend that, although Bundaberg gave a considerable majority in favour of the referendum, I would be safe in saying that there were 300 or 400 people who did not vote on that matter.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Do you think they were all on the other side?

Mr. BARBER: Probably they were; I know a very large number of them were. Then, again, during the period that has elapsed since the Federal elections, on the publication of figures as compiled at the referendum, I have found that a very considerable number of the electors in many electorates voted under a misapprehension. Some of them have told me that at the time they voted they did not believe, or did not know, that, in voting for the referendum for the alteration of our educational system, it meant that the clergy should have the right to enter our State schools and give lessons there during school hours. As a matter of fact, a considerable number of people who took a very active part in this Bible in State schools campaign have since informed me that they voted for the matter under a misapprehension in this respect.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: There are some the other way as well.

Mr. BARBER: There may be, but not so many. There is another thing: I understand that some time prior to the recent Federal election, the Federal Executive Council issued

[Mr. Barber.

a minute intimating that this referendum should not be held in the same building as the polling for the Federal candidates. Now, in all the polling-booths which I visited during the course of polling on Federal election day, the polling practically took place in the same building, or under the same roof; and in one instance, immediately after the opening of

the poll, one of the Federal pre- [4 p.m.] siding officers had to request the returning officer who was acting on behalf of the Bible in State Schools League to clear out of the room. And in other cases, the ladies who were working in the interests of the Bible in State Schools League practically took charge of the whole of the front of the building. So much so, that they actually hampered the going to and fro of the electors attending the polling-booth to vote for the Federal candidates, and the police sergeant in one place had to request them to move from the front of the building altogether. In another polling-booth two men were inside the booth all day on behalf of the Bible in State Schools League, and I am credibly informed, by letter and otherwise, that from all parts of Queensland, in addition to the insufficient supply of ballot-papers provided for voting, that the polling-booths were practically overrun by people who were working for the Bible in State Schools League.

Mr. G. P. BARNES: Where were the returning officers to allow it?

Mr. BARBER: I presume that when the Federal election, with so many questions to vote upon, was going on the returning officer had sufficient work to do—more than sufficient in some cases—without troubling about continually clearing the hall of people who had no right to be there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do not forget that, notwithstanding all you state, a very large percentage of votes was polled as compared with any other election.

Mr. BARBER: I have only half an hour on this question.

Mr. ALLEN: We will give you extra time. It is a very important matter.

Mr. BARBER: One of the chief reasons that have been urged in favour of the alteration of our present school system, which I look upon perhaps, although not altogether, as perfect—at any rate, it is the best system of State education there is anywhere in the universe—I say before any alteration is made in our present system in Queensland a far larger number of votes should have been polled on this matter; and on the majority which was obtained, I hold that the Government of the day are not warranted in making any alteration in our educational system. Some years ago, when taking a referendum on this matter in Victoria—the questions no doubt in two cases were somewhat confusing, but the main question, as to whether there should be any alteration made in the system, which is practically identical with ours—there was a very large majority against it, and the whole referendum was of such a character that the Government of Victoria decided that they would be quite unjustified in interfering with the system obtaining there.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did you say a majority against it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bundaberg has occupied the time

allowed by Sessional Order. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be allowed to proceed?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. MURPHY: They are putting the gag on again.

Mr. LENNON: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—Might I make a remark?

Mr. MURPHY again interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Will the hon. member for Croydon contain himself, and try to behave as a gentleman should?

Mr. LENNON: The hon. member for Bundaberg very rarely takes up the time of the House at all, and I think it would be ill-becoming for hon. members of this House to object to his having an extension of time on this occasion, when it is of such rare occurrence that he addresses the House at all. I therefore hope that hon. members opposite will reconsider the matter and allow him to proceed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have only acted as I have done in the proper execution of my duties. I informed the House that the hon. member for Bundaberg has occupied the time allowed by the Sessional Order, and I asked whether it was the pleasure of the House that he be allowed to proceed. An objection having been raised, I have no other option, and I must ask the hon. member, with great reluctance, to resume his seat.

Mr. LENNON: I beg to move that the hon. member for Bundaberg be further heard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is—That the hon. member for Bundaberg be further heard.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I think I am in order—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I recognise that there can be no debate, but the hon. member, having been one of the objectors, probably there is no objection to his making a few remarks.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I think hon. members will recognise at once that if this concession be allowed to the hon. member for Bundaberg, a similar concession must be allowed to every other member of the House—

Mr. MURPHY: You allowed further time to the hon. member for Rosewood.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And it would entirely defeat the Sessional Order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That is not the question, and the Secretary for Public Instruction will not be in order in debating the subject of the Sessional Order. The question before the House is—"That the hon. member for Bundaberg be allowed further time to address himself to the question of the alteration to the State Education Act."

Mr. LESINA AND Mr. MURPHY having risen—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There can be no debate.

Mr. LESINA: There is a motion before the House, and I wish to give reasons in favour of that motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There can be no debate. I have already refused permission to the Secretary for Public Instruction to speak. The Sessional Order provides no debate upon the question as to whether the hon. member for Bundaberg be further heard or not.

Question—That the hon. member for Bundaberg be allowed further time to discuss the second reading of the State Education Act—put; and the House divided.

In division,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I put this question, I want the House to understand fully what the exact position is. The hon. member for Clermont rose to ask whether my ruling was that the question was to be put without debate. The hon. member must know that, when it comes to a question that further time be allowed an hon. member in debate, that question must be put under the Sessional Order, without amendment or debate.

AYES, 19.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Collins	" Mann
" Crawford	" Mullan
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" McLachlan
" Hardacre	" Payne
" Keogh	" Ryan
" Land	" Theodore
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Lesina and Mr. Murphy.

NOES, 34.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hawthorn
" Appel	" Hodge
" Barnes, G. P.	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, W. H.	" Kid-ton
" Booker	" Macartney
" Bouchard	" Morgan
" Brennan	" Paget
" Bridges	" Philp
" Corser	" Roberts
" Cottell	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Stodart
" Denham	" Swayne
" Forrest	" Thorn
" Forsyth	" Tolmie
" Fox	" Walker
" Grayson	" White
" Gunn	" Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Roberts and Mr. Tolmie.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*): I do not wish to give a silent vote upon this important question. At the last two elections, I was asked, if the referendum was favourable to the Bible being taught in State schools, would I support it, and I distinctly said I would not.

Mr. ALLEN: And they put you in.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: My answer was that I could not conscientiously support any alteration in the present system of education changing it from free, secular, and compulsory to free, religious, and compulsory. I see no reason why we should change our present system, which has given satisfaction all over the State, to a free, religious, and compulsory system, which has never been a success in any part of the world. When I was young, the people in the part I came from in the Highlands were principally Roman Catholics. A school was put up, I think, in the year 1846 or 1847. There were attending the State school 150 Catholic children and about half a dozen Protestants. A school was put up by the Roman Catholics, and Catholic

Mr. Mackintosh.]

teachers were secured. My parents and their neighbours contributed towards the expenses. The school was allowed to go on for about twelve or eighteen months, when the powers that be saw fit to raze that school to the ground. Those Catholics, sooner than allow their children to go to a school for Protestant religious education, allowed them to grow up without further education; and that kept me from obtaining the education that would have made me more intelligent than I am at present. I mention this in order to show that we are living now in more liberal times. In Queensland we keep up our own schools—people of the Catholic religion, to which I belong, keep up our own system of education. I, with others, believe that no system of education is complete unless the mind and spirit are educated as well as the body. If we are now to change our system and have religion taught in the schools, where there is a mixed community such as exists in all parts of Australia, and Queensland in particular, what sort of education or religion would be taught to the children? I believe it is the duty of the parents and the church to which they belong to mould the minds of their children to their own religious belief, because children are the gift of God, and parents are responsible for their upbringing both corporally and spiritually. If children are not taught from infancy a system of religious belief, when they grow up they will be infidels. People believe that their system of religion will enable them to get to heaven hereafter. If they believe that, then I maintain that it is their duty to bring up their children according to their religious belief, and not leave them without religious instruction till they are mature enough in years to take the Bible in their own hands, and interpret the inspired Scriptures perhaps to suit their own ideas. My objection to the Bible being taught in our schools is that very few understand the Scriptures. Take a large plan—a plan perhaps of this building. If we look at it we will

[4.30 p.m.] perhaps say that it is a magnificent plan—a magnificent architectural design. If an architect is present when we are looking at it he might ask us, "What is the meaning of this crevice?" and not one of us can explain it. But if another architect comes along he will know all the colours and all the squares and crevices and the meaning of them, and he will be able to explain the meaning of the whole plan, simply because he quite understands it. It is the same with religious instruction. We must have an architect who understands it to explain it to us. I have listened to a great many speeches which have been delivered on this matter, and not one of the speeches gave an opinion or showed clearly that it would be of any benefit at all. In fact, everyone I heard speak on the matter deplored that the referendum did not turn out to be against it. We all agree that it will be injurious to the community, that it will be disastrous as regards the friendliness amongst the community if this religious education is brought about. The cry is that the majority must rule. But I do not believe that the majority of electors voted for this Bill at all. As a matter of fact, the majority of the electors are really against it, because there is an old saying, and a true one, which is, "Those who are not with us are against us." That being so, what about the thousands who did not vote at all? There were 70,000 who voted for it, but over 200,000 electors did not vote for it. How can anyone say that it is the will of the people that has been expressed by the vote that was

[*Mr. Mackintosh.*]

taken? If it is the will of the people, why did not they express it by going to the polls and recording their votes for it? I do not hold at all that in some places there were irregularities taking place which prevented people from voting. I believe that the elections were carried out fairly enough. So far as that is concerned, I have not so much objection to that, because I believe that the people who did not vote were under the impression that it would not be carried, and that it was not necessary for them to go to the poll at all. In any case, the majority of the people are not favourable to it at all. The majority of the people did not express themselves as being favourable to this alteration being made in our Education Act. If we must have religion taught, then the proper persons to teach that religion is the parents themselves, or the ministers who will teach the children the same religion as their parents. In a mixed community like ours you cannot have religious education in the State schools at all. How is the time to be arranged for the children who belong to the different sects? Five hours daily is allowed for the education of the children in our public schools, and one-fifth of that time may be devoted to religion. The State cannot teach any system of religion which will be satisfactory to the children of a mixed community like ours. Besides that, it will cause a great deal of disagreement amongst the people. The children will bring yarns home from the schools, and that will lead to trouble. The children will fall out with each other at school, and the parents will fall out with each other at home. The children will go home and say that the Catholics at the school make the sign of the cross, and they will talk about it. It will give offence to others, and it will lead the children to disparage each other. I saw something in the *Courier* to-day which was disparaging to the Redeemer of the world. Such a thing as that is to be deplored, and I was sorry to see such a thing, because the cross of Christ is the sign of the redemption of the world, and it should not be despised and belittled. It should not be ridiculed, because the people hold up the cross to remind them of the crucifixion of Christ. Now, I was told that if I voted against the introduction of the Bible into the State schools that I would go down next election. Well, I will go down honourably if I do.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MACKINTOSH: I told my electors distinctly at the time of the elections that whatever the referendum was I would not vote for the measure to alter the Education Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You are on perfectly legitimate ground.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: It is admitted that at the present time we have the finest system of education in the universe. I have no doubt that it is so, and it has been in existence for thirty-five years, and it has given all the necessary satisfaction to all parties concerned. With regard to the teachers themselves, who will be entrusted to teach this religion, a great many of them admit that they do not believe in the Bible at all. A great many of them are atheists. Is it not wrong that the teaching of the Word of God should be placed in the hands of teachers who admit freely that they do not believe in the actual lesson they are reading to the children, and they do not believe it should be there? It is simply deplorable.

Mr. LESINA: The teacher must have religious enthusiasm or he cannot teach the children at all. He will laugh at it, and the children will laugh at it.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: The Bill provides that ministers of religion shall be allowed to come into the schools and give religious lessons. How many of them will agree on this matter? They do not agree as it is, and how can they agree on the particular religious lessons to be given in the schools? If this system of religious education comes into force, then in all our future elections we will have a great deal of bigotry and religious animosity. I know from the letters which I have received myself that this sort of thing will be indulged in.

Mr. ALLEN: Garland is raising the sectarian cry himself.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: It will be detrimental to the interests of the rising generation. It is the duty of the parents to bring up their children with the same religious belief as themselves, as if they do not the children will grow up and believe in nothing. A great many people say how the Catholics put up their own institutions to instruct children in their system of education. We do that because we believe in it. If you go into any Catholic family and you meet a child of three or four years you will find that that child knows the catechism, because the parents believe in teaching their children. So far as the referendum on this question is concerned, I may say that I do not believe in a referendum at all. I will never vote for a referendum again, because I consider that the referendum taken on the question of federation has been the most disastrous thing that has ever happened to Australia. (Opposition laughter.) We should never have a referendum on a conscience matter at all, as next time it will be a referendum as to whether we are to have a State church and a State religion.

Mr. LENNON: That will all come in time.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: How is it possible to make people agree by a referendum? Suppose there are four people, three of whom are Protestants and one Catholic. Suppose they take a vote as to whether they will compel people to eat meat on Friday. (Laughter.) The three Protestants will carry the vote in the affirmative; but do you think that is going to make me eat meat on Friday? (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: They will compel you.

Mr. MACKINTOSH: Not at all. We Catholics have a unique system in connection with the teaching of our children. There are no Catholic children in Queensland who would get religious education if the children were all taught together. In all the towns in Australia where there is any sort of a population the Catholics have schools of their own, but in country districts it is not possible to have two schools, and they all go to the one State school. That being so, this system of education which we are about to introduce will be detrimental to them. We spend nearly £400,000 on our education in Queensland at the present time, and it will soon be £500,000. Indirectly the Catholics are taxed to teach the Protestant children, because, as we have our schools independently of the State school, the Protestant children are being taught religion at our expense. That is not right. It has been remarked by a writer in the *Courier*—I do not know who he is—that anything which is embarrassing to another,

or which is tyrannous or hurtful to another, is uncharitable; and anything that is uncharitable is unchristian. If we steal from another, or appropriate from another what does not belong to us, that is uncharitable and unchristian. This measure has been introduced because there are supposed to be 75 per cent. of the population of the State who recorded their votes in favour of it. But what are the facts? There are some 280,000 odd names on the electoral rolls, and 76,000 persons voted in favour of religious instruction in State schools, which means that 25 per cent. of the people voted in favour of this measure. The Minister for Education and some other members probably conscientiously believe that the proposed change in our system of State education is necessary and that it will be beneficial; but the rest of the members of the House deplore the fact that this Bill has been introduced. The Premier does not believe in religious instruction in State schools. Consequently he has made this a non-party question, and he has actually implored members here and there to vote against it if they felt so inclined. I trust that all members who conscientiously are opposed to the measure will vote against it, notwithstanding the vote given at the referendum. I give the Minister for Education credit for believing in the Bill, but at the same time I think he should consider whether it is wise to hurt the feelings of others by passing it. I say that because I know that he would not willingly hurt a fly. I hope that members who are against the measure will vote against it, and so endeavour to continue that peace and agreement which now exists in the community. The experience we have had in connection with this referendum ought to be a lesson to us never to vote again for a referendum on a matter of conscience, and to be very careful about voting for any referendum at all. What we now think is good we may find in six months' time to be wrong. I know that never a day passes without my doing something wrong, which I would do differently had I the chance to do it over again. At any rate, I think those members who believe that this measure will be injurious to the community should record their votes against it. When the division takes place I shall vote against the Bill, even if nobody else does so. I shall do that because I think we should look at the matter from the point of view of whether it will enable the people to live in harmony and friendship. The great commandment is that we should be charitable towards each other, and if we have not charity our faith will avail very little. If we try to impose on others a thing which is opposed to their conscientious belief, we are not acting charitably. I shall say no more, except that I hope that those members who are conscientiously opposed to this measure will not give a vote which they think will satisfy a clamour of some persons outside or gain them some votes, but will vote according to their consciences.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Moreton*): I hope that this debate will not introduce any ill-feeling or sectarian feeling, because that would not be wise, and it is absolutely unnecessary. Why do I say this? Because, as a matter of fact, we are all creatures of circumstances. Is it not a fact that if the father and mother of a child are Catholics the child is also a Catholic? There may be some change of opinion in the child's after life, but as a rule children follow the religious teaching of their parents. A

Mr. Forsyth.]

child born a member of the Church of England or the Presbyterian Church generally remains a member of the church in which he was born. So that we are practically, to a large extent, the creatures of circumstances in this matter. We have heard a great deal on the subject of religious teaching in State schools. Of course, we know that the feeling of a certain number of our friends is against religious instruction in State schools. But all the arguments advanced against that are arguments which should have been raised when the Referendum Bill was proposed. Looking at the division on that Bill when it was before the House in 1908, I find that no less than forty-nine members voted in favour of a referendum being taken, and only fifteen members against it. What, then, should we think of a Minister who, after that Referendum Bill was passed and a considerable majority of the people who voted at the referendum voted in favour of religious instruction in State schools, refused to introduce a Bill to give effect to the opinion expressed at the referendum? I am not looking at the matter from a religious point of view, but from the point of view that this question was brought forward in the House, and that, rightly or wrongly—I will not discuss that question—the House decided by the enormous majority of 49 to 15 that the Referendum Bill should be passed, and that it should be left to the people of Queensland to say whether they wanted religious instruction in State schools or not.

Mr. KEOGH: You must admit that the referendum was taken at the wrong time.

Mr. FORSYTH: That does not matter. I am going on the principle. The Referendum Bill was passed by an enormous majority, and, whether the decision was right or wrong, it was the duty of the Government, having such a huge majority in its favour, to refer the matter to the people. I was not in the House at the time, but I understand that a large number of members on the other side voted for the Referendum Bill as well as members on this side. The Bill was passed, and a referendum was taken. Supposing the referendum had gone the other way, does anyone think that those who believe in religious instruction in State schools would have complained about the referendum having been improperly taken?

Mr. LENNON: You know very well they would have renewed the agitation straight away.

Mr. FORSYTH: I do not think so. I do not think it would have been necessary to renew the agitation at all, although I do not think it would have been wrong for them to renew it. But even those who are against this Bill must agree with me that, as the matter was referred to the people, and, as a large majority of the people voted in favour of religious instruction in the State schools, it is our duty to carry out the wishes of that majority.

Mr. LESINA: A majority of the votes cast were in favour of it.

Mr. FORSYTH: Well, what else do you have at an election? If you have only 30 or 40 per cent. of the people on the roll voting, you do not say, "We must have another election." That would not be fair. Therefore I say that, no matter what a man's own opinion may be—it does not matter two straws whether he believes in religious instruction in the State schools or not—the question is whether he believes in religious instruction having been carried in this House by the huge

[Mr. Forsyth.]

majority of 49 to 15, and in view of the fact that the referendum itself was carried by a considerable majority, the will of the majority of the people shall be given effect to by this House.

Mr. LESINA: Have you no independence in this matter?

Mr. FOLEY: Do you have your religion cut out for you?

Mr. FORSYTH: That is not the question. We know that a large number of people who voted for the referendum are dead against us. What else can we do but carry out the will of the people in this matter? The hon. member for Bundaberg stated that, in spite of the majority both on the Bill in this House and in favour of the referendum, we are not warranted in carrying out the will of the people. Now, I think that is a statement the hon. member had no right to make. I think the Government had a right to bring this Bill before the House after the result of the referendum. If it is thrown out, the responsibility is upon those who throw it out.

Mr. FOLEY: Whether the Government believe in it themselves or not?

Mr. FORSYTH: It is not a question of whether the Government believe in it or not. I am very sorry the hon. member is not logical, and I would advise him to study logic. The question is whether this House is going to carry out the will of the people. We are asked by the Labour party again and again, "Why don't you follow the will of the people? The will of the people is predominant."

Mr. LENNON: Not in religious matters.

Mr. FORSYTH: Can the hon. member quote any case where the will of the majority is not carried into effect?

Mr. LENNON: The majority have no right to decide a question of this sort.

Mr. FORSYTH: If hon. members are in a minority on a Bill, does it not become law in spite of them? Of course it does.

Mr. HARDACRE: It should not be so in regard to religious matters.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. member is trying to bring in side issues.

Mr. LENNON: The next thing you will introduce will be a religious test for teachers.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not discussing the question of whether this is a wise thing or not. The question is whether we shall give effect to the will of the majority of the people.

Mr. HARDACRE: It was introduced wrongly, and it was wrongly carried out.

Mr. FORSYTH: Whether it was introduced wrongly or not, the Bill was passed by a huge majority, and the referendum was carried by a large majority, and now we have this Bill before us. I can understand why a considerable number of members do not believe in religious instruction in State schools.

Mr. KEOGH: There are many men of the same belief as you are who are opposed to it as much as I am.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not discussing that at all. As the hon. member for Cambooya explained, the Catholics have schools of their own.

Mr. KEOGH: Why don't your people do the same?

Mr. FORSYTH: There are very few Protestant schools. There are a few, I believe, but, as a rule, Protestants send their children

to the State schools. Where they have schools of their own, I understand they give religious instruction to the children just as the Catholics do in their schools. Where they have no schools of their own, they send their children to the State schools.

Mr. LENNON: You claim that the State schools are Protestant schools?

Mr. FORSYTH: Not at all. The hon. member is again illogical.

Mr. LENNON: No; you are.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not. The hon. member is trying to put something into my mouth that I will not allow him to put there. I say there are a few Protestant schools, where I understand they give religious instruction the same as they do in the Roman Catholic schools; but there are very few of these schools, and a large majority of the Protestants send their children to the State schools. The State schools are not Protestant schools. As a matter of fact, our Education Act provides that the education given in the State schools shall be secular.

Mr. LENNON: Hitherto it has been, but it will not be secular if this Bill passes.

Mr. FORSYTH: I shall be very sorry if any sectarian feeling is introduced, whether this Bill is passed or not.

Mr. LENNON: You cannot keep it out.

Mr. KEOGH: It is impossible.

Mr. FORSYTH: Some of the speeches that have been made against the Bill will not help matters. My own idea of a way to get over the difficulty—because there is a certain amount of difficulty—is that, if the Bill is passed, two or three of the heads of the principal churches in Brisbane should meet. The Roman Catholic Archbishop—as fine a man as we have in Queensland—(hear, hear!)—the Anglican Archbishop, if you like, and the head of one of the leading Nonconformist churches might meet and arrange a course of religious lessons to be taught by the teachers in the State schools. If that were done—and I see no reason why it should not be done, because we do not want any dogma; in fact, it is distinctly prohibited by the Bill—it would be a solution of the difficulty. The children should be taught simply high moral principles.

Mr. LENNON: So they are now.

Mr. FORSYTH: I grant you that; but I believe that if three men who stand high in the religious world—men in whom we would all have absolute confidence—arranged such a course as I suggest, it would be acceptable to the people of every denomination.

Mr. LESINA: What about the Seventh Day Adventists and the Christadelphians?

Mr. FORSYTH: I hope that some such scheme as that will be carried out, and it might do away with this sectarian feeling that we hear so much about. I

[5 p.m.] do not see why this feeling should exist. The Catholics and Protestants have every accommodation, and they are all aiming at the one goal, the one end. They may have different ways of getting there, different ways of teaching, but so long as religious teaching imparted to the children is of a nature that will be pleasing and acceptable to all these denominations, why should we object to anyone being allowed to teach, no matter what denomination he may belong to?

Mr. LENNON: The ingenuity of man cannot solve it.

Mr. FORSYTH: It has been done before, and I do not see why it should not be done again.

Mr. LENNON: I deny that it has been done. It has never given satisfaction wherever it has been adopted.

Mr. FORSYTH: There is one thing in common with this matter to which I wish to refer. I think the Minister should be very careful as to the time allotted for teaching religious instruction. I do not know what the regulations will be, but I think that if half an hour a week was given—

Mr. LESINA: Half an hour a day, they propose.

Mr. FORSYTH: I am not discussing the Bill. I am discussing what to put in the Bill. The Bill can be altered. I say that in connection with this religious instruction we should not curtail the hours of the children too much, so far as secular education is concerned, because, after all, the amount of time they have is only about four hours, and I should imagine that if about half an hour or one hour a week is given by the teachers, and the same by any religious teachers who may come to the school, that might meet the case.

Mr. LESINA: You must cut out something. What are you going to cut out of the curriculum to give them half an hour a week?

Mr. FORSYTH: If the hon. member wants to know how it is done elsewhere, all he has to do is to study the system in New South Wales. I would suggest that, possibly, as the children leave the school at half-past 3 o'clock in the afternoon, the teaching given by religious teachers should be after that time, just the same as we have in the Act now. Under the Act, religious teachers can go into the school after school hours. I say that might be done.

Mr. KEOGH: They have got that opportunity now.

Mr. FORSYTH: If the school children left at a quarter-past 3 o'clock and they were given half an hour, from a quarter-past 3 o'clock to a quarter to 4 o'clock, that might meet the case as far as religious teachers are concerned, and I think there should be no more time of the school taken up; because, while it may be wise to give religious instruction to children in State schools, we must not interfere with their secular education. I would strongly advise the Minister, in framing the regulation in the matter, to see that that is done. I do not want to say much more. All I hope is that, whatever is done, there may be no ill-feeling either in this House or outside.

Mr. FOLEY: You cannot stop it.

Mr. FORSYTH: There is no occasion to say that at all.

Mr. COLLINS: That is a statement of fact.

Mr. FORSYTH: The hon. gentleman should not say they are facts until they are proved to be facts. As a matter of fact, there is very little trouble down South; there may be a little, but there is not much. However, I do not wish to say any more on this question, but I think that this House, having decided to refer the matter to the people, which has been done, and the people having decided by a majority to have religious teaching in State schools, it does not matter one straw as to what our individual belief may be. The question is whether we are going to carry out the mandate of the people. It does not matter whether we are for it or

Mr. Forsyth.]

against it—the point is as to whether we, as members of the House, should carry out the decision of the people as expressed on the referendum.

* Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*): I am very pleased to have an opportunity of speaking against this measure. I consider I would be performing a very doubtful service as a Queensland citizen if I did not oppose such a measure. I have a great admiration for our present system of education. (Opposition "Hear, hears!") The proposed alteration amounts to nothing short of a national calamity.

Mr. ALLEN: A diabolical outrage.

Mr. THEODORE: It has been stated that the question we have to consider is not as to whether we should alter the system, as proposed by the Secretary for Public Instruction, but as to whether we should not give effect to the will of the people. From the statements made by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, he would lead one to believe that he is not altogether in favour of this measure.

Mr. FORSYTH: You have not the slightest conception of what my meaning is.

Mr. THEODORE: It is a pity the hon. member did not give the House some conception of what his ideas were. If we are not able to determine what his opinions are in regard to this principle after his half-hour oration, then he was very successful in talking all round the point. I believe the principle before the House is not the question he has raised, nor the question which the Premier raised on a previous occasion when speaking on this measure. It is not a question whether we should carry into effect a decision given by certain people who went to the poll on 13th April, but as to whether we shall enable the Minister to alter the present system of education by introducing this measure.

Mr. WHITE: Oh, no!

Mr. THEODORE: That is the question we have to consider, and that is the question I am going to deal with. I am not going to be influenced by the hon. member for Moreton or by the Premier as to what view I shall take upon this question. The Premier indulged in heroics when he was speaking. He said hon. members did not recognise their real duty in this matter. He said that, no matter what their individual or private opinions may be, they should not oppose this measure, because it was carrying into effect the supreme will of the people as expressed by referendum. That is not the question at all. That is a mere subterfuge, an attempt to cloud the issue. The Premier himself gave some of the strongest reasons why the measure should be opposed, and why we should not alter the present educational system in the direction that it is intended to alter it by this measure. The Premier did not attempt to justify the measure. He never attempted to justify its introduction. He simply said, because of a previous action—an action which should not concern this Parliament—because a previous Parliament agreed to submit this matter to a referendum of the people, and the people gave a certain decision, then members' decision on this measure should be a foregone conclusion, and if they opposed it they were committing a shocking offence. I consider that the previous Parliament, which autho-

rised the taking of the referendum, performed a very doubtful service to Queensland. I do not care what the majority was for it or what were the circumstances—

The TREASURER: Several of your members voted for it.

Mr. THEODORE: I admit that is so, and they consider it was a most grievous mistake they made on that occasion. The Premier, and also the hon. member for Moreton, has raised the question as to what is the real issue now before Parliament. I admit there are two questions to be settled—whether the introduction of religious instruction in State schools is a question for the referendum, and, if that can be answered in the affirmative, whether we are wise in opposing it. I hold that it is not a question for a referendum—that no Government has the right, and no Parliament has the privilege of submitting such a question to a referendum, and for hon. members sitting on the Government benches to attempt to justify their action, and attempting to laud up their belief in the principle of the referendum, is simply incongruous, because they have always opposed the principle of the referendum and always will oppose it; and if ever we have a Bill before this House to enable the carrying into effect of the general principle of the referendum, we shall probably see a majority of members on that side voting against it. If we have such a measure before this House at any time—a measure that will establish the principle of the referendum—who will doubt that referenda upon these particular questions will be specifically excluded? Who will doubt that there will be in such a measure a provision excluding questions of conscience and religion? There is no one in this House who is democratic but will admit that statement. There must be some restricting influence regarding the questions that shall be submitted to a referendum, and no one doubts that this will be one of the questions that will be omitted. Surely those hon. members who disapprove of that argument will not admit that the majority have a right to tyrannise over the minority? The hon. member for Cambooya, who was speaking just now, raised a very pertinent instance that may occur under such a principle. Surely no majority will have the right to tyrannically coerce any individual as to what he shall eat on a particular day, or as to what he should wear or what he should believe? No one who is liberal minded will question that proposition, and that is the proposition to be considered when we are considering this Bill. I am not violating any democratic principle by voting against the measure, even if it has been submitted to a referendum and agreed to by a majority of the persons voting. I believe in the general principle of the referendum, and I believe the sooner we have some measure which will enable certain important questions of political or economic significance to be submitted to the people, the better it will be for the people. There were absolutely no restrictions placed upon this referendum. The question was submitted to the people in the most loose form imaginable, and the people gave a certain decision. The Government are trying to justify their action in introducing this measure on that decision. In England they require a four-fifths majority of the parents voting on questions of this sort—as to whether there shall be certain alterations in regard to religious instruction—before that alteration is made. There would be at least some redeeming feature in the matter

[*Mr. Forsyth*

if the Government had made a stipulation that at least there should be a four-fifths majority in favour of this measure before it could be put into force. I am not saying even then it would be a good principle, but at least there would be some justification for it. I hold with the opinion expressed by an eminent statesman in England not long ago. He said that the attempt to settle, or delegate to the people to settle, what were the common elements of Christianity, was arrogant and absurd, and inconsistent with democratic traditions regarding secular and theological relations. The Premier took up a very dictatorial attitude on this question. He said the people had spoken, and he took that as a mandate, and justified the Minister taking that as a mandate for the introduction of the measure. The people spoke just as emphatically at the last State election. They spoke in favour of the Government policy, and they also returned certain members to oppose that policy, and if the votes given at that election were counted up we would find a majority of the electors voted for the Government, and surely we of the Opposition are not violating any democratic principle when we are opposing the Government policy? The Premier took up the attitude that any member sitting in this House, on whatever side, and opposing this measure, was guilty of a shocking impertinence—an attitude I consider is most absurd, and cannot be borne out by any logical arguments or upheld by any logical principle. It is merely so much bombast. Personally, I am perfectly satisfied I am not violating any principle in opposing the decision of the referendum, nor are other hon. members who are opposing it. We are violating no democratic tenet whatever, and if we can give satisfactory reasons why the measure should not be carried into effect, then we are justified in opposing it, even if it has been submitted to a referendum, and the majority of those voting decided in favour of it. One of the three great evils upon the grounds of which this measure should be opposed is that it will cause endless dissension and sectarian bitterness amongst the parents of children attending the State schools. Following out that argument, I will quote what Picton has written on this very phase of the question in his work, "The Bible in School." On page 16, he says—

Who will dispute that on the relations of religion to moral instruction, and of the Bible to religion, discordant and irreconcilable opinions are held with equal intensity of conviction by many of the worthiest members of the Commonwealth? But those differences are more than merely intellectual divergences. They touch on deepest faiths and inspiring hopes and infinite fears. They are the clash of mutually-contradictory oracles held by opponents in the debate to be the divinest utterance of their deepest and most real being. Indeed, the differences are such that, if the opinions of any one group are adopted as the law of the people's schools, all other citizens must suffer painful and dishonourable disabilities. No matter what may be the selection made, whether the opinions of Conformists or Nonconformists, of Catholics or Protestants, of Rationalists or of "unsectarian" Evangelicals, all the rest must endure what they regard as the perversion of the State's authority and resources to mischievous and demoralising uses. As taxpayers they must support out of their wages or wealth the propagation into the new age of doctrines which they detest. As teachers they must either play the hypocrite or take an inferior position. As parents they must either acquiesce in the installation into their children's tender minds of what to their parental affection seems dangerous poison, or, by availing themselves of the "conscience clause," they must inflict on their

families the fate of little pariahs during all their school hours. As citizens they must submit to have the whole moral energy of the land they love devoted to immortalising errors which, according to their point of view, may be superstitious or godless or loose and latitudinarian.

I think he states the case there admirably. His remarks are most apposite to the question. All the evils of which he has spoken are likely to be inculcated under the new system the Minister seeks to introduce into Queensland. The second objection I have to the measure is a very serious objection, and it is one to which the Minister should give serious consideration. It is the moral effect the new system will have upon teachers. The hon. gentleman has given no information as to whether the teachers will be permitted to refrain from giving religious instruction. The opinion has been expressed here that there should be a conscience clause under which teachers would be permitted to refrain from giving religious instruction in the schools. I say the teachers should be considered, otherwise this is going to have a demoralising effect on them. Certain Bible leagues in Australasia—I do not know whether it has been the case with the Queensland league—have advocated the teacher making the selection of lessons to be taught. In a circular issued by the Wellington Householders' League in New Zealand, an organisation having the same object as the league in Queensland, it is laid down that the Bible should be read in school hours by the scholars, the teacher to select the portions to be read; and no comment to be allowed except upon geographical, historical, or grammatical subjects. I do not know whether that has been advocated here, or whether the Minister intends to permit that to be done. What Mr. Picton says in regard to the moral effect on the teachers is most interesting. At page 53, he says—

As an illustration of the sort of service which latitudinarians or heretics are allowed to give, take the following extract from a letter printed in *Democracy* of February 23rd, 1901. The occasion of it was a previous letter from a board-school teacher, complaining of the odious task of teaching what he did not believe, whereupon "Another Board-school Teacher" addressed the editor thus—

"Sir,—The state of feeling disclosed by the remark of the 'Board-school Teacher' anent the pressure put upon him to teach 'Scripture' against his wish is, I am afraid, common to many others of that class of the community. One does lose a certain amount of self-respect in standing before a class and teaching for truth what one believes to be false. But, under somewhat similar circumstances, I ask myself, Why be honest? Why trouble at all about the matter? The Scripture lessons occupy little time, after all, and the harm done cannot amount to much. In view of the facts that all the work done in the school may be described as an attempt to enable the children to conform to the canons of Christian or commercial morality (*sic*), and that no degree of conformity to those of either cult will abate the ills or conduce to the welfare of humanity, I feel that more harm is done in the ordinary school work than in the time set apart for religious instruction. But one must get a living somehow; so I, personally, comply with the terms of my agreement with my employers, and let conscience go hang.

That is a letter written to one of the British papers by a teacher in the unfortunate position of having to give religious instruction under the system existing there; and the moral effect may easily be seen by the strain

Mr. Theodore.]

of his letter. He is prepared to "let conscience go hang," and keep on teaching something in which he could not believe.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A good way to create hypocrites.

MR. THEODORE: No doubt it will create hypocrites; and in order to obviate that, perhaps the Minister will see the necessity of introducing a religious test for candidates seeking admission to the service of the Department of Public Instruction. The next objection I have is the moral effect it will have on the children themselves, which is one of the most serious aspects of the whole question. Will the religious instruction we seek to impose be likely to improve their moral condition? Statistics compiled in countries where they have religious instruction in State schools go rather to show the contrary. In an article contributed to the *Melbourne Age* of recent date, a Victorian teacher says—

A strong reason against disturbing the purely secular character of the education given in the State schools is the fact that no proof has yet been brought forward that our secular system gives inferior results to those obtained where religious instruction is imparted daily as part of the ordinary school course.

Further on, he says—

Victoria and South Australia are States where purely secular education has been on trial in the State schools for a considerable time. The table given hereunder is derived from the last "Victorian Year Book," and shows the number of persons per 1,000 of population in each State charged with offences against the person at different dates—

	1890.	1895.	1900.	1905.
Victoria ...	3.66	2.12	1.88	1.59
New South Wales...	7.92	3.53	3.28	2.50
South Australia ...	1.64	1.18	0.85	0.66

Between the two secularly educated States of Victoria and South Australia, the religiously educated New South Wales appears much the more addicted to violent crime.

Those figures, quoted from statistics compiled by a responsible officer of the Victorian public service, furnish a strong argument against the introduction of religious instruction in our State schools. There is another phase of the question which can be considered in connection with my third objection, and it is this: What will be the position of the child, after having been taught certain geographical, historical, or geological lessons in the ordinary curriculum of the school, if he finds that they conflict with the Scriptural lessons? And what will be the position of the teacher who will be unable to explain the anomalies and paradoxes that seem to occur? The Minister has given no explanation as to what will be done under such circumstances.

MR. LESINA: How will they harmonise Genesis and geology?

MR. THEODORE: That is one of the paradoxes of which I was thinking. After the teacher has given a lesson from Genesis, in which there is the circumstantial story of the creation of the world in six days, there may be a lesson about the scientific discoveries of geologists and archaeologists; and the scholars will find that the great pyramid of Cheops, in Egypt, was known to have been in existence 6,000 years B.C., whereas, according to the chronology of the Bible, the creation is dated no further back than 4,000 years B.C. If the scholar is of an inquiring turn of mind, he will raise the ques-

tion; and if the teacher is prohibited from giving an explanation of the lesson from Scripture, where will the child be? And when the scholar learns of certain fossilised human remains having been found in the north of Europe, which conclusively show, after scientific, geological, and ethnological investigation, that man has been in existence ever since the glacial epoch, 50,000 years ago, how will he be able to reconcile this with the dogmatic facts in the Scripture lesson which he has been taught to believe are accurate and beyond doubt? Of course, it can be easily explained by saying that the Scripture account is not to be interpreted literally, and that when it speaks of "days" it really means "periods," and so on; but we have been assured that the teacher will be prohibited from giving any explanation from the fear of imparting polemic influence to the scholar. I am inclined to think that the whole system will prove most disastrous to the education system of Queensland, and will not tend to improve the children who will be the products of such a system. I therefore think that members will be performing a duty—which will perhaps later on be recognised—in strenuously opposing such a measure. Rather than perform a duty now which will only be the expressed will of a

[5.30 p.m.] certain percentage of the people, they will be performing a much greater duty in opposing such a measure. If they can explain some of these anomalies which have been raised by myself and other members, both on this side and the other side of the Chamber, I would be pleased to listen to them. No hon. member in favour of this measure has attempted to justify his attempt to alter the present system of education. No hon. member yet has attempted to justify it. They merely seek to hide themselves behind a subterfuge that the people have given them a mandate, and that they will carry it out. They have not attempted in any way to give facts bearing out their allegations of the benefits to be accrued from such an alteration of our educational system. I will say this: That those members of a previous Parliament who voted to have the referendum taken committed as great a wrong as those members now in the House who will vote in favour of the measure which we now have before us.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. KEOGH (rising)—

MR. LESINA: You have spoken.

MR. HAMILTON: Go on. The Deputy Speaker did not stop you.

Question put.

MR. LAND (*Balonne*): I say that I am very strongly opposed to this measure. I consider that our present educational system, which has been in force for so many years, should not be altered, and certainly not in the way that it is proposed to alter it. Now, a good deal has been said in this House about the referendum. I do not think that this Government or any other Government should have referred this question to a referendum at all. I have spoken on this question before, and I have referred to it on the public platform; and so strongly have I been opposed to it that I have said if I was the only person in Queensland opposed to it I would still vote against it, and I intend to do so. (Hear, hear!) I do that because I think that while we have a system like the present secular

[*Mr. Theodore.*]

system—a system that is doing good work, and which has always done good work—I do not see when we have a system like that that it should be referred to what I might call a bogus referendum. In my opinion, there never was any sincerity in the Government which submitted the question in the first place. I understand that the present Government are not the only Government that promised to submit this question to a referendum, and I think that in the best interests of the people of the State it never should have been introduced at all. But since the question has been introduced, and the people have spoken in the way they have spoken, I say that the majority of the people have not voted in favour of this question. There were a large number of people on the roll who did not vote at all. A large number of the people did not understand the question. I know many people who had no idea of the dominion of this question at all. They have got some ideas on it since the referendum was taken. They are a good many people who believe in secular education in our State schools, but they did not know that that word “secular” was going to be struck out in that referendum. That is one of the particular reasons why I, and others who signed the Labour platform with me, are opposed to this question. There are not half a dozen members in this House who believe in altering our present system of education to admit of religious instruction being given in our State schools. That being so, why should a measure like this be passed at all, when you come to take into consideration that there is such a vast majority against it? It has been said that we must give effect to the will of the people. I would not mind so much if that was really the case. If this measure was introduced and was to be carried out to give effect to the will of the people I would not mind if it was carried. But I claim this—that you are not giving effect to the will of the people at all. You are only giving effect to the will of a few of the people. I was strongly of opinion when this matter was referred to the people that it would be carried, and I opposed it in every way that I could. I spoke against it and worked against it, and endeavoured to explain to the people the effect it would have on the Education Act if it were passed. Still, I do not think the people understood the effect it would have on the Education Act if it were passed. As a matter of fact, the people did not believe that it would be passed at all, and I believe that is a good deal the reason why many members in this House agreed to submit it to the people, because they would vote against it, and they thought that the majority of the people would be against it. Now that it has been carried by a majority of the people, that is the cry that has been raised. That is the argument used—that we must give effect to the will of the people. Instead of giving effect to the will of the people by introducing this measure, we are imposing a penalty on the vast majority of the people of this State. Now, to give you my true opinion, I believe that underlying the whole thing it is nothing but a political dodge. That is what I believe.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION:
That is another discovery.

MR. LAND: That is my opinion, anyhow. I have arrived at that opinion because I believe that it is a great scheme. I honestly believe that. I noticed that there are men com-

ing here from the other States. These men do not come here preaching for nothing. Money must be found for these men to go about preaching. Who finds the money for these men? I believe that at the bottom of this is a deep-laid political scheme to split the people of this State. I hope that the people will have more sense, anyhow, and see through it. It has been said by some people that the children of Queensland are growing up godless. If Garland said that, he ought to be ashamed of himself. I notice that the Catholics are not advocating to have the Bible taught in the State schools, consequently it must be the Protestants, and, if he says that the people are growing up godless, who is to blame? The clergy of this State are to blame. The clergy have been with us all the time. Ever since before separation there were churches in Queensland, and there have been any amount of churches in Queensland ever since, and if the children are growing up godless whose fault is it?

MR. ALLEN: There are any amount of parsons.

MR. LAND: Yes; any amount of parsons.

MR. LESINA: They are false shepherds. They are responsible.

MR. LAND: I think it is a libel on the children of the State to say that they are growing up godless. I was talking to a minister of one of the leading English churches in Brisbane, and he asked me my opinion on this question, and I told him. He then said, “The men won’t go to church. Very few women will go to church.” And he also said, “I met a child of twelve years who had not heard the name of our Saviour,” and he added, “I have not got a second shirt to my back.” So there is a good deal to be taken out of that.

MR. HAMILTON: Out of the shirt?
(Laughter.)

MR. LAND: No; out of what he said. I have lived all my life in Queensland, and I have never found that the people are any worse morally than the people of other countries are represented to be. I noticed that there were 50,000 present one day at the last exhibition held in Brisbane, that there were other amusements going on at the same time—races and other sports—that the theatres were filled every night to their utmost capacity; and I did not hear of anyone complaining of the behaviour of those people. What purpose is it supposed this measure will serve? It is supposed that it will make the people good; it is supposed that it is necessary to introduce religious instruction in State schools because the people are bad. Is there any man in this House game to stand up and say the people of Queensland are worse than the people anywhere else, or that the women and children of Queensland are worse than the women and children elsewhere?

MR. LENNON: No.

MR. LAND: Then why do some people want a system like this?

MR. LENNON: They want a State church.

MR. LAND: That is very likely what they do want. There was a good deal in what was said by the clergyman to whom I have referred. He is the minister of one of the leading churches in Brisbane, and he says he

Mr. Land.]

cannot get the men to go to church, and that he cannot get many women to go to church.

Mr. LESINA: Who is he?

Mr. LAND: It is not necessary to give his name, but if any members doubt my word I will give his name privately. That gentleman said he had not got a second shirt to his back. Surely that shows that the present system has broken down, and that there is a necessity for adopting some other means for carrying on the churches—that we should get somebody to give him another shirt to put on his back. I do not think any man should be allowed to go about the country telling lies about the people of Queensland, saying they are bad. The Commissioner of Police will have a pretty good idea of the character of the people of the State, as he has the police records, but even those records do not give very much information. They will tell you about a poor unfortunate man who has taken a drink too much and has been locked up, but will say nothing about the number of persons in good positions who have taken gallons of liquor but have never been locked up. If you go to the gaols and interview men, women, and young people who have been convicted of some offence, you will find that many of them have been well brought up, well educated, and have even been to Sunday school. All this shows that it is not through ignorance that they have committed an offence or got into trouble, but from different causes. Everybody is honest up to a certain time. Then temptation comes and leads some astray, and leads them to commit crime. But, speaking generally, the people of Queensland are not bad. That being so, why is a measure like this introduced—introduced in a half-hearted way and supported in a half-hearted way? Several members on the other side have said that we must give effect to the will of the people. But they do not care any more about the will of the people than the man in the moon. We know from experience that whenever the interests of the people are at stake those members are not on the side of the people. The members of this party are sent here by the multitude, by the poorest classes in the State, and yet everything that we bring forward for the welfare and good of the people is always opposed by members opposite, who are now introducing this measure to try to make the people good. They are only pretending to make good people who are not bad. Will any member of this House stand up here and say that the people as a whole are bad? Will the hon. member for Townsville say that the people outside are not as good as the people inside this House?

Hon. R. PHILP: They are much better.

Mr. LAND: Then you should have introduced a measure to make the people inside this House better.

Hon. R. PHILP: You couldn't.

Mr. LAND: Instead of trying to make people outside better, members opposite should try to make the people inside better. They are making a holy show of the people, anyhow. If members opposite were sincere, I would not care twopence about the matter. We have in the distance a Police Jurisdiction and Summary Offences Bill to make the people better.

The PREMIER: A very difficult job with some of them.

[Mr. Land.

Mr. LAND: A Licensing Bill is also to be introduced with the object of making the people better. I have no doubt that some of these measures may be necessary to amend existing laws, but I do not think they are necessary to make the people better. And my opinion is that the Government have not got that object in view in introducing this Bill. I look upon its introduction as a piece of hypocrisy, and I feel sure that many people outside will not forget their action at the next general election. Some persons have said that our children are growing up godless. I do not agree with that, but if it is true I blame the clergy for not doing their duty. How much money has been spent on the churches to keep the clergy going?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I thought you said that one of them had not a second shirt.

Mr. LAND: I said that; but all the same a vast amount of money has been spent on the churches, and there is still a large amount of money invested in them. We have a great many clergy, and, if the children are bad, I blame the clergy. I do not see how you are going to improve the children by giving religious instruction in State schools. I believe that if the clergy do their duty they will have Sunday schools in connection with their churches. They can find any amount of young people to teach classes in the Sunday schools; they can superintend the classes, and can always be among the young people, advise them, and set them a good example. I maintain that they can in that way teach the children proper religion. I do not quite agree with the Premier's assertion that parents are not fit to teach their children, though, of course, there are exceptions to every rule. I think true religion is the religion you are taught by your mother. I do not suppose the advocates of religious education in State schools, or even the Premier himself, would say that a mother is not the proper person to teach her children religion. My experience is that what you are taught at home you never forget, and I believe the home is the proper place to teach religion. Here is another thing: By introducing this religious system into the State schools a lot of time will be taken up, and I maintain that a poor man's children require all the education they can get in the State schools. I go further than that, and say that there are many children of poor people in Queensland who cannot get any education at all under our present system. There is any amount of room for an alteration in that direction, instead of—I will not say wasting time, but taking away from the time they now have. Not very long ago I received a wire from a person in a country district saying that there were eighteen children growing up wild. There had been a school there, but the school was closed under the departmental regulations, as there must be so many children before a school can be kept open. According to the regulations they can only pay so much per annum, and, from the position of this place, it was a hard thing to get a teacher to go there. That is only one case out of many. Circumstances like that go to prove that the children of poor men in Queensland are not getting the instruction they ought to get at the hands of the Education Department. There are many children throughout the length and breadth of Queensland to whom it is hard to give any education at all. Yet we are introducing a measure like this, which

will take away from the time allotted for education in the State schools. That is an aspect of the question that deserves serious consideration. I suppose there are about thirty different religious denominations in Queensland.

Mr. COLLINS: A great many more.

Mr. LAND: I was going as far as I could remember. That goes to show that in every State school there will always be so many different denominations. The ministers, or whatever they call them, belonging to all those different denominations will be going into the schools, and it must always breed trouble. I feel sure there is no possible chance of having religion taught in the State schools without creating a lot of ill-feeling. It does not matter what anybody says about New South Wales. My experience of the people of that State is that they admit that there has been a terrible lot of friction between different denominations there. I have talked to men who have been educated in private schools in the old country, when they had to pay for their education. They have informed me that religious instruction was given in those schools without any friction, but they admitted that the schools belonged to the churches, and only the children belonging to the churches attended the schools, so that there could not be any friction. Of course, sectarian differences could not arise there, but things are very different here. The times are different to those to which I have just been referring; the place is very different; and the people are also very different. People are different to-day to what they were twenty-five years ago, and we do not want to go back to the old system. We want progress and not retrogression. Just to show how easy it is for sectarian bitterness to originate, I may mention a case where the people belonging to the Church of England in a certain place in this State were desirous of getting up a bazaar for the purpose of doing something for their church. They had tickets for sale, and one person thought it would be an easy way of getting these tickets circulated to send them to the schoolmaster and ask him to be good enough to hand them out to the Church of England children as they were leaving school. The teacher did not see any harm in doing so, and he did as he was asked. Some little Roman Catholic children came to him and asked for some tickets, and he said, "You can't get them; they are for the Church of England. You have quite enough to do to look after your own church." Now, that created no end of trouble in a short time. Those children went home and told their parents, and the matter was brought before the school committee. That in itself was quite enough to prove to the people that it would be very easy to create sectarianism in that school. Many people from New South Wales with whom I am well acquainted have been working in Queensland at election time. Of course they had no votes, but, being Labour fellows, they took an active part in the elections in this State. One of the first things they ask about a candidate is, "What is he?" Of course we tell them, "He is the endorsed candidate for the Labour party;" and then they ask, "But what is his religion?" One very important thing is to try and keep religion out of politics altogether. The Secretary for Public Instruction laughed when I told him my opinion; but I will give you my opinion, and I am responsible for it, and I do not care what any man on that side of the House thinks of my opinion. I will give you my opinion because it is my opinion. I put

my opinions before the people that I represent, and they have a clear course [7 p.m.] open to them every time. It is not a good thing for men to laugh at me, especially men on the front Treasury bench. I do not care what the Government think of my opinions on this question. I do not care what the daily Press think of my opinions on this question. I am concerned about the people of the district I represent.

The PREMIER: That is noble.

Mr. LAND: The hon. gentleman may consider it noble or otherwise; but I consider that, when a man expresses certain opinions before his electors, he should stick to those opinions in this House. The people in the district I represent are strongly opposed to any alteration in the present education system, most particularly those people who understood the question and voted against it. There were many who did not take sufficient interest to understand the question. During the election I asked many people if they had voted on the question of religious instruction in State schools, and they said that they had four ballot-papers, and had voted four times, and that that finished it. Many of them did not know that they had to go to another part of the building to vote on this question, and many of them at the time refused to vote. Many of them had not the opportunity. One of the strongest objections I have to this motion being carried at all is because it was not a fair referendum.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Balonne has occupied the time allowed by the Sessional Order. Is it the pleasure of the House that he be further heard?

Mr. LENNON: As provided by the Sessional Order, I beg leave to propose that the hon. member for Balonne be further heard.

Question—That the hon. member for Balonne be allowed extended time—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 18.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mackintosh
„ Barber	„ Mann
„ Blair	„ May
„ Breslin	„ Mulcahy
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Crawford	„ Murphy
„ Hamilton	„ McLachlan
„ Land	„ Payne
„ Lennon	„ Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Crawford and Mr. Murphy.

NOES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
„ Appel	„ Hunter, D.
„ Barnes, G. P.	„ Kidston
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Macartney
„ Bouchard	„ Morgan
„ Brennan	„ Paget
„ Bridges	„ Petrie
„ Corser	„ Philp
„ Cottell	„ Roberts
„ Cribb	„ Somerset
„ Denham	„ Swayne
„ Forsyth	„ Thorn
„ Fox	„ Tolmie
„ Grayson	„ Walker
„ Gunn	„ White
„ Hawthorn	„ Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Corser and Mr. D. Hunter.

Resolved in the negative.

* Mr. D. HUNTER (*Woolloongabba*): It is very seldom that I have heard any man in this House stand up and make a speech such

Mr. D. Hunter.]

as the hon. member for Bundaberg delivered to-day. I think it is a pity that our politics have sunk so low that men can repudiate pledges they have given to the electors for the purpose of being returned to Parliament.

Mr. ALLEN: No, never.

Mr. D. HUNTER: Because no man who has given a pledge at the elections in answer to a question has a right to go back on it, even at the dictation of any other body of men. The hon. member read a letter which he had written, and at the end of it he stated—

But in the event of the referendum being in its favour, I shall be prepared to bow to the will of the people.

And he also received a circular as follows:—

In the event of the referendum under the Religious Instruction in State Schools Act being in the affirmative, will you be prepared, if elected to Parliament, to give effect to the will of the people as expressed by the referendum?

And he signed it "Yes," and he put his name to that—"G. P. Barber." I contend no man has a right to give a pledge of that kind when before the people, and go back on it at the dictation of any outside body. What is the excuse which the hon. member has given? It is this: That his pledge, which was given to his friends for free, secular, and compulsory education, was given before he gave this pledge.

Mr. ALLEN: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. HUNTER: I have always understood the common law to be that the last will and testament of a man was the one you abide by. In this case we are to go back on the last pledge that he gave, and say that because that first pledge conflicted with his later pledge, then the former pledge must stand. If that is just, then that organisation which took advantage of a pledge which he gave for the purpose of getting its vote was equally to blame. Surely the hon. member, in giving that pledge, did not go behind his own organisation? Surely his organisation knew he had given that pledge, and if his organisation knew he had given a pledge which was contrary to its platform, they ought to have called him to book before the election was over, and not call him to book after the election has passed by. Another hon. member told us what he had done on this same question, and that may be found on page 979 of *Hansard* of last year. Mr. Ryan stated—

I do not think we should try to deceive the people who desire to have that religious instruction in the State schools by giving them a referendum that will afterwards not be taken notice of by Parliament, and the Premier himself has thrown out the suggestion to those who are opposed to it. During the recent election I stated, in answer to a question, that if the referendum was carried I should certainly support the carrying of the Bill through the House.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I maintain that those gentlemen, in giving that pledge, are in duty bound, and I call upon them to be true to their pledges, and vote for the Bible in State Schools Bill.

Mr. LENNON: They will do what you want them to do, of course.

Mr. D. HUNTER: A very strong attack has been made on the Rev. Garland, because he has attempted to do—what? He asked hon. members opposite to keep to the pledges which they gave to him before the elections and during the elections.

Mr. LESINA: They had no right to give those pledges.

[Mr. D. Hunter

Mr. D. HUNTER: Any man has a right to ask a candidate on the public platform what vote he will give in a certain event, and the Rev. Garland has justified his position very strongly when he stands behind 74,422 people. As a matter of fact, he is the leader of 74,000 people.

Mr. BRESLIN: Who is?

Mr. D. HUNTER: And he is the secretary of an organisation which polled that number of votes. How many votes did the Labour party poll at the last election? Only 579 more than those cast for the Bible in State schools.

Mr. ALLEN: And you gag us here.

Mr. D. HUNTER: That number includes the votes polled for all members sitting on that side, and the Labour party themselves did not poll so many at the last election as the Rev. Garland and the Bible League polled on this question. Consequently, I maintain that we have a right to put that on the statute-book whether we believe in it or not. Any party which has the referendum on its platform is in honour bound, once it has gone to the people, to give effect to that referendum. I maintain that that referendum is a plank of the platform of the other side just as much as free, secular, and compulsory education is a plank of their platform, and having also a referendum on their platform, every plank of that platform is subject to the referendum, and anyone who attempts to deny that free, secular, and compulsory education, while it is a plank of their platform, is not entitled to a referendum, takes up an attitude which no democrat can support.

Mr. LESINA: Are you a democrat?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Yes; I claim I am a much better democrat than hon. members opposite, because I want to support the will of the people as expressed at the referendum. We have seen the other House—we have heard it railed against because they would not give effect to the will of the people. I have never known it at any time—even the House of Lords—I have never known it, once the people have given a definite decision, that they were not prepared to sit down and take it.

Mr. BRESLIN: Where was your House of Lords?

Mr. D. HUNTER: The hon. member must be quiet. Only recently there was a tremendous agitation in the old country in which the Lower House was engaged, and the House of Lords took up a very determined attitude, but when the will of the people as expressed at the ballot-box was given, the House of Lords, although it meant to them an immense amount of money, quickly acquiesced and allowed it to pass through.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about home rule?

Mr. D. HUNTER: When the people have given a decision on home rule I am quite satisfied the House of Lords will abide by it, but they have never done so. When it was put to the people, the Government which tried to carry it was defeated. It has never been carried by the will of the people. I can quite fancy what a howl of execration would be heard here if the Upper House in this country was to dare defy the will of the people. We would have the hon. member for Clermont standing up and challenging its very existence; but the position the Labour party take up is

that they are allowed to challenge the will of the people and put themselves above the expressed will of the people.

Mr. HAMILTON: Are you a home ruler?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Where are they looking for support at the present time? Not in this Chamber—their hopes are centred somewhere else because they know somewhere else is inclined to give them help. I gave those figures about the Labour party, and they got 579 votes more than the Bible in State Schools League got recorded for them, but if we give the Labour party the 791 which they were entitled to of the informal votes—their proportion—and we give the league their proportion of their informal votes, the figures work out this way: The Bible in State Schools League got 78,749 votes, and the Labour party got only 75,598. We have heard it stated that the Act which was passed thirty-five years ago was a piece of splendid legislation which we ought not to disturb. The people of thirty-five years ago with a restricted franchise were more wise in their generation according to members opposite than the people with a less restricted franchise. At that time many men were on more than one roll, and there were only 35,000 names on the rolls of Queensland. That only made 20 per cent. of the population of Queensland at that time. When this vote was taken, our franchise provided for 46 per cent. of the people being on the rolls, and they came to a decision by 53 per cent. of them voting. That represents 23 per cent. of the population of Queensland voting on the question. I think we may dispense with the bogey of sectarianism which the other side are seeking to raise. Nobody is more anxious to stall it off than the Government, and I hope the Government will be determined in their view that, once the people have come to a decision, until that decision is reversed the will of the people must prevail.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: Are you authorised to speak on behalf of the Government?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I am speaking for myself; and I hope the Government will continue on their present course and allow the will of the people to prevail. There is an attempt to make out that we are about to stir up a tremendous amount of sectarianism; but I contend that there is absolutely no need for sectarianism. There is so much in common with all classes of religion that if we take that which is common we can easily avoid any sectarian strife. I will just read the Scripture lessons in the Western Australian curriculum for 1907; and if anyone can find any difference between the Douay version and the authorised version as far as those lessons are concerned, I hope he will let us know what it is—

Infants.—Lessons on the children of the Bible and on the life of Our Lord.

Standard I.—Simple stories from the Book of Genesis. Simple lessons on the leading facts in the life of Our Lord. The Lord's Prayer to be learnt.

Standard II.—Lessons from the life of Moses. Simple lessons from the life of Our Lord. Learn St. Matthew v. 1-12.

Standard III.—Lessons from the lives of Samuel and David; the story of Ruth. Lessons from the life of Our Lord and the following parables:—The Talents, the Good Samaritan, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Piece of Money, the Prodigal Son, the Pharisee and the Publican. Learn the Ten Commandments.

Standard IV.—Lessons from the Pentateuch, with special references to the lives of Abraham,

Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses. Lessons from the Gospel of St. Luke. Learn Psalm 23, and St. Matthew 22nd, 35-40.

Standard V.—Lessons from the Books of Joshua and Judges. Study of the Acts of the Apostles I.-XII. Learn I. Corinthians 13, and Psalm 91.

Standard VI.—Lessons on the life and times of Samuel. Study of the Acts of the Apostles, 43 to end.

I may say with regard to the Acts of the Apostles, that as far as I can judge the Douay version and the authorised version are practically the same. I dare say that hon. members on the other side would scorn to compare them. To show how this has acted in Western Australia, I may say that no one in that State, as far as I know, has raised any objection. As a matter of fact, here is what Mr. McGowen, the leader of the Labour party in New South Wales, says on the question of religious instruction in the schools in that State—

I am a firm believer in our present public school system. Permission is granted to all sections of religion to attend on certain days in the week and impart religious instruction to the children who are of their faith. I believe the opportunity is availed of by most of the ministers. I believe that this is a better and more successful method than expecting the teachers to do it.

That is Mr. McGowen's opinion; and I maintain that if we are honest in this affair we can so shape our legislation as to make no sectarianism enter into it. At the last election we on this side left the question to the people absolutely; and I never heard a greater compliment paid to the leader of a Government than was paid by the Opposition to the Premier when they stated that if he had kept his promise and asked the people to vote against this it would very likely not have been carried. What a compliment to the man they have been opposing all they can!

Mr. LENNON: It was a repudiation of his promise.

Mr. D. HUNTER: If he had only said it, the people would have gone by what he said!

Mr. RYAN: Do you believe that?

Mr. D. HUNTER: No. I believe the religious sentiment was so strong that the vote would have been carried in any case; and if this is not passed after the people have declared themselves at the referendum, the Bible in State Schools League have a tremendous power still behind them.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Is that a threat?

Mr. D. HUNTER: It is not a threat. There were 56 per cent. of men who voted on this question and 49 per cent. of women; and everyone knows that the religious sentiment is much stronger in women than in men. In that way they have a tremendous power to fall back upon; and if this is not carried now, at the next election I am afraid that those women who did not vote before will go into the subject properly and fight the battle harder than it was fought before; and probably 65 per cent. of them will vote instead of being beaten by the men. Is it not better to have it now after the people have decided in its favour and have it passed by a Ministry which we know have not gone in for sectarianism, but who are wanting to pass this Act and avoid sectarianism—a Ministry which is much more likely to make lessons which both Roman Catholics and Protestants may agree upon—than to allow it to be the subject of a battle at the next election, when a Government will be called into existence which will be compelled to take up a sectarian attitude.

Mr. D. Hunter.]

I believe that it would be far better to pass it now. The Baptist Association, who were opposed to this religious teaching in the schools before, have now declared at their conference that they repudiate the action of our friends on the other side in seeking to oppose it.

Mr. BRESLIN: Let them.

Mr. D. HUNTER: The Baptist Association were against religious instruction in State schools, but the Baptist Association have now determined to let the will of the people prevail.

Mr. LENNON: What do the Calathumpians say?

Mr. D. HUNTER: If we do not abide by the will of the people, then I can only say that our friends on the other side will have made the mistake of their lives.

Mr. LENNON: Why should you worry over that?

Mr. D. HUNTER: I worry for this reason: that they worried me terribly before.

Mr. LENNON: And we will worry you again, too.

Mr. D. HUNTER: I know you will if you can, but I do not ask for any quarter from my friends on the other side.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. HUNTER: I will never ask it, and I do not want it. (Hear, hear!) I was able to get in without their assistance, but if I do go out I will go out true to [7.30 p.m.] the pledges which I have given to the electors, and no outside organisation will ever influence my vote in order to force me to break my pledges.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. D. HUNTER: Every issue of the *Worker* that comes out calls on members here to defy the people.

Mr. LENNON: And the *Courier* is calling on you to do their bidding every day.

Mr. D. HUNTER: And the *Worker* is still calling upon them. They are turning the handle, and we can see the result. They ground out one who at the beginning of the session said he was going to vote for it, and they have squeezed him so much that he is now going to vote at the bidding of the caucus.

Mr. BRESLIN: Whom do you mean?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Yet we are told that hon. members on the other side have their own consciences to guide them in this matter—that they are dictated to only by their own consciences on this matter. The hon. member for Bundaberg said that in his organisation he had 1,200 votes behind him. Why is it, then, that the votes cast against the referendum only totalled 765, while the votes cast in favour of it totalled 1,223? Why do not the figures for the referendum in Bundaberg agree with the figures which the hon. member has given? They have tried everything. They have argued from every standpoint to show that if they only had the chance they could have reversed the decision. Well, some day they may come over here.

Mr. ALLEN: And we will reverse it quick and lively.

Mr. D. HUNTER: They will reverse it only if the people of Queensland allow them to reverse it. I have not the slightest doubt that when they come over here they will not try to befool the people. I hope that this

[Mr. D. Hunter.

question will pass, and that we will avoid as much as we possibly can any attempt to stir up sectarianism as our friends on the other side are trying to do.

Mr. LENNON: You ought to be ashamed to say it.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*): When I was last on the hustings I declared my position in connection with this measure in a very emphatic manner. I told my electors that I did not believe in religious teaching in the State schools for the reason that I did not believe it to be a good thing either in the interests of religion or the State. I also assured them that in my opinion it was a question which should not be referred to a referendum, and I said that, even if the referendum were carried, and a Bill brought into this Chamber to carry out the provisions of that referendum to introduce religious teaching into our State schools, that my vote would be cast against it, because I did not recognise that the majority had the right to override the consciences of the minority. On that standing I was elected to this Chamber. I should like to know how the Minister for Public Instruction or the Premier or any other member in this Chamber can even expect my vote. The people knew my stand perfectly well, and yet they elected me. In my electorate there were more votes cast for me than were cast altogether on this question. I think the Minister said that there were 41.9 votes cast in the Bulloo electorate on this question. Well, in my case I got 422 votes out of a total of 1037, leaving out the informal votes, which means more than 41.9 per cent. I listened very carefully to the arguments for and against this Bill during the debate, and I have heard absolutely no reason brought forward in favour of the provisions of this Bill. All we heard is that we should pass this Bill because it has been carried by a majority of the people. Well, in the first place, it is not correct to say that it has been carried by a majority of the people. I think, roughly speaking, there were about 74,000 electors who voted in favour of this proposal. Now, 74,000 is not a majority of the electors of Queensland. We heard to-night that the majority should rule, and that this Bill should pass because the people have declared in its favour. I say, without fear of contradiction, that the people have not declared in its favour, and that 74,000 people do not represent a majority of the electors of this State. We have heard a great deal about the great necessity there was for this religious teaching, and how the people in the far back were crying out for it; and yet, although the Government deprived hundreds of people in the far Western districts of an opportunity of recording their votes against this proposal, still right throughout the West, where the advocates state this proposal was most desired, the people said there in a most emphatic manner that they did not want it. The people there are hard thinkers. They are not carried away on the spur of the moment on catch questions as they are in the cities. I remember seeing in a certain place in Brisbane a placard stuck up with the words, "Vote for God." I heard that same remark used in private conversation. I know for a fact, too, that the same people who advocate this proposal did raise the sectarian cry. They raised the question of one denomination against the other denominations in this matter. Every member of this Assembly who followed this question closely knows very well

that that little dodge was worked, and yet, in spite of all these dodges, in spite of the fact that in every town in the State there was an active organisation for this proposal, and that they were all working, the supporters of the old system, the best system in the world, were active in other directions. Yet, in spite of all that, they only managed to secure 76,000 votes. There is no getting away from the fact that there is a very great gap between the number of votes recorded at the Federal election and the number recorded on this question; and as we are here now in the form of revisers, we are justified in closely examining all the circumstances. The Prime Minister of Great Britain, when speaking on one occasion on the duty of members of Parliament, said—

When you are trying to answer the question as to whether a particular measure is desired or not desired by the people, you are bound to go back to the circumstances of the election.

What were the circumstances of the election in this case? We know that in this proposal we are going right back on our present educational system—we are getting right round. For the last thirty-five years we have had a system of free, secular, and compulsory education, and there is not a single politician in this Chamber to-day who is game to get up outside and denounce that system. If he did, I have not the slightest hesitation in predicting that he would seriously endanger his chance of getting back into the House. There is another peculiar circumstance in connection with this matter, and that is that the great bulk of members in this Chamber, who are supposed to represent the feeling of the community on all public questions, are opposed to the scheme of this Bill. If they voted according to their convictions, they would vote against the Bill, and their only excuse for voting for it is that "we must abide by the result of the referendum." I am going to ask them to vote according to the dictates of their consciences. Let them review the circumstances of the referendum, and say did both sides get a fair chance. Everyone must admit that the prominent opponents of this measure were actively engaged in other matters at the time of the referendum. We had the Federal elections on, a referendum on the financial agreement, and a referendum on the State debts, and those things took up the attention of the more prominent opponents of this measure; while, on the other hand, little coteries of those in favour of Bible reading in State schools were actively at work in the various towns. It was practically a case of the judges hearing only one set of pleas. I think that fact, if nothing else, should cause us to go very slowly in this matter. A few minutes ago I alluded to the fact that there was a great discrepancy between the number of votes recorded at the Federal election and the number of votes recorded at this referendum. I have been wondering why that was the case. In an utterance which was made here some time ago by the Premier, I have found one reason, which we should weigh very carefully. Speaking on the Referendum Bill last year, *Hansard*, page 410, the Premier said—

It is a better thing—and a far wiser thing—to remit a question of this kind to the electors, who can vote as they want to. Every person in this House, as well as outside, will have his full rights as a citizen to persuade his fellow-citizens to vote this way or that way as he thinks fit.

Mr. HARDACRE: To enter into a controversy.

1910—41

The PREMIER: But to those who think that the community ought not to settle this question, I would point out to them that, as a matter of conscience, they ought not to vote on the referendum. They ought to abstain from voting on the referendum altogether.

I contend that we have very great reason for believing that a number of people followed the advice of the Premier—they did not believe that the question should be referred to the people, and consequently did not vote at the referendum. Later on, in the Committee stage of the Bill, the Premier said—

They had better leave the matter to the people, and let the representatives of the people in that House afterwards settle what was the right thing to do. That was the honest and democratic way of dealing with the matter.

Yet, in the course of this debate the hon. gentleman has told us that we have no right to review the decision at the referendum, that we have no right to do anything except to act the part of voting machines. During that same discussion on the Referendum Bill, the hon. gentleman stated his intention of actively opposing the proposal to introduce Bible reading into State schools, but we find that he did not do that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Don't forget that the quotation you have given was from a speech made by the Premier on an amendment to the effect that the poll should not take effect unless 50 per cent. of the electors on the roll recorded their votes.

Mr. ALLEN: The Premier said—

They had better leave the matter to the people, and let the representatives in that House afterwards settle what was the right thing to do. That was the honest and democratic way of dealing with the matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: To be absolutely fair, you should read the whole of what he said.

Mr. ALLEN: The hon. gentleman practically admitted that this House had the right to review the decision at the referendum. I should like the Minister for Education to show if I have been unfair in the other quotation I made, in which the Premier advised those people who did not believe in the question being referred to the people not to vote. We know that for the State election—I am speaking from memory—70 per cent. of the electors voted, while on this question, which was every bit as important as a State election, only 53 per cent. recorded their votes. The difference is quite large enough to change the majority in favour of religious teaching in State schools into a minority. I do not think this question has been dealt with in a fair manner at all. Last year the Premier brought down a proposal to alter the date of the referendum. Many members on this side of the House, and some on the other side, wanted to make other alterations in the measure, but we were not allowed to do so. Because it appeared that we were strong enough to do it, the Premier dropped the Bill altogether. So that, even if we ignore this referendum altogether, we are not stultifying ourselves in any way, because this Parliament is not the Parliament that was responsible for sending the question to the people. When the matter was brought up, we were deprived of the right of saying how it should be dealt with.

Mr. MACARTNEY: In consequence of your own opposition.

Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

Mr. ALLEN: Not my opposition. The hon. member is attempting to put me in a false position. When the Bill was brought in I think it was the hon. member for Leichhardt who moved an amendment which would have allowed us the opportunity of moving other amendments in the old Bill. That proposition was only defeated by one or two votes, and because we got so close to the Premier's numbers, he dropped the measure altogether, and did not give us a chance of making any alterations.

Mr. MACARTNEY: Owing to your own obstruction.

Mr. ALLEN: It appears to me that the Government think that if we want to carry any of our own ideas we should go down on our bended knees to the Premier. If we move any amendments, they are obstructive. I hope the hon. member will quote that as a case of obstruction when next he refers to the obstructive tactics of the Labour party from the platform.

Mr. MACARTNEY: You do not always know what you are asking.

Mr. ALLEN: If that is the case, I would be something like the Premier. The Secretary for Public Instruction when introducing the Bill—which looks a very simple, harmless, little thing—

Mr. LENNON: It is like poison.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes; it is just like a grain of strychnine—it will have the effect of revolutionising our educational system. When the hon. gentleman was introducing the Bill, he did not tell us what he was going to cut out of the syllabus. Another very important thing is that, when the question was referred to the people, they were not told what was going to be cut out of the syllabus. They were kept in the dark.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Bill is exactly on all-fours with the question which was submitted to the people.

Mr. ALLEN: My contention is that, if the people had been given fuller information, and had been informed what part of the present syllabus is going to be cut out, the result of the referendum would have been very different, even with those people who went to the poll. But that was not done. This House—which the Premier said in 1908 should review all the circumstances and do the right thing—is asked to pass the Bill without being told what part of the syllabus is going to be thrown overboard. I dare say that the Rev. Archdeacon Garland and other educational authorities of his type told the people that there would be no need to make any alteration. I feel certain that that was the impression in the minds of many people. Such being the case, it just shows how incompetent the people were to judge on the question. Nobody would ever think of bringing in a dozen men from the street to a sick man and accepting a majority verdict from them against the advice of a qualified doctor. Yet that is what was done here. The people did not understand all the conditions that were attached to the proposal, and now the Government propose to carry out that verdict, although the majority of the members of this House are opposed to the change. Apart from that, I should say that the majority of those people who are competent to speak on educational questions in this State are also opposed to the change. I should like to ask the Secretary for Public Instruction what is the opinion of the great majority of the teachers in the

service of the department? I know from my long connection with the department that the teachers are almost unanimously against this change. The teachers and the inspectors complain already about the syllabus being overloaded, and yet there is another great burden going to be put on the shoulders of those officials. Up to the present there has been no religious test, and teachers have entered the service on that understanding. They have been trained in their profession, and some of them have given a great part of their lives to it on the understanding that it was a secular system. Now, by one swoop, we are going to alter the whole position. What is going to be the position of those teachers? Is the Minister going to make any provision for them at all? Supposing the majority of the teachers object on conscientious grounds to giving these religious lessons, is the hon. gentleman going to sack them and make room for untrained teachers? Is he going to place religious teaching first and all the rest afterwards? Are these teachers to receive no consideration at all? No matter how it is put, it will end in this—that the man who conscientiously objects to giving religious teaching is going to be penalised if this Bill is passed. Perhaps he will be transferred to Cape York or some other out-of-the-way place. That is the way they will be penalised. Another very im-

[8 p.m.] portant question is this: Why should the taxpayer who does not believe in this teaching be called upon to pay for something he does not believe in? We have seen in other parts of the world men go to gaol before they would pay taxation for teaching religions or creeds that they did not believe in. Disguise it how Ministers will, there is no getting away from the fact that many of the taxpayers of Queensland are going to be called upon to pay for religious teachings that they do not believe in. The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat read out a list of lessons which he said could be accepted by both Protestants and Roman Catholics.

Mr. MACINTOSH: He is no authority.

Mr. ALLEN: Even admitting that Protestants and Roman Catholics could accept that, are they the only people in the community? Why should the Mohammedan have to pay for these teachings that he does not believe in—or the Jew or the Buddhist or the agnostic? And then, again, even amongst Protestants and Catholics, this is not accepted, although the hon. gentleman tried to make out that they could accept these lessons. Anyone knows that there are a great number among the Protestant denominations—not necessarily parsons—but there are a great many Protestants who conscientiously object to State aid to religion. A great section of the Protestant community are opposed to the proposal, and hon. members know it. I, for one, object to any dogmatic religious teachings. I object to religion being taught in the same way that two and three are five. I am opposed to religious dogmas, and I object to paying for these religious lessons. I object to my child going into the public school—(laughter)—and, perhaps, being placed in charge—although I will take every care that my child—(renewed laughter)—or my family, when they grow up, will receive religious instruction in the home and the church and Sunday school. I certainly object to them being sent to a State school to be placed in a class for religious instruction, which will be given, say, by an

[Mr B. F. S. Allen

Anglican or by a Roman Catholic, or, worst of all, by an atheist. There may be a shrug of the shoulder or a sneering manner in giving the lesson. A teacher can give his pupils the idea that the whole question is all rot, or he can lead them towards a course of thinking unconsciously, which I, as the parent of that child, do not accept. A Roman Catholic would naturally show bias towards the Roman Catholic teaching—even if he was trying to do a fair thing all round he would unconsciously do that—the Anglican the same, and the Baptist the same; and try and disguise it as we may, there is not the slightest doubt that the whole thing would end in chaos. I do not think that our community would be more religious than it is at the present time; on the other hand, I think it would be worse.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bulloo has occupied the time allowed by the Sessional Order, and he must resume his seat, unless it is the will of the House that he be further heard.

Mr. LENNON: In accordance with the Sessional Order, I move that the hon. member for Bulloo be granted an extension of time for the purpose of being further heard.

Question—That the hon. member for Bulloo be granted extension of time—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 23.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Mann
" Breslin	" May
" Collins	" Mulcahy
" Crawford	" Mullan
" Douglas	" Murphy
" Foley	" McLachlan
" Hamilton	" Payne
" Keogh	" Ryan
" Land	" Theodore
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Douglas and Mr. Land.

NOES, 34.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kidston
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Booker	" Morgan
" Bouchard	" Pasol
" Brennan	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philp
" Corser	" Rankin
" Cribb	" Roberts
" Decham	" Somerset
" Forrest	" Swayne
" Forsyth	" Thorn
" Fox	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Grayson and Mr. Roberts.

Resolved in the negative.

* Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I desire to say a few words on this question before it goes to a vote, although I think my views on it are pretty well known to the House. I have always opposed this measure every time it has come up in this Chamber, and when I was out in my electorate, before the elections, I told my constituents that I would oppose it at every stage. I am going to carry out that promise, and oppose it. I gave no promise to the Rev. Garland or to anyone else that I would support it, although the Rev. Garland wrote to me just the same as he wrote to other hon. members, but I destroyed his letter, and never answered it.

The reason I take up this stand is this: I have seen this system conducted years ago, when I was a boy at school in Victoria.

Mr. KEOGH: I remember you when you were a boy there.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes, that was when the hon. member for Rosewood first knew me. I saw this thing in operation in Victoria, and then I knew it raised a sectarian feeling, even amongst the children. Apart altogether from the sectarian lines, I look upon it this way: Our present curriculum is pretty well over-crowded now. Any parent who has children attending the State schools now knows very well that after the children come home at night there is another hour or an hour and a-half occupied in learning lessons and going through their exercises, which should be occupied by the children in the playground. Not only is the curriculum over-crowded already, but we have the temperance people crying out that they want temperance principles taught in our public schools. Then there are others who wish hygiene taught in the schools. Then, again, we have another section crying out for the elements of agriculture to be taught in the schools. We know very well that every year a lot of the State school teachers go away to the Gatton College—spend their recess, I think, at Gatton College getting instruction in agriculture, which they are supposed to impart to their pupils later on. As I said before, we have the Bible League trying to carry its point, and we will have the temperance people coming along asking for an addition to the curriculum, and then we will have this hygiene, and agriculture, and all those things. Although these propositions will add to the curriculum, yet we are going to take away some of the time the children have at the present time—an hour is to be taken away by the parsons during school hours. I say it is impossible to teach the children all those subjects, unless you are going to put the children to the risk of having a breakdown in their constitutions by over-teaching. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Woolloongabba that one or two other hon. members on this side of the House who have pledged themselves to vote for the Bible in State schools are breaking their pledges, and he was trying to ridicule the idea of them obeying instructions they had received from their political organisations. If it came from any other hon. member on that side of the House who had been politically consistent—consistent in following any one party—I would not have taken exception to it, but when those criticisms come from an hon. member who was once the high priest of the Labour party in the Woolloongabba electorate, I think his criticisms come in very bad grace. What I want to point out is this: That I do not regard the poll that was taken as a fair expression of the will of the people or the opinion of the people, even if I believed in a poll being taken on a religious question, which I do not believe. I believe myself this question should never have been submitted to the people. While there are many questions of public importance that should be referred to the people, I say this is not one of them; and, what is more, although there are a great many members on the other side now who state they are going to vote for this, and believe in it, yet when the question of the referendum came up there were only two members on that side of the House who said

Mr. Hamilton.]

they believed in the principle of religious teaching in State schools. They were the senior member for Townsville and the present Minister for Public Instruction. Nearly every other member on that side of the House spoke against it, and none of them believed in religious teaching in State schools. The manner in which the poll was taken was not a fair one. Take the electorate I represent: There are not half the polling booths in that electorate at Federal elections that there are at State elections, and only where there was a polling-booth for the Federal elections was a polling-booth established for the taking of the referendum on the Bible in State schools, and a great many people in that electorate never had an opportunity of recording their vote either for or against it. Those who had an opportunity of voting—a majority of them recorded their votes against the present proposition. I have spoken to a good many people since, some of them down here, who voted for this proposition, and they stated they did not know when they were voting that they were voting to allow the parson to go into the schools. They thought they were only voting for religious teaching to be given by the teachers, or lessons from the Bible to be read in the schools, as suggested by the hon. member for Woolloongabba. They said if they had had any idea at all that the parson would be allowed in the schools, they certainly would have voted against it.

Mr. PAYNE: There were half a dozen questions before the electors at that time.

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes. Another thing that militated against an expression of opinion was that the question of the Bible in State schools was over-shadowed by the larger questions that were agitating the minds of the people at the Federal elections. There were two or three questions of large national importance—the question of the State debts and others—which overshadowed this question. And there was no one working against the Bible in State Schools League, who had their organisers and their people trying to drag people into their net.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Was there any organ working on your side?

Mr. HAMILTON: To a very small extent, I think, the *Worker* took the matter up. I think it was taken up more with matters affecting the Federal elections at the time. Since the elections it has gone into the matter more. If we pass the second reading of the Bill and get into Committee, there should be a conscience clause inserted, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Bulloo. A few weeks ago Archdeacon Garland, writing to the Press, strongly deprecated the idea of a conscience clause for teachers. Why should he do that? If a teacher does not believe in the Bible—and I suppose there are any amount of men in the public service who are atheists or agnostics or something of that sort—I think it would be wrong to force them to give Scripture lessons.

Mr. KROGH: Don't you know the reason is because they have not the proper earmark, my friend?

Mr. HAMILTON: I am glad to see that on this occasion the hon. member for Rosewood has the proper earmark. If this is carried, I think that after a year or two's trial of the system there should be another referendum

to give the people a chance of saying whether they are in favour of continuing this alteration of our State school system.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You don't believe in the referendum?

Mr. HAMILTON: I say that if this is forced down the throats of the people, they should be given an opportunity later on of saying what they would like to be done. Apart from any question of sectarianism that might arise from the passing of the Bill, I say we are going too far in taking away time that is at present allotted for the teaching of other subjects. Later on we shall, perhaps, have people wanting temperance taught in the schools; and time may be wanted for other subjects as well. I do not say it would be a bad thing to teach temperance principles; but, if the attempt is made to teach the children too much, they will profit very little indeed in the long run. I shall certainly oppose the second reading of the Bill; and if a vote of mine would wreck the measure I would gladly give it to-morrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS (*Cook*): I wish to briefly state that I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill. I voted for the referendum being taken on the subject; but it was apparent to me during the time the matter was being dealt with by the people that a referendum on a religious subject could not be taken without prejudice. I am satisfied that a large section of those who voted in favour of this amendment of our State Education Act—something like 70,000, I understand—were worked up by the Bible in State Schools League; and, in my opinion, those people to a large extent voted in the affirmative believing that a large section of our community were against teaching children the Bible in any shape or form. Though I am against the proposed amendment of our State Education Act, I am one of those who strongly believe that the Bible should be taught to children, and that they should receive as much religious instruction as it is possible to instil into them. But I do not believe that the State should select from the Bible certain lessons to be taught by State school teachers who may, perhaps, be persons professing no religion, and who may have to explain dogmas from which they differ.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Don't you know there is to be no explanation?

Mr. DOUGLAS: The Bill provides that ministers of religion may enter the schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction; and they certainly will teach their own dogmas. I speak as one who attended a State school in New South Wales where religion was taught, and where there was no such thing as children of certain denominations leaving the room when the Bible was taught. The head master gave the Bible lessons himself, and he was held in the highest respect and esteem. I dare say that in many places in this State, particularly in country schools which are attended by scholars of various denominations, there will be no such thing as leaving the school when the minister enters to give religious instruction. There is a good deal to be said in favour of teaching children in their youth the lessons of the Bible; and I want it to be clearly understood that though I oppose the amendment which it is sought to make in our present system, I do not connect it with the intention of excluding children from lessons of the Bible. In my opinion, religion is largely a matter for teach-

[*Mr. Hamilton*

ing in the home and in the churches and Sunday schools to which the children belong. If this measure becomes law, one hour is to be set aside during which a minister of religion can enter the school and give the children of his own denomination religious instruction. I want to know how

[8.30 p.m.] this is going to be worked. Who is to decide how this one hour is to be set aside? Who is to decide whether it is to be one hour per day, one hour a week, one hour a month, or one hour a quarter—who decides that?

Mr. KEOGH: Who decides it? Why, Dill Macky, of course. (Laughter.)

Mr. DOUGLAS: Can the Minister give us any information on this matter? Are the school committees going to decide it? Are they going to set aside the one hour? The curriculum of our State school occupies something like five hours a day.

A LABOUR MEMBER: Four hours.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Four hours, is it? It seems to me, then, that one-fourth of the time is going to be set aside, if it is going to be one hour a day. I do not know if I am correct in that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It does not say one hour a day.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I would like to know what the intention is? Is it to be left to the school committee? What portion of the school curriculum which at present they are being employed in teaching is going to be set aside for the Bible teaching?

Mr. THEODORE: There is no doubt about it their intention is one hour a day.

Mr. DOUGLAS: I want to point out that on our Estimates this year there is the sum of nearly £400,000 which is to be expended in imparting education throughout the State. Now, if we are going to allow one hour a day or one hour a week—I take it that it will be one hour per week. I do not think for one moment that the intention of the Government in introducing this measure is to devote one hour a day out of the present instruction to religious teaching, but it ought to be specified more clearly in the Bill. It may be a matter of detail, but it seems to me at the present time something of a matter of importance. If it means one hour per day, it means—seeing that the Education Estimates amount to £400,000—it means that we will be spending £100,000 a year in imparting religious instruction in our State schools. Something like one-fourth of the population of Queensland take the stand that in religious matters they prefer to have their own denominational schools, where it is possible to establish these schools. I refer particularly to the Roman Catholic schools, and where it is possible to establish these school they do so, and they impart teaching—not only religious teaching, but secular teaching—and they perform the latter work satisfactorily to the education authorities of the State. The State school inspector goes through their course of instruction and the work done in these schools, and, so far as I am able to judge, the education which is imparted at the hands of the Roman Catholic teachers in their own schools compares very favourably indeed, and is on a par with, if not better than, the education imparted in our State schools. (Hear, hear!) Can you expect these people to sit down quietly and expect them to contribute towards the cost of imparting this religious instruction, which, at the ratio of one-fourth of our population, will

come approximately to about £25,000. It seems to me that it is unfair to expect people of a denomination who prefer to impart their own religious instruction, not only to contribute to the cost of the education of their own children but also to bear a share of the cost of teaching lessons from the Bible to children of another denomination than their own. I therefore am of opinion that if this measure becomes law a reasonable amount of assistance, on a per capita basis, might very well be allotted to any denominational school. Mind you, I do not advocate this, because I believe that our system of State education should be free, secular, and compulsory, just as it has been for the last thirty-five years in Queensland.

Mr. KEOGH: We Catholics do not want to alter it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: In my opinion it is better that our State school curriculum should be entirely free from any sectarian education. It only leads to strife, and I am afraid that this measure will be the means of raising strife in religious matters in this State, perhaps from this time henceforth. We have been singularly free in Queensland for the last twenty or thirty years from religious turmoil and sectarianism.

Mr. KEOGH: Some of us have suffered from it.

Mr. DOUGLAS: Now that it is going through these stages has commenced the strife which we may expect to continue and increase in force and violence for perhaps another generation. I would prefer to see our system of education remain as it has been—free, secular, and unsectarian. But if the House is going to accept this referendum—and, as I said before, I do not think the people of the State are capable of judging without prejudice on religious matters of this kind—it is not a fair thing to accept the decision of the majority on a religious matter. Everyone is entitled to his own opinion in regard to religion. It is one of those things in which the church and State should be kept separate. You are going to establish practically a State religion, and who is going to decide what lessons are to be imparted to the children? It seems to me that it is going to be entirely in the hands of the Education Department, probably guided and influenced by perhaps—

Mr. ALLEN: Archdeacon Garland.

Mr. DOUGLAS: By ministers of certain denominations, and although they may have as a guide the Bible books in use in New South Wales and other places, still you cannot get away from the fact that you are establishing, to a certain extent, a State religion to be imparted to the scholars attending the State schools. I think that that is a regrettable state of affairs; but, if this Bill is going to become law and pass through its final stages both here and in the Upper Chamber, I consider that unless an amount of money is set aside to denominations who may wish to establish their own schools, you will be doing an injustice to a large section of the community. I am not speaking particularly from the point of view of the Roman Catholic schools. There may be other denominations. There may be those who have no religion at all who might wish to start schools of their own who do not agree with religion being taught in State schools, and there may be other denominations who do not believe in it. All these may start schools of their own. So, if you are going to subsidise religion in any shape or form,

Mr. Douglas.]

you should give the denominations who have their own schools a just share of the taxation which they pay in imparting education to the children. I have occupied all the time I wish to take up on this question. I simply say briefly to this House and to the country that I intend to oppose this measure. Although, perhaps, unfortunately, in our State elections the question of religion may crop up in the future as a result of the passage or rejection of this measure, I am prepared to stand or fall by it. (Hear, hear!) If it be made compulsory that the children be taught the Bible while attending the primary schools, you might very well say that it should be compulsory in the secondary schools.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Don't you know that there is nothing compulsory in it at all?

MR. DOUGLAS: There may be nothing compulsory about it, but at the same time you set apart portion of the time which the people of the State pay for, and I believe it may become customary for all denominations to attend. My experience when attending a State school in New South Wales was that there was no such thing as children withdrawing when religious instruction was being given. One thing which occurred when the Bible lesson was being taught on one occasion fastened itself on my memory. The lesson was in connection with Joshua, and the head master asked the class whose son Joshua was? No one knew but one boy, who said Joshua was the son of Nun, and the boy was forthwith granted a holiday. The fact that he got a holiday for knowing that Joshua was the son of Nun impressed the whole circumstances on my mind. Members of this House have been in receipt of communications from the Bible in State Schools League for the last two or three years. I have had a number of communications from that body, but, notwithstanding that, I have taken up the attitude that I shall stand or fall by my own opinions on the matter, and shall not be swayed one way or the other by outside influences. What I object to in connection with these communications is that members of this House have been subjected to threats during the past two or three months that unless they accede to the wishes of that section of the community who desire to introduce religious instruction into our State schools they will have considerable difficulty in keeping their seats at the forthcoming election. Such threats do not affect me, as I am in a position to place my case before my electors with every measure of confidence. As to my abiding by the decision of the referendum, I can only say that I gave no undertaking, either verbally or in writing, to support this measure. What is more, I know that some of those who were very prominent in advocating the aims and objects of the Bible in State Schools League did not intend to abide by the referendum if the vote had gone in the negative. That I can prove if necessary. I have been in correspondence with the representative of the particular organisation in my own electorate, who has seen fit to intimate to me that unless I vote in favour of this measure I shall receive his opposition at the next election. I have replied to him privately, and all I need say now is that I can prove that ardent supporters of this proposal had no intention of accepting the decision of the people had it been in the negative.

MR. PETRIE (Toombul): It is not my intention to talk at any length on this subject, but

[*Mr. Douglas.*]

I feel it incumbent upon me to say a few words. When the question of the referendum came up in my electorate I stated that I was willing to refer this matter to the people, so that they might say whether they wished to have religious teaching in our State schools or not. Having made that statement, I feel that it is my duty now to vote for the second reading of this Bill. If I chose I could talk for an hour or two on this subject.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, you could not; you would not be allowed.

MR. PETRIE: I beg pardon; I mean that I could talk for half an hour under the Sessional Order. Half an hour is quite enough for any man, and I believe I could say as much in half an hour as some members could say in an hour. Some members have stated that the introduction of this measure is calculated to raise a sectarian feeling. I do not think so, but I think that if we do not pass this Bill after taking a democratic referendum, that will be more likely to give rise to sectarian feeling than the passing of the Bill. The people have declared by a majority of votes that they want religious teaching in State schools, and I say it is the duty of every member now, having voted for the referendum, to see that the will of the people is given effect to. I have in my hand a statement of the "Opinions of Educational Experts from personal experience" on this subject. Perhaps other members may have been supplied with a copy of the same paper. It says—

At a conference of teachers, inspectors, departmental officers, and prominent educationists, held in Sydney in April, 1904, the heads of the various religious denominations within the State were present, and delivered addresses on ethics, civics, and morals, in which the question of religious instruction in our schools was introduced. A copy of this conference report is forwarded under separate cover, and may be of interest to you, especially in connection with the subject under consideration.

I may add that no sectarian difficulties are found in working the clauses of the Public Instruction Act providing for general or special religious instruction to the children attending our State schools. The system has always formed a part of the school routine here, and probably only a very small percentage of parents would like any change made.

During the year 1905 the total number of visits paid to State schools by clergymen or other religious teachers, for the purpose of imparting special religious instruction to children of their own denomination, was 42,481. Detailed information is given in the subjoined table:—

Denomination.	Number of Visits during the Year.
Church of England	23,769
Roman Catholic	797
Presbyterian	7,150
Methodist	7,373
Other denominations	3,387

I have a lot more quotations which I could give, but I do not think it is necessary to read them.

MR. MACKINTOSH: Are they correct?

MR. PETRIE: The hon. member apparently does not believe they are correct. I could quote statistics which are unquestionable, but the hon. member will not believe anything on this subject. I believe the Roman Catholics have sense enough to know that if we pass this Bill, it will not interfere with them in any shape or form. I am not a Roman Catholic.

MR. KEOGH: You ought to be.

MR. PETRIE: I have a mother-in-law who is one. (Laughter.) I do not say that with any disrespect, because I believe she is one of

the finest ladies who ever trod the soil of Queensland—(hear, hear!)—and I would not have said it had not my hon. friend, who, we know, is a very strict Catholic, made that interjection. I merely mention it to show that I am unbiassed in this matter. I agreed to submit this matter to the people for decision, and a large majority in my electorate voted in favour of religious teaching in State schools. When they carried that by a majority, it became my duty to support this Bill. I may have my own opinion regarding the matter; but, if every hon. member carries out his duty honestly and properly, he will vote for the Bill without any trouble. I am sorry that the sectarian cry has been raised, but I have no fear of that cry, because I believe the Bill is bound to pass in spite of what any hon. member may say on the other side, and it will not make the slightest difference to any one of us. I hope those hon. members who have been so persistent in trying to raise the sectarian cry will not continue.

Mr. LESINA: Nobody has raised that cry.

Mr. PETRIE: Yes, they have; members on both sides have been trying to make it a sectarian matter, so as to cast a slur on those of us who say we are bound to act on the decision of the people. It is a very unfair thing for them to try to put the blame on us and raise the sectarian cry.

Mr. LENNON: Well, this is a proselytising measure.

Mr. KEOGH: Some of us never went to the country on the referendum. I never voted for it.

Mr. PETRIE: I went up to help the hon. member for Rosewood at the last election. I am not going to say anything about it, but at one meeting, where nearly every man in the audience was a Roman Catholic, I dealt with the question. I told the hon. member that he would be making a mistake if he did not vote for the referendum, because he would not be committing himself, but would only be leaving it to the people to say whether they would have religious teaching in the State schools or not. The hon. member cannot get away from that fact. I do not want to give him away. (Laughter.) He simply did the proper thing. I explained the position to his electors, and they were all satisfied. I am going to support the Bill all I can. I am pledged to do so, and I shall support it no matter what my own feelings might be one way or the other, and I believe a great many other members are in the same position. I hope the Bill will go through its second reading without much delay.

Mr. KEOGH: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. KEOGH: I wish to make a personal explanation.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be heard?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KEOGH: The explanation I have to make is that the hon. member for Toombul made a certain insinuation. He was through my electorate, and I ask him whether he ever heard me say one word in favour of the Bible in State schools?

Mr. LESINA: No; never. (Laughter.)

Mr. CRAWFORD (*Fitroy*): I am very glad that at last this Bill has come back to us, and that we have an opportunity of discussing it and of getting rid of it. It has been with

us now too long, and we ought to have done with it, so that we can soon see it in operation. I feel quite certain that it is going to pass this House. I know it will, and my vote is being given for it. I have made no bones about that from the very inception of the discussion on the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: What about the platform?

Mr. CRAWFORD: I shall discuss the platform before I finish, to the satisfaction, and perhaps the edification, of the hon. member for Bulloo. The matter is one of very great importance—nobody will deny that. The object of all education is to see that we have healthy, intelligent citizens brought up in our midst, and to see that the children who are going to school are given an education which will fit them to become the rulers of this great and growing State in the future.

Mr. KEOGH: Who?

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member for Rosewood has had his say, and I am endeavouring to have mine.

Mr. KEOGH: I asked you who were going to be the great rulers.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Those who are attending our schools to-day will be the rulers of the future. They will have enlarged intelligence because of the knowledge that will come to them through the operation of this measure; and the knowledge which will come to them through its operation cannot possibly be detrimental to the progress of this State. The Bill has aroused a great deal of criticism—some of it bitter, some of it mild, some of it logical, and some of it quite the contrary. It is quite true that a measure of this kind should be thoroughly criticised, and we are here to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity to discuss measures of so much importance as this. I believe a great deal of misconception has centred round the Bill—misconception which will only waft itself away when the measure comes into operation. There is nothing like the operation of a measure to dispel the delusions which surround its birth. In the first place, I wish to say that in the last Parliament—unfortunately for the good of the country I was not here—(laughter)—the referendum on this question was decided upon, and a considerable number of the most intelligent members of the Labour party voted for it in the full belief that it was the best way of settling the question.

Mr. MAY: I did not vote for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I beg the hon. member's pardon. He is one of the intellectual members who were excepted. (Laughter.) The referendum was voted upon, with what result we all know. It resulted in a great majority in favour of this change in our educational system; and I am firmly of opinion that, were the matter submitted to another referendum, a still greater majority would be in its favour.

Mr. KEOGH: That is where you make a mistake.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Well, I suppose my powers of prophecy are quite equal to those of the hon. member for Rosewood. I reiterate that I firmly believe that, if the measure were once more submitted to the electors, a greater number would vote in its favour.

Mr. KEOGH: You will never come back as a Labour man, old friend.

Mr. CRAWFORD: It is nothing to me whether I come back as a Labour member or whether I do not come back at all. The

Mr. Crawford.]

country will go on, I suppose, whether I am here or not. It may probably get on worse for my absence, but that cannot be helped—(laughter)—and I am not very much troubled whether I come back as a Labour member or whether I do not. I have come here as a representative of the people, and I claim the liberty to express my opinions on what is good and what is consistent with the interests of the people, and what is consistent with the principles of democracy, as I understand them. Now, the result of that referendum, as I have said, is well understood. The referendum principle has always had my support.

Many years before I had any idea [9 p.m.] of becoming a candidate for Parliament, I was supporting the referendum principle, because I saw that it was synonymous with majority rule. I supported it upon that ground, and I consider that whether we have it embodied in our Constitution, or whether we have it simply as a proposal or a method which may be adopted from time to time by Parliament, the principle of the referendum is the same—whether it is on the statute-book, or whether it is within the will of Parliament to arrange for from time to time upon any particular subject. When a pledge came forward to me during the last election—which wisely resulted in sending me to this House—(laughter)—I took it to be one which—to be consistent with the referendum platform I had signed—I could consistently sign, and without worrying myself at all about the matter I signed that pledge, though at the present stage of discussion on this measure I regard it as a somewhat irrelevant circumstance, which will come into operation only when we get into Committee on this Bill. Yet I consider I was perfectly right in signing that pledge. What do we understand when a Bill is submitted to us here for consideration? One thing we must understand is this—that the Bill must be consistent in all its clauses; that one clause must not contradict another. Well, adapting that principle to the Labour platform, I say that one plank of that platform should not contradict another, and yet we find that it is so.

Mr. LESINA: How?

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is at the head of the Labour platform the referendum principle, and further down is the plank in regard to education. Now, it is understood by a large number of Labour supporters throughout the country that such a thing as a change in our educational system which involves the introduction of religion should not be submitted to a referendum.

Mr. KEOGH: Hear, hear!

Mr. CRAWFORD: The hon. member says "Hear, hear!" to it. I hope he will say "Hear, hear!" also to the conclusion of my argument, which is this: That we cannot on one platform have one plank calling for majority rule, and another plank forbidding majority rule.

Mr. LESINA: Majority rule is a good thing except on matters of conscience.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Matters of conscience are matters which I shall deal with before I sit down, and the hon. member will have no cause to complain if he will simply allow me to proceed with my remarks. I may say that I have endeavoured to give some consideration to this matter, and I do not think anyone who knows me intimately will say I am bigoted on this or any other matter. I simply wish to deal with it as I ought to deal with it as a representative of the people. I have asserted

[Mr. Crawford.

—and I leave it to those who have better powers of logic to prove the contrary—that there cannot exist on the one platform a plank calling for majority rule, and another plank forbidding majority rule. And yet that is precisely the position of affairs which has been placed before the country by a large number of those who have been consistently supporting Labour—until this referendum was taking place—when they began to exercise their mental powers and say that those who, like myself, had signed a pledge to support the result of a referendum would be breaking the platform of the Labour party. Now, I hold that I am not breaking the platform of the Labour party.

Mr. ALLEN: Yes; you are.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am agreeing to the will of the majority, as expressed on the referendum.

Mr. ALLEN: On a religious question?

Mr. CRAWFORD: On a religious question! How can you tell people who enjoy adult suffrage that they shall not decide this question, that question, or any other question? You cannot take it out of the hands of the people. You cannot possibly tell a whole people that they shall not agitate for an alteration of the law upon any particular matter. If you can do so, I want to know how. I want to know the precise words which can be incorporated in the Constitution forbidding the people to agitate for a reform of any particular law. That is exactly what I want to know, and when I was, in a manner, invited to explain my attitude before some of my constituents a while ago, I put these questions to them. I asked them how any party could tell a whole people enjoying adult suffrage that they must not agitate for an alteration of a particular law?

Mr. ALLEN: Affecting religion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I got no answer. Then I put the question in a different form. I said, "Supposing Parliament refused to make arrangements for a referendum, how could you prevent the people from so agitating and organising that a particular question would become the real fighting issue of a general election?" There was no answer to that.

Mr. KEOGH: It would be far better to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And so I understand, despite the continuous interjections of the gentlemen on the back bench, that there is no possible way of telling the people that they shall not agitate for the alteration of a particular law. I stand, then, on perfectly democratic ground in saying that I am consistent with the referendum principle—I am consistent with the Labour platform—in taking the stand which I did in regard to this measure; and I believe that whether I had given this pledge to the Bible in State Schools League or not, my thoughts on this question would have led me to take the stand I am taking now.

Mr. KEOGH: Free, compulsory, and secular—is not that the Labour platform?

Mr. CRAWFORD: When I require interpretation of the Labour platform I shall not go to the hon. member for Rosewood. I think I am not under any compulsion to do that.

Mr. ALLEN: But do not go to the Premier.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is another thing I think I might as well say before proceeding

—there is not one plank of the Labour platform which is realisable without the aid of a majority.

Mr. LESINA: Hear, hear! That shows it is the Labour platform.

Mr. CRAWFORD: Not one plank which can be carried into law; and as to the plank with regard to education, does any hon. gentleman think that you can tell the people there shall never be any alteration in that particular law?

Mr. LESINA: No; we do not take up that attitude.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And yet that is the conclusion to be drawn from the arguments which have been used in various places throughout the State—

Mr. LESINA: You argue wrongly.

Mr. CRAWFORD: That there shall never be any alteration in this law, and that the system as it exists now shall not be altered. We cannot carry anything into law without the aid of a majority. We must have that majority; and therefore I say that majority rule—that is the referendum which embodies that principle of majority rule—embraces the whole of the matters in the Labour platform. There is not one matter, therefore, which must not be submitted to the will of the people before it can be carried.

Mr. ALLEN: Religious instruction is not in the platform.

Mr. LESINA: Hear, hear! That is where he goes wrong. He thinks religion is in the platform. The Labour platform contains no religion.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not worrying about the hon. member for Clermont. I do not think he can tell me a great deal about what is in the Labour platform or what can be deduced from the Labour platform. I am just giving my opinion, and I am trying to hammer it into his otherwise dull cranium—that you cannot make an alteration of the law, and that you cannot carry any proposed law into existence, without a majority. That is perfectly clear, and I do not think I need use any further arguments in support of that proposition.

Mr. LESINA: You are using a steam hammer to crush a beetle. (Laughter.)

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is one other matter I wish to say in regard to religious instruction. I am convinced of this, from the attention I have given to the matter: That whether the Labour party likes it or not, and whether hon. members on the Government side like it or not, this matter will come into existence. From time to time there arise feelings—emotions—which influence people in a particular direction, and we find now that there is a distinct tendency towards the introduction of religious instruction in State schools, and I simply, without saying too much on that question, bow to the inevitable, and every party and every individual must bow to the inevitable.

Mr. KEOGH: No man will regret that more than you in the near future.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I shall not regret it at all. In regard to the charges that have been made that this Bill will introduce sectarianism—

Mr. ALLEN: Hear, hear! That is the question.

Mr. LESINA also interjected.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Clermont and the hon. member for Bulloo, who both have had an opportunity of discussing this matter, to refrain from their interjections, and allow the hon. member to pursue the debate in an orderly manner.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am a very slow speaker, and I am endeavouring to cover a lot of ground, and I do not wish to ask for any extension of time. I simply wish to go over this important matter, and when the Committee stage of the Bill is reached, I shall have a few more words to say. In regard to sectarianism, I do not at all believe that this Bill is going to accentuate sectarianism. When we remember that our population is being constantly recruited from those older countries in which the traditions of the religious persecutions are enduring, we must see that there must always be here the latent elements of sectarian warfare. When we reflect—and I would ask hon. members to thoroughly reflect on this matter—when we see from time to time that the secular papers which are denouncing sectarianism never for one moment bring up the Roman Catholics for ridicule but always the Protestant clergymen—we see the way in which sectarianism is perpetuated. I say without fear of contradiction—

Mr. LESINA: There are very few amongst the Roman Catholics.

Mr. CRAWFORD: There is Cardinal Moran and others—

Mr. KEOGH: You cannot point to one as bad as Dill Macky.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I am not called upon to contrast the characters of Dill Macky and Cardinal Moran at all, but I do say sectarianism is perpetuated by the methods of those who think they are putting it down. Sectarianism feeds upon what some people think should destroy it. It is kept alive by a variety of methods, and will be kept alive for many years because of this fact. However much we may philosophise about this, that, or the other religion, custom and tradition are stronger than philosophy, and will survive, and there will always be the latent elements of an outbreak of sectarian warfare. We need not think we are going to kill it—the seeds of sectarianism are always amongst us.

Mr. KEOGH: You are going to create it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: The debate that has preceded my little interruption of it, will do more to create sectarianism than the facts which I am quoting. I think the best way to suppress sectarianism is to tell the truth about it, and I am endeavouring to tell the truth about it. It has been said that this system in New South Wales, and wherever it has prevailed, has been fruitful in producing crime. Crime is not committed by any denomination; it is committed by individuals under every variety of influence and every variety of temptation. The majority of mankind is not like members of this House—always under the control of cold, calm, reason. They break out from time to time in strong eruptions and various crimes, and these cannot be traced to any religious teaching. They are the result of a thousand and one impulses, motives, and objects. Let me go further: It has been pointed out that, if the Bible is taught to children in the State schools, the most prurient and objectionable passages in it will be put forward for their education. I ask, Is it reasonable to suppose that the school teachers, in any State in the

Mr. Crawford.

Commonwealth, will be so wanting in their sense of duty to the children under their charge as to submit the worst portions of any book in order to instruct the children in it?

Mr. LESINA: I do not believe it.

Mr. CRAWFORD: I say they would not. Then why is it that the hon. member for Rosewood and others in the House and outside have made use of this argument—that if the Bible was submitted, those portions of it which show the infirmity and weakness of human nature in past times will be held forward for instruction in the State schools? The logic is humiliating. That argument, I think, is absolutely disgusting, and I am astonished that any man at all could make use of such logic. Are we, if we visit a big town, to confine our gaze and our hearing to the sights and sounds of the slums, and to forget all the beauties of the galleries and architecture? If we take up any book of poetry, are we to search, with every degree of curiosity, for the most purulent and repulsive passages? I say that is not so. We take the bad with the good. We adjust the balance, and see that the weight comes down on the good side in nearly every case. (Hear, hear!) I know I shall be taken to task for the attitude I have taken up on this question, but I have satisfied my conscience in some degree by taking up this attitude. I have thought very deeply and honestly on the question, and in the time allotted to me I have endeavoured to place before the House what my views are. There is just one other matter, and it is this: I am quite satisfied there is a large number of the children in this State who know nothing whatever of the Bible.

Mr. ALLEN: That is no credit to the parsons.

Mr. CRAWFORD: And the time may come when they will be called upon in the court of law to give that religious sanction to moral obligations which are therein required, and how can they give the proper sanction by holding the Bible in their hand when they know nothing whatever of its contents? I say it is a good thing for children to know something about a book which, more than any other book that was ever read or printed or heard of, has influenced for good the whole of this universe.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CRAWFORD: I feel called upon, in further justification of my attitude, to say that the division which took place in the last Parliament on the question of sending this matter to a referendum, the following members of the Labour party voted for the platform:—

Messrs. Bowman, Huxham, Mulcahy, Mullan, Nevitt, Ryland and Winstanley.

We all deplore the absence of Mr. Bowman, and hope to see him back again in health and vigour.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CRAWFORD: On this subject, he said the referendum was the best means of settling this vexed question. I do not wish to say anything about an absent man. I have a very great respect for Mr. Bowman, and am extremely sorry that he is afflicted with sickness. I would very much like to see him here, because I would be able to say things in justification of my attitude which I do not think proper to say now. I am glad the matter has reached this stage; and I feel certain that when the Bill has been in operation

[Mr. Crawford.]

for a few years we shall not worry about it. In New South Wales, where I was brought up, and where I spent thirty years of a more or less profitable life, this system was in vogue all the time. It has been in vogue so long that it is taken as a matter of course. No one worries about it, and the Labour party in that State is not trying to abolish it. I think we may take it from the experience of the older State that we have nothing to lose by permitting this measure to become law, because in a few years we shall be devoting our attention to matters affecting wages and other conditions affecting the welfare of the people, whilst our educational system proceeds on its way quietly and successfully. I am pleased to have had the opportunity of expressing my sentiments on this important measure. (Hear, hear!)

* Mr. BRENNAN (*Rockhampton North*): After the very able speech delivered by the hon. member who has just sat down, I think there is no need for me to detain the House long. Members on this side are not concerned with the attitude of the Labour party as far as this matter is concerned. They have discussed the question, and opposed it from conscientious scruples, and from the idea that it was an inefficient referendum; also from the point of view that if the proposed amendment of the law is adopted, it will take away from the time devoted to the subjects now embraced in the school curriculum. I do not think one hour in the week would make any material difference in that respect. I read a statement the other day in reference to an examination lately held in Brisbane, from which it appeared that the first five or six places and the eleventh place were gained by pupils of the Christian Brothers. I do not think any hon. gentleman opposite who is a Roman Catholic will tell me that the Christian Brothers do not teach religion in their school. If so, it cannot be said that the time so occupied takes away from the efficiency of the instruction imparted in other subjects. Another point for consideration is that religious instruction will not be given to the children whose parents object—only to those whose parents are willing that they should attend. As for the efficiency of the referendum, I do not think this Parliament is justified in raising any objection to that referendum, because there are fifty-two members of this House who were members of the last Parliament, which put through the Referendum Bill. I think it is only fair to state that there are members now in the House—some on this side and some on the other side—who consistently opposed that Bill in all its stages. And I think it would be fair of me to name

those gentlemen, so that their [9.30 p.m.] present actions may not be misunderstood. I will read the names of their electorates as well. They are: The hon. member for Bundaberg, Mr. Barber; the hon. member for Warrego, Mr. Coyne; the hon. member for Gregory, Mr. Hamilton; the hon. member for Leichhardt, Mr. Hardacre; the hon. member for Balonne, Mr. Land; the hon. member for Herbert, Mr. Lennon; the hon. member for Clermont, Mr. Lesina; the hon. member for Cambooya, Mr. Mackintosh; the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McLachlan; the senior member for Ipswich, Mr. Maughan; the hon. member for Flinders, Mr. May; and the hon. member for Mitchell, Mr. Payne. I think it is only right that the names of these hon. gentlemen should be mentioned in this

House, so that those outside may not misunderstand their position. With the exception of those gentlemen—

Mr. ALLEN: And the new members. Don't forget them. The members who came in at the last election.

Hon. R. PHILP: He is only dealing with the fifty-two.

Mr. BRENNAN: Twelve of the members now members of this House voted consistently against the referendum, and, of course, they are consistently now opposing the passage of this Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: There are other members in the same position.

Mr. BRENNAN: It happened that in connection with the referendum which was taken on the 13th of April we on this side of the House are in the position that every electorate which every member on this side of the House represents voted in favour of the introduction of religious instruction in State schools. Also there are thirteen members on the Opposition side of the House whose electorates voted "Yes" on the question, and there are eighteen electorates represented on the other side of the House which voted "No" at the referendum. So if the position taken up by the hon. member for Barcoo be the correct one, that those whose electorates voted against this question should vote "No"——

Mr. RYAN: I did not say that.

Mr. BRENNAN: You did, or words to that effect.

Mr. RYAN: Point out where I said that.

Mr. BRENNAN: If every hon. member in the House takes up the same attitude, then there will be no doubt whatever as to the fate of this Bill in this House. But there are hon. gentlemen opposite who, notwithstanding the fact that their electorates voted "No" on the referendum, are prepared to vote quite the contrary. I have no fault to find with any man who takes up that stand. I can only say that in my opinion he is acting under a mistake. But that is for himself. Hon. gentlemen opposite also argue that as so few voted at the late referendum, therefore, the referendum should not be honoured in this House. I think it is only right to take it in this way: Switzerland is, I understand, a country which is actually the mother of the referendum. Now, in our State, over 53 per cent. of the electors of Queensland voted at the referendum of 13th April last. That is not considered enough to validate a referendum according to some hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, I have here a London paper, one of the most respectable weeklies in London, and anything appearing in it is credited. It gives here the result of the referendum votes in Switzerland from 1897 to 1908—a period of twelve years. In that time fifteen—shall I say referendums or referenda—were taken. The first was taken on the 28th of February, 1897. I need not read what the proposals were, but I shall give the percentages of voters. There is a table here giving the date of polling, subject, votes on the register, votes cast, and proportion per cent. to the total electorate. The first referendum showed that 63 per cent. of the total votes in the electorate were cast. The next two were about 34 per cent., then followed 77 per cent., 50.2 per cent., 65.9 per cent., 44.7 per cent., 72.6 per cent., 50 per cent., 36.5 per cent., 50 per cent., 74 per cent., and 44.6 per cent. In point of fact, the majority of the referenda are considerably under that of Queensland. Now, if these are

considered valid in Switzerland, when the percentage is down as low as 36.5 per cent. and 34 per cent., while ours is as high as 53.27 per cent., I do not think that the arguments of those hon. gentlemen who depreciate or attempt to depreciate our referendum hold good. I am not dealing with the subject of religious instruction in State schools at all. I simply intend dealing with the matter of the referendum to show that in other States a referendum is valid, and in Switzerland 36 per cent. is sufficient.

Mr. RYAN: Do you believe in Bible in State schools?

Mr. BRENNAN: Yes; I do.

Mr. FOLEY (*Townsville*): I do not intend to take up much time on this matter, having said all I want to say on this question on the Address in Reply, when our attention was called to the fact that this Bill would be brought forward at a later stage in the session. However, I would like to be able to say a few words, because I do not like to give a silent vote on the question. I think I made myself fairly plain when I last spoke on this matter, when I said that whenever the opportunity arose and I had the chance of voting on this vexed question I should most certainly vote against the introduction of religious teaching into the State schools. On that occasion I stated that my principal reason for objecting to this Bill was that it makes provision for ministers of religion entering State schools during school hours and preaching the doctrines of their religion to the children. I am not an objector to religious teaching. I am one of those who believe that there is not sufficient religious teaching in this world, and that if we had more Christian teaching and more Christian practice we should not have so much trouble, strife, and destitution as there is at the present time. My principal objection to the measure is that it allows the parsons to go into schools and teach their different doctrines and dogmas to the children. As I said on a former occasion, I should be satisfied if the parsons themselves could agree on the religion they want taught in State schools. There are 101 or 103 religions in the world. We have in our own community several religions or denominations, the representatives of which differ among themselves as to which is the right way to teach children. We have the Methodists, the Wesleyans, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Seventh Day Adventists, the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, and a number of others, who, as the hon. member for Moreton says, are all aiming for the one goal, but they have different roads of getting there, and they generally squabble among themselves as to which is the right road. For that reason I would not allow the parsons to enter the State schools for the purpose of teaching religion. We have every reason to believe that the children taught under the present system work amicably together and come out of school the best of friends, as they went in. The Bill provides that any parent who objects to his children being taught by a particular parson may withdraw them from the class during the hour of religious instruction. That will lead to many people who are sceptical about different religions insisting on their children being withdrawn during the time of religious instruction, and that means breaking up the classes and sending some children into the school yard or into some other room until the religious instruction is finished.

Mr. Foley.

That will cause the children to cast slurs upon one another—to call one another "old Baptist" or "old Wesleyan"—and the result will be strife among them. That strife will not end with the children, but will be carried into the homes of the children, and the parents will be brought into the trouble. It has been stated in this House that there is no great demand for an alteration of the education system now in force in New South Wales. The system there has been in vogue for many years, and, as the hon. member for Fitzroy said, it is now taken as a matter of course. But I say that wherever there is religious teaching allowed in State schools there is a demand for an alteration of the system. There is bickering among the parsons in New South Wales, and even in the old country, over the question of teaching religion in State schools; and in the old country even the parsons are beginning to see that the proper solution of the question is to do away with religious instruction, and have secular instruction only. For many years there has been an agitation going on in New South Wales to do away with the present system of religious education in State schools.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The evidence is that it is satisfactory.

Mr. FOLEY: The hon. gentleman's evidence is drawn from persons who are paid by the Education Department, and, of course, they are naturally expected to report that it is satisfactory when they are called upon by the Minister to report on the matter. I do not place very much confidence in such reports as the hon. gentleman has. I have read them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You certainly have not read mine.

Mr. FOLEY: I have read reports from the people the hon. gentleman has got his reports from.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; I got mine direct from the department.

Mr. FOLEY: I take it that the hon. gentleman's reports are from teachers employed by the New South Wales Government, who have been asked to report on the educational system prevailing in that State. I am of opinion that those men have been compelled to give a satisfactory report, whether they approved of the system or not, otherwise their job would very likely be interfered with. The fact is that there has been an agitation going on for many years to do away with the present system of religious instruction in State schools in New South Wales. We had a similar system in vogue in Queensland for many years, but it was found so unsatisfactory that Parliament, on the advice of Sir Charles Lilley and others of that ilk—men who were more fit to discuss the question than we are to-day—insisted on altering the system and establishing a secular system of education. From all the evidence that is available we find that the present system is working smoothly, and that there are no complaints about it. Then why alter it? The Minister has not brought forward one reason why the present system should be altered.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He brought forward a very important reason—namely, that the people to whom the question was submitted said it should be altered.

Mr. FOLEY: The affirmative vote at the referendum was got by the parsons of the churches going round to the women and

[*Mr. Foley.*

pleading with them not to cast their votes against God and the Bible. They got at the hearts of the women and secured their votes.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And yet the percentage of men who voted was much greater than the percentage of women.

Mr. FOLEY: Not much greater. It was the women's vote that carried the referendum.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: If you take my advice, you will always try to get the women's vote.

Mr. FOLEY: I always do. There is no doubt that, if the referendum had been submitted at some other time than at a general election, it would have been carried the other way, because a large majority of the people never took the trouble to vote at all. Scores and scores of people in my electorate who voted for the Federal candidates and in the Federal referenda, refrained from voting on this question. They said that it was a question of conscience, and they would not allow anybody to dictate to them how they should worship God. The Secretary for Public Instruction has, therefore, nothing to pride himself upon, because, if the people had taken sufficient interest to vote, I am satisfied there would have been a large majority the other way.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Your trouble is that they took too much interest in it.

Mr. FOLEY: It is not. Compared with the number of votes recorded in the Federal election, the number of those who voted in the Bible in State schools was very much less in every town in Queensland—not more than half in some places. Then we know that, whilst 74,000 or 76,000 voted in favour of the Bible in State schools, and 53,000 or 54,000 voted against it, 120,000 of those on the rolls never voted at all, so that there is nothing to boast about. They certainly got a majority of the votes polled; but if the votes that were not polled had been polled, I think the majority would have been considerably the other way. The hon. member for Fitzroy seems to justify himself for voting for the Bill because the Labour party has a referendum plank in its platform. Now, the Labour party has also a plank which says that education shall be free, secular, and compulsory—higher, optional, lower, compulsory. I have recognised that platform for more than twenty years. I had the honour of being one of those who drew up the first platform, and that plank was inserted in the first platform. There was no fear at that time of there being a referendum on the Bible in State schools question in the near future, but we knew that there was an agitation going on. There has been an agitation going on for many years in Queensland, and previous Governments have been asked to bring in a Referendum Bill; but, to the honour of the Philp Government and previous Governments, they would never entertain the idea.

Hon. R. PHILP: We promised one.

Mr. FOLEY: I did not know that. Anyhow, like many other promises that old Government used to make, it was never carried out. A referendum has been asked for for many years, but there never was a Government until the present one that was weak enough to bow to the wishes of the Bible in State Schools League. That referendum was granted, and the vote taken was not a satisfactory one. Our party, as I

understand them, have always been against a referendum on this question. We admit that it is a question for individuals and not for majorities at all. We say every man has a right to worship God in his own way. If all the other members of this House said they had an idea of how God should be worshipped, I should claim the right to worship Him in my own way. The most impressive sermon I ever listened to was on the text, "Prepare to meet thy God." The parson told his congregation that, when the Day of Judgment came, every man had to meet his God and give an account of his life, and that there was to be no Mediator at all. Every man had to face God and answer for his own sins in his own way. That being so, I claim the right to decide upon which way I shall worship God, so that, when I come before Him, I shall have to answer for my own sins in my own way.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Has anyone questioned that?

MR. FOLEY: Yes. This Bill attempts to impose upon children a religion that their parents may not wish them to have. I believe, if a referendum of this House were taken, it would be found that 80 per cent. of the members would vote against any alteration in our present education system.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You have forgotten that it has gone past the members of this House to the people, and that the people have settled it.

MR. FOLEY: I give the hon. member credit for conscientiously believing in Bible teaching in the State schools. I believe he is one of five or six members of the House who conscientiously believe in the Bill; but the other 85 per cent. are opposed to the Bill. The Premier asked us as plainly as man could ask, without putting the matter straightforwardly, to vote against the Bill. Of course, the hon. gentleman is not game to vote against it, and he is now sheltering himself behind the referendum, or, as he calls it, the will of the people. It is well known to all of us that the hon. gentleman and a lot of hon. members on the other side are going to shelter themselves behind the fact that some people have said they want religious teaching in the State schools; but they said it when they really did not know what they were saying, because they were rushed into striking out the word "No," and they did not know whether they were voting for or against Bible teaching. There is so much bickering and quarrelling amongst the various religious denominations in the old country as to which shall predominate, that even the ministers are actually coming to the conclusion that the best way to settle the question is to adopt a secular system. In order to

[10 p.m.] show members the feeling that prevails there, I would like to read a few remarks by the Rev. D. J. Hiley, at the Baptist Union Assembly at Liverpool, consisting of 1,800 Baptist ministers, held in October of 1907. In speaking to a resolution about the denominational training colleges, Dr. Hiley made use of these words—

He was coming more and more to the belief that the only adequate and fair solution was the secular. They might have a hundred reasons for preferring unsectarian teaching, but, he declared—and the declaration drew much cheering—it took the logic absolutely away from them. If it was right to have religion in the schools, it must be right to have a religious test. He knew that what he was

saying was counted heresy—(Here there were cries of "No, no!")—but, in view of the fight that might come to-morrow or the day after, he did not want to be compromised. He wanted an open field and a fair road, and if it did not come from the church of God it would come from the trade unions and those outside it.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Don't you know that that is not at all analogous as far as Queensland is concerned, or even New South Wales?

MR. FOLEY: I am only showing that the secular education system is becoming popular all over the world. It is recognised that where the parsons are allowed to interfere with education in State schools the effect is not good, and even the parsons themselves are becoming dissatisfied with religious teaching in State schools, and he says the best solution of the difficulty is to adopt the secular education system. I think that should be sufficient proof to warrant this State in retaining that system, instead of altering it and going back to the old days of religious teaching, which was found to be so unsatisfactory that it had to be altered by Act of Parliament, and I think the House would be doing wrong in repealing the Act in order to bring back religious teaching in State schools. I have also here some remarks by the Rev. Dr. Clifford, and this is taken from the *Christian World*, of 15th April, 1909. Dr. Clifford, in speaking of "the civic solution," says—

It is very significant that Mr. C. Hole, president of the National Union of Teachers, has declared in favour of "secular" education as the only possible settlement of the present controversy. But the reason he assigns for this conclusion is even more significant than the conclusion itself. The president says he "has been driven to the conclusion that the State must disendow all sectarian and religious teaching and concern itself only with the provision of secular education." "President after president has pleaded for a simple course of Biblical instruction in our schools such as that set forth by the London education authority." But "it had not received the approval of contending theologians, and therefore it appeared useless to urge further a scheme which was bound to be rejected."

There is a declaration by the Rev. Dr. Clifford that the theologians themselves cannot agree as to the proper teaching to give children in State schools. As I said before, when the parsons themselves are agreed upon the religion they want taught, then it will be time enough for this Government to bring in a measure embodying religious teaching in State schools. First let them decide upon a religion that everyone can embrace, then there will be no objection to that religion being taught to the children; but while we have so many different denominations all aiming for the one goal, and all going different roads to get there, it is wrong to introduce these matters into the State schools, where children of so many different denominations are met together on one common ground and under the one teacher. Further on, Dr. Clifford says—

That is the fact we have to face, and it is well we should try to understand it. The majority of the citizens of England and Wales will agree with Mr. Hole that the "State must disendow all sectarian teaching"; but at the same conference the Bishop of Manchester expressed the grim determination "that the principle of the legislation of 1902," which was that of placing the churches on the rates, "shall not be reversed"; and the recent negotiations for a settlement have left no doubt that the "convinced denominationalist" is as resolute as ever in his purpose to make the public school an annexe to his church; and the State-paid

Mr. Foley.]

teacher a "curate" qualified to teach the particular creed and catechism of his church—a policy which, at the present moment, according to the president of the union, "shuts out from 14,000 schools all opportunity of appointing men and women who cannot subscribe to the religious faith which is in the ascendant in the government of the schools." Somehow or other that intolerable state of things must be brought to an end.

Here is a system that you see has grown up in the old country, where this religious teaching has been allowed in State schools. The Church of England has simply dominated the whole matter by insisting that a teacher must pass a certain examination to enable him to teach in the State schools. That may happen in Queensland. How do we know that in a few years from now, if this teaching is allowed in State schools, and the Church of England predominates over other sects—how do we know that a teacher wishing to enter the public service, and teach in the State schools, will not have to pass a Church of England examination before he can become a State school teacher? That would be interfering with the liberty of the subject, and it would be shutting out a large number of men and women from the public service, because they had religious scruples, and could not become members of the Church of England. If there is a danger of any evil such as that arising, by allowing religious teaching in State schools, we should think twice before we allow this Bill to go through. Further on, Dr. Clifford says—

Well, I said many years ago that I am as strongly opposed to the establishment by Parliament of what is called "undenominational teaching" as I am to Romanism—i.e., I protest with all my might against teaching at the expense of the ratepayers a set of dogmatic theological opinions on which Christians generally are supposed to be agreed, as I protest against the teaching of any distinctively Roman or Anglican doctrine. I wish theological dogma to be taught, but taught by the churches, and entirely at the expense of the churches, and not by the officers of Parliament and at the expense of the ratepayers.

These are words from Dr. Clifford, who is recognised to be a great man in the church, and he has come to the conclusion that the only way to deal with children in State schools or in public schools is to give them secular education, and not allow the introduction of religious teaching in any shape or form, because it is bound to bring in its train the parson who claims that he has the right to teach the children his particular dogma or doctrine. That is the part of the Bill I object to.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member for Townsville has occupied the time allowed under the Sessional Orders, and must resume his seat unless it is the pleasure of the House that he be further heard.

Mr. FOLEY: I should just like to get a few minutes longer.

Mr. ALLEN: I move that the hon. member be further heard.

Mr. MULLAN (to Mr. Foley): Move it yourself.

Mr. FOLEY: I move that I be further heard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be further heard?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: No, no!

[Mr. Foley.

Question—That the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Foley, be further heard—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 23.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Mackintosh
" Barber	" Mann
" Blair	" Maughan
" Collins	" May
" Crawford	" Mulcahy
" Douglas	" Mullan
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore
" Lesina	

Tellers: Mr. Allen and Mr. Theodore.

NOES, 33.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Appel	" Kidston
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macartney
" Barnes, W. H.	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Petrie
" Brennan	" Philp
" Bridges	" Rankin
" Corser	" Roberts
" Cottell	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Thorn
" Forrest	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
" Hooge	

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Wienholt.

Resolved in the negative.

* Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): Like other hon. members who have spoken, I have no desire to give a silent vote on this important question, and, therefore, I wish to make a few casual observations in regard to the Bill. In my opinion an hon. member might have reasonably voted for the submitting of this question to a referendum of the people, and now take a stand in this House against carrying out what the Premier and the Minister for Public Instruction have pointed out as being the will of the people, for the simple reason that in taking the referendum the Government acted with a great deal of unfairness. A return called for by an hon. member a couple of weeks ago showed conclusively that the Government did not open polling-booths in all the places where polling-booths are usually opened on the occasion of a State election, and it appears to me that members of the Government, including the Premier—who was bitterly opposed to any alteration in our present educational system—when it came to a question of allowing the people outside to settle the matter—joined forces with the Bible in State Schools League, not for the purpose of giving the people of Queensland an opportunity of coming to a just decision upon this question, but in order to try and have a referendum deciding in favour of Archdeacon Garland.

The PREMIER: Which they did not want.

Mr. MURPHY: Which they did not want at the time they brought forward the question of the referendum. We know that on the 13th April last, when this question was submitted to the people of Queensland, quite a number of Federal matters were also being submitted for the decision of the electors, and we know that the Government of Queensland were very anxious to win the Federal elections. They were prepared to join forces with any party in the State which would assist them to try and down the Labour men on

the 13th April. We know that the Premier even went to Melbourne and entered into a secret arrangement with Mr. Deakin to try and win the election; and he joined forces with the Bible in State Schools League in Queensland to try and carry the elections in this State against the Labour party. Having put that phase of the question before the House, I propose to try and show that it would be unjust on our part to alter our present educational system. Even after the passing of the Bill for the taking of a referendum, the Government made certain alterations in connection with education, taking command of technical colleges and other educational institutions throughout the State. They also passed a Bill for the establishment of a University; and we were told that one of the great features was that the State would have absolute control of education in the State. I have no hesitation in asserting that this is a Bill for the teaching of Protestant sectarianism in our State schools; and I make that assertion because I am a Protestant.

The PREMIER: What?

Mr. MURPHY: Because I am a Protestant. I suppose the hon. gentleman is a Calathumpian. (Laughter.) When the question was brought up, we had Archdeacon Garland lobbying members. The reverend gentleman met me one night, and said, "I have put you down as an opponent of the Bible being taught in State schools." I said, "You are quite correct, but not for the reason which actuated you, because I happen to be a member of your own church." I suppose the reverend gentleman, when he struck a member of Parliament who was named "Murphy" came to the conclusion that I was a member of the Roman Catholic denomination. (Laughter.) When we are told that it is our duty to give effect to the will of the people, I want to know why the will of the people, as expressed at various elections, has not been given effect to by the present Government. What about all the items contained in the Rockhampton programme? Did not the hon. gentleman tell us that if the people sent him back to power, there were certain measures which it would be his duty and the duty of his Cabinet and his supporters to put on the statute-book? Where are they? There was the Trades Disputes Bill, for instance. The hon. member for Woolloongabba talked to-night about repudiation. Did not the hon. member, after the coalition of 1907, go to his electors at Woolloongabba and tell them that the one reason why he decided to support the coalition and follow the Premier was because he knew it was the only possible chance of obtaining a Trades Disputes Bill? But though the hon. gentleman has been a servile or solid supporter of the Government ever since the date of the coalition, where is the Trades Disputes Bill?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope the hon. member for Croydon will now discuss the question before the House.

Mr. MURPHY: Yes, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I submit that when the Secretary for Public Instruction is privileged to tell members that they have a right to give effect to the will of the people and not oppose the Government in putting this Bill through, I have a right to point out that the Government have not given effect to the will of the people in other directions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member is quite in order in merely referring to other Bills, but he will not be in order in discussing details.

Mr. MURPHY: I do not propose to discuss details, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Since the Rockhampton programme was issued, the Premier has been sent back to power on two occasions; and I say that before he can find fault with any member and criticise his action in not wishing to give effect to the will of the people in this matter, he should show us why he has not given effect to the will of the people in regard to the matters contained in the Rockhampton programme. There was a Licensing Bill promised, but that has gone by the board. There is also the nationalisation of the Grammar schools; also the question of State insurance. If the Government were absolutely honest in the matter of carrying out the will of the people, a State Insurance Bill would have been introduced long ago. Then there is the encouragement to mining, about which a great deal was made at the last election. The will of the people was expressed in favour of encouragement being given to mining; and the way the Government have carried out the will of the people in that matter is by cutting down the vote and giving no assistance to the industry.

Mr. MORGAN: When are you coming to the Bill?

Mr. MURPHY: For the benefit of the hon. member for Murilla and [10.30 p.m.] other hon. members, I will now come to the Bill. I would like to have the privilege of taking this Bill out and burning it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear! and laughter.

Mr. MURPHY: I think if this Bill is passed, it will be one of the worst things that has ever happened in Queensland. (Hear, hear!) Now, I have only to refer to a quotation from a speech made by the Secretary for Lands, Mr. Denham, when this question was brought under his notice. This is what Mr. Denham said—

Our education system was free, compulsory, and secular; and if there was to be any change at all it rested with the people. The public would very shortly have an opportunity of saying whether they wished any change. But if it meant anything like the strife that had eventuated in England it would be a sorry day for Queensland. If there was any system of religious instruction adopted in Queensland State schools it would be only fair that the Roman Catholics, who had supported their own schools, should receive some compensation from the State Treasury.

The hon. gentleman in charge of this Bill has told us that the object is merely to have Bible reading in State schools. But we know from his colleague, the Secretary for Lands, that an attempt will be made, when this Bill passes, for the Roman Catholic denomination to obtain grants to assist them in keeping their schools going.

Mr. MAY: And they will be justified.

Mr. MURPHY: If we were dealing with a Bill for the purpose of assisting the Roman Catholics to keep their schools going and I had an opportunity of voting for it, I would record a vote against it. (Hear, hear!) And I am going to record my vote against this Bill. I think that our system of education has been absolutely perfect, and there is absolutely no necessity to alter it. Of course, I must confess that the matter has been referred to the

Mr. Murphy.]

people, but the Government did not altogether fairly refer the matter to the people. And, so far as I am concerned, I take into consideration the 150,000 who did not record a vote upon this question at all, and I honestly believe that if the question were again submitted to the people to decide, there would be a big majority given against it. (Hear, hear!) Because the people must recognise what a splendid system of education we have at present. We have not taken into consideration the matter of selecting teachers, or in connection with the working of the schools, what religion our servants were. We are going to alter all this. We are going to introduce a big change into our educational system, and we are going to raise sectarian strife throughout Queensland. (Hear, hear!) Before I sit down I propose to move an amendment.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: I am objecting to this Bill because I am against the appropriation of public money for sectarian purposes. I think that is a very good ground to take.

Mr. LESINA: It is the very best ground that you can take.

Mr. MURPHY: The very best ground that I can take is to object to money being appropriated for sectarian purposes. When we go into this question we know in Queensland that colonists who have dealt with this question of religious instruction in our State schools have pointed out over thirty years ago there was a big fight to alter our denominational system of education. It has been pointed out by one writer that thirty years ago, when this fight took place, the majority of Protestant clergy were unanimous in expressing the belief that the Sunday schools would supply all the religious training and teaching necessary for the rising generation, and that if the State undertook and carried out the instruction of the young in the necessary secular branches of knowledge, that was all that could be required of it—indeed, all that should be permitted to any State comprising a community of varying religious beliefs. They carried the day, and our present excellent secular system was carried out. Our denominational system was wiped out, and our splendid national system of to-day was established, and nobody could find fault with it. Why, the very best speeches that have been delivered against religious instruction in State schools have come from the Government side of the House. If I had been at all inclined to have voted for this Bible in State Schools Bill, after I had listened to the Premier, with his varied experience and the happy way he has got of placing the facts before the House, I should certainly have voted against it. I think that we are making a great mistake, and I propose to move this amendment—

That all the words after "that" be deleted, with the view of inserting the following words:—"That the second reading of the State Education Acts Amendment Bill be postponed until a schedule is prepared indicating in what selected Bible lessons instruction shall be given in State schools."

(Hear, hear!) It has been pointed out that so far as this religious instruction is concerned, it would be no good unless a school reading book acceptable to all denominations is prepared. This amendment will give the Government an opportunity of obtaining such a book. I think it will be much wiser, even at this late hour, for hon. members on the other side of the House to postpone this, because I am certain of this: When I was a lad in New South

Wales under the denominational system we had a Protestant school, a Roman Catholic school, and a national school in nearly every town. The hon. member for Clermont will remember it too.

Mr. COTTELL: Did you have religious instruction when you were young?

Mr. MURPHY: I had so much religious instruction when I was young that when I became older I dodged it as much as I could. (Laughter.) The amendment is one which ought to commend itself to every hon. member of this House. It ought to commend itself to the Secretary for Public Instruction. It is simply asking that the Government prepare a school book that will be acceptable.

Mr. COTTELL: Acceptable to whom?

Mr. MURPHY: Acceptable to the various denominations. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman laughs, but he is prepared to support a Government which will put a Bill through this House which will be only acceptable to one denomination.

Mr. COTTELL: Which one?

Mr. MURPHY: The one represented by Archdeacon Garland. I am not going to have any quarrel with Archdeacon Garland and the Bible in State Schools League. I believe if you are going in for a fight, you cannot go wrong if you fight well. We have to compliment Archdeacon Garland and his committee on the excellent fight which they put up on the referendum. It is a great pity that members of this Chamber did not take the matter up and fight it too. The fact of the matter was that during the time that referendum was taken, there were so many national questions to consider as well. The people had to decide whether the States or the Federal Government was to be paramount, and there were so many referendum papers that they did not have an opportunity of properly considering this matter. As regards the Premier, they refused to accept his advice as regards altering the date on which the referendum was taken.

Mr. COTTELL: What has that got to do with this Bill?

Mr. MURPHY: It has a lot to do with it. The hon. member for Toowoong has the same right to vote for this Bill as I have to vote against it. I am not taking any exception to the attitude adopted by any hon. member. I suppose that if the hon. member for Toowoong had been selected by the Labour party as their candidate for that electorate, he would have been just as antagonistic to this Bill as he is in favour of it to-day. When the Premier proposed that the date of the referendum should be altered, he pointed out that it would be better not to have it at the time of the Federal election. I was one of those who thought that while the people were going to the polling-booth to deal with Federal matters they could also deal with this question of altering our educational system. I think the amendment I have moved is a reasonable one, and it would not surprise me if the Secretary for Public Instruction agreed to accept it. There is absolutely no necessity to rush this Bill through the House. We have much more important measures to deal with. This is a matter which so materially affects the well-being of the people of Queensland that its consideration could be postponed for three or six months without any harm being done. In the amendment I have not proposed how long the matter should be postponed, but have left that to the Government. I suppose that the Secre-

[Mr. Murphy.]

tary for Public Instruction, now that he has consulted the Premier, will agree to accept the amendment. The kindly feeling of the Secretary for Public Instruction would probably induce him to give due consideration to the amendment, but I do not know that I can say the same for the Premier. As far as I am concerned, I am going to vote against the Bill, because I think it is a bad Bill. Queensland has so far been free from big sectarian fights, and it is the duty of this Legislature to keep it free from such fights.

Mr. COTTELL: You voted for the referendum, didn't you?

Mr. MURPHY: I did. Like people of quality, I do wrong occasionally. If the hon. member will look at the *Hansard* report of my speech on the Referendum Bill, he will find that I made a similar speech to that which I have made to-night. Anyhow, it is a matter of perfect indifference to me how I voted on the Referendum Bill. I am going to vote against this Bill. I remember that when a prominent politician in this State used to be met with the statement, "Look how you voted on this question," he replied, "Let my friend look up *Hansard* and see how I talked." I do not pretend to be a prominent politician, but I do pretend to know something more about the game of politics than the hon. member sitting in the corner. In any political fight that I have been brought into I have been able to speak for myself, while the hon. member has always had to get somebody to speak for him. I have expressed my opinion on this question, and have pointed out that in my judgment we shall be doing a wrong thing in passing this Bill, which will undoubtedly break up our splendid system of education that has done so much for Queensland. No member on the other side of the House has risen in his place and attempted to deny that. When this question was first raised, we were told that it was a question of simple Bible reading in State schools; then we were told that it was to be religious instruction in State schools; then that clergymen were to be admitted into the schools; and now we are told that teachers are to act the part of clergymen, and that there is to be absolutely no conscience clause in the Bill. State school committees are not to be allowed any privileges in connection with the matter. In places where there are mixed communities there are representatives of various denominations on the school committees, and they work together in the most kindly and amicable way. This Bill will break up the kindly feeling which has hitherto existed. In most of the country districts there are men of all denominations on the committees, who not only work together harmoniously for the educational advancement of the scholars but who also provide pleasure for the children. Yet here we are rushing through a Bill at the bidding of the Bible in State Schools League which is likely to do away with all that kind of thing. There is nobody who knows the injury that this measure is likely to do better than hon. members who are sitting behind the Government and helping them to put the Bill through the House. The splendid speech delivered by the Premier on this question ought to convince anyone who was prepared to vote for the Bill that it would be a wrong thing to pass the Bill.

Mr. COTTELL: What about the speech of the hon. member for Fitzroy?

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member for Fitzroy can do as he likes in the matter; he

is not responsible to me for his vote. I sincerely hope that some consideration will be given to my amendment. I do not suppose the Government are so anxious to get the Bill passed that they desire to rush it through the House without giving any time for its discussion. We know that they rushed through the Mines Regulation Bill, which affects 20,000 miners and millions of capital, in a couple of days, and they may be going to rush this Bill through. But I hope they will not do anything of the kind, as it will stir up sectarian strife throughout Queensland. If this Bill is passed, we shall see the effect of it at the next general election, when, for the first time in the history of Queensland, we shall probably have a sectarian fight. I move the amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the amendment seconded?

Mr. MAY (*Flinders*): I beg to second the amendment. Since I first became a member of this House, in 1907, every time an election has taken place I have had to fight a sectarian battle. The Rev. Canon Williams fought me tooth and nail at Hughenden, Cloncurry, Richmond, and wherever it was possible for him to do so, but, notwithstanding his opposition, the solidarity of our party was so great that I was always returned. Even when I had not to contest the election, whenever I addressed a meeting in my electorate something always cropped up in connection with Bible reading in State schools. At every meeting I have always advocated keep our State schools secular, and it has been the wish of the bulk of the electors of Flinders that that should be so. During the last Federal campaign I was not so much among my own electors as previously, and I could not feel their temper so well, but 55 or 60 per cent. of them were against Bible teaching in the State schools; so that I stand on good solid ground in protesting against the introduction of this Bill. There have been a good many arguments brought forward on the other side, why this Bill should become law. Well, I believe it will be the means of stirring up sectarian strife. We have one of the best educational systems extant in any civilised country. It has been in vogue for some thirty-five years, and why should we alter it just to please a few faddists and cranks? One must admire them for the manner in which they have worked. Nobody can help admiring Archdeacon Garland as a fighter and for the indomitable energy he has put into his work. On a trip down the bay I had a conversation with him upon this question, and he said he would have to go into the electorates and fight us. "Well," I said, "go up into my electorate if you like, and I will fight you on the question." I told him he was not game to go into the Flinders and fight me, and I gave him my opinion in language more forcible than polite—language which I shall not repeat in this Chamber. In Hughenden several Protestants have sent their children, after finishing at the State school, to the convent to be taught by the nuns, who are finished musicians. There are several Protestant children at the convent, but I never heard of one instance in which the nuns have ever been accused of attempting to proselytise any of those Protestant children.

Mr. KEOGH: We are more honourable than that.

Mr. MAY: When the referendum was taken, there was a vast number of people who did not know how to vote when they went into the polling-booths. In my electorate I tried to educate them, and I had a few friends also trying

Mr. May.]

to educate them to vote according to my ideas of what was right, and the result was very satisfactory. At the same time, there was a certain amount of apathy amongst a number of our own men. The greater question of the Federal elections overshadowed the Bible in State schools issue. The hon. member for Bowen made a good point when he said that this meant an appropriation of the money of the whole of the taxpayers for the benefit of one section of the community, and that it would be used for sectarian purposes. If the Bill becomes law—and I very much fear it will—I think we shall have unheard-of strife in Queensland. I believe it will be the inception of squabbles and troubles which may eventually lead to bloodshed. I go that length, because every hon. member who is familiar with the history of the past knows that the wars of by-gone days were mostly due to religious differences. The Thirty Years' War was nothing else than a war between Protestants and Catholics, and they are on the same go now. In Queensland we have had none of this sectarian strife. What little bickerings there have been have always been patched up, and the people have been good friends the next day. Whenever one sect is having a bazaar in any of our country towns, all the other religious bodies help. They have been living in a state of paradise as far as religion goes in the Northern towns, and on Sundays they go to their respective places of worship.

Mr. COLLINS: And on Sunday afternoons they play football together.

Mr. MAY: I see no harm in playing football or cricket on a Sunday afternoon. It is a pure, clean, and honest recreation. We do not want to make people religious by law. If they are not religious by natural instinct, they will never become religious. As far as our children are concerned, the proper place to teach them religion is at the mother's knee. Isolated instances may be cited of children appearing in our courts who do not know anything about the Almighty; but you will find a great deal more of such ignorance in the slums of London and other large cities. In the Australian bush the air is so much purer than it is in big city slums, and the environment is so much better, that our children's minds are naturally purer than in the case of children who are brought up in the gutter. I shall support the amendment. It is a very good suggestion to make, and I hope the Minister will display, to use a rather hackneyed phrase, a little "sweet reasonableness" and allow the consideration of the Bill to stand over until a clause is prepared giving a synopsis of what the children are to be taught. Here we have a bit of paper placed before us. We do not know what they are going to do.

We do not know the length of time [11 p.m.] that a parson or a priest may go into these schools. It is not definite enough. Of course, when we get to the Committee stage, I suppose the Minister will give us more information than we can get at the present time. But there is also this in it: You are talking about the conscience clause. The education system has been open to the teachers of every denomination, or of no denomination, in Queensland. They enter the public service, no matter what denomination they belong to. How can a teacher conscientiously teach children against the doctrines of his own church? I am told time after time in my own electorate, "Whatever you do, fight this religious instruction tooth and nail, from first to last." And if I cannot alter it, I will record my vote against it whenever a division is taken. I do not wish to detain the House very much longer. I do not suppose we will have a chance to get our train to-night, so that whether we sit here for half an

hour more or less makes no difference. I will sit down to hear the Minister give a reply to what has been said.

The PREMIER: I consider the question before the House a very important question.

Mr. LESINA: I rise to a point of order. The point of order is this: You have not stated the question in its proposed amended form.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I stated the question very fully from the chair, and called upon the hon. member for Flinders, who rose, to answer me as to whether he wished to second the amendment. I cannot say that I feel at all inclined to state the question again, and I refuse to do so.

The PREMIER: I consider that the question before the House is a very important one, in relation to its consequences. At the same time, I have looked upon it as a very simple proposition—that is, few men in the House will have much difficulty in making up their minds as to how they will vote on the matter. Now, although there has been a tedious amount of repetition, I was willing to sit longer for the sake of giving everyone a chance of speaking, until the amendment moved by the hon. member for Croydon was put. After all the members who have spoken on the matter, an amendment is moved which is merely a peg to hang another row of speeches on.

Mr. LENNON: There are other speakers here.

Mr. THEODORE: Members who have not spoken on the main question.

At 11.5 p.m.,

The PREMIER: I do not propose to allow obstruction to be started, and I move—That the question be now put.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is—

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask whether, in your opinion, this amendment has been sufficiently discussed?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! In answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Clermont, the fact of my rising to put the question is sufficient evidence that I consider that the whole question has been sufficiently debated. I find thirty-four members on my list—nineteen on my left and fifteen on my right—have debated the question, and I cannot see—I may be wrong—that there will be any object in having a discussion upon the amendment which has already taken place upon the main question. Therefore I shall proceed to put the question. The question is—That the question be now put.

AYES, 33.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Appel	" Kidston
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macartney
" Barnes, W. H.	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Petrie
" Brennan	" Philp
" Bridges	" Rankin
" Corser	" Roberts
" Cottell	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Thorn
" Forrest	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
" Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. Allan and Mr. Tolmie.

[Mr. May.

NOES, 24.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Mann
" Breslin	" Maughan
" Collins	" May
" Douglas	" Mulcahy
" Foley	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Lesina and Mr. Murphy.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Murphy's amendment*) stand part of the question—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 35.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Appel	" Kidston
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macartney
" Barnes, W. H.	" Morgan
" Booker	" Mulcahy
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Brennan	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philip
" Corser	" Rankin
" Cottell	" Roberts
" Crawford	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Thorn
" Forrest	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
" Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. Cottell and Mr. Walker.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Breslin	" Mann
" Collins	" Maughan
" Douglas	" May
" Foley	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Theodore.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is—That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. RYAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker—

The PREMIER: I move—That the question be now put.

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I ask, in your opinion, has the Bill been sufficiently debated?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As I stated previously, in my opinion the amendment and the main question are identical, and as thirty-three or thirty-four members have taken part in the debate on the question, in my opinion, the question is sufficiently debated.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 33.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
" Appel	" Kidston
" Barnes, G. P.	" Macartney
" Barnes, W. H.	" Morgan
" Booker	" Paget
" Bouchard	" Petrie
" Brennan	" Philip
" Bridges	" Rankin
" Corser	" Roberts
" Cottell	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Thorn
" Forrest	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
" Hodge	

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. White.

NOES, 25.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Blair	" Mann
" Breslin	" Maughan
" Collins	" May
" Crawford	" Mulcahy
" Douglas	" Mullan
" Foley	" Murphy
" Hamilton	" McLachlan
" Hardacre	" Payne
" Keogh	" Ryan
" Land	" Theodore
" Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 36.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kidston
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Blair	" Morgan
" Booker	" Mulcahy
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Brennan	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philip
" Corser	" Rankin
" Cottell	" Roberts
" Crawford	" Somerset
" Cribb	" Swayne
" Denham	" Thorn
" Forrest	" Tolmie
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Swayne and Mr. Wienholt.

NOES, 22.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Breslin	" Mann
" Collins	" Maughan
" Douglas	" May
" Foley	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Payne.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PROPOSED COMMITTEE OF THE BILL.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I move that the committee of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for tomorrow.

Mr. LENNON: I think, although perhaps it may not be agreeable to members on the other side of the Chamber, I might be permitted to offer a very strong and emphatic protest indeed against the use of the gag on this occasion. In view of the fact that the senior member for Ipswich, Mr. [11.30 p.m.] Maughan, has come down 25 miles for the express purpose of addressing himself to this important question—

Mr. RYAN: And other members, too.

Mr. LENNON: Also the hon. member for Barcoo, the hon. member for Port Curtis, and the hon. member for Leichhardt—all of whom had a perfect right to take part in the so-called deliberations of this Chamber. But there seems to be a compact by the members behind the Government, who are whipped into line in the belief that they are determined to force this Bill through at all hazards, regardless of sense or decency. I take this last chance which I shall have of offering my emphatic protest against the action of the Premier, the Secretary for Public Lands, and

Mr. Lennon.]

other members who are diametrically opposed to the provisions contained in this Bill voting like dumb dogs in favour of it. It is a disgrace to the Parliament of Queensland, and I trust that we shall not have a repetition of it in Queensland. But I suppose that we shall have a further exhibition of it so long as the present party are sitting on that side of the House.

The PREMIER: I do not want to discuss this matter, but I do not like this continual imputation that members on this side are—

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: Dumb dogs.

The PREMIER: That members on this side are under the dominance of somebody outside that has the power to make them do something they are not wanting to do.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: It is perfectly true.

The PREMIER: If there are to be imputations that any party is under the domination of any league you have only to look on the opposite side of the House and to see what that domination means.

OPPOSITION dissent.

The PREMIER: I would just like to say that I am sorry that the hon. member for Ipswich was not permitted to have his speech, and also the hon. member for Barcoo and others who have not spoken.

Mr. MULLAN: You are not sorry. You can remedy it if you are sorry.

The PREMIER: If I am not sorry, there is not the slightest occasion why I should say that I am sorry. The "Whips" of this party, and my friends sitting on this side of the House, know quite well that I had made up my mind to sit all night for the sake of getting this Bill through and allowing everyone to have a chance to speak.

Mr. MULLAN: Why did you gag the main question?

The PREMIER: Will you listen patiently, and you will hear the truth? Listen patiently to the truth, and it may be of some assistance to you.

Mr. LESINA: You have them all terrorised.

The PREMIER: If they will listen they will know what will happen on the next occasion if they attempt the same thing. Almost every member who spoke on that side of the House to-night insisted on being gagged before he sat down.

Mr. HAMILTON: That is not true. I only spoke for ten minutes.

The PREMIER: Almost every member who spoke on that side—every second speaker—insisted on being gagged himself before he sat down.

Mr. LENNON AND OTHER OPPOSITION MEMBERS: No, no!

The PREMIER: The records of the House will show it. But notwithstanding that every member had his say, there was not a member, with the exception of one member, who had anything new to tell the House.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes; there was.

The PREMIER: In addition to the hon. member for Gregory—

Mr. LAND: We are all responsible to our electors, and not to you at all.

The PREMIER: That is a matter that might be very important, as I said before, but it is really very simple in its essence. You can decide on it one way or the other, because it is very simple. In spite of all that, as I have already told the House, we

[Mr. Lennon.

would have sat patiently and allowed the debate to proceed until a purely obstructive motion was moved. It was substantially the same question that we were debating. It was not putting a new question before the House in any way, but was, according to the Standing Orders, putting up a peg on which to hang another row of speeches.

Mr. MURPHY: Why didn't the Deputy Speaker call it obstructive? He has got the privilege of saying that it is an obstructive motion.

The PREMIER: Under the circumstances, not because I am in any particular hurry for the passage of this Bill—

Mr. MULLAN: You wanted to have the division before Ferricks comes back. He will be back to-morrow.

The PREMIER: I have to consider the other business that has to be got through. So long as members are willing to discuss questions reasonably, we are willing to listen.

Mr. LESINA: Why did you drag this Bill in at all?

The PREMIER: Naturally, if they attempt to do this kind of thing, I shall have to do my duty in the matter, whether I like it or whether I do not like it. There are one or two members I know who had not the opportunity of speaking, but they must blame members on their own side of the House.

Mr. MAUGHAN: We will speak to our own electors about it.

The PREMIER: It was a mere waste of time on the part of members opposite.

Mr. KEOGH: As one on this side of the House it must be thoroughly understood that I am not in touch with the Chief Secretary on this matter. While I have supported the present Administration in all that was for the betterment of the State, I hold that with regard to religious views I think the Premier is making a mistake. (Hear, hear!) My friend on my left is laughing, but he may laugh the wrong side of his face afterwards. I say that the Premier was wrong in gagging this matter through.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The question before the House is that the committal of the Bill stand an order of the day for to-morrow.

Mr. LESINA: Then how did the Premier get that speech in?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it is within the knowledge of hon. members—and I can assure the hon. member for Clermont that I do not require any instruction from him in regard to the conduct of the business of this Chamber, as I see my way to do it from the chair.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But the deputy leader of the Opposition made certain statements on the floor of this House, and I allowed the Premier to answer them. If the Premier had made those statements, I should have allowed the deputy leader of the Opposition to answer them. (Hear, hear!) I shall always try to follow that practice. The hon. member must confine himself to the question before the House, which is that the committal of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

Mr. KEOGH: I have to bow to your ruling, Mr. Deputy Speaker. But you allowed the Premier and the deputy leader of the Opposition to state their case, and I think it is only fair and just and honourable that I should

also have my say in this matter. (Hear, hear!) All I have got to say is this—and I confine myself to one remark—that I think the Premier has made a mistake, and a most grievous one, in putting this matter through under the gag, and when the gag is put forward in this House I shall never vote for it. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MURPHY : I object to the committal of this Bill being made an Order of the Day for to-morrow. I consider that under the circumstances the Premier might reasonably allow the Committee stage to stand over till next week. Some members on this side have not had an opportunity of discussing the measure. We never anticipated that the Committee stage of the Bill would be taken to-morrow, consequently we are not in a position to prepare our amendments to the Bill. It has been suggested by Ministers on previous occasions that amendments should be printed and circulated in order that all members should be in a position to consider them thoroughly ; but, if the Government are going to treat us in this wretched fashion, we will extend no courtesy to Ministers introducing Bills. We will rise in our places and move any amendments we like, and simply hand them to the Chairman of Committees, and deal with them in that fashion. When a Bill of this importance is rushed through the second reading by means of the gag, members are prevented from extending that courtesy to Ministers which they ask from hon. members. The Opposition last night treated the Secretary for Public Lands in a very courteous manner, because he treated them courteously. But I say that in view of the wretched way, the mean way, the contemptible way—if that is a parliamentary phrase—in which the Premier is dealing with the Opposition, we should band ourselves together as an Opposition to fight the Government every inch of the way.

Mr. LESINA : Declare a vendetta.

Mr. MURPHY : Certainly, declare a vendetta. After this we ought to fight every Bill right to the finish. If the Government are looking for an opportunity to gag us, then it is the duty of the Opposition to make them gag through every Bill on their programme and every Estimate. We are getting no consideration whatever from the Government, and we should show them no consideration. If the Premier desired to be at all courteous to the Opposition, he would not have proposed to fix the Committee stage of this Bill for to-morrow. Why cannot the Premier be courteous to the deputy leader of the Opposition, and put off the Committee stage of the Bill till next week, so as to allow Mr. Bowman to be present—as it appears likely from the reports which appear in the newspapers he may be—to reply to the attacks which have been made upon him. I say the Government are taking a mean advantage of the leader of the Opposition, and that they have taken an absolutely mean advantage of the Opposition right through the session, and the Opposition should be prepared under all circumstances to worry the Government as much as they can. Why should we be courteous to a Government which is not courteous to us? Why should we extend consideration to a Government which extends no consideration to the Opposition? There are many occasions in this House when, if the Opposition wished to put the Government in a hole, they could do so. For instance, we could have done so last Friday, but we recognised that we had had a strenuous week and allowed members to catch their trains and go home.

The PREMIER : You couldn't do anything else.

Mr. MURPHY : The hon. gentleman has known me long enough to know that I could have done something else last Friday if I had

wished to do so, but we were courteous to members supporting the Government. Still we are met with the gag and guillotine right through the business. The Government are not game to bring in a measure and stand or fall by it, but as soon as a Bill is partially discussed they want to gag it into the Committee stage. They have got to get a Chairman of Committees to-morrow, as their Chairman is away, and the members of the Opposition, seeing how badly they have been treated, ought to fight that matter. I have lived on a mineral field for years, and you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have travelled over mineral fields in the early days—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order! The hon. gentleman is going entirely away from the question before the House.

Mr. MURPHY : I am only dealing with this phase of the question : that in view of the consideration which the Government gets from the Opposition—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order! That is not the question before the House. The hon. member must obey my call to order, and keep to the question.

Mr. MURPHY : Yes. The question before the House, as you put it from the chair, is that the committal of this Bill be made an Order of the Day for to-morrow, and that is the question I have been dealing with. I have been trying to point out that there is no necessity to take the Committee stage of the Bill to-morrow.

Mr. KEOGH : It ought to be this day six months.

Mr. MURPHY : I do not say it should be taken this day six months or this day six weeks, but that the Government might reasonably take into consideration the fact that the leader of the Opposition, who has been attacked by members on the other side, may possibly be in his place next week.

Hon. R. PHILE : Who attacked him?

Mr. MURPHY : Several members on that side referred to the fact that the leader of the Opposition voted for the referendum to be taken, and said he is now going back on his principles. They accused him of absolute inconsistency on the second reading of this Bill. If the Government were at all considerate they would give him an opportunity of refuting the statements made against him. There is no necessity to go on with the Committee stage of this Bill to-morrow. The Government have other business that they can go on with, and this matter might very well stand over for another week ; but instead of agreeing to that the Government are rushing the measure through and bringing the Assembly into contempt.

* Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) : I desire to say a word on this motion. I am very much surprised that the Government have adopted the course of applying the gag to this measure. It seems to me that there was no necessity for doing so. I hope I am in order in making these remarks, because the application of the gag deprived me of the opportunity of speaking on the Bill. This is a measure that is going to effect a very drastic change in our educational system, and it requires plenty of time for consideration and deliberation. It is a measure which should be discussed calmly and coolly, quite apart from any likes or dislikes. It is a measure which should be considered simply from the point of view of whether it is just or unjust that it should be passed. I am afraid that the action of the Government to-night has not tended to allay any ill-feeling that may have arisen in connection with the measure up to the present. On the contrary, it tends to intensify any such feeling. Seeing that we have Sessional Orders which

Mr. Ryan.]

allow each member only half an hour to speak on a Bill, every member should have been allowed his half hour on an important measure of this kind. I fail to see how an important matter of this kind, which affects every constituency in the State, can be considered to have been sufficiently discussed when every member did not have an opportunity of speaking on it. Only one member who has spoken on the second reading of this Bill has had an extension of time, and he was a member sitting on the Government side of the House. Why should I be deprived of the opportunity of speaking on it? Why should the hon. member for Ipswich and other hon. members be deprived of the opportunity of speaking on it? I feel the loss of that opportunity the more because members sitting on the opposite side of the House have levelled criticism against me personally. It has been levelled at me by the secretary of the Bible in State Schools League, who has written a letter which has appeared in the *Western Champion*, which is published in my electorate. Now, I have been compelled to give a silent vote simply because I have been gagged by the Government. I have not been given an opportunity of saying why I have voted as I have done. On a measure of this kind every member should have been given an opportunity of speaking. I do not consider it proper legislation unless we are accorded an opportunity of explaining why we vote against the Bill. The Premier expressed regret that we had not an opportunity of speaking, but it was in his power to give us that opportunity. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Croydon was quite sensible. I had intended to speak on the main question, and I would only have taken a few minutes. If there had been any desire to adopt obstructive tactics, the amendment might have been used for that purpose; but no such desire was manifested. I would remind the Hon. the Premier of the fact that last night the Secretary for Lands got through the second reading of the Land Bill quite easily. The Premier ought to have sufficient knowledge of human nature to know that if he used the velvet glove a little more and was a little less inclined to impute motives to members on this side, and to give members sitting on this side a better opportunity of expressing their views, business would get on better. I have been subjected to all sorts of criticism, and yet my mouth has been shut. I do not blame the Premier only. I blame every member who voted for the gag. They saw me rise in my place, and the Hon. the Premier rose simultaneously to move—"That the question be now put." Two members who attacked me—the hon. member for Woolloongabba and the hon. member for Rockhampton North—voted to shut my mouth when they saw me rise in my place, and I ask if that is a fair thing? There is one remedy, and that is that I can trust to the intelligence of my electors—not only those who voted against the Bible in State schools but those who voted for it. On a previous occasion I left my tenure of my seat in the hands of half the number of those who voted for the Bible in State schools. That is my opinion of the intelligence of my electors. There is not one of my electors who has written to me and requested me to vote in favour of the Bill, although 503 of them voted for it. I can only leave the matter in their hands, and take an opportunity later on of explaining to them why I have taken up the position I have in regard to the Bill. But I again say that I consider it is most unfair that we should have been gagged on this measure.

[*Mr. Ryan.*

Mr. HARDACRE: Before we go into Committee on this Bill, I think the Premier should reconsider the position, and give those hon. members who have been prevented from speaking an opportunity of explaining their attitude in regard to the Bill. I probably would not have spoken for more than five minutes in explaining my position on the Bill, but I have been prevented from making that explanation, and I do not think it is a fair thing.

Hon. R. PHILP: You can make your explanation now if you like.

Mr. HARDACRE: I cannot make it now.

Hon. R. PHILP: The hon. member for Barcoo spoke for a quarter of an hour.

Mr. HARDACRE: We cannot reopen the discussion on the second reading now, unless the Premier agrees to retrace his steps and place the second reading on the business-paper again, and I do not know whether he can do that. At the same time it is unfair that we should be rushed straight into Committee, thereby further involving members who have not had an opportunity of putting their views before the House and the country and particularly before their own electors. I think it would have been better if another week were allowed so that hon. members might have an opportunity of explaining their position.

Hon. R. PHILP: You can do it in Committee.

Mr. MAUGHAN: I will make my explanation in my own electorate. I shall not be gagged there.

Mr. BRESLIN: I am one of those members who have been deprived of the opportunity of speaking by the servile supporters of the Government. I am one of those who have been subjected to a great deal of criticism in connection with this matter. I am one of those in whose electorates the Bible in State Schools League have found it necessary to hold a meeting. I came here to-night prepared to state my views and explain my attitude, and I have been gagged. Government supporters will not hesitate to level criticism at me in my electorate; they will not hesitate to criticise my action in voting as I have done to-night; but I have been allowed no opportunity of stating my views on the matter, and explaining why I have voted as I have done. I have been deprived of an opportunity of explaining my attitude to the electors of Port Curtis. I am absolutely gagged. Under the Sessional Orders every member is supposed to have half an hour in which to explain his views, and I was prepared to compress my remarks within the limits of half an hour; but I find the question gagged through, and I have not been allowed to speak. There is talk of clerical domination, but the domination would seem to be exercised on the other side. We have had the Bible in State Schools League propounding its views every day of the week. There has been scarcely a day on which hon. members have not received circulars from the league.

Mr. LESINA: Threats, too.

Mr. BRESLIN: Some of the circulars have conveyed resolutions. I was not allowed to speak on the second reading of the Bill, but was simply told to sit down and keep quiet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! A difficulty arises on such an occasion as this. I believed that it was the desire of the House that the hon. member for Barcoo and one or more members who had not spoken to the

original motion might be allowed a little latitude, and I allowed latitude. Of [12 p.m.] course, I knew that it was possible that the hon. member for Clermont and several other members would ask for the same latitude, and I shall have to refuse it. A precedent has been established through my having allowed too much latitude, and in future I shall confine members closely to the question. If the House requires the Standing Orders to be closely adhered to, then the House will have to support me in keeping to those Standing Orders, and hon. members must not expect any latitude. Hon. members who have not spoken, such as the hon. member for Port Curtis, should, I think, on this question that the committal of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow, be allowed some latitude, but not to the extent to which he is going into detail.

Mr. BRESLIN said that as a representative of Port Curtis he was gagged from giving any expression of opinion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! That position has nothing to do with the occupant of the chair, who for the time being controls the proceedings of the House. Will the hon. member confine his remarks to the question.

Mr. BRESLIN said that some of his constituents voted for the Bill thinking there was to be purely and simply a Scripture reading by the teachers, and they were not prepared to allow ministers of religion to go into the schools and upset the regular routine. He entered his emphatic protest at the manner in which the Bill was being sent on to Committee. He came here to-night prepared to speak on the second reading, and to make his position clear to his electors, but he was absolutely gagged.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall have to call upon the hon. member to resume his seat for tedious repetition, if he keeps referring to what he terms "the gag."

Mr. BLAIR regretted that the Premier had moved that the Committee stage of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow. Even the curtailed freedom under the Sessional Order had not been allowed in the debate, and, personally, he had had no opportunity of speaking on the second reading; and there would be no opportunity of considering what amendments they required to move before the Committee stage came on. Protests were unavailing, except that they could be recorded and made use of at the proper time. It seemed to him that the business of the House was degenerating into something which was really a travesty on what legislation should be. The Premier said that every second member had spoken at such length that he really had to be gagged. When hon. members asked, as they were entitled to do under the Sessional Orders, for an extension of time, the request was refused, and the Premier stated that as a course which would justify the imposition of the gag. He regretted that the matter should be forced through in this way, and the Committee stage brought on so soon, that the opportunity was denied to members of improving the Bill, or, at all events, ventilating the views that they held and for which they were responsible to their constituents.

Mr. LESINA was very pleased that the Government had adopted the attitude of pushing the Bill through by brute force. The Bill struck at the fundamental principles of the system of legislation, and the action of the Government in the matter was one of the worst possible advertisements they could get. It was adding another

stone to the superstructure of the edifice of unification, and it proved conclusively that they could pass legislation without debate at all. Instead of taking the Bill into consideration at a later hour, hon. members would have to sit like graven images while the Minister moved clause after clause.

At twelve minutes past 12 o'clock,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER said: I call upon the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. TOLMIE thereupon took the chair.

Mr. LESINA (continuing): The reason why he was not anxious to see the Bill taken into consideration at a later hour of the day was that certain members had not been permitted to discuss the Bill as they were entitled to. It was a significant fact that the Government took advantage of the absence of the leader of the Opposition through illness, and also of the temporary absence of certain members of the Labour party, to rush the Bill through in a hurry. He would also point out that sufficient debate had not been permitted on the amendment moved by the hon. member for Croydon. Only two members were permitted to speak on the amendment, and then discussion was blocked. The historian of the future, when he came to dig up *Hansard* for the records of debates, would be inexpressibly shocked to find that arguments were not listened to at all. The fundamental principles of the present educational system were violated by the proposed legislation passed in this brutal fashion, and that would serve as an excellent text upon which the historian of the future would preach some valuable sermons.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I must ask the hon. member for Clermont to confine his attention to the question before the House.

Mr. LESINA said he had no further remark to make.

Mr. MANN protested against the committal of the Bill being taken at a later hour of the day, when members would not be in a condition to properly discuss amendments that might be brought forward. He intended to move an amendment authorising committees of State schools to exclude clergymen if the majority of the parents were against the teaching of religious doctrine. He urged the Minister, as a Christian gentleman, to put off the discussion until such time as all members could be present.

Mr. MULLAN said that if business was to be conducted as it had been conducted during the last few weeks, there would soon be a parliamentary crisis. The gagging of [12.30 a.m.] that Bill through the House was done very deliberately because it was well known that the hon. members for Kennedy, Carpentaria, Gympie, and Charters Towers were in New South Wales helping the Labour men there to down Wade, the Queensland Premier's friend.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to the question before the House, which is that the committal of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow. I have no knowledge of anything that transpired before this motion came before the House.

Mr. MULLAN: The further consideration of the Bill might be allowed to stand over until the leader of the Opposition returned. Why did members of the Cabinet allow the Bill to be rushed through when it was well known that they did not endorse the conduct of the Premier? The despotic action of the Premier would meet with the condemnation of every right-thinking man in the Assembly.

Mr. HAMILTON protested against the Committee stage being fixed for a later hour of the day. There were a number of members who

Mr. Hamilton.]

did not speak on the second reading at all, although it was understood when the Sessional Orders were passed that every member would be allowed half an hour on every second reading. Yet they had the representative of the Government in another place saying that the business received from the Assembly had not been sufficiently discussed, and they would be practically dealing with Bills in their initiatory stage. Fancy that from a member of the Legislative Council in reference to the Mines Regulation Bill! If the Committee stages were rushed through, it would mean that the measure would be sent to the Council in an incomplete form. Every member in the House represented a constituency, and had a right to be heard on every subject that came before the Chamber. If members of the Opposition were not to be allowed to speak, they might as well stop away from the House for all the good they could do in it. Members required time to prepare amendments to the Bill, and if the Committee stage was taken at a later hour of the day they would have no time to prepare those amendments. He entered his emphatic protest against the manner in which the Government were rushing through legislation without proper discussion, and hoped that their time on the Treasury bench would be short.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*) entered his protest against the Committee stage of the Bill being taken so soon after the second reading. There was a number of amendments which it was proposed to submit. He intimated in his speech on the second reading that he desired to move an amendment containing a conscience clause for teachers, and another amendment scheduling the items of religious instruction which should be given in schools, but owing to the manner in which the measure was being rushed through the House he would not be able to prepare those amendments and lay them before the Committee. He did not know whether it was the intention of the Minister to proceed with the Bill in Committee at a later hour of the day, but if it was not he might inform the House what was his intention.

Mr. ALLEN protested against the indecent haste with which the Bill was being forced through the House, and desired to know whether the Minister had made up his mind not to accept any amendments. Possibly Archdeacon Garland had brought the Bill to the Government and would not permit any amendments to be made. The Committee stage should be postponed for at least a week, as there were many important amendments to be moved. The proposal was unreasonable and unfair, and he would appeal to members on the other side whether they would like to be treated in the same manner if they were in opposition.

At three minutes to 1 o'clock a.m.,

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

Quorum formed.

Mr. ALLEN again appealed to the Minister to agree to the committal of the Bill being postponed for at least a week. If the third reading was brought on at a later hour it would be something worse than the gag.

At 1 o'clock a.m.,

The PREMIER: I move—That the question be now put.

Mr. ALLEN asked had the question been sufficiently debated?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Certainly; I am of opinion that the question has been sufficiently debated. No less than fifteen members have discussed the question before the House.

Mr. LENNON said the question had been debated very briefly.

[Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. MAUGHAN rose to a point of order. Was the Acting Speaker entitled to put the question? Standing Order No. 10 read as follows:—

When, in consequence of protracted sittings of the House, or from any other cause, Mr. Speaker is unable to continue in the chair, the Chairman of Committees shall take the chair as Deputy Speaker during Mr. Speaker's absence.

No. 11 implied that the House should appoint a Deputy Speaker.

The PREMIER: It frequently happens that the Speaker calls upon some other member. There is nothing at all in that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I rule that, according to the practice of this House, I am quite justified in ruling that I think that the question should be now put.

Question—That the question be now put—put; and the House divided.

In division,

Mr. LENNON pointed out that, no doubt inadvertently, the Acting Speaker omitted to state the question immediately before appointing the tellers.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: He did.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I distinctly stated the question before I called the tellers.

AYES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kidston
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Booker	" Morgan
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Brennan	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philp
" Corser	" Rankin
" Cottell	" Roberts
" Cribb	" Somerset
" Denham	" Swayne
" Forrest	" Thorn
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. D. Hunter.	

NOES, 24.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Breslin	" Mann
" Collins	" Maughan
" Crawford	" May
" Douglas	" Mulcahy
" Foley	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodo e
Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. Theodore.	

IPATR.

Aye—Mr. Grant. No—Mr. Blair.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the committal of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 32

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hodge
" Appel	" Hunter, D.
" Barnes, G. P.	" Kidston
" Barnes, W. H.	" Macartney
" Booker	" Morgan
" Bouchard	" Paget
" Brennan	" Petrie
" Bridges	" Philp
" Corser	" Rankin
" Cottell	" Roberts
" Cribb	" Somerset
" Denham	" Swayne
" Forrest	" Thorn
" Grayson	" Walker
" Gunn	" White
" Hawthorn	" Wienholt
Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Hodge.	

NOES, 24.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
" Barber	" Mackintosh
" Breslin	" Mann
" Collins	" Maughan
" Crawford	" May
" Douglas	" Mulcahy
" Foley	" Mullan
" Hamilton	" Murphy
" Hardacre	" McLachlan
" Keogh	" Payne
" Land	" Ryan
" Lennon	" Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Land.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Grant. No—Mr. Blair.

Resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. Under the circumstances, I think I may be permitted to say that the first business at a later hour of the day will be the consideration of this Bill in Committee. I might say, for the information of hon. members, that according to the business-paper that I made out for myself for business in advance, I put down the Committee stage of this Bill for the 25th October—

Mr. HAMILTON: Why don't you keep to it?

The PREMIER: But after what has taken place on the purely formal motion, I think hon. members will agree with me that we had better deal with this Bill at a later hour of the day. It is a little Bill of practically one clause, and it has already received twice the length of time that the Land Bill received.

Mr. HAMILTON: Because you were not in charge of the Land Bill. If you had been in charge of the Land Bill, you would not have got it through in a month.

The PREMIER: I think hon. members will see that it is much better, as this is an acrimonious matter, that it should be dealt with and got out of the road and not be put off and kept as a bone of contention.

Mr. BRESLIN: Gag it through.

The PREMIER: I hope hon. members will assist in getting it through at the next sitting of the House.

At eighteen minutes past 1 o'clock a.m.,

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Armstrong) resumed the chair.

Mr. LENNON: I think the Premier might have asked that this House adjourn without adding insult to injury—after what has taken place, he has altered his mind. He was going to ask that the Committee stages of this Bill should be dealt with on the 25th October, but after restricting the privilege of hon. members, the hon. gentleman has, in that churlish spirit, determined that he will use his power to still further curtail those privileges, and in a worn-out House he is going to bludgeon the Bill through in spite of opposition. I am sure the hon. member will live to regret that action. I have nothing more to say.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at nineteen minutes past 1 o'clock a.m.