Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 6 OCTOBER 1910

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

THURSDAY, 6 OCTOBER, 1910.

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

REPORT OF INSPECTOR OF HOSPITALS FOR THE INSANE.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. G. Appel, *Albert*): I beg to lay on the table the report of the Inspector of Hospitals for the Insane for 1909, and move that the paper be printed.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I would like to make a suggestion in regard to the printing of papers. In New Zealand the Government Printer, when printing papers ordered to be furnished by Order of the House, states at the end thereof the number issued and the approximate cost of publication. It appears to me that we might adopt that plan here with considerable profit in connection with papers ordered to be printed; and I think the Treasurer, in whose department the Printing Office is, might take the matter into consideration.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: May I suggest to the hon. member that the Printing Committee has charge of these matters, and, if the suggestion made by the hon. member is brought before them, I can give him my assurance that it will receive consideration.

Mr. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I would like to ask a question, and your remarks lead up to it. We know there is a Printing Committee, and I was amongst those nominated to it, and that is the last I heard of it. Is the Printing Committee ever called together? What are its duties? What are they to supervise? There are other members in the same position as myself in regard to this matter. According to your remarks, papers to be printed are supposed to come before the Printing Committee. A lot of papers have been ordered to be printed already, but, as a member of the committee, I have never been called upon to attend a meeting.

The TREASURER: You ought to get a move on.

Mr. HAMILTON: I have never been invited to attend a meeting. If we are responsible for the printing, it is only right that we should have some say in it.

The PREMIER (Hon. W. Kidston, *Rockhampton*): There was a tone of reproach in the hon. member for Gregory's remarks; and he looked across to this side of the Chamber as if the reproach rested here. After this House appoints a committee, it is the duty of the members of that committee to see that they do the business for which they are appointed.

Mr. HAMILTON: Who is the chairman? Who is responsible?

The PREMIER: No one here has anything to do with the working of the committees appointed. This House cannot control them after they are appointed.

Mr. HAMILTON: I was just asking for information.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): We have heard of this not only in connection with the Printing Committee but also in connection with the Buildings Committee. We know that in

connection with the Library Committee there must be someone to call them together, and we know there are meetings of the Refreshment-rooms Committee. There must be someone to call these committees together. The hon. member for Gregory has been twitted with the suggestion that he ought to have got the committee together, but I do not presume it is the duty of an individual member of a committee to run round trying to get a meeting. There should be somebody authorised to give notice of meeting. After the Printing Committee was appointed, there should have been a meeting, and a chairman should have been appointed to deal with these matters. The appointment of committees at the beginning of the session seems to be merely routine business. The sum of £750 was spent in connection with that lift; and some of the members of the Buildings Committee did not know there was a meeting of the committee. There should be some means of bringing the members of these committees together.

Question—That the paper be printed—put and passed.

WAGES OF ORPHAN BOYS.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg to lay on the table a Return to an Order, made by the House on the 1st September, at the instance of the hon. member for Bulloo, relating to the wages paid to State orphan boys employed on farms.

Mr. ALLEN: I would like to ask the hon. member if he proposes to print that return?

The HOME SECRETARY: If I had proposed to have it printed, I would have moved that the paper be printed.

Mr. ALLEN: I give notice that to-morrow I will move that the paper be printed.

Mr. WHITE: It does not matter what the cost is.

QUESTIONS.

BUTTER MANUFACTURED IN BUTTER FACTORIES.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

1. What was the total amount of butter fat purchased or received from suppliers by the various butter factories in operation in the State during the first six months of the year?

2. What amount of butter was manufactured therefrom?

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

1. The statistics asked for are not available.

2. 15,025,670 lb.

CHINAMEN EMPLOYED ON PRIVATE RAILWAYS.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

Is there any truth in the statement made in the Senate the other night by Senator McGregor that "At the present time in Queensland there are private railways on which Chinamen are working, and which are bounty-fed"?

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

I am not aware of any private railways in Queensland on which Chinsmen are working.

Mr. FERRICKS: What about the tramways?

A LABOUR MEMBER: What about the Ingham Tramway?

Mr. FERRICKS: There are Chinese and Japanese employed on the tramways.

FERRO-CONCRETE PILES FOR PORT ALMA RAILWAY.

Mr. BRESLIN (*Port Curtis*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

(*a*) Were any ferro-concrete piles constructed under the supervision of the Railway Department for the Port Alma Railway or wharf during the last six months?

(*b*) If so, how many, and at what total cost?

(*c*) Is it correct that, when a trial was made, these piles sank so rapidly in the mud that the idea of using them was abandoned?

(*d*) If this is the case, what system will be now adopted, and what will become of the ferro-concrete piles now on hand for these purposes?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS replied—

(*a*) No.

(*b*), (*c*), and (*d*) See (*a*).

(Laughter.)

SUPERINTENDENT OF SUGAR EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

1. Did the department call for applications for the purpose of filling the position of superintendent of sugar experimental stations?

2. How many applications were received, and from whom?

3. In view of the marked hostility existing between the A.S.P.A., representing the sugar manufacturers, and the Canegrowers' Union, representing the small growers, does the Minister not consider it would have been wiser to have appointed a man outside the influence of both the abovementioned associations?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE replied—

1. No.

2. One, from Mr. H. Baskerville Staples, of Mossman.

3. The Minister is not aware that the general superintendent of sugar experiment stations is influenced by either of the associations mentioned.

Mr. BARBER: Not badly put.

REFERENCES TO AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. RYAN (*Barcoo*) asked the Treasurer—

In what part of pages 3, 4, or 5 of the Auditor-General's report can the necessary information be obtained as to—

(*a*) Why in quoting from the judgment of Mr. Justice Higgins in the letter dated 6th September, 1910, the following words were omitted at the end of the sentence—viz., "That is to say, practically until the appropriation lapses"?

(*b*) Whether there is any statutory provision in Queensland similar to section 5 of the Commonwealth Surplus Revenue Act?

The TREASURER (Hon. A. G. C. Hawthorn, *Enoggera*) replied—

If the hon. gentleman will again read my answer of the 4th instant he will see that I refer him to the Auditor-General's report as a place where he will get all necessary information.

Mr. RYAN: It is the same evasion as before.

GOLD AND OTHER MINERAL FIELDS.

On the motion of Mr. MULLAN (*Charters Towers*), it was formally resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing—

1. Names of gold and mineral fields in Queensland.
2. Area of each such gold and mineral field.
3. Area of each such gold and mineral field—(*a*) Under occupation license; (*b*) alienated; (*c*) held under any other tenures.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that, in the temporary absence of the Acting Chairman, Mr. Grant, in accordance with Standing Order No. 11, Mr. Tolmie, hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, do take the chair during the absence of Mr. Grant.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I desire to call your attention to Standing Order No. 11, and to ask your ruling whether the Premier is in order in moving for the appointment of a Chairman of Committees to-day? Standing Order No. 11, dealing with the absence of Chairman, reads as follows:—

> In the absence of the Chairman of Committees, or if he is acting as Deputy Speaker, the House shall appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committees in his place.

I call your attention to the fact that, owing to the illness of the Speaker, Mr. Bell, you, as Chairman of Committees, took the position of Deputy Speaker of this House. Upon you taking that position, the Government moved that Mr. Grant, the senior member for Rockhampton, be appointed Chairman of Committees. That was carried. I ask your ruling as to whether the Government can now move for the appointment of a temporary Chairman of Committees during the absence of Mr. Grant, who has been appointed Acting Chairman of Committees. I do not think they are in the position to do so, and I would like your ruling upon that point.

Mr. LESINA: On the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon, as to whether this is in order, the hon. member only quoted one Standing Order, and I shall quote another. I call attention to Standing Order No. 35, which comes under Chapter IV., relating to motions. It reads—

> A notice of motion may not be given for the same day on which it is given, nor for a day later than the eighth next sitting day of the House.

How does the reading of that Standing Order apply to this motion which the hon. gentleman has moved, and which you expect the House to deal with now? I simply refer to that for the purpose of buttressing up the point of order taken by the hon. member for Croydon, and in support of that point of order. He quotes Standing Order No. 11, and I quote No. 35, and I ask you to take the two together.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon, the House has given notice that it requires certain work to be done in Committee to-day. Until the roll of members was called, the House had no official knowledge that the Acting Chairman of Committees was temporarily absent. In order to conduct the work of the House, it is incumbent upon the leader of the House to act under Standing Order No. 11, and move that the House shall appoint a member to act as Chairman of Committees.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The question is that Mr. Tolmie do take the chair in Committee during the temporary absence of the Acting Chairman of Committees.

Mr. MURPHY: I am entitled to discuss that motion, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand that the hon. member did discuss the motion.

Mr. MURPHY: No; I merely raised a point of order. So far as the appointment of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, is concerned, I do not know that I am going to take any great exception to it. So far as the business of the Assembly is concerned, the Government, with their majority, will do absolutely as they like. But I should like to point out, in connection with the appointment of officials of this House, that members are not selected by the Government party in consequence of their capacity or ability, but in consequence of the good they can do for the Government. There have been occasions in this Chamber during the term of office of the present Government when the gentleman who has been nominated for the high position of Speaker has been dragged in from the lobby to record his vote in order that he might obtain the position. We have also seen that under this system of selecting members merely from the Government side of the House for the high, and what should be honourable, positions in this Chamber, the gag has been applied on the casting vote of the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. THORN: You voted for the gag many a time.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not discussing the gag at the present time. I am only laying before the House the fact that, if a member wants to obtain any high position in this Chamber, he has only to serve the Government, or wait until the Government get into a corner, and then tell them that unless they are prepared to give him something for himself——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is distinctly out of order in imputing motives, and he must refrain from such conduct.

Mr. MURPHY: If you will pardon me, I was not imputing any motives to any official of the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member will be equally wrong if he imputes motives to any hon. member, and I call upon the hon. member not to treat this matter in a flippant manner.

Mr. MURPHY: I am not treating it in a flippant manner. I have referred to certain facts within the knowledge of members of this Chamber. I say that Mr. Tolmie, the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, has been selected for the position of Acting Chairman of Committees, not because he is the most capable man on the Government side of the House but because, I suppose, he has been a loyal supporter of the Ministry, and is an influential party man. And the Government just put him in that position to-day for the same reason that they have appointed other members to similar positions. The very best men should be chosen for

the positions of Speaker of the House and Chairman of Committees, and I say that has not been done in the past. That is all I have to say on the question.

Mr. LESINA: I do not know by what process of discrimination you can discover which member is the best for the position of Chairman of Committees, unless you try them all in that position. I suppose that on this occasion we have to try someone. There are members on this side of the House who would fill the position admirably, but the Government have chosen the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, who has studied the Standing Orders, who has ambitions and aspirations which may or may not be realised in the course of time, and who is an important person who must not be allowed to blackleg. The complaint that it is a political appointment will apply to all appointments made by the Government, from the Speaker downwards.

Question put and passed.

STATE EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

MOTION TO GO INTO COMMITTEE—POINT OF ORDER.

On the Order of the Day being read for the House to go into Committee on this Bill,

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. W. H. Barnes, *Bulimba*): Mr. Deputy Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair.

Mr. MURPHY: Before you leave the chair, Sir, I desire to obtain your ruling upon the question as to whether the Committee stage of the State Education Acts Amendment Bill is legally before this Chamber? During the later stage of the last sitting, when the second reading of this measure was before the House, you had occasion to leave the chair, and you called upon the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, to relieve you in the chair. I submit, or perhaps it is better to use the legal phrase, I venture the opinion, that under Standing Order No. 10—"Temporary absence of Speaker during sitting"—the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba was not privileged to occupy the Speaker's chair; and, consequently, the hon. member being illegally in possession of the Speaker's chair, the House being illegally constituted, all the later stages of the State Education Acts Amendment Bill were illegal, and we cannot now deal with the measure in Committee. Standing Order No. 10 says—

> 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 the Speaker's absence.

I hold that that Standing Order privileges no ordinary member of this Chamber to occupy the Speaker's chair. It is laid down very conclusively that during the temporary absence of Mr. Speaker, his place shall be occupied by the Chairman of Committees. Mr. Grant, the Acting Chairman of Committees, being absent, I hold that there was no other member of the House competent to take the Speaker's chair, and that if the Speaker was unable to continue to preside over the deliberations of the Chamber, the House should have adjourned. I should like your ruling on that point, as to whether the House is now competent to deal with the State Education Acts Amendment Bill in the Committee stage—whether the Committee stage of the Bill is now legally before the House?

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*): Before you give your ruling, Sir, may I ask [4 p.m.] whether you are prepared to hear other hon. members on the point raised by the hon. member for Croydon?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I shall be very pleased to hear hon. members on the point raised.

Mr. HARDACRE: With the hon. member for Croydon, I think that this Bill is not legally before the House at the present time. Whilst the Standing Order to which the hon. member has referred applies to the question, it does not seem to me to be clear enough. Standing Order No. 10 provides that, in the absence of the Speaker, he shall call upon the Chairman of Committees to take his place as Deputy Speaker. Now, it so happened that last night there was no Chairman of Committees present except yourself. Standing Order No. 12 specifically lays down the procedure which is to be followed in such a case—

> The House may from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

It is to be noted that the House has to appoint another member to take the position of Deputy Speaker. That course was not followed at all. Last night the Deputy Speaker, when leaving the chair temporarily, called upon another member to take his place. That is not the procedure laid down in Standing Order No. 12, and therefore this Bill is irregularly before the House at the present time. There was no doubt very good reason for laying down this procedure, because the Speaker is the supreme officer of the House. He lays claim to all the rights and privileges of this House, and he is supposed to protect those rights and privileges. The Deputy Speaker can also exercise those supreme powers. As the procedure as laid down in Standing Order No. 12 was not adopted, I claim that the House was irregularly constituted when the Deputy Speaker left the chair, and that the House, in passing the second reading of the Bill and referring it to the Committee to-day, was not entitled to give such instructions. As neither the Speaker, the Deputy Speaker, nor another member temporarily appointed to act as Deputy Speaker was in the chair when those instructions were given, the House was not competent, under our Standing Orders, to bring this Bill before us this afternoon. I therefore think that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon is a sound one.

Mr. RYAN: It seems to me that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon goes even beyond the Standing Orders. There is an Act of Parliament which governs the position—the Legislative Assembly Act of 1867. Section 12 of that Act reads—

> The members of the Legislative Assembly shall upon the first assembling after every general election proceed forthwith to elect one of their number to be Speaker, and in case of his death, resignation, or removal by a vote of the said Legislative Assembly, the said members shall forthwith proceed to elect another of such members to be such Speaker.
>
> And the Speaker so elected shall preside at all meetings of the said Legislative Assembly, except as may be provided by the Standing Rules and Orders hereinafter authorised to be made.

Therefore Parliament has provided that the Speaker shall take the chair unless the Standing Orders provide that under certain circumstances someone else shall take the chair. In principle it seems to me that the contention of the hon. member for Croydon is well founded. The policy of the Legislative Assembly Act seems to be that the Speaker shall be the presiding officer of the House, and he must be appointed by the vote of a majority of the members of the House. So likewise with the Chairman of Committees. If it is within the power of the Speaker, contrary to the provisions of section 12 of the Legislative Assembly Act, to call upon any private member to take the chair, we have the position that the House is being presided over by someone who is not necessarily the choice of the House. In other words, the House has the right to choose its own presiding officer. If the procedure which was adopted last night is correct, then the Speaker has the right to name the presiding officer of the House in his absence. Now, I can find nothing in the Standing Orders which permits of that being done. There are several Standing Orders bearing on the point. Standing Order No. 9 provides for what shall be done in the absence of the Speaker. Standing Order No. 10 reads—

> 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.

Standing Order No. 11 reads—

> In the absence of the Chairman of Committees, or if he is acting as Deputy Speaker, the House shall appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committtees in his place.

Standing Order No. 12 provides—

> The House may from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

The TREASURER: The House "may" appoint.

Mr. RYAN: I quite agree that it says that the House "may" appoint another member to act as Deputy Speaker, to get over the sort of position that arose last night. That, to my mind, is the reason for appointing a Deputy Speaker. Of course, it is a thing in regard to which anyone might easily make a slip; but, on looking into the matter, I am honestly of opinion that the House was not properly constituted when the chair was taken by the hon. member for Toowoomba. I think that what was then done is contrary to the provisions of section 12 of the Legislative Assembly Act, and therefore that the point raised is a very serious one.

Mr. BLAIR (*Ipswich*): I regret that I do not see eye to eye with the previous speakers on this matter, and, as it is a point of procedure, I think we ought to take abundant precaution that no incorrect ruling should be arrived at. I am going to offer my opinion for what it is worth, but the view of the Standing Orders that I take leads me to infer that the point taken by my friend, the hon. member for Croydon, is in this case not well founded. I entirely agree with what the hon. member for Barcoo has said with regard to the section of the Legislative Assembly Act he has quoted—that power is there given to appoint a Speaker, and in the absence of the Speaker a Deputy Speaker may take his place, provided the formalities of the appointment are duly observed. That is a section of an Act which, of course, should be strictly observed. Now, the House in those particular matters, as in all other matters, practically is master of its procedure—it absolutely controls its own internal management. If any objection is to be taken as to procedure in the House, it ought to be taken at the specific time the matter challenged arises. If it is not taken at the specific time, then it is taken that the House tacitly approves of any action that has been taken to which specific objection is not taken at the proper time.

Mr. MULLAN: Objection was taken at the time by the senior member for Ipswich.

Mr. BLAIR: With regard to the objection being taken at the time, that is the first point. If that objection were not persisted in to the extent of getting a ruling, and if a ruling were given which ruled that objection out, and exception were not taken to that, or it was not disagreed with, then the position in which the House is to-day is not an improper or illegal one.

Mr. MULLAN: That is exactly what has happened. He ruled it out of order.

Mr. BLAIR: If he ruled it out of order, we are driven back to the unfortunate thing that the procedure of the House may, after all, settle this point, and every other point, by a majority. The important points in the Standing Orders are these: First of all there is No. 10—

> 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.

That is perfectly clear on the face of it—that if the Chairman of Committees be present he shall take the chair in the absence of the Speaker, temporary or otherwise. Now, in this particular instance, the Chairman of Committees was not present, therefore we have to go further on to Standing Order 11, which says—

> In the absence of the Chairman of Committees—

which is the case here—

> or if he is acting as Deputy Speaker—

Assuming you, Sir, were out, and you called on the Chairman of Committees to take your place—

> the House shall appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committees in his place.

Supposing you were called away, and the Chairman of Committees were present, and you called on him to take your place, and he were Deputy Speaker, and he then was called away, the House would then have to appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committees in his place. That is incumbent upon the House, because it "shall." Now, an interesting point might arise there, which has not been touched upon by the hon. member for Croydon, and might create some difficulty—namely, that in this case it is really not the Speaker who is taking the action at all; it is the Deputy Speaker. That is No. 11.

> In the absence of the Chairman of Committees, or if he is acting as Deputy Speaker, the House shall appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committees in his place.

That does not arise in this instance. That is only to appoint, as the hon. member for Croydon interjects, a member who is to act

as Chairman of Committees, so that that does not help us. We have then to go on to No. 12. You notice the phraseology of the Standing Order is altered altogether. It says—

> The House may from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

Mr. MURPHY: He is a permanent official.

Mr. BLAIR: Let us follow the phraseology, word by word—

> The House may—

In the first place, it has discretion—

> from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker—

if he is away—

> and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

It all turns on this, as I understand it: That the House may from time to time do a certain thing. You, Sir, called on Mr. Tolmie, the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba, last night. At the time you called on him no objection was taken——

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes.

Mr. BLAIR: At the time he was called on, if hon. members will pardon me, no objection was taken.

Mr. HARDACRE: Quite right.

Mr. BLAIR: And he assumed the position of Deputy Speaker, or Acting Deputy Speaker —whatever terms you like to use to describe the discharge of his functions or the position he held. That was the time that objection should have been taken. If it were not taken at that time, the House tacitly agreed to the procedure that was adopted, and any technical objection was waived by it not being taken then. I conceive that section 20 of the Acts Shortening Act comes in, and that, *á fortiori*, the rule which applies to the Acts of the Legislature will apply to the Standing Orders of the House, which have not the full force of Acts of Parliament, but which have something of the force of Acts of Parliament with regard to the discipline of the House itself—

> Where in any enactment passed after the 27th day of November, 1858, a power is conferred on any officer or person—

In this instance on the Speaker or Deputy Speaker—

> by the word "may" or by words "it shall be lawful" or by words "shall or may be lawful" applied to the exercise of that power, such word or words shall be taken to import that the power may be exercised or not at discretion, but where the word "shall" is applied to the exercise of any such power the construction shall be that the power conferred must be exercised.

Now, the word that is applied to the exercise of that power under Standing Order No. 12 is "may," which shows absolutely that, at the time the hon. senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba was called upon to take the chair, the House then might have taken exception. The House "may" appoint. As the House did not do that, I take it that it tacitly approved of your ruling. As no objection was taken at the very time that he assumed the chair, the House by its inertia or acquiescence ratified the position. Therefore, under all these circumstances—having accepted your invitation to express our views on the matter—I take it that the objection is ill-founded.

The PREMIER: I agree with the hon. member for Ipswich——

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Of course you do.

The PREMIER: That if objection was going to be taken to this, the only proper time it could be taken was when the Deputy Speaker called upon the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba to relieve him in the chair, because, if the House did not object at that time, the House consented to the same being done, and virtually approved of the appointment of Mr. Tolmie.

Mr. RYAN: The consent of the House cannot get over an Act of Parliament.

The PREMIER: But I think that neither of the three Standing Orders that have been quoted applies to the case at all, and, if hon. members will look at these Standing Orders, they will see that nothing has been done which infringes any one of them. Each of those Standing Orders makes provision for a certain thing, and none of these certain things occurred last night.

Mr. HAMILTON: The proper procedure was not adopted.

The PREMIER: No. 10 says—

> 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.

And what is to happen if the Chairman is not there? The Standing Order does not provide for what shall happen.

Mr. RYAN: Then you must go back to the section of the Act which says the Speaker has to continue in the chair.

The PREMIER: Then the House shall appoint another member to act as Chairman of Committees in his place. It has no bearing on the case that occurred last night.

Mr. LENNON: The same thing could have been done last night.

The PREMIER: The first Standing Order is that, "The House may, from time to time, appoint"——

Mr. HARDACRE: "Who shall"——

The PREMIER: "Who shall," and the House may appoint another.

Mr. HARDACRE: It provides for a certain thing in his absence.

The PREMIER: But it does not provide for what happened last night, and the only way of avoiding it was for someone to give notice of motion last night. Was someone to give notice of motion for the next day for the appointment of a temporary Speaker for half an hour, and was the Speaker to leave the chair and the House adjourn?

Mr. HARDACRE: It does not need notice of motion for that.

The PREMIER: I think that in this matter you, Sir, acted not only in good sense but in a business-like, sensible, and ordinary common-sense manner, but you followed the precedent of what had been done on previous occasions——

Mr. HARDACRE: Never before.

The PREMIER: Without the protest of this House.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The PREMIER: It has been done, I think, on two occasions.

Mr. HARDACRE: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The PREMIER: I have just pointed out that if objection was taken to you, Sir, calling upon Mr. Tolmie at the time, then the House could have prevented Mr. Tolmie taking the chair; but the House did not do that, but did, in fact, consent to Mr. Tolmie going into the chair. What position the House would have been in had it objected, I leave the House to imagine. All I claim is that no Standing Order has been broken. A situation occurred last night which none of these three Standing Orders provide for.

Mr. RYAN: The section of the Act does.

The PREMIER: The Deputy Speaker in the sight of the House—and the House has power to correct him if they know he is wrong—Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the sight of the House, followed a precedent that has been set twice, I think, within the last two years.

Mr. MANN: Give a case in point.

The PREMIER: I cannot give the dates, but the matter was called to my notice some time ago—long before this thing occurred—of Mr. Speaker appointing another member, other than the Chairman of Committees, because the Chairman of Committees was out of the Chamber.

Mr. FERRICKS: Then he was wrong.

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Speaker Bell called upon the member for Logan, but he admitted that he was wrong in doing so.

The PREMIER: In *Hansard* for 1909, vol. ciii., page 499, I read—

> At 8.45 p.m., the SPEAKER said: In the absence of the Chairman, I call upon the hon. member for the Logan to relieve me in the chair.
>
> Mr. STODART thereupon took the chair.

Mr. HARDACRE: That was the Speaker.

Hon. R. PHILP: The Deputy Speaker has exactly the same power.

The PREMIER: Mr. Deputy Speaker, in acting as he did last night, followed a precedent which had been set in the House, and it was a sensible way of dealing with the matter, even if there was no precedent—the only way of dealing with the matter if there had been no precedent. He followed precedent in a case of emergency—a precedent which the House had raised no objection to. With regard to what the hon. member for Leichhardt said about him being only Deputy Speaker, in regard to such matters the Deputy Speaker is in exactly the same position and has all the powers of the Speaker. That does not affect the matter in any way whatever.

Mr. MURPHY: We are not raising that point at all.

The PREMIER: The situation is just this: There is no actual provision in our Standing Orders to adjust such a case, and none of the Standing Orders quoted have been violated in any way. This particular emergency is not provided for in our Standing Orders.

Mr. ALLEN: What about the Act?

The PREMIER: And the Deputy Speaker, with the consent of the House, followed a precedent that had been carried out with the consent of the House, and it is hardly a fair thing to challenge the matter now.

Mr. ALLEN: Why not?

Mr. MANN (*Cairns*): I have listened very carefully to the argument of the Premier, in which he intimated that the Standing Orders just mentioned do not provide for the case that occurred last night, and I quite agree with him—they do not. But we can infer something from the other Standing Orders. Now, the procedure in regard to the Chairman of Committees getting another member to relieve him in the chair is clearly laid down. It reads—

> When, in consequence of the illness of the Chairman, or the protracted sittings of the Committee, or for any other reason, the Chairman is unable to continue in the chair, he may call upon any member then present to take the chair, and the member so called on shall take the chair, and shall, until the return of the Chairman, have and exercise all the powers and functions of the Chairman.

When that Standing Order was laid down, the Standing Orders Committee would have made the same Standing Order for the Speaker—they would have said in the absence of the Chairman of Committees he could call upon any other member to relieve him in the chair. But they did not do it, and not doing it, and reading it with Standing Order No. 12—

> The House may from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

they left it in the hands of the Chairman of Committees to call upon anyone to take his place in the chair. But they did not leave it in the hands of the Speaker, save and except to allow him to call in his place the Chairman of Committees, an officer appointed by the House. The House clearly wished it left in their power to appoint the Speaker, though it was only for a short period. I claim that the proper procedure for you, Sir, to have adopted last night was to have risen in your place and asked, "Is it the pleasure of the House that the senior member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, do take my place in the absence of the Chairman of Committees?" And then it would have lain with the House to have either given you permission or refused it. And I am quite certain that if you had adopted that procedure, which I claim is the proper procedure, that the House, knowing that the Speaker, after all, is only human, would have raised no objection to him leaving the chair and allowing another member to take his place. But this House, and all other Houses of Parliament, is very jealous of its privileges. The Speaker is allowed to exercise very considerable authority, and I claim, before anyone can take the chair as Speaker, this House must set their approval on the appointment. They only permit the one man to take the chair in the absence of the Speaker, that is the Chairman of Committees—a man who has been appointed to his position by the House; and, failing the Chairman of Committees, I claim that you, Sir, as Deputy Speaker, should have submitted to the House the question whether the House was agreeable or not for the senior member for Toowoomba to take the chair. That is my definition of what took place last night, and my ruling on it.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Brisbane North*): I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Ipswich say that the Standing [4.30 p.m.] Orders should be discussed by either side of the House irrespective of party. I think the House should set up a high standard for themselves and exact obedience to the Standing Orders as far as possible. (Hear, hear!) I think, Mr. Deputy

Speaker, that there was no authority for the placing of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba in the chair as he was placed last night. It is quite true that Mr. Speaker Bell on a previous occasion appointed the hon. member for Logan in that way, but there was no authority for it then. The Standing Orders make provision for the filling up of temporary vacancies in certain cases, but such a case as happened last night is not provided for. It is open for the House to have a Deputy Speaker in reserve to fill the position should occasion arise, a step that might be taken with advantage at the commencement of the session by motion in the ordinary way. The Standing Orders read by the hon. member for Cairns shows that there is special provision to enable the Chairman of Committees to call upon any member to relieve him in the chair. I do not think we have anything to guide us in "May," because in the English House of Commons there is a panel of deputy chairmen elected by the House, and a temporary vacancy is filled by one of them. Here it is not so. I think, with the hon. member for Ipswich, that the House practically assented to Mr. Tolmie's assuming the position of Deputy Speaker; and it is rather late now to raise any question as to the effectiveness of anything done while he was in the chair. I think the position has been very aptly stated by the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair.

Mr. HAMILTON: I do not agree with what the hon. member for Ipswich said—that simply because the House did not protest at the time, that legalises what was done and enabled the House to do an unconstitutional thing. I want to quote a ruling given by Mr. Speaker Cowley in connection with the Special Retrenchment Bill, on page 447 of *Hansard* of 1904. The Bill had gone through all its stages as far as the third reading; and when the motion was made for the third reading the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, got up and asked a question. It says here—

> The TREASURER moved that the third reading of the Bill stand an Order of the Day for to-morrow.
>
> HON. R. PHILP: I think we have been passing this Bill rather hurriedly, and I now rise to a point of order. I contend that this Bill is an Appropriation Bill, that it ought to have been introduced by a message from His Excellency the Governor, and that it ought to have been introduced in Committee of Ways and Means. That has not been done.

The Speaker invited discussion on the point, and after several members spoke, he said—

> If no other hon. member wishes to address himself to the point, I think I am bound to rule that the Bill is not properly before the House.

The hon. member for Brisbane North said there was nothing in "May" to guide us, but I take it that there is something in "May" at page 190, where it says—

> At all times there are Deputy Speakers, appointed by commission to officiate as Speaker during the absence of Lord Chancellor or Lord Keeper. When the Lord Chancellor and all the Deputy Speakers are absent at the same time, the Lords elect a Speaker *pro tempore;* but he gives place immediately to any of the Lords Commissioners on their arrival in the House; who, in their turn, give place to each other according to their precedence, and all at last to the Lord Chancellor.

That applies to both House of Commons and House of Lords. If the Speaker and Deputy Speakers are absent and they want a member to fill the position, they have to go through the procedure of specially electing a member to the position of Deputy Speaker. Our Standing Orders are just as plain; and in such a case as happened last night a Deputy Speaker should have been appointed, instead of a member merely being called upon to take the chair.

The PREMIER: What is to happen if nobody else has been appointed?

Mr. HAMILTON: The Standing Orders provide that nobody else shall act.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. HAMILTON: It says—

> The House may from time to time appoint another member to be Deputy Speaker, who shall, in the absence of both Mr. Speaker and the Chairman of Committees, take the chair as Deputy Speaker.

Nobody else shall do so.

The PREMIER: It does not say that nobody else shall do so.

Mr. HAMILTON: The procedure to be adopted is clearly pointed out in "May," and the point raised by the hon. member for Croydon is a fairly valid one.

Mr. LESINA: I agree with the view expressed by the hon. member for Ipswich, and support the opinion that this Chamber, as a democratic Assembly, is the governor of its own proceedings. What a ridiculous thing it would be for a man to bind up his own house with rules and regulations so that he could hardly act without discussing with his family how certain things should be done. I say we want freedom in these matters, and the more freedom we have the better.

Mr. HARDACRE: Why have any Standing Orders at all?

Mr. LESINA: As a unificationist I believe that the more we simplify the procedure of this Chamber; the more we can democratise it; the more we get rid of red-tapeism and encourage healthy deliberation, the better it will be for the Assembly and for the conduct of business. After all, we have to go to a vote to determine the thing.

Mr. HAMILTON: Your argument is in favour of abolishing all Standing Orders.

Mr. LESINA: Of course it is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Will the hon. member try to enlighten me in regard to the point of order rather than discuss the general question?

Mr. LESINA: I am supporting the stand you take, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and I think you are quite right.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not asking for the hon. member's support; I am asking for information.

Mr. LESINA: I think a good deal of information has been given.

Mr. LENNON: He already knew you were a unificationist.

Mr. LESINA: I take up the attitude in connection with this point of order that it cannot be sustained. Some members rely on Standing Order No. 12. Upon that Standing Order they base their opinion that the Assembly may select an official to act in the place of the Speaker as Deputy Speaker. Of course, the key-word of the Standing Order is the word "may." The Assembly may or may not appoint a Deputy Speaker. It is not mandatory. It is permissive. It has been done previously, and it can be done again. So long as there is no harm done, and so long as no wrong is done, it is all right. Then no wrong can be done to this

Assembly because one of the lay members of the Assembly takes the chair for a time to relieve the Speaker. If the Speaker wants to leave the chair at any time, must all the business of the Assembly be held up? Must all our business stop if the Speaker wants to go outside and rest himself at any time? The Standing Order is that the House should be consulted on this matter. Before the Speaker can go outside and have a cup of coffee after sitting in that chair for nine or ten hours, he must take members into his confidence, in order that they may appoint a lay member of the House to take the chair in his absence. Why, that is the very red-tapeism which we always object to.

Mr. HARDACRE: It is our Standing Orders.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, I know it is. But our Standing Orders are merely the rules which we adopt for the purpose of governing our deliberations. We are not slaves to rules. Some of our Standing Orders may be necessary, and they lay down a course of procedure which it is necessary we should always follow, but there are several Standing Orders which are not so necessary, and which may be waived from time to time to suit the convenience of this Assembly. To elevate our Standing Orders like the American Constitution, before which the people are constantly on their knees, is to make it a fetish—to make it an object of worship, instead of a means to do deliberative work. After all, the Standing Orders are only a channel through which we are to do our work. If a Speaker calls on a member to take the chair, and he does it without disturbing the business of the Chamber, it seems to me that it is an excellent thing, and I hope that the Standing Orders Committee will put it into the Standing Orders themselves. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. MULLAN: We realise the necessity for it now.

Mr. LESINA: I take the veiw, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that you must determine against this point of order on that ground, and I am prepared to vote to support your ruling. The more we can simplify our Standing Orders the better it will be for this Assembly. The more we get rid of this red tape the better will it be for our deliberations.

Mr. HAMILTON: Then why did you assist in bringing in the Sessional Orders?

Mr. LESINA: Because they are simplifying procedure in every direction. My idea of the Parliament of the future is a place where we will not have to debate the matter at all, where there will be no Standing Orders and no speeches, and where all the work prepared by the Committee will be passed. With our Standing Orders we have months of public time wasted through members arguing whether they apply this way or that way. We find members taking legal opinion, consulting one another, setting one Standing Order against another Standing Order, and they talk about it for weeks. We want a simpler channel through which our legislation can flow without all this red tape and rules to follow, and if I see an obstacle in that channel I am prepared to remove it. I do not want the Speaker to exercise a dominant authority. If the Deputy Speaker decides against this point of order, it is open to any member in this democratic Assembly to move that his ruling be disagreed with, and we settle it by majority rule. Heads are counted, and the ruling is upheld. It takes hours to do it sometimes, and we should do away with that kind of thing. On looking into the matter very carefully, and taking into consideration the view of the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, who studied it carefully, and brought to bear on it a legal mind, experienced in reading the phraseology of enactments—and this is a legislative enactment passed by this Assembly and approved of by the Governor—you must decide against the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In my opinion I must decide against the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon. The reason I have for giving that ruling is that, whilst giving attention to the point raised by the hon. member for Barcoo with reference to section 12 of the Legislative Assembly Act, that point may hold good, but we have to consider it in connection with the Standing Orders, which also govern the procedure in this Chamber. Besides the Standing Orders, you have also other precedents, to which I shall presently refer. Last night I asked the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba to relieve me in the chair after a somewhat protracted sitting, as hon. members know, extending over seven or eight hours, and in doing that I followed the procedure that had been previously followed by Mr. Speaker Bell. I heard the hon. member for Leichhardt say that a case did not occur of the Speaker calling on anyone else to relieve him other than the Chairman of Committees. I find, on page 499 of *Hansard* for 1909, that the hon. member for Logan, Mr. Stodart, was called to the chair by Mr. Speaker Bell, and I find also that, on page 748 of *Hansard* for 1909, the hon. member for Leichhardt, Mr. Hardacre, was called upon to take the chair by Mr. Speaker Bell.

Mr. HARDACRE: Not by a Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hon. members will know that there has been no such peculiar coincidence which has occurred, either in the history of the Queensland Parliament or, I think, in any Parliament of Australia, where the Deputy Speaker has been called upon to perform the functions of Speaker for so extended a period as has fallen to my lot, so that it is hardly possible that we should discover a precedent in regard to that. A further question was raised by the hon. member for Gregory, who quoted the House of Lords procedure, and said that it was the same as the procedure in the House of Commons. As a matter of fact, that is not so. The House of Commons have their own Rules. The Chairman of Committees and Deputy Chairman are appointed, and under the Rules of Procedure and Standing Orders of the House of Commons, which we find in the "Manual," page 252, section 9, it is laid down there absolutely that either the Chairman of Committees or the Deputy Chairman of Committees may relieve the Speaker in the chair. Coming to the point raised by the hon. member for Ipwsich, Mr. Blair, for which I thank him, and which I may say is the one upon which I decide this question, that is the point that this House sets up its own precedents and does its own business at any time. (Hear, hear!) Authorities are made for our guidance, but we have on occasions—and we know this very well—that there are occasions when our authorities, Rules, and Standing Orders have

to be set aside for the rule of convenience. I have the ruling of Cushing in regard to this matter, where he lays it down—

> In most of the Legislative Assemblies of this country it is also provided, by a rule, that the presiding officer if a member may substitute some other member to perform the duties of the Chair, in his place, if he have occasion to be absent for a part or the whole of the then present sitting.

That has been accepted as the procedure in the past, and under the peculiar circumstances which I found myself placed in last night, the Deputy Chairman not being here, it would have been, in my opinion—I may be wrong—an absurdity to have adjourned the House because I found that I could not continue in the chair, after sitting for seven and one-half hours in it. So the only course open to me was to call upon the hon. member whom I thought fit to carry out the duties and the business of this House, as had been done before. No objection was taken at the time, and I consider that the business was properly conducted, and this measure is properly before the House, and so dismiss the point of order raised by the hon. member for Croydon.

Question stated.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I do not think you should leave the chair, not that I desire to see you remain longer in the chair than is absolutely necessary, but because I do not think you should leave the chair just now. If you leave the chair now, the House will go into Committee to consider this Bible in State Schools Bill, and I should like to know before we go into Committee whether we shall be permitted to consider the Bill or whether it is to be thrust down our throats by main force. If the Minister will assure us that we shall be allowed reasonable time to discuss the measure, and that he will consider amendments moved by members on this side of the House, I am prepared to say you should leave the chair and that the Committee should be constituted.

Mr. WHITE: What do you consider reasonable time?

Mr. LESINA: Our Sessional Orders provide reasonable time for discussion in Committee. On each clause and on each amendment we are allowed twenty minutes each, so that there is ample provision made for discussion in Committee, if we have a guarantee that we shall be allowed to discuss the Bill. But before 6 o'clock the Premier may come in and apply the gag by moving "That the question be now put," and I suppose that if he does so his supporters will assist him in carrying that motion. Then the Bill will pass without discussion.

Mr. KEOGH: I will not vote for the gag.

Mr. LESINA: I know that some members on the other side will not vote for the gag; they are independent enough to take up that attitude, but all hon. members are not equally independent and sympathetic. Notice has already been given of some amendments, and if we are given an assurance that those amendments will be properly discussed we shall be justified in agreeing that you should leave the chair and that the House should go into Committee. But if we are not to get a chance of discussing those amendments it will be simply a farce your leaving the chair.

Mr. MURPHY (*Croydon*): The point raised by the hon. member for Clermont——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has spoken.

[*Mr. Armstrong*

Mr. MURPHY: I have not spoken on this question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the hon. member's assurance that he has not spoken on this question.

Mr. MURPHY: No, I have not spoken on this question; I only raised a point of order. The point raised by the hon. member for Clermont is one to which consideration should be given by the Minister in charge of the Bill. It seems to me absolutely absurd that we should vote in favour of your leaving the chair, and then go into Committee to consider the Bill, if we are to be treated in the same manner as the Opposition were treated last night. A member on the other side has asked, "What is reasonable discussion?" We answer that at the beginning of this session the House in its wisdom came to the decision that certain Sessional Orders should be passed, in order that reaonable discussion should take placed on the various matters brought before the Chamber, and we argue that we are entitled to receive an assurance from the Secretary for Public Instruction that if we agree to the House going into Committee to consider this Bible in State Schools Bill, we shall be guaranteed by the Government an opportunity for the reasonable discussion which is prescribed by the Sessional Orders. Unless we get that assurance I consider that we have no right to go into Committee, and that it would be only a farce going into Committee to consider the Bill. We should be guaranteed an opportunity of dealing with the various amendments which may be brought forward, of criticising the clauses of the Bill, and of replying to the arguments of the Minister and other members on the Government side of the House. If the Minister will give us an assurance that we are not to be treated in the way we were treated last night, when the Government gagged, guillotined, bludgeoned, and sandbagged motions through the House, I have no objection to your leaving the chair in order that we may get on with what is usually called the King's business. Can the Secretary for Public Instruction give us that assurance? Is he in a position to speak for the Government, or have members of the Cabinet to do simply as the Premier directs? I have no objection to going into Committee to get the Bill out of the road, but I have an objection to the House going into Committee to consider the Bill unless we are allowed to consider the Bill properly. It is absurd for the House to go into Committee to consider the Bill if the Government will not allow the Bill to be considered at all. The Government have decided that the Bill shall be put on the statute-book, and they showed very conclusively last night that no member on this side of the House is, in their opinion, entitled to be heard on any amendment which may be submitted. There are members on this side of the House who desire to move amendments in the Bill.

The PREMIER: Why don't you allow them to move them?

Mr. MURPHY: Why don't you go outside and lose yourself?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Blair, has circulated an amendment, and before I agree to the House going into Committee I want to know whether that hon. member and other hon. members on this side of the House will have an opportunity of dealing with that amendment—whether we shall have an opportunity for the reasonable discussion for which provision is made by the

Sessional Order, or whether, as soon as the hon. member moves his amendment, and before we have time to consider it, the Premier will move "That the question be now put" and gag the measure through Committee.

Mr. THORN: I would gag you if I could.

Mr. MURPHY: I know you would, but I have certain rights and privileges, and while the Government may bludgeon their own supporters they cannot bludgeon me, though they have tried to do so.

Mr. COTTELL: That is why you are annoyed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member's remarks are entirely irrelevant to the question before the House. I must ask him to confine himself to the question that I do now leave the chair.

Mr. MURPHY: I must confess that I have been drawn off the track. My objections to the motion have been stated very lengthily, and I have no desire to repeat them. All I have to say, in conclusion, is that members of the Opposition are entitled to a guarantee from the Government that this Bill will not be forced through Committee with the gag. Unless we get that guarantee we should put up an objection to going into Committee.

Mr. ALLEN (*Bulloo*): I have no objection to the House going into Committee——

The TREASURER: Well, sit down then.

Mr. ALLEN: Provided the business of the Committee is carried on properly, and that members have a reasonable opportunity for discussion. Of late, business has been carried on by means of the gag and other fancy weapons, and I do not see why we should go into Committee on this Bill if we are to be treated as we were treated last night.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The question is that I do now leave the chair, and the hon. member must confine himself to that question.

Question put and passed.

COMMITTEE.

(*Mr. J. Tolmie, Drayton and Toowoomba, in the chair.*)

On clause 1—"Short title and construction of Act"—

Mr. LESINA said there was no necessity to rush the measure through. He had nothing much to say upon the clause himself, but, as other members might wish to speak or move amendments, he would say
[5 p.m.] a few words while the Bills were being distributed. Hon. members had not seen their Bills yet, and had not had time to submit amendments on the clause. He hoped the Acting Chairman would give hon. members an opportunity of fully discussing the Bill. It had not received adequate consideration in the House, and he hoped full opportunity would be given in Committee to hon. members to ventilate their opinions and to move amendments.

Mr. ALLEN thought that the Bill was very badly named, and it would be an improvement if they called it "The Sectarian Bill," as that would be much nearer the mark.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member desires to move an amendment on the clause, he should indicate it.

Mr. ALLEN asked if he was to understand that he had no right to speak on the clause unless he had an amendment to move?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must indicate his intention if he wishes to move an amendment.

Mr. ALLEN: I was hoping that the Minister would give us some information.

Mr. MURPHY: Before the clause went through, he would like to have some information from the Secretary for Public Instruction regarding the Education Act of 1875. He had always been under the impression that, when that Act was passed, the people of Queensland decided that there should be secular education; and he would like the Minister to inform them whether the Act was passed by the Legislature of Queensland in order to provide secular education for the children of the State. The hon. gentleman might also give them some information regarding the stand taken by the people of Queensland in 1875. He had always been led to believe that the Act was a very good one, and that the people were well satisfied with the system. He also believed it was recognised that the primary schools of the State had turned out some excellent scholars. He regretted to think that the passage of this clause and of the subsequent clause would go a long way towards breaking down the splendid educational system upon which so much money had been spent by past Legislatures, and that, instead of benefiting the rising generation from an educational standpoint, it would be absolutely the means of creating sectarian strife throughout Queensland, and of causing bitterness, and, he might say, wickedness, where previously love, charity, and good fellowship had prevailed.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I desire to say to the hon. member for Bulloo that the intimation I made to him a few minutes ago was certainly a wrong one.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That clause 1 stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 34.

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

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

NOES, 22.

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

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. May.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. Murphy.]

On clause 2—"Amendment of section 5 of principal Act"—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He recognised that this was a question on which many members disagreed, and as Minister in charge of the Bill he wished to adopt those methods which would help very speedily to put the Bill through Committee. He thought it would be helpful to the Committee if he explained straight-away some of the proposals of the department in connection with this particular clause, and it would assist them in dealing with some of these amendments. He noticed in looking through the amendments—and hon. members would at once recognise it—that the carrying of some of the amendments simply meant killing the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: Not at all. Are there not some good amendments?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He wanted to say at once that it would be simply impossible for amendments like that to be accepted on this side.

Mr. LENNON: "On this side." And yet it is a non-party measure!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Well, he would say for the Government. It was a non-party measure, and hon. members would have noticed in the division that some members who ordinarily voted on this side had voted on the other side, and he thought that that was the clearest indication that it was a non-party measure. There was one amendment on line 12, which suggested that there should be a separate reading-book. He might say at once that that was one of the amendments that no one need hesitate about accepting. He wanted to say that, because there was a desire in a matter where apparently people had some little feeling—a desire not to unduly irritate those who might not see eye to eye with them. He would be glad if hon. members would allow him an opportunity of stating what they had done before they entered into a discussion of the clause. During the discussion of the measure on the second reading, the question frequently arose as to what was a fair lesson, and hon. members seemed to have a feeling that these lessons might be prepared by some person or persons who would be antagonistic to the rising generation, as viewed from their own standpoint. He thought he ought to make that point perfectly clear in connection with the committal stage of the Bill, and for the information of the House he would state what was proposed by the department in the event of this Bill becoming law. The hon. gentleman might or might not be aware that at the present moment there was a committee sitting which was busy preparing the new reading-books for the scholars of the State schools of Queensland.

Mr. ALLEN: Have they not finished yet?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Oh, no; those gentlemen were still sitting. He was going to tell the Committee who those gentlemen were; and, further, he was going to add that the department recognised that in connection with those gentlemen they had five experts who were not bound in any way by political or other ties—they were men who had been, in the main, in the department for years and years, who knew the needs of the department, and he was going to tell hon. members that it was the proposal of the department that those gentlemen should be asked to prepare these separate reading-books.

Mr. KEOGH: Let us know their denomination, though.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He would state who they were, and hon. members would recognise that there had been no attempt made—and as a matter of fact the gentlemen whom he was going to select this afternoon were gentlemen who had been engaged in this work of preparing the books long before there was any idea of this coming into the House. He thought the House would accept his assurance that there was no attempt in any way to pack the committee. He would just read who they were. The present committee consisted of the following gentlemen:—Messrs. Kennedy and Canny, Messrs. Exley and Papi, head teachers, associated with Mr. E. W. H. Fowles, M.A. Those were the gentlemen they proposed to ask to do the work of preparing these lessons.

Mr. HARDACRE: What Mr. Fowles is that?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mr. Fowles had been associated with the preparation of these books for months and months. He hoped hon. members would not be suspicious—this was the committee that was at present at work, without any addition whatever, in the preparation of school books.

The PREMIER: The thing has been going on for years.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It had been going on for a long while, and the desire of the department was that they should get books that would be suitable for the school children of the State——

Mr. MURPHY: Just one moment. Is Archdeacon Garland there?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: When the hon. gentleman put a fair question he would answer it.

The PREMIER: A serious question.

Mr. FERRICKS: He is a Minister without portfolio.

Mr. KEOGH: Were those names submitted to the Rev. Garland?

Mr. MCLACHLAN: I would just like to ask——

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There were inquiries all round the Chamber, and he could not answer them all at once.

Mr. MCLACHLAN: Have those persons declared themselves publicly on this question?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The only answer he could give to that question was, that he had no more idea than the hon. member himself had.

Mr. LESINA: One of them has.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: What was the use of answering questions if hon. members would not accept the assurance? He was not there to make misstatements.

Mr. ALLEN: We accept your assurance, as far as you are concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Personally, he had never, directly or indirectly, had a single word with any one of the five gentlemen whose names he had mentioned, and the Committee should

be satisfied with that assurance. The question had been raised as to what was the nature of the lessons to be taught. Every hon. member would give him credit for being, right through the chapter, sincere in that matter, and he would say at once that he was personally not favourable to the lessons as provided by New South Wales.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Excellent in the main as the New South Wales lessons were, some of those lessons, according to his judgment, would be very much better left out.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He might say that his leanings went in the direction of the Western Australian lessons. He made that clear and concise statement, not in the desire to irritate any hon. member on a matter they felt very keenly about, but in the hope that it would help towards the peaceful getting through of the Committee stages of the Bill. He would further add, that he would be very pleased, as the Committee stages proceeded step by step, to give any information that he possibly could to hon. members.

Mr. MANN had very strong objections to the passage of this clause, as practically, by the passing of it all that they had been fighting against would be carried. If the Committee wiped out section 5 of the principal Act they wiped out the provision that only secular teaching would be given in the State schools, and he had very serious objections to any teaching other than secular teaching being given in the State schools, and in saying that, he thought he was voicing the sentiments of a large percentage of members of the Committee. The system at present carried on had given every satisfaction, and no case had been made out for repealing section 5 of the principal Act. The Minister admitted that he did not like the lessons taught in the New South Wales schools. If the lessons as taught in New South Wales had been submitted to the electors of Queensland along with the Bill, did they think for one moment that the referendum would have been carried in the affirmative? It was because the people did not know what lessons were to be taught that the referendum was carried. Many people in the old country who had been taught Bible reading in the schools, where practically all the scholars were of one denomination, said in an off-hand manner, "I was taught the Bible when I was at school, and it won't hurt the youngsters." That was all very well when the children were all of one religious body, but when they had, as there was in Queensland, a mixed community, and with children of every denomination and creed attending the schools, they were going to have a great deal of trouble if they introduced religious teaching. It was quite evident that there were not sufficient clergymen to attend all the schools to give instruction, and instruction must be given by the teacher, if it was to be effective. If they repealed section 5 of the principal Act, the churches would attempt to say what teacher shall be appointed to a particular school, and they would argue—and argue rightly—that, say, 80 per cent. of the scholars belonged to a particular body, the teacher sent to that school should hold the same religious opinions as the opinions held by the bulk of the scholars attending the school. That meant that there would be intriguing in regard to getting teachers shifted from one school to another. As soon as trouble arose, there would be a letter to the Minister from the parents or the school committee asking for a certain teacher to be removed. Take, for instance, a community where there was 85 per cent. or 90 per cent. of Presbyterians, and there was a Roman Catholic teacher there. The children would go home from school after reading the Bible and tell their parents what the teacher said, and immediately an agitation would be got up to remove that Roman Catholic teacher. Or it might be a Church of England community and a Presbyterian school teacher. The Anglicans always considered that every dissenting body had no standing whatever.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Oh, no; we are a great deal broader minded than that.

Mr. MANN: They always alleged that a Presbyterian, Baptist, or any other dissenting parson had not been duly ordained, and they allowed them no rights whatever. The Anglicans had always tried to persecute the dissenting bodies. It was at the instigation of the Anglican Church that King Charles the First persecuted the Scottish people, and endeavoured to force them to conform to the English Church. Everyone who read history knew that it was Archbishop Laud who advised King Charles I. to commence that campaign against the Presbyterians, and he got every support from the Anglican Church. It was because King Charles I. was foolish enough to raise trouble with the Scotch on the question of religion that allowed the English Parliament to win that great constitutional fight.

The PREMIER: There is no doubt about that in Scotland.

Mr. MANN: Any student of history knew that quite well. He (Mr. Mann) held with no particular religion himself, although he occasionally went to church as a matter of courtesy to a friend. He stated that because he wished the Committee to understand that he had no bias for one religion or another. He was arguing in favour of secular education because no school teacher or [5.30 p.m.] clergyman could be found to give religious instruction that would be satisfactory to every pupil in the school. He remembered that in Scotland the people of the Free Church, the Established Church, and the United Church, whose fundamental doctrines were exactly the same, could not agree. And what was going to happen in a mixed community where the people differed on fundamental doctrines? In any village in the old country where there was a Protestant school and a Roman Catholic school, it was a point of honour with the boys attending the two schools to have a fight when the school was over. Where there was one school and the same teaching for all, there was no fighting amongst the scholars.

Mr. MURPHY: It might be gratifying to some hon. members to learn that the Secretary for Public Instruction was desirous of being conciliatory this evening; but, after the way they were treated last night, he had no desire for any member of the Cabinet to confer kindness or conciliation upon him. The Minister said that members who opposed the Bill did not agree with the decision of the people.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I did not say that.

Mr. MURPHY: He was going to attempt to prove that the hon. gentleman did say it; and he thought he would be able to convince the intelligent members of the Committee that the Minister laid it down this afternoon that it was not the intention of the Education Department to give effect to the will of the people on this question.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not so.

Mr. MURPHY: What was the question on the ballot-paper at the referendum? Was it not whether they would agree with the institution in Queensland of a system similar to that in New South Wales? Yet the Minister said they were going to provide a reading-book to be prepared by certain gentlemen in the department. The hon. gentleman did not believe in the lessons in the New South Wales system.

Mr. ALLEN: That shows his wisdom.

Mr. MURPHY: Possibly it did. But the Government were now dodging the question. They were not game to carry out their agreement with Mr. Garland and the Bible in State Schools League. The ballot-paper was first submitted to Mr. Garland and his executive; and it was because they agreed to it that it was submitted to the people. If the Government were honest with the electors they would give Mr. Garland and his executive what they promised—the New South Wales system. But they knew that if they introduced that system into Queensland it would be the means of creating sectarian strife throughout the land. They had come to the conclusion that it was undesirable to introduce such a system; and they were trying to get out of it by saying they were going to appoint five members of the Education Department to draw up certain lessons. And if they were going to provide religious education for the rising generation, was it not essential that the lessons should be drafted by gentlemen who believed in religion? But they had no guarantee, outside the Secretary for Public Instruction, that any of those gentlemen was a religious man. And they did not know whether those gentlemen were willing to accept the task. Possibly they would take a suggestion from the Minister as a command, and undertake the task, not because they believed in it or because they felt specially competent, but because they would have no desire to fall out with the Minister. This clause provided for the repeal of section 5 of the Education Act, which reads as follows:—

> In State schools and provisional schools secular instruction only shall be given, and no teacher shall give any other than secular instruction in any State school building. Provided that such restriction shall not apply except during school hours to any teacher in any school receiving aid under the twelfth clause of this Act.

That was passed at the time the State was doing away with the denominational system. The clause they were now dealing with provided for the abolition of secular education, and the House having decided, under the gag, that secular education should go by the board, in future they were to have religious instruction in the schools. The Minister told them that a book was going to be provided. He would like to know if the lessons in that book would be paraphrased or would it consist of passages from the Bible?

Mr. LESINA: Expurgated—selected passages bowdlerised—with all the naughty words eliminated.

[*Mr. Murphy.*

Mr. MURPHY: The Minister practically said that a certain number of persons selected by the Education Department were going to write a number of moral essays, and these were to be read by the teacher to the school children. Then what was the necessity of going to the expense of £8,000 for the referendum? They could have done without referring that question to the electors at all. And what was the necessity of the unholy alliance between the Bible in State Schools League and the Government? He saw the Chairman looking at the clock, so he would resume his seat.

Mr. PAYNE (*Mitchell*): He would vote against the clause, as he had been consistent in voting against the measure all through. The first line of the first clause was doing something that would place the people of Queensland in an awkward position hereafter. Section 5 of the principal Act was to be repealed. That meant that their beautiful secular system of education which had given such great satisfaction for so long was to be wiped out in a few words. He had never seen any proof, nor heard any Government member give any logical argument, why that system should be done away with. The Minister intimated that a committee would be appointed to draw up a book of lessons to be taught to the children that would give offence to nobody. He could say, without heat or bitterness, that that was not possible. The hon. member for Cairns told them what happened in Scotland, and the same thing happened in New South Wales. He, and other members who had been taught in the New South Wales schools, knew that there was no Christianity in the business at all. Speaking as a Christian man, he could say that the whole system of religious instruction in the State schools would mean that a great many would degrade the sacred name of God Almighty. The Queensland Education Act was recognised as being the best in the world, and in a few words it was proposed to wipe it out, and it would not be possible to rectify it for years.

Mr. FERRICKS (*Bowen*): Seeing that he had no opportunity of voicing his opinion on the main question, he proposed to make a few remarks on the most vital part of the amending Bill, and that was in regard to the proposed removal of that provision providing for secular education. He had not time to explain his attitude on the question, but he could summarise his stand and his opinions in no better way than by briefly recapitulating the three questions which were propounded to him on the public platform and his answers thereto.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine himself to clause 2, and not discuss questions which may have arisen on the public platform. The question is that clause 2 stand part of the Bill.

Mr. LENNON: Clause 2 is the Bill.

Mr. FERRICKS: The first question asked him on the public platform was if he was in favour of Bible teaching in the State schools, and his answer was "Decidedly not." He said that he would be no party to a system that would be the means of having the little Presbyterian children playing in one quarter, the little Methodist children playing in another quarter, and the little Roman Catholic children in another quarter. He was then asked if he would be in favour of the system as carried out in New South Wales schools, which were visited by the Roman Catholic priests 1,100

times in the previous year. His answer was "No, not if they paid 11,000 visits." He was then asked what could be done if people would not go to church and children would not go to Sunday school, and, in reply, he said that that was a very fair admission that nowadays there was too much churchianity and not enough Christianity preached. He further said, in regard to secular education, that he would be no party to bringing into the fair young land of Queensland the old feuds and enmities which had separated their forefathers in days gone by, and, if they wanted to raise the Australian nation to the position which it would have to occupy in the world, they woud have to rise above religious differences and feuds and enmities. The measure before the House was nothing more nor less than a sectarian measure. When the Premier was speaking on the Bill at its introductory stage he asked what was the question before the House, and he (Mr. Ferricks) interjected "sectarianism." The hon. gentleman attempted, figuratively speaking, to jump down his throat for making that remark, and yet a few minutes after that the Chamber was at boiling heat, members on both sides were addressing to one another heated arguments about the merits of different clergymen in the metropolis, and the heated condition of affairs was only varied by the interposition of the hon. member for Croydon, who turned the debate into a jocular vein. Sectarianism was very rife at the present time, especially in Southern Queensland, and the person mainly responsible for that was not Archdeacon Garland or any member of the Bible in State Schools League, but our toadying Premier, who had truckled to those people in his desperate effort to cling to office. The experience of the Federal election, when he came a cropper over his sectarian selection of candidates for the Federal Parliament, ought to have been enough for the hon. gentleman, but apparently he was going to ride the sectarian devil to death. When the hon. gentleman next appealed to the country he would probably meet with his own political death. The position of the Labour party on this matter was that there should be free, secular, and compulsory education, fair and just treatment for all creeds and nationalities, with favour to none, and that was a reasonable attitude to take up. Whenever the State and church—no matter what church it was—became allied, it was bad for both the State and the church. The Anglican Church was the prime mover in this matter of introducing religious instruction into State schools, which was only the thin end of the wedge of State aid to the church. In the ranks of the Labour party there was no place for the sectarian wolf, unless it was prepared to lie down with the lamb of toleration, and then the wolf would be shorn of its sectarianism. The Secretary for Public Instruction no doubt believed that the proposal in the Bill was a good one, and he had every respect for a gentleman who advocated such a proposal from conviction, but he could find no word strong enough to express his contempt for the Premier, who said he did not believe in the measure and yet was going to vote for it. The Premier stated if an agnostic taught the Bible, he would impart of his agnosticism to his pupils. The Secretary for Public Instruction had informed the Committee of the personnel of the committee or commission which had been appointed to draw up a scheme of Bible lessons for teaching in State schools. Let him tell the hon. gentleman that one of the members of that commission was a confirmed agnostic, unless he had changed his views very greatly during the last few years. Bearing in mind the remark of the Premier that an agnostic would impart his agnosticism to his pupils, what could be said of an appointment of that kind?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. COLLINS thought it would be one of the greatest mistakes of the twentieth century if they repealed the word "secular" in the present Education Act. In every civilised country in the world to-day men were clamouring for a system of secular education, and this proposal was a backward step in legislation. The experience of the past proved that where there was a State system of religious education the people fought against one another, and, in order to avoid that kind of thing in Queensland, he would vote against the omission of the word "secular" from the Education Act. He hoped to see a broader system of religion established, and that was the religion of humanity. Another reason why he objected to clause 2 was that it would allow clerics to enter State schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction to children. He strongly objected to the clerics interfering with the rising generation, as, speaking from personal experience, he could say it was not good for the young. If clerics were admitted into the schools they would teach a theology which would be in contradiction to the scientific knowledge imparted in those schools. The reason why it was proposed to admit clerics into the schools was that the Government saw in every country in the civilised world the rise of progressive ideas which might annihilate the present system of society. He was not so much concerned about the parents as about
[7 p.m.] the children. The masses had suffered in the past from the lack of education, and just as they were about to emerge from that state of affairs they were to be thrown back, instead of forward, by this measure. It was a reflection upon the clergy throughout the State. They were a well-organised body, and they had failed to do the work for which they were paid; and, having failed in their duty, they now asked the State to do it for them. He objected to that. This measure affected the working classes more than any other class.

Mr. BOOKER: Every one of us belongs to the working classes.

Mr. COLLINS: It all depended upon the standpoint from which the question was approached. He was not going to be drawn into giving a definition of who constituted the working classes; but, if the hon. member did not like that expression, he would say that this measure affected the poorer classes more than it affected the wealthier classes. The latter were in a position to send their children to any schools they thought fit; but the poorer classes had no other place to which they could send their children than the State schools. To give the children of those people equal opportunities, they did not want any school time to be devoted to religious instruction. He objected very strongly to having to spend money to do what the clergy were paid to do. If the Labour party only had as many organisers as there were clergy in the State, they would be over on the Treasury benches after the next election. The clergy were in the position of organisers and teachers, and they ought to be able to teach the children religion, if they were desirous of religion

being taught. Underlying this movement was something to the detriment of the working classes. Conservatism would always ally itself with the clerical party when their position was in danger. They would always raise the sectarian devil if they thought their occupancy of the Treasury benches was in peril; and there was no doubt that this measure was simply a red herring drawn across the trail to enable the Conservative party to retain the reins of government for a considerable time.

The PREMIER: Is the sectarian devil a red herring? (Laughter.)

Mr. COLLINS: Unfortunately, the hon. gentleman was raising the sectarian devil, and it might be the means of putting him out of politics altogether. They knew how religious feuds had retarded human progress in the past, and they were going to bring about religious feuds in the future, especially in the country districts.

Mr. BOUCHARD: You are trying to.

Mr. COLLINS: He was not trying to. He said, "Perish the whole seventy-two members of this House rather than that the progress of humanity should be retarded in any way!" His party might be in a minority on this question, but that did not prove that they were wrong.

Mr. FERRICKS said that he had spoken at as many meetings during the Federal campaign as any member in that Chamber, but he had not at any of those meetings referred in any way to the question of the referendum on the Bible in State schools.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must connect his remarks with the clause before the Committee.

Mr. FERRICKS: The question before the Committee was the repeal of the section in the principal Act which provided for secular education. If the campaign were to be taken over again, he would probably address just as many meetings as before, and he would adopt precisely the same attitude, and would not open his mouth on the question of the Bible in State schools. It was an act of abject cowardice on the part of the State Parliament to relegate the taking of the referendum to the date of the Federal election. It was essentially a State matter, and, if a referendum had to be taken at all—he was one of those who contended that a referendum on such a question should never be taken—it ought to have been taken at a State election. If it were taken apart from a State election, an energetic and organised minority would beat an apathetic majority, as they did on the 13th April last. Although the Labour party had not sought the issue, the gauntlet had been thrown down by the Bible in State Schools League, through the instrumentality of a toadying Premier. The Labour party contended that there should be no second referendum, but the second referendum would be when they went to the country at the next election; and he was satisfied that, if they went on broad and tolerant lines, they had nothing to fear. Previous editions of this same continuous Government had dragged politics into the gutter. But, although they had done that, and trampled it deep in the mire, it remained for the hon. gentleman who, by sufferance of the Philp party, was leading the Government—who was the nominal leader of the Government—to drag religion and nationality into the gutter with politics. In fact, he had trampled them deeper in the mud than ever the old Philp party had trampled politics, and that was saying a good deal. He had instanced a few minutes ago how the hon. gentleman had made a selection of Senatorial candidates, and how he bit the dust in consequence, but that had not been enough for him. He rode a winner at the last State election on the sectarian devil, but at the last Federal election he came in a bad second.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in discussing the Premier, and I must ask him to keep to the clause. I do not know whether he is aware of the fact, but in his second speech he is only allowed five minutes, and unless he addresses himself to the clause he will have very little time left.

Mr. FERRICKS: He was endeavouring to show that the question of the repeal of section 5 of the principal Act was most vital to our State educational system, and that it was through the instrumentality of the truckling and toadying Premier that this had been brought about.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FERRICKS: In his last effort to cling to office he was clinging desperately to the tail of the sectarian devil. He had for the past three or four years hunted with the hounds and run with the hares, but that would not go on for ever. The people realised that he was being buffeted between the Bible in State Schools League and the Licensed Victuallers' League; he was endeavouring to appeal to both of them.

Mr. MURPHY pointed out that, under the principal Act, clergymen had already had permission to enter our State schools, but they had to go before school hours. They arranged with the children of their own denomination to meet earlier than the school hours. In his own district the Church of England clergyman almost every day had the Church of England children assembled at the Sunday school in Croydon, and imparted religious instruction to them before they went to school. Now they were asked to repeal section 5, in order that the clergymen might be able to go and impart religious instruction without having to go to any bother at all. Returns had been furnished to the House showing that in New South Wales, in spite of the fact that these clergymen had had the privilege for many years of attending State schools for the purpose of imparting religious instruction, they had not availed themselves of the privilege to any great extent. The clergymen wanted to get away from the trouble of doing that for which communities paid them—of imparting religious instruction to the children—and wanted to compel the State to do it. Now, if the electors had decided that it was essential that religious instruction should be imparted to children attending the State schools, why were the Government not perfectly honest in this matter, and insist that every child should attend for religious instruction in State schools? They were not prepared to do that, because they knew that if they tried to compel all parents to have religious instruction imparted to their children in State schools, there would be such an upheaval as to quickly bring about the repeal of such a provision. By permitting

this Bill to be carried, they were doing away with the system of secular education, which had stood the test so long in Queensland. The Minister said he desired to do away with the secular education system, in order to introduce into the school a reading-book, and to practically compel the schoolmaster to act the part of religious instructor, and it was very unfair that they should be compelled to give religious teaching that they possibly did not believe in. The Minister pointed out that the children would read these lessons, and then he (Mr. Murphy) supposed the teacher would be called upon to explain them. If there was going to be no explanation of the lessons, what was the good of reading them? The principal part of teaching was the explanation of the lessons. School teachers had to show that they were competent to impart instruction to the young.

Mr. RYAN: This clause seemed to be the principal clause of the Bill, as it contained the real alteration which was proposed to be made in the State Education Act, as a consequence of the referendum which was taken in April last. It was said that because a referendum had been carried proposing a certain alteration in our Education Act, therefore Parliament should give effect to it.

The PREMIER: You dissent from that?

Mr. RYAN: He dissented from it, and he also dissented from the proposition laid down by the Premier, that, although he did not agree with religious instruction in State schools, he should vote for it because the people had carried it. If that was true, it simply meant that the man who was able to gauge exactly as to how the majority would be would shape his course accordingly, and would remain in office for ever—in other words, that was the true definition of a time-server. On the same day that this referendum was carried, there was another referendum in regard to the adoption or otherwise of what was known as the financial agreement. The people of the Commonwealth rejected the proposal of the Premiers, which they had entered into with the then Federal Prime Minister, Mr. Deakin.

The TREASURER: But not in Queensland.

Mr. RYAN: Did the hon. member therefore say that he should change his views and support the attitude of Mr. Fisher? Did Mr. Deakin take up that attitude in the Federal Parliament?

Mr. FERRICKS: It does not matter what they do; they don't count.

Mr. RYAN: They were told that because the people had carried it, they must carry it. Members should come to Parliament for a certain purpose, and if they found the majority of the people were against them, then they ought to be prepared to take the responsibility and go out of Parliament if the people wanted them to go out.

The PREMIER: Why don't you go out?

Mr. RYAN: He would go out when the people who elected him put him out—not sooner. And he hoped he would so conduct himself that the Premier would not be able to move that he be put out. A certain amount of criticism had been levelled at him, and he had not, on the second reading of the Bill, an opportunity of replying. Certain quotations were read by the hon. members for Woolloongabba and Rockhampton North which misrepresented his position in regard to a pledge he had given prior to the elections. He (Mr. Ryan) did not believe in majority rule in connection with a religious matter. Every person should have free latitude for the exercise of his religious views. He believed in the words of James Russell Lowell, who said—

> They are slaves who fear to speak
> For the fallen and the weak;
> They are slaves who will not choose
> Hatred, scoffing, and abuse
> Rather than in silence shrink
> From the truth they needs must think;
> They are slaves who dare not be
> In the right with two or three.

They were slaves—that was a very apt phrase—they were slaves who dared not to be in the right with two or three. The true principle which governed a matter of that kind was well stated by saying—

> Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do you even so to them.

If that maxim were carried out, it would do away with all the bigotry and intolerance, a great deal of which had been expressed of late. A certain question was put to him (Mr. Ryan) prior to the elections by one of his electors in Barcaldine, and also by the Rev. Garland, and he would explain the interpretation he placed on the question, to show that it was an evasive question. He was asked would he vote to give effect to the will of the people as expressed at the referendum, and he replied "Yes." Whom did he represent in the House? He represented the electors of Barcoo.

The PREMIER: Not on this question.

Mr. RYAN: Certainly on this question, and the will of those people as expressed at the referendum was "No." They were against religious instruction in State schools.

Mr. MORGAN: That is a lawyer's quibble.

Mr. RYAN: He did not think the hon. member had the ability to make a quibble. Certainly he had the ability to put the Government into a hole every time he rose to speak.

Mr. MORGAN: He is too honest for that.

Mr. RYAN: The hon. member was too honest and too simple. Some people with the intelligence of the hon. member, and perhaps some with greater intelligence, thought that the pledge he (Mr. Ryan) had given applied to the result of the referendum in Queensland in general. Taking it as such, what was his position? To give the people who elected him to Parliament a reasonable opportunity of sending someone else, he had placed his position in the hands of those 503 people who voted in favour of Bible teaching in State schools, and said he would resign his seat in the House on the condition that if he was returned they paid his expenses; and if he was not returned, he would pay the expenses of his opponent. That was a fair offer, and it was not accepted. He felt that he represented very reasonable electors, whether they were for or against Bible reading in State schools, and not one of them had taken the trouble to write and say that they desired he should support the Bill, or that they took exception to his action. The Rev. Garland had written to him, and also to a Barcaldine newspaper, as he was at liberty to do. He (Mr. Ryan) was not afraid of the effect of that letter, and was prepared, if opportunity arose, to meet any attack made on him. Apart from all the

other reasons he had stated, every hon. member was bound to vote against a measure of this kind if opportunity was not given for a full and effective discussion. They were making an important departure from the system which had been so successful in Queensland for a long period of years. The Bill proposed to allow religious instruction during school hours, and a large number of people wished to know what secular subject was to be taken out of the curriculum in order to allow of religious instruction. It did not appear to him desirable that any secular subject should be taken out, and the four hours at present allowed for secular education should be retained, and with that object he moved the omission of the words "sections twenty-three and" in line 4, with the view of inserting the word "section." Section 23 of the principal Act provided that in every State primary school four hours at least in each school day should be set apart for secular instruction. He did not desire that section to be altered, and that was the reason of the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN: Before speaking to the amendment——

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must speak to the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN: He would like to hear the views of the Minister on the amendment.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I shall be very pleased to answer you when you give some reason why it is proposed.

Mr. ALLEN: The number of hours devoted to instruction in the State schools at the present time was five. Section 23 of the principal Act provided that four hours at the least in each school day should be set apart for secular instruction. With the huge syllabus they had at the present time, four hours was far too short a time for secular instruction, and they should not take away one hour every day for religious instruction. If this amendment was not accepted, it would mean that [7.30 p.m.] the whole time of the school might be given to religious instruction. Were they going to turn the schools into churches? Was all secular education to be cast to the winds and nothing but religious dogmas taught? He was now dealing with the word "secular."

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The hon. member, if he reads the clause, will see that the word "secular" is not under discussion. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Barcoo is the omission of the words "sections twenty-three and," and I hope the hon. member will confine himself to the question before the Committee.

Mr. ALLEN: If the amendment was carried, it would mean not only that the words "sections twenty-three and" would be omitted from the clause, but it would also mean that the word "secular" would be retained in section 23 of the principal Act, which they desired to leave as it stood, because it provided that at least four hours a day should be given to secular instruction. The unreasonable attitude taken up by the Minister and the Premier was simply throwing down the glove. It was laid down in the New South Wales Act that at least four hours a day should be given to secular instruction; and all they were asking for was that the Queensland system should be placed on exactly the same footing as the New South Wales system. He did not want to go as far as the New South Wales system—he did not want the thing at all; but it was better to be certain that they were going to provide for four hours of secular instruction at least than to trust to chance. He hoped that what he had said would make the Minister see that the amendment would not affect the question of religious teaching at all; and he hoped the hon. gentleman would follow the example of the Minister for Lands, and not submit to the dictation of the Premier, and not sell himself to Archdeacon Garland. He thought the Minister for Public Instruction honestly believed that religious instruction in State schools would be a good thing. He (Mr. Allen) thought the opposite; and he wanted to point out that this amendment was not going to kill religious teaching in State schools. All it meant was that twenty hours out of the twenty-five hours a week would be given to secular instruction, leaving five hours for the parsons to come in and create a row. Did they want the parsons to be there all the time?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order, order!

Mr. ALLEN: They only wanted to make sure that four hours would be devoted to secular instruction.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask the hon. member for Bulloo to obey the call to order.

Mr. LENNON: He was just crossing the t's and dotting the i's.

Mr. ALLEN: Cannot I finish the sentence?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: No; the hon. member must obey the call to order. I think I have only to mention this to the hon. member to have the Rules of the House observed. I do not think that the hon. member is desirous of overriding the Rules of the House.

Mr. ALLEN: No.

Mr. LAND: You ought to ring the bell for the last lap. (Laughter.)

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: It is the rule of the House that an hon. member must resume his seat when his time has expired.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Mr. Tolmie——

Mr. LENNON: We have drawn him at last.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He was only too pleased to be drawn, because they wanted to get through the business in the best possible way they could.

Mr. MURPHY: Are you not going to gag it through?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The hon. member sometimes required the gag, but he hoped he would not require it to-night. The mover and seconder of the amendment, and those who had spoken, had entirely overlooked the fact that a little further down in the Bill provision was made that the religious instruction would not take longer than one hour. No one would anticipate that the whole school time would be given up to religious instruction. Would not that be the very best way, right from the inception, of killing the whole thing? If he accepted the amendment, would it not practically defeat the whole principle of the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He considered that it would, and he could not on any account accept the amendment. The referendum had been carried; it was necessary to carry out the pur-

poses of that referendum, and anything that aimed at the destruction of the Bill in that particular direction could not be accepted. He was not saying that he would not accept amendments from the other side. He had already indicated that he would accept the next amendment. Where the principle of the Bill was not interfered with, there was no desire to refuse any amendment.

Mr. McLACHLAN (*Fortitude Valley*): The Minister said that the acceptance of the amendment would have the effect of killing the Bill. The word "secular" was mentioned in section 23 of the principal Act, and they wanted to keep it there by moving the amendment now before the Committee. If the amendment were carried it would ensure that four hours a day secular instruction would be given. In the New South Wales Education Act they made it compulsory for four hours daily secular instruction to be given. Section 17 of the New South Wales Act read—

> In every public school four hours during each school day shall be devoted to secular instruction exclusively, and in a portion of each day, not more than one hour shall be set apart when the children of any religious persuasion may be instructed by the clergyman or other religious teacher.

The Minister said the amendment would nullify the object of the Bill, but that was not so. Although the New South Wales Act made provision for religious instruction, it was emphatic in stating that four hours must be given to secular instruction.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Indirectly this Bill does the same thing, as it provides for only one hour's religious instruction.

Mr. McLACHLAN: If the clause were left as it stood, it left the door open for less than four hours secular instruction to be given to the children in one day. The Minister said that lower down, in line 21, provision was made for only one hour's religious teaching each day. The part of the clause the hon. gentleman referred to applied to ministers of religion only. It said—

> Moreover, any minister of religion shall, in accordance with the regulations in that behalf, be entitled during school hours to give the children in attendance at a primary school who are members of the religious society or denomination of which he is a minister religious instruction during one hour of such school day or school days as the committee or other governing body of such school are able to appoint.

That provided only for clergymen who were desirous of giving religious instruction in primary schools, and did not refer to religious instruction given at other times by the State school teacher. He should be very pleased if the Minister could show him anything in the Bill which provided that not more than one hour in the day should be devoted to religious instruction, whether that instruction was given by a minister of religion or by a State school teacher. The present State Education Act had worked admirably for the last thirty or thirty-five years. The standard of education given was very high, the results which had accrued from the system were very satisfactory, and members should be very careful about interfering with the system in any way that would tend to reduce the present high standard of education. He believed that the change which it was proposed to make by this measure would tend to lower the present high standard, and sow a certain amount of dissension among scholars and teachers; and, once that sort of thing was introduced, it would nullify to a material extent the good effects of our education system. He trusted the Minister would be able to see the amendment in the same light as those members who advocated it, and incorporate it in the Bill.

Mr. KEOGH: When the referendum was being taken the Bible in State Schools League issued a ballot-paper showing that they desired to introduce the New South Wales system of Scripture lessons. Since then the Minister in charge of this Bill had stated that he did not agree with some portions of the New South Wales Act.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I must point out to the hon. member that there is a question before the Committee. Probably the hon. member was not here when that amendment was submitted, so I will recite it for him. The amendment is that the words "sections twenty-three and" on page 2, line 4, be deleted, and the question now is that the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause. The hon. member must connect his remarks with the amendment, otherwise he will be disorderly, and I am sure the hon. member desires to preserve the order of debate in this Chamber.

Mr. KEOGH: He was decidedly in favour of the amendment, because its adoption would insure that there would be four [8 p.m.] hours each day devoted to secular instruction in primary schools. If the amendment was not adopted, they had no guarantee that the children would receive secular instruction for four hours each school day. It had been stated that the religious instruction in New South Wales was not sectarian. He held in his hand a letter from the Under Secretary for Education in New South Wales, in which it was stated that clergymen of any denomination could go into any school and give "sectarian" religious instruction for one hour in the day. That was a bad thing for the State, and it should be by all means avoided. Since this Bill had been introduced, a kind of creeping animus had arisen between even members of that Chamber, and the same kind of thing would happen in the country if the Bill became law. The giving of religious instruction in State schools, which made distinctions between the yellow, the green, and the red, would not bear out the sentiment of the poetic lines—

> Let the orange lily be thy badge, my patriot brother!
> The green for me, the orange for you,
> And we for one another.

This religious instruction would not tend to maintain the good fellowship which had existed for the last thirty-five years, since denominational education was done away with in the State schools. He regretted to think that this Bill would have the effect of raising the old bone of contention. As he had said before in that Chamber, he had suffered from sectarian bigotry. He was, perhaps, the only member of the Committee who had spent six weeks in Her Majesty's gaol in consequence of it, and he was prepared to do the same thing to-morrow, and to stand shoulder to shoulder with his friends in trying to do away with this persecution, this bigotry, which was being introduced into their midst.

Several HONOURABLE MEMBERS interjecting,

Mr. Keogh.]

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I would direct hon. members' attention to the fact that all interjections are disorderly; and, for the sake of preserving order, I would ask them to bear that in mind.

Mr. FERRICKS would like to say a word in favour of the amendment, which sought to preserve to the children attending the State schools the privilege of having four hours' secular education each day. They heard a great deal from some quarters, and particularly from the official organ of the Bible in State Schools League—the *Brisbane Courier*—about the necessities of the people in the country towns and on the land. Might he raise his voice in advocacy of the privileges of children of those people? Four hours a day for secular instruction was little enough. Three hours a day, or less, might be all right for the children of the aristocracy, who, at the termination of their State school career, could go to secondary schools; but for the children of the poorer classes, whose education was confined to the State schools, four hours a day for secular education was little enough. If the Bill took away one hour a day from the time allotted to secular instruction, those children would be handicapped in the battle of life. He spoke rather feelingly, as he happened to be one of those who had had to work early and late. His father, unfortunately, had not £22,000 in the bank. In those days there were no B.I.S.N. subsidies, and that sort of thing, to be paid.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FERRICKS: There were no £2,000 or £3,000 a year knocking about as palm grease; and, if there had been, his father would not have received them, consequently he (Mr. Ferricks) had to struggle, and that was the reason he felt for boys who were similarly situated. He might be told that the majority said so-and-so, but the majority had not said anything of the sort. He was surprised at the rather shuffling attitude adopted by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill. His department went even further than the department in New South Wales—which was bad enough. There they stipulated that there should be four hours per day devoted to secular instruction; but young Queenslanders were supposed not to be worth all that time. They were to have rammed in amongst their secular education intermittent hours of religious instruction by clerics of various denominations. That was not only irrational, but it was against the very spirit of the referendum of which they heard so much. If 95 per cent., or 99 per cent., if they liked, voted in favour of a proposal of that kind, the minority of 5 per cent. or 1 per cent. were not bound by it. They heard a great deal about the absence of sectarianism on this question, but there was no gainsaying that the whole Government was dominated by the clerics. It was built on the shifting sands of sectarianism, and what else could they expect from Ministers? Every colour of the religious rainbow was embraced in the present Ministry. He did not say that the members sitting behind the front Treasury bench were very brilliant, but he ventured the opinion that he could walk over blindfolded and pick out half a dozen men on the back benches who, in ability, outshone the occupants of the front Treasury bench. It was not denied that the occupants of the front Treasury bench, with perhaps one exception, were not there because of their ability. It was realised, not only in that Chamber, but in the country, that ability was the last thing that seemed to have counted with the Premier in the selection of his colleagues.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is getting away from the question before the Committee. He is allowing himself to be carried away, and I would ask him to confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. FERRICKS: It was said by the advocates of the Bill that it was in the interests of bush children, who had been referred to as "bush pagans." Far from assisting these so-called "bush pagans," it was aiming at their detriment and their educational destruction. He protested against the aspersion which had been cast on the bush children. He had been over a great deal of Queensland, and seen boys and girls growing up to maturity, but he had never witnessed any scenes in the country which he had witnessed during his nine months' residence in the city. It was a common thing in the streets here to see boys and girls linked arm in arm on bright moonlight nights—here in the haunts of the clerical teachers. Where was the influence of the religious teaching there, and why were libels cast upon the children of the bush? Yet the advocates of this measure said it was in the interests of the bush children that it should be introduced. It was remarkable, if that was so, that the outside districts almost unanimously voted down this referendum with a very heavy thud, and the further you went out the heavier the thud. In Carpentaria the majority against it was exceedingly large. Around the metropolitan area they carried it, but further away the majority decreased till it got to vanishing point, and as they passed out further the majority increased by leaps and bounds. It was altogether unfair that these aspersions should be cast upon the bush children, and that these children, whose educational days were limited, should be robbed of an hour's instruction in the week, in order to allow pastors of religious denominations to go in and run riot amongst them. In the battle in after life the children of these farmers and workers had to enter the lists against the children of well-to-do parents, who were able to send their children to higher schools and keep them there to a much greater age than country people were able to do. A boy in the bush had to start work at a very early age, and when eventually he did trot off to school he did not always concentrate the whole of his powers and interest on his lessons before him.

Mr. MURPHY: From what he could see of the amendment the hon. member for Barcoo proposed to try and retain at least four hours' secular education every day to the children of Queensland. In 1875, when the principal Act was passed, Parliament laid it down that there were to be certain things taught in our State schools. Section 22 of the Act provided that the subjects of instruction should be as follows:—

> Reading, writing, arithmetic, English grammar, geography, history, elementary mechanics, object lessons, drill and gymnastics, vocal music, and (in the case of girls) sewing and needlework.

Since that time the curriculum had been largely increased. The Government had sandbagged the Bill through its second reading; it had to be put through the Assembly by brute force—their followers came in and voted

for the gag whenever the bell rang—and it behoved the Opposition to try and see that at least four hours' secular instruction was ensured for the children of Queensland.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MURPHY: Even the New South Wales system provided that four hours' secular instruction should be given to the children, but when a member of the Opposition asked the Minister to guarantee that there would be no taking away from the four hours provided in the principal Act of 1875, the Minister would not accept the amendment. The Bill provided that for an hour every day a clergyman might give religious instruction in our schools, and the Minister said he had had a committee preparing a reading-book on religious questions which were to be added to the curriculum of the schools. If a clergyman was privileged to give religious instruction for an hour, how much religious instruction was going to be given out of these reading-books? The Minister said that he was anxious that the children of Queensland should be as well educated as they were in any other part of the world, and that should induce him to guarantee that when this Bill passed, as it undoubtedly would pass—because they all knew that God was on the side of the big battalions, and they would put this God-fearing Bill through, this Bill to create sectarianism and strife in Queensland, by battalions which walked in on the ringing of the division bell, and gagged and guillotined members who opposed any resolution introduced by the Government. They should insist on a guarantee being placed in the Bill, because he absolutely declined to accept any statement given by a member of the Cabinet. They had been fooled too long by statements. Was the Minister prepared to put it in the Bill—to do as Parliament did in 1875, and state that four hours a day at least was to be devoted to secular education? Was the Bill going to take away from the Education Department the control of our public schools, and hand them over to clerical domination? They ought to keep the Bill free from anything like that. They would be given some privilege if the Minister accepted the amendment, which was moved, not to wreck the Bill, but to do good to the children of Queensland. This Bill provided for the introduction of religious teaching in State schools. They had to submit to that, not because it was a good thing but because the big battalions were on the other side. Since the principal Act was passed in 1875 many items had been added to the curriculum. Queensland had made progress in educational matters, and arrangements had been made by which the State school children were enabled to study for Grammar school scholarships, and he objected to the time the young people had to devote to study being filched from them. He wanted it to be distinctly understood that he wanted an assurance that that time would not be taken away inserted in the Bill. If the amendment were carried it would effectually preclude the filching away of the time allowed for secular education in the schools. Time's up!

Mr. PAYNE: The idea of the hon. member for Barcoo in moving the amendment was to make provision that the children attending the State schools should get not less than four hours each day for secular education. If the Secretary for Public Instruction or the Premier thought that four hours was too long, it was necessary that some specified time should be laid down. During the course of the debate the Secretary for Public Instruction and the Secretary for Railways tried to make the Committee believe that it was provided for in a paragraph lower down in the clause, which would read—

> Moreover, any minister of religion shall, in accordance with regulations in that behalf, be entitled during school hours to give to the children in attendance at a primary school who are members of the religious society or denomination of which he is a minister religious instruction during one hour.

But that paragraph simply applied to ministers of religion. There was not one iota of evidence in the Bill showing that time would be given to secular education, and it was highly necessary that some time should be specified, if not four hours then three and a-half hours, and allow no loophole of escape. It was all very well for the Secretary for Public Instruction to assure the Opposition that it was all right—that no school teacher would be so silly as to spend two or three hours a day in giving religious instruction. It was quite possible there might be some school teachers who would think it more necessary to devote the time to religious instruction than to secular instruction. A great deal had been said about the referendum taken on that question, and a great many jeers had been thrown across the Chamber in reference to that particular referendum. A referendum on a religious question was not right—was not sound—and would not bear the light of day. Even if a referendum were a right way to settle a question of that sort, the referendum taken on 13th April last in reference to the matter was rotten. He was scrutineering at a polling-booth in Sandgate, and he saw prominent citizens carting in people to vote, who, when they came out, admitted they did not know what they were voting for. In the Mitchell electorate there were between eleven and fifteen polling-booths less than the number of polling-booths at a general election, and there were something like 200 polling-booths in the whole State in connection with this referendum less than the number at a general election. Therefore, how could any hon. member say the question was submitted to the people? Then, again, the referendum was taken at an inopportune time. There were four or five questions submitted to the people at that time, and the whole thing was that conflicting and mixed up that scores and scores of people did not know what they were doing. On a serious question such as that there should have been as many polling-booths established in the State as obtained at a general election.

Mr. MANN: If the amendment were carried, it would practically mean that the Bill would be inoperative, and therefore he would support it. He would have been glad to hear the opinion of the Acting Chairman, who has been a teacher, on the matter of allowing the clergy to go into the schools and impart religious instruction. If it was desired to get the Bible into the schools for the purpose of teaching the simplicity and purity of diction of the old version, he would have no objection to that being done, but he did not believe in the Bible alone for moral teaching. He claimed that some teaching in the Bible was exceedingly bad. It stated that Jacob deceived his father Isaac, and in spite of that fact he was still a favourite of God, and in spite of all the evils committed by Esau and Abraham they were

marked out for special favours. The teaching of the Bible in many cases did not mean the teaching of morality or justice or even the everyday standard of right [8.30 p.m.] and wrong; and he was decidedly opposed to the teaching of the Bible in State schools unless it could be shown that there was a necessity for it, and that there was sufficient time to teach religion as well as other subjects. If, as had been alleged, there were children in the bush growing up as pagans, what was there to prevent the establishment of bush missions by religious organisations for the purpose of teaching religion to those children? He understood that it was the intention of the Minister to have certain Bible lessons put into reading-books for use in the schools. Were those books going to contain passages such as those to which he had referred? He entirely condemned such passages, the reading of which would do the children no good. If they wished to provide moral instruction for the children, why take passages only from the Bible? Why not go to the Talmud, the Buddhist bible, the teachings of Confucius, and the Koran?

Mr. BRENNAN: What is the moral of your address?

Mr. MANN: The moral of his address was that we had a good system of education at present, and an attempt was being made to destroy it. If he thought the introduction of religious instruction in State schools would do the least good, he would cheerfully support the proposal, but his experience showed him that it would do harm rather than good. He had a religion of his own, which he did not seek to impose on anyone else; and he did not want other people to impose their religious views on him. If this Bill came into operation, he would refuse to pay taxes to help provide for this religious instruction. He would let the Government summon him for the amount of his income tax; and rather than pay he would go to gaol.

Mr. THEODORE (*Woothakata*) said he presumed that the Minister had examined the results of last junior examination in connection with the Sydney University. A close analysis of those results revealed the rather surprising fact that our public schools took a very minor part in the examination, and if they reduced the time available for the teaching of secular subjects—the only subjects on which the children were examined—it would have a disastrous effect. What was the opinion of the high officials of the Education Department in regard to the matter? Did they recommend the cutting out of certain portions of the school curriculum? He ventured to say that those officials had been ignored in the matter. The department had experts to draw up a curriculum. The board of experts went thoroughly into the matter, and recommended school papers and school books, but they were not asked their opinion as to the advisableness of making this alteration. Where did the high educational experts of the State come in in the matter of having one hour's religious instruction each day in the schools? If they had a Bill before the House expressing the advisableness of constructing a railway to a certain district, the opinion of the experts of the Railway Department accompanied the Bill, but when it was a matter of the welfare of the future generations of the State they were ignored. The Minister should consider whether he was not jeopardising the chances of the scholars in the State schools for the University examinations before he made this alteration in the curriculum.

Mr. MULLAN: It would be better for the Minister to explain the object of repealing the word "secular" in section 23, which stated that four hours in each day in primary schools should be set apart for secular instruction. If the clause was agreed to as printed, it would mean that the whole day could be devoted to religious instruction. That was the only deduction that they could take from it. They were going to have Scripture books, and if the word "secular" were repealed they might be in use all day at the schools. It would save them from wasting further time over it if the Minister explained it.

Mr. LESINA: There is no waste of time.

The PREMIER: A little bit of truth slipped out.

Mr. MULLAN: It would waste the time that other Opposition members wanted to bring in more amendments. The curriculum of the school was already crowded, and if they put in religious lessons, then the secular education of the children was bound to suffer. He hoped the Minister would explain if he were wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He had purposely refrained from speaking, as he did not want to waste any time. In all these matters they were governed by regulations. Regulations were framed, and fresh regulations would have to be framed when the Bill became law. He could assure hon. gentlemen that when the regulations were framed, the utmost care would be taken to see that there would be no possible construction such as the hon. gentleman referred to.

Mr. MURPHY pointed out that in the case of the agreement between a big shipping company and the Government, when the Premier was in England, it was provided that if there was no objection to the agreement by a certain date that it became valid. The agreement was poked away under a book at the corner of the table where no one could see it, and when the hon. member for Leichhardt got up to speak about it, he was told that the time had expired and the agreement had been ratified. They were not going to take any assurances from the Minister that when the regulations were framed he would give the matter his most careful attention. It was the duty of the Committee to give it careful attention and see that the Bill provided for four hours' secular teaching every day. The Secretary for Public Instruction practically guaranteed that four hours' secular instruction would be given, so why could he not put in a clause to that effect? He remembered when he (Mr. Murphy) and the senior member for Townsville had to fight for five hours in trying to get the Secretary for Railways to put in a clause in the Port Alma Railway Bill so as to make it absolutely certain that what they wanted would be carried out, and at last the Secretary for Railways consented to put it in.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: I think you must be mistaken.

Mr. MURPHY: He was not mistaken, as the hon. gentleman would find if he turned up the matter in *Hansard*. They saved the country something like £7,000 or £8,000 by the fight they put up on that occasion, and they should fight to get this amendment inserted in the Bill before the Committee. They

did not want the Minister's assurance that something would be done during the recess, or that it would be done by regulation. They wanted it made clear in the Bill that four hours should be devoted to secular instruction daily in State schools, and they were perfectly justified in contending for that, seeing that it was a right conferred on the children by Act of Parliament.

HON. R. PHILP: He was not going to assist the hon. member for Croydon to obstruct this Bill for five hours. He did not believe there was a single member in the House who thought for a moment that the children of Queensland would get less than four hours' secular instruction every school day.

Mr. ALLEN: Why not put it in the Bill, then?

HON. R. PHILP: At present children received five hours' instruction, and the Bill provided that not more than one hour should be devoted to religious instruction. If the Minister was wise, he would make the time much less than one hour. Many people who went to church and heard a sermon lasting twenty minutes or half an hour thought the minister was long-winded, and some of them did not go again. He did not suppose that three or four clergymen would go to a school every day, so that there would be no need for devoting an hour to religious instruction each day. He would suggest that this matter should be taken out of the hands of the school committees, and left entirely to the department, otherwise they might find some committees opposed to religious instruction being given, and others wanting too much of it. It would be far better, therefore, to leave the regulating of the matter to the department. A great deal of the debate which had taken place that evening would have been very appropriate when the Referendum Bill was before the House, but it was rather out of place on the clause under consideration. The matter had been referred to the people, and a majority of those who had voted had decided that religious instruction should be given to children attending State schools. He did not apprehend any serious thing happening from teaching the Bible in State schools. He had always spoken in favour of it, and had done so before Archdeacon Garland came on the scene at all. He would rather that Archdeacon Garland had kept out of the matter, for he did not believe that gentleman had done much good. So far as he (Mr. Philp) was concerned, neither Archdeacon Garland nor any other parson had got hold of him in this matter.

Mr. ALLEN: You are one of the few honest men on that side of the House.

HON. R. PHILP: There were plenty of honest men on that side of the House, and he thought there were honest men on both sides. This was supposed to be a Christian community. Every member of the House listened to prayers read by the Speaker at the opening of each sitting, and he could not understand why any member should object to Bible teaching in State schools. When the agitation in Queensland in favour of secular instruction in State schools started, Bishop Quinn and Bishop Tuffnel appeared on the same platform fighting for the denominational system of education, but they were defeated, and Parliament passed a Bill providing for secular education. Then a considerable section of the community built schools of their own, paying every shilling of the cost themselves, which showed that even then the present system of education was not favoured by all sections of the community. We had had only two referenda in Queensland—one on federation and one on Bible reading in the State schools. The majority in the federation referendum was only 7,000 or 8,000, while that in favour of Bible reading in State schools was 15,000.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The women vote was strong in that case.

HON. R. PHILP: Women were probably more anxious about the welfare of their children than men, and he be-
[9 p.m.] lieved that the woman vote was a big factor in the majority in favour of Bible reading in State schools. It was only an insult to the intelligence of the electors who voted in favour of the proposal to say that they did not know what they were voting for. Seeing that the majority of the electors wanted to have Bible teaching in the State schools, they should give the system a fair trial. If it did not turn out as the majority believed it would, there would be an agitation to repeal it by taking another referendum. It would not do any harm to the young people of Queensland. If he thought it would, he would not vote for it

Mr. COLLINS: Will it do them any good?

HON. R. PHILP believed it would.

Mr. PAYNE: Has it done any good in New South Wales?

HON. R. PHILP thought the people of New South Wales were a very good lot of people.

Mr. PAYNE: On the population basis, there is more crime there than here.

HON. R. PHILP: He did not think that was because there were Bible lessons in the State schools. New South Wales had been settled by not the best class of people from the old country, and there was a good deal of the old leaven still in New South Wales.

Mr. FERRICKS: The next election will settle it.

HON. R. PHILP: It was no use the hon. member for Bowen talking about the next election, because the hon. member would not be here after the next election.

Mr. FERRICKS: I am referring to the next election in New South Wales.

HON. R. PHILP: So far as the principle was concerned, he hoped the debate would cease. Instead of devoting an hour each day to religious instruction, it was more likely that it would not amount to more than one hour a week.

Mr. RYAN thought the senior member for Townsville did not understand what the amendment meant. If he really felt what he had just said, he should support the amendment. One of the things the Bill proposed to repeal in the Education Act of 1875 was the word "secular" in section 23. That section provided that there should be at least four hours a day devoted to secular instruction, and they wanted a guarantee that that time should not be reduced, and it could be done by allowing the word "secular" to remain in the section.

Hon. R. PHILP: You know that there will not be less than four hours.

Mr. RYAN: He did not, and the attitude taken up by the Government made him sceptical as to what the regulations would

really do. He had had a good deal of experience in teaching, and he felt that the measure would give rise to a lot of confusion. The proper people to consult with regard to the arrangement of time-tables were not the school committees, but the head teachers, as the latter were the most competent to deal with the matter. The Government had promised the people that they were going to get the New South Wales system. That system provided for certain Bible lessons being taught and for four hours' secular instruction per day. Now, why did the Minister desire to do away with those two things?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I would direct hon. members' attention to the fact that there is too much conversation going on in the Chamber. There are groups carrying on animated conversations; they can be distinctly heard, and the speaker has considerable difficulty in placing his views before the Chamber. I ask hon. members to observe the rule that members are entitled to be heard in silence.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. RYAN: The Secretary for Public Instruction had already intimated that he did not agree wth the Bible lessons that had been inserted in the New South Wales books, and yet he had told the people of Queensland that he was going to give them the New South Wales system. He had gone back on that, and now he wanted to go back on the four hours' secular instruction. The compact that had been made with the electors when the question was submitted to them should be kept. Did the people realise that in the Bill there was no guarantee that four hours would be devoted to secular instruction? It was all very well to say that that would be provided for by the regulations, but it was better to have the matter fixed by a section of a statute. There must be some object in proposing to make this alteration in section 23. He desired to reply to the interjection of the hon. member for Townsville, when he spoke on this referendum. The Premier told the people of Queensland from his place in the House that those who did not agree with the principle of settling religious matters on the referendum should not vote at all; and now, when he had persuaded these people from voting, he came and said that the referendum represented the majority of the people who wanted it. By that argument it would mean, if they followed the hon. gentleman's advice, that all those who did not believe in such matters being settled by referendum should not vote at all.

The PREMIER: They should have allowed those who did believe it to settle it. (Opposition laughter.)

Mr. RYAN: That, of course, was merely quibbling, but it was a complete answer when the hon. gentleman got up and said the referendum must be taken as a guide to what the people wanted.

Mr. LESINA said the amendment appeared a very good one, and he would vote for it if it came to a division. If the word "secular" was struck out, it was practically placing in the hands of the Government the whole of the power of saying what particular time should be devoted to religious instruction by teachers. That was altogether too great a power to be placed in the hands of the Government, because it imposed no finality. A Government elected during a wave of religious enthusiasm might take up two hours a day, whereas a Government, more inclined to secular instruction, might devote five minutes a day to religious instruction. It would be better to put the thing in the Bill, so that there could be no doubt about it. It depended on Government members whether that could be done. He understood there were not ten men in the House who really favoured any departure from the present system of secular education. Here was an insincere House passing a Bill that it did not believe in because a number of people outside had declared they wanted a change, and on the Premier's advice, as mentioned by the hon. member for Barcoo—he deliberately advised those who had conscientious objections not to vote on the referendum, and the result was that little more than half on the roll voted. The meaning of the word "secular" ever since it was introduced into our system of education had been debated. In Collins's Graphic English Dictionary "secular" was defined to be—

> Coming or observed once in an age or century; appreciable only at long intervals; pertaining to this present world, or to things not spiritual or holy; worldly; not bound by monastic vows or rules; a layman; in the Romish church, an ecclesiastic not bound by monastic rules—

and so on. On looking up the debate of 1875, he could imagine the spirit of every member who spoke on that occasion—the men who fought hard to establish on our statute-book this glorious system of national education—pointing a finger at the men who were now trying to tear down that system. Mr. Macrossan spoke on this very motion. On that occasion Mr. Macrossan asked what was meant by "secular," and later on he said—

> He believed that many of those in favour of the Bill were under the impression that some kind of religious instruction would be given in the schools; but he could assure them that, if that was so, it would not be purely secular instruction.

There was some doubt right from the start as to what was meant. The then Attorney-General, Sir Samuel Griffith, after admitting that he was not prepared to give a philological definition of it, said—

> He believed it was generally understood that secular instruction excluded from being taught in the schools what was commonly termed religious instruction or religious dogma, and every honourable member would know that it was impossible to teach religion without giving some dogmatic instruction.

Mr. Ivory also said—

> The Honourable Attorney-General had confessed himself unable to define the meaning of the word "secular," but he thought, before proceeding further, it would be advisable to attach some meaning to it, as otherwise one administrator of the Bill, when it became law, might give one definition to it, and another another, and thus lead to confusion. He thought himself that "unsectarian" was a better word than "secular."

The Attorney-General then got up and said—

> He should be very glad to find a word conveying the same idea, but he confessed that he was unable to do so. The word "unsectarian" would hardly do, as one Minister might hold the opinion that the views he held were common to others, whereas "secular" meant the opposite of religious teaching, or, rather, the exclusion of religious teaching.

Mr. Macrossan again spoke, and gave his reasons—

> There was one reason especially that had made him anxious to have a proper definition of the word "secular," and it was this:—That, according

to the Education Act in Victoria, secular instruction was only to be given; and yet, within the last three months, he noticed that a teacher had been discovered in that colony giving religious instruction and even attempting to proselytise. When discovered, the Minister for Education had imposed a fine of £1; but he thought that, if the teacher had understood that he was giving religious instruction, he would not have attempted it, and that if the Minister thought that he was intentionally giving that instruction, he would have dismissed him for life.

There was a danger of that. He believed that only recently a statement had been made that proselytising had been indulged in by teachers in another State. Some men had an unconscious theological bias, and could not help imparting it into the lessons they gave the children, and the moment we opened the door we gave free rein to that kind of thing, and the laying of a charge of proselytism against these persons. Sir Thomas McIlwraith said—

> He believed that many honourable members held with himself that "secular" meant "non-sectarian," and he thought that a definition should be given to it so as to detach it entirely from religion.

Mr. Buzacott also thought that—

> If they omitted "secular," and inserted "unsectarian," they would be opening the way for religious instruction, and that was just the thing the promoters of the Bill were anxious to avoid in the State schools.

Mr. Douglas, the father of the present member for Cook, in this Chamber, said—

> The word "secular" was used by persons in reference to schools where no religious instruction was given.

That was the consensus of opinion, and finally Mr. Kingsford said—

> That secular instruction might mean, "That this standard of common school instruction shall not in any way be associated with the beliefs and opinions of any religious sects."

That was the meaning he (Mr. Lesina) attached to it, and he proposed to support the amendment for the reason that it would retain that word, and the consensus of opinion expressed by the parents of the Act—men who put it on the statute-book thirty-five years ago—was the meaning he attached to it now. He was afraid if they left out that word it would leave the matter to the domination of the Minister, and the bias of political party might lead them to interfere in the matter. As they voted £400,000 a year for education, and it was proposed to take one-fifth of the time for religious instruction, one-fifth of the national expenditure was to be devoted for the purpose, and he was not prepared to vote £80,000 a year in order to subsidise the teaching of any particular dogmatic theology of any particular sect in the community.

The PREMIER: He would like to point out to hon. members who were pressing for the acceptance of the amendment, that they had emphasised the wrong word in section 23. If they would read section 23 of the Act they would see that it did not mean that the instruction shall be secular during those four hours, because the Act provided only for secular instruction. As a matter of fact, the Act provided that only secular instruction should be given, so that what the section did was not so much fixing the secular instruction as fixing the number of hours that instruction must be given. He would point out that the people of Queensland at the referendum expressed their desire to take away that word "secular." A very big change was being made in the educational system—it was no good to try and disguise that fact. They were adopting a system of religious instruction instead of a secular system—whether they approved of it or not, it was no good disguising that fact. Not only did they introduce a system of religious instruction in place of purely secular instruction, but they did two things in that referendum—they stipulated that not only should there be up to an hour's direct religious instruction given by clergymen or authorised teacher, but that there should also be reading lessons on religious subjects. It was quite clear that if the school committee in anyway permitted some clergyman to give an hour's religious instruction, and the teacher had also to give a reading lesson, there could not be four hours given to purely secular instruction, and therefore the people who pushed the amendment were disregarding the instruction given by the referendum. It was not a question whether it was good or bad—whether it was right or wrong—he was merely pointing out that those members who were asking for the insertion of the amendment were refusing to carry out the instructions given at the referendum—that such arrangements would be made that would permit of an hour's religious instruction by a person of some denomination, and in addition to that the teacher would give a reading lesson on a religious subject.

Mr. HARDACRE: Both in the same day?

The PREMIER: Not necessarily, but provision had to be made for it. He did not know what arrangements would be made by the school committees, but provision had to be made in the Bill to permit them if they so wished. He did not suppose an hour would be taken up by both. He agreed with the hon. member for Townsville that the clergyman who lectured the children for an hour would find he did very little good. Hon. members should make no pretence about the matter. If they were going to accept the verdict given at the referendum, then they should honestly pass a Bill that would give effect to it and they should not alter the Bill in any way which would prevent the judgment of the people being carried out.

Mr. RYAN: Will this amendment prevent the judgment of the people being carried out?

The PREMIER thought he had made that clear enough to any ordinary intelligence.

Mr. RYAN: To your own satisfaction.

The PREMIER said he would do it over again. The present school curriculum provided for five hours' instruction, and to younger children four hours. The referendum provided that one hour's religious instruction might be given and, in addition to that, a reading lesson was to be given by the teacher.

Mr. LENNON: You do not say for how long.

The PREMIER: Suppose the reading lesson was only to take five minutes, then it broke into the four hours, and the hon. member who moved the amendment had intelligence enough to know that if he got the amendment inserted it would break down the whole Bill.

Mr. THEODORE: The member for Townsville said otherwise.

The PREMIER: They were no longer holding a representative character in regard to this particular subject.

Mr. RYAN: You advised the people not to vote.

The PREMIER: Surely it was good advice to a man who claimed that he had no right

to vote on a subject, not to vote—not to outrage his conscience, but allow those whose conscience would permit them to vote and settle the matter? The hon. member for Townsville also referred to a matter which had been overlooked. A very large section of the people who did not agree with the ordinary schools of the State being purely secular felt so strongly that religious instruction should be given to children day by day that they made a sacrifice, and got schools where religious instruction would be given, and he said all honour to the men who made a financial sacrifice of that sort for the sake of carrying out their idea in the matter. The people decided that the purely secular system should be altered; [9.30 p.m.] and the clergymen of that church would have the same right as any other clergymen to use the State schools for the purpose of giving religious instruction. There could be no complaint of unfairness in the matter, because every sect would have exactly the same right. The hon. member for Clermont pointed out that, as one-fifth of the time would be taken up in religious teaching, we would be paying £80,000 a year for religious instruction. He would remind the hon. member that it was the people paying the money who had decided that they would spend the money in that way. As to the people not understanding the question when the vote on the referendum was taken, it was an impertinence to say the people did not understand it. The bulk of them understood it quite as well as hon. members. Some of them might have the hardihood to disagree with the verdict of the people, and there was no reason why they should not disagree with the majority in this matter, but there was every good reason why they should not attempt to come between the majority of the people of Queensland and their way of governing Queensland. It was their clear duty to carry out honestly the verdict of the people.

Mr. LENNON: The Premier tried to make out that the advice he gave to the electors in regard to the referendum was good advice; but it must be borne in mind that a great many people held the opinion that this was a matter that should never have been submitted to a referendum. He also tried to show that ministers of religion of all denominations would have the right to give religious instruction in the schools one hour a day by arrangement with the school committees. They were also aware that a committee had been appointed to draw up a suitable book of moral lessons or Bible lessons for the children, but there was not a word as to when that lesson-book might be used, and they wanted a guarantee that four hours at least would be devoted to secular instruction. The hon. gentleman talked about a particular class who deserved credit for the sacrifices they made in providing for the education of their children; but by this amendment of the Education Act they would be Protestantising the State schools—and most unfairly. There were in Queensland about thirty-nine religions, and they were assured that no religious tenet would be taught in the State schools. If the proposed religious teaching was not to be founded on any one of those thirty-nine religions, it must be a perfect haggis of religions. Gentlemen in the Education Department were to prepare this book of moral lessons or Bible lessons, so that it would be a scheme propounded by State officers; and if that was not a State religion, he would ask what kind of religion it was. Where there was a State religion, the State must see that it was properly maintained, and that meant that they must employ capable teachers. That implied that the teacher must undergo a religious test; and if a religious test was not going the whole way in establishing a State church, he was a very poor judge of what was likely to happen under such a Bill. In time to come they might see the Secretary for Public Instruction a mitred abbot; and he and his friend, Archdeacon Garland, might be battening and fattening on the State church in Queensland. They ought to keep church and State distinct, and he appealed to members on both sides to support the amendment.

Mr. THEODORE: They heard the senior member for Townsville on that matter, and also the Premier on the same subject; and as their views conflicted with each other, he would like to hear the Secretary for Public Instruction on the same subject. The senior member for Townsville was definite in his statement that four hours a day would be devoted to secular subjects. The Premier said there could be no doubt that the people had instructed members of the Chamber to allow the ministers to enter the schools and give one hour's religious instruction each day, and in addition to that, on the same day the teacher of the school might give Bible lessons. There was a conflict of opinion, and he would like to hear the Minister.

Mr. LESINA: The Premier had pointed out that it was an impertinence on the part of members of the Chamber to attempt to lecture the people on this matter, as they had made their selection and the choice had fallen. But if the Premier was such a devoted admirer of the principle of the will of the people, why did he not put it into practice a little oftener? He had a splendid following returned by the people on the Rockhampton programme, which contained the Trades Disputes Bill. What had become of that Bill, on which they had received a mandate from the people?

Mr. D. HUNTER: Not by a referendum.

Mr. LESINA: A general election was a referendum of mixed issues. There were 150,000 people who did not vote at all at the referendum. They took the Premier's advice and abstained from voting; they were total abstainers in the matter. A large number of young unmarried men voted at that referendum, and they had no responsibilities in the way of educating young children. There were also a lot of young unmarried women who voted, who had come straight from the bands of hope and Sunday schools. They had been steadily and actively trained by the parsons for three or four years how to deposit a vote in the ballot-box for the purpose of altering Queensland's educational system. The way the question was put was a deliberate ruse to bamboozle the electors, and he believed that Archdeacon Garland was practically the framer of that ballot-paper. The big informal vote showed either ignorance on the part of the voters, or it illustrated the difficulty of taking a vote on such a question. If the House had accepted his amendment when the Bill was going through and put the question this way—"Are you in favour of an alteration in our secular system of education so as to provide for religious instruction, Yes or No"—it would have been better.

The PREMIER: If it had been put that way and had been carried, would you have voted for the Bill?

Mr. LESINA: No. (Laughter.) He objected to a referendum on the question at all. It was not true statesmanship to submit to the counting of heads a question of conscience. It cost £400,000 for education in Queensland, and to take one-fifth of that each year for religious instruction was a burden on the taxpayers.

Mr. FERRICKS: Unless they allowed at least four hours for secular instruction, the bush children would be robbed of that education altogether. He had some experience of school teaching, and he knew that there had been a complaint about the cramming that had gone on amongst the children, and they were going to add to that cramming by having religious lessons of one hour's duration. In the early part of the year he was one of a deputation that waited on the Minister for Works and the Premier to ask for the introduction of an Eight Hours' Day Bill, but the Premier said there would be no time to introduce it this session. In spite of that, they found this Bill introduced at that late hour of the session, when so little business had been done. There was time to introduce sectarianism, but no time to improve the conditions of the workers. Did not the Minister think it would be more humanitarian and Christian-like to improve the conditions of men who had to work twelve hours a day for the princely wage of £1 5s. a week? The proper place to give religious instruction was from the parents, as those who were crammed with religious lessons in their school days abandoned it in after life. He spent some time and money in going round the polling-booths of Brisbane on Federal election day to see the voting, and he became convinced of the fusion that existed between the Government and the Bible in State Schools League. The officials of the league wore the People's Progressive League badge as well as their own ribbons. The clergymen in the country districts who were vice-presidents of the People's Progressive League were also connected with the Bible in States Schools League. He noticed a fusion between the Government, the licensed victuallers, and the Bible in State Schools League to down the Federal Labour party. A referendum should never have been taken on this question, as it was one which no majority should decide. Members were sent to the House to make or revise laws, and not to manufacture religion for other people. In North Queensland people did not care what a man's creed or nationality was, but accepted him for his own worth; but in South Queensland if a man's creed or nationality was sufficiently pronounced it would get him a portfolio. If a man worshipped at a particular shrine or belonged to a particular nation, and there was no man of his brand in the Ministry, the Premier would see that he got one of that colour into his Cabinet pretty quickly.

Mr. COLLINS supported the amendment, because he thought it was desirable that children should be assured of four hours' secular instruction each school day. If the word "secular," in section 23 of the principal Act, was repealed, then the Bible lessons drawn up by the five gentlemen named by the Minister might comprise fifty or sixty chapters, and the whole four hours of school time be occupied in reading them. No religious teaching should be given in primary schools by State school teachers. It was not the duty of the State to teach religion, or to give even Bible reading in State schools. He did not worry about what was done in New South Wales or Western Australia. It did not follow that those States were the most progressive States in the world because they had religious instruction in their primary schools. We, in Queensland, should seek to carve out a future for ourselves.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I would point out to the hon. member that he is worrying me by keeping away from the question before the Committee. The hon. member should confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

Mr. COLLINS: Without disputing the ruling of the Chairman, he would say that if he was getting away from the question, a lot of other members had done likewise.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: He objected to the repeal of the word "secular" in section 23 of the Education Act of 1875.

Mr. D. HUNTER: After the decision at the referendum?

Mr. COLLINS: He was not worrying about the referendum.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I must ask hon. members on the Government side of the House to allow the hon. member who is speaking the privilege that he is entitled to—to be heard in silence. The hon. member has only a limited time at his disposal, and it is altogether unfair that he should be deprived of his full opportunity for putting his views before the Committee in the way he thinks best. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. COLLINS: He was not worrying about the referendum, but was arguing in favour of retaining four hours for secular instruction. A large number of people abstained from voting at the referendum, probably from conscientious or religious scruples, and members might be voicing their sentiments in advocating the retention of the present system of secular education. He hoped the Minister would accept the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY: There was a difference of opinion between the Premier, who had come into the Chamber and taken charge of the Bill, and the Secretary for Public Instruction, who introduced the measure, regarding what was likely to be the effect of the amendment if carried. If any member would go into the library and look up certain newspapers, he could get evidence which would convince the Committee—if there was any possibility of convincing members on the other side—that the organising committee of the Bible in State Schools League laid it down very clearly that if the people decided in favour of religious instruction in State schools they were quite prepared to see that four hours' secular instruction was accorded to the children. The Premier told them that, as the people had agreed by a majority to have religious instruction in State schools, any-
[10 p.m.] thing that might have been said by either the advocates or the opponents of religious instruction must go by the board. He failed to see that. The executive body that was fighting for breaking up their national system of education, having laid it down very clearly to the country that they were not anxious to reduce the four hours allowed at present for secular instruction provided by the Act of 1875, that Chamber had

very good grounds for insisting upon the Government giving them a guarantee that they would not reduce the time for secular instruction to less than four hours a day. The Secretary for Public Instruction said that he would try to deal with the matter in the regulations, and that he would not allow less than four hours to be devoted to secular instruction. The Premier said, on the other hand, that, the referendum having been carried, as much time as they liked could be devoted to religious instruction. It was a matter of indifference to the hon. gentleman whether the whole five hours a day was taken up with religious instruction. It was evident that the head of the Government and the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill differed on the subject, and it was, therefore, the duty of the Committee to obtain some definite information on the subject. He regarded the amendment as the crux of the Bill. If the Government would insert a clause providing at least four hours per day for secular instruction, a great deal of the objection to the Bill would be removed, not because they did not believe the Bill should be fought, but simply because they realised that the Government had a majority. The matter should be decided by the Committee, and they should not allow the Minister to fix it up in the regulations. The hon. member for Barcoo did not try to flout the will of the people by introducing this amendment, but he simply proposed that the Committee should safeguard the children as much as possible. It had to be remembered that quite a number of hon. members on that side of the Chamber represented electors who were totally opposed to any change in their educational system.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Premier's speech contradicted the understanding of many members on the Government side. The senior member for Townsville assured hon. members that there was not going to be more than an hour per day devoted to religious instruction; but the Premier made it quite clear that that was not what was intended at all by the omission of the word "secular" in the Education Act. The Premier's explanation was that it meant that whatever time was taken up by clergymen in giving religious instruction would be in addition to the time taken up by the Bible lessons given by the teachers. Now, that went very much further than the questions submitted to the people, which were—

> Are you in favour of introducing the following system into State schools—namely, the State schoolmaster, in school hours, teaches selected Bible lessons from a reading-book provided for the purpose, but is not allowed to give sectarian teaching.
>
> Any minister of religion is entitled, in school hours, to give the children of his own denomination an hour's religious instruction on such day or days as the school committee can arrange for.

According to the Premier, it meant that, on the days when clergymen entered the schools, two hours might be devoted to religious instruction—one hour by the teachers and one hour by the clergymen. That was not how the electors construed the question which was submitted to them at the referendum. He thought that, on the days when clergymen entered the schools, the Bible lesson given by the teachers should be dropped. For that reason he intended to vote for the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN had not heard one argument against the amendment that would hold water. It was rather amusing to hear the contradictory speeches of hon. members on the other side. The Premier and the Secretary for Public Instruction were in conflict. Then they had the hon. member for Townsville expressing his opinion. He did not think the Cabinet had given any attention to this subject at all. It appeared to him that the Bill was the work of Archdeacon Garland, who had taken up his pen, and said, "I am the leader of these 74,000 electors, and I am going to blot out that word 'secular,'" and out it went. This Bill had been handed on to the Ministry, with a threat that if they did not swallow it holus-bolus, and force it down the throat of Parliament with the gag and the time limit to speeches, the Premier would not have the 74,000 votes which Archdeacon Garland was supposed to carry in his pocket. The Premier sheltered himself behind the referendum, but what was the position? All Archdeacon Garland and his followers wanted was the same system which was in force in New South Wales, but the Minister was not prepared to accept the New South Wales conditions to-night. The Minister pleaded the will of the people, but did not the people say they wanted to have the same Act as they had in New South Wales? The Premier was supposed to be bringing in the Bill to satisfy that section of the people which wanted the New South Wales Bill.

Mr. LESINA said the Minister should exercise his independence in this matter, and not be bound hand and foot by the Premier, who said that no amendment should be accepted. This was the most vital amendment in the Bill. The Minister had not manifested that independence which he should have done. Where was the Under Secretary and those persons upon whom he should rely for advice? They were pushed away to the back of the building, and in the front they found some clerical gentleman and other gentlemen connected with the Bible in State Schools League, to whom the Minister always referred when they wanted an amendment. Was not this reducing legislation to a farce? It was a most humiliating position for this House to have reached—that the Minister of a responsible department gave his ear to persons from outside the Chamber, who had no other claim than the fact that they were associated with one of those pestilent organisations which considered it their business to interfere in other people's creeds.

Mr. ALLEN: When he was forced to resume his seat a few minutes ago, he was just going to touch on the question of the syllabus. Even if there were not a similar clause in the New South Wales Act to the one they wished to insert in the Bill, hon. members would be justified in urging the acceptance of the amendment on the ground that already the secular syllabus was overloaded—that in twenty-five hours a week the requirements of the syllabus could not be fulfilled. The annual report of the department was bristling with criticisms—"work not up to the mark"; "too much expected," and so on. Inspector Ross, in his report, stated that many conscientious teachers complained that they could not devote the time to reading and composition that they would like, owing to the increase of work in other directions; and yet they were going to make it worse. The Committee ought to make things as easy as possible for those teachers instead of allowing the parsons to go along and create chaos. The teachers did not have

an easy time at present, and could not keep up to the standard that the inspectors desired and hoped for, and yet they were asked to take 20 per cent. off the time now allowed for secular instruction. Inspector Canny in his report, dealing with reading and composition, said he hesitated to make any recommendation towards still further over-weighting the schedules. And yet the Minister would not tell the officers under him what time would be given to them to deal with secular education. They had to get on as best they could, and be bossed about by any pettifogging committee or parson. If a teacher got into any of those localities that were extraordinarily religious—where religion was everything—he would not be able to do the secular work, and when the inspector came round he would get a black mark placed against his name, and the only way the teacher could get out of an awkward position was by a transfer. Surely five hours a week for teaching dogmas ought to satisfy the most unreasonable religious fanatic in the community.

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

AYES, 31.

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

Tellers: Mr. Booker and Mr. Grayson.

NOES, 24.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, Mann
,, Collins	,, Maughan
,, Douglas	,, May
,, Ferricks	,, Mullan
,, Foley	,, Murphy
,, Hamilton	,, McLachlan
,, Hardacre	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Allen and Mr. Collins.

PAIR.

Aye—Mr. Hodge. No—Mr. Keogh.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. MULLAN moved the insertion after "a," in line 12, of the word "separate." The Minister had already stated that the department was preparing a new reading-book, and the object of the amendment was to provide that the Bible lessons to be given [10.30 p.m.] to the children should be put into a separate reading-book. Those who objected to their children receiving religious instruction in the schools would object to the use of books containing those Bible lessons.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I have already said I would accept the amendment.

Mr. MULLAN: He wished to state the object of the amendment, and make himself appear intelligible. The purpose they had in view was to prevent these lessons from being embodied in the books used by children whose parents did not want their children to be given religious instruction in school. As the Minister had said he would accept the amendment, he would not labour the argument.

Mr. LESINA: He was opposed to the Bill, and he would vote against every amendment. It was proposed to have separate books for religious instruction, as they had in New South Wales. The Minister for Public Instruction said the New South Wales books contained some things that should not be put into the hands of a child. He had some of those books, which he would lay on the table; and he defied contradiction when he said they contained questions which the Minister would not permit to be asked of his child. How would any hon. member like his daughter to be asked questions about the seed of man, the seed of woman, and circumcision, such as were asked in New South Wales? If not, why vote for a clause which would permit such questions to be asked? Why should members opposite have the ineffable effrontery, the cold-blooded blastiferous arrogance, to push down the throats of his children questions of that description? This prurient literature was intended for the moral delectation of the boys and girls in New South Wales; and if they examined the statistics relating to antenuptial and illegitimate births they would find a chaper of revelations showing the effect of this extraordinary teaching. He would vote against the amendment, and against any proposition to make the Bill any better. It was bad as it was, and could not be made better, and the only way to make it better was to throw it out altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION thought he had made it perfectly clear at the opening of the Committee stages of the Bill that he would accept the amendment of the hon. member for Charters Towers. He thought he had made himself perfectly clear that whilst he, personally, thought the majority of the New South Wales lessons were satisfactory, there were some of them which he, as Minister for Education, could not approve of.

Mr. LESINA: Fancy Barnes editing God's work. (Laughter.)

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Having accepted the amendment, the Committee might very well proceed with the other amendments.

Mr. MULLAN agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for Clermont, and his amendment was to prevent these lessons being included in the general reading-book. He wanted a separate book, so that those who objected to it need not have it.

Amendment (*Mr. Mullan's*) agreed to.

On clause 2, as amended—

Mr. McLACHLAN moved that after the word "purpose," on line 13, the words "provided that such selected Bible lessons shall have received the approval of Parliament" be inserted. He agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for Clermont about the New South Wales books, and that showed the necessity of having the text-books that were to be used in Queensland added as a schedule to

Mr. McLachlan.]

the Bill or laid on the table of the House. He presumed that the Minister had also read them.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I read them long ago.

Mr. McLACHLAN: There were passages in the New South Wales books which should not be placed in the hands of the children, nor in the hands of the teachers to teach to the children. The Minister said that a committee of experts were going into this matter of supplying text-books.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not religious lessons. They will not do that until the Bill passes.

Mr. McLACHLAN: The committee were compiling other school books, and they would also compile these text-books, because the Bill was going to pass, the Government having the majority behind them to pass anything. Parliament should have some choice or control in the books they were going to place in the hands of the teachers to teach the children. The Minister should have had the text-books he proposed to place in the Queensland schools laid on the table of the House when the Bill was first introduced. The Committee should not permit any further progress to be made with the Bill until the Minister laid on the table of the House the actual lessons that were to be handed to the teachers to teach the children.

Mr. WHITE: Would this House be a competent judge?

Mr. McLACHLAN: The House would be a competent judge. The Minister evidently considered he was a competent judge in the matter, since he had taken it upon himself to say that certain lessons taught in the New South Wales schools should not be included in our text-books. If the Minister was competent to judge whether certain lessons should be included in those text-books, surely the collective wisdom of the House should be better able to produce a book which would be acceptable to the people of Queensland than five men with the censorship of the Minister. The New South Wales text-books should not be admitted into any school. Any member who had not read those books should acquaint himself with their contents, and he was perfectly satisfied that any member who did so would be prepared to vote for his amendment, providing that the text-books to be used in Queensland should first be approved by Parliament.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He regretted that he could not accept the amendment.

Mr. LESINA: Why not? The Premier is absent.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He could not accept the amendment, because it would simply mean shelving the Bill, and he was not prepared to take that responsibility. The hon. member who moved the amendment had referred to certain lessons in the New South Wales text-books. He wished to say at once that no men of self-respect who were appointed to draw up a scheme of lessons for our primary schools would draw them up at the dictation of the Minister. As he had already said, he thought the New South Wales lessons were, in the main, satisfactory, but there were some of them that he could not personally approve of. He did not hesitate to give his opinion as to what kind of lessons should be adopted, but hon. members must clearly understand that it was only his own personal opinion. He thought that no person could cavil at lessons on the children of the Bible, leading facts in the life of our Lord, and simple lessons from His life, lessons from the parables of the talents, the good Samaritan, the lost sheep, the lost piece of money, the prodigal son, and the Pharisee and the publican. Practical lessons might also be derived from the teaching of Moses with reference to the poor, the stranger, the fatherless, the widow, parents, and children. He did not think anybody could object to the twenty-third psalm. His preference went rather in the direction of the Western Australian system, and the lessons he had indicated were included in the Western Australian text-books. No doubt anyone preparing lessons for our schools would consider those lessons as well as others, but he had no right to direct the gentlemen appointed to frame a scheme of lessons what particular lessons they should adopt, though as Minister he would have the right to final decision with regard to them. He hoped the explanation he had given would be satisfactory to members of the Committee.

Mr. PAYNE thought it was possible for the House to decide in a calm, honest [11 p.m.] way what lessons would be acceptable quite as well as any body of men that might be appointed to make the selection. The more the question was debated the more convinced he was that, if the Bill was passed, a lot of harm would be done. A question arose as to what Bible the lessons were to be selected from. A difference of opinion would at once arise on that question. Instead of wasting precious time in discussing the Bill, it would have been much better if the Government had introduced some of the legislation that they were doubly pledged to pass, such as a Trades Disputes Bill, a State Insurance Bill, and a Workers' Compensation Bill.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the question before the Committee.

Mr. PAYNE: There was nothing wrong in suggesting that the Committee should select the lessons that were to be taught to the children attending the State schools. As the representatives of the people, they should be in a better position to make a selection than any outside body of men.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER (*Maranoa*) intended to support the amendment. Seeing they had decided to alter their educational system, it was a wise thing that they should also decide what the lessons were to be. It was regrettable, on the whole, that such a decision had been come to, but it would be equally regrettable if the selection of the lessons was left in the hands of the Minister or the Under Secretary for the time being. If Parliament made the selection, it would be a sort of safeguard that, when Ministers changed places with the Opposition, they would not have alternating lessons. As Ministers or Under Secretaries changed, so they might have alterations in the lessons. He thought the Committee should insist upon having control in the matter.

Mr. BARBER also intended to support the amendment. He regretted very much that there was to be any alteration in their educational system; but, since that had been decided, he contended that, before the Bill

went through, hon. members should have samples of the lessons submitted to them. It should be left to Parliament to ratify the lessons. Members of the Committee were just as capable of expressing an opinion upon the Scripture lessons that were to be taught to their children as anybody else. The Minister should have had the lessons drawn up long ago, and had them placed on the table of the House. He had obtained a set of the lesson books in use in New South Wales, and he was shocked that some of those lessons were being taught to the children of New South Wales. He did not pretend to be a saint, but he would never think of allowing his children to read some parts of those books. After all, however they might differ on some things, there was sufficient in the Sacred Book which they could all admire, and which, if acted upon, would help to build up nobility of character in the community. One of the paragraphs under the heading of "subjects for instruction," showed that moral lessons must also be given in truthfulness, honesty, cleanliness, perseverance, modesty, and other things. An agitation had been going on in New Zealand in this matter, of the same character we had here. The Bible in State Schools League there wished to introduce Scriptural lessons, and they had the good sense to appoint a conference to draft a table of lessons, which they presented to Parliament. They had tabulated a list of lessons which he he did not think anyone, of whatever creed he might be, could take exception to at all. So far, the New Zealand Parliament had not passed a referendum Bill, though the people had been agitating for it for some time. Then a list of lessons was drawn up by a commission appointed by the Victorian Parliament in 1900, which practically represented all the creeds there were in Victoria. He had gone carefully through the list, and there was nothing which anyone could cavil at. It included the Lord's Prayer, portions from the Psalms, and other portions of Scripture which were non-dogmatical, and that system was as good a one as we could adopt here. The other States had been wise enough to insist upon a list of lessons being drawn up and submitted to Parliament, and he thought that such a list of lessons should have been presented to the House for ratification.

Mr. COLLINS: It was the intention of the Minister to have a committee of five independent gentlemen to draw up the lessons, but he thought that when the lessons were drawn up they should come before Parliament for its approval. He did not think it was right that they should have the lessons drawn up at all, but, as they could not get what they wanted, they would have to accept the inevitable. He pointed out that the lessons would have to be very carefully drawn, in view of the conflicting opinions of scientists and theologians with regard to religion. He also hoped that the committee of five gentlemen would endeavour to get into the reading-book some socialistic ideas that were taught in the Bible. He drew attention to the teaching embodied in the Book of James, chapter v., which could be strongly recommended, because it was quite true even in the twentieth century. If that lesson were included, it would let the children see at once that as far back as 1,900 years ago there was a certain set of conditions existing which James at that time tried to expose.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You are evidently becoming a convert to Bible reading.

Mr. COLLINS: He had read the Bible from Genesis to Revelations over and over again, and it was because he knew something of the Bible that he objected to Bible reading in the State schools. It was one of those books from which you could argue from every conceivable standpoint, and the five gentlemen forming the committee would have a very big task to say what lessons should be included in the book. Seeing that the religious denominations throughout the world disagreed in regard to the Bible, there could be no finality. In the American civil war the men who believed in slavery quoted from the Bible in defence of slavery, and the men who believed in the abolition of slavery also quoted the Bible in support of their beliefs. At the present time the clergy wanted to make the young mind slavish—he could remember the time when they were supposed to raise their hats to the parson.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I would like the hon. member to show how he connects his remarks to the question before the Committee—that the selected lessons should be submitted for the approval of Parliament.

Mr. COLLINS: He was pointing out that the selected Bible lessons might have a tendency to make the children slavishly inclined.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is that the lessons receive the approval of Parliament.

Mr. COLLINS: The amendment read "provided that such selected Bible lessons" and to his mind, no matter what part of the Bible the lessons were selected from, they would not help in the education of the children of Queensland. Therefore, he was opposed to Bible lessons in any shape or form.

Mr. MURPHY would also support the amendment, because it was an eminently reasonable one. The people having decided that there should be an alteration in the educational system, they, as representatives of the people, had a right to decide whether the book prepared by the committee mentioned by the Secretary for Public Instruction was a suitable one. The Secretary for Public Instruction had told the Committee that he would practically have the final approval as to whether it was a suitable book to be placed in the schools. Why should a party Minister for Education have the right to finally deal with a matter of such vital importance as the placing of a religious book in our schools? He would like to have an assurance from the Minister that the gentlemen who had been selected to prepare those Bible lessons were absolutely competent to do the work, and he would like to know what position the Minister would take up if there was a dispute amongst those gentlemen as to which lessons should be included in the book. Were the Bible lessons to be selected by a majority of that committee? And if the Bible lessons were to be selected by a majority of the committee, that was a good argument why the selected reading-book should be adopted by a majority of the House. Supposing the committee appointed to prepare this book decided that all the lessons in the New South Wales books should appear in the Queensland book though the Minister said he could not approve of some of those lessons, was that a reasonable [11.30 p.m.] state of things to permit? The committee might not be able to come to a decision under several months;

and it would not much retard the new system if members of that Assembly had the privilege of deciding what lessons should be included. A very sensible suggestion had just been made by interjection by the hon. member for North Rockhampton. The hon. member said that if the Minister was not prepared to wholly accept the amendment he might give an assurance that a draft copy of the reading book prepared by the committee would be laid on the table before it was finally printed. If that suggestion were adopted, they would be able to criticise the book before it was issued; and the majority having decided that it was suitable for introduction in the State schools, the minority would have to submit to the will of the majority.

Mr. FERRICKS was surprised that the Minister did not accept the amendment, which was a reasonable one. He was not prepared to take any assurance from the Government in regard to the Bill, because in this matter they were not their own masters, but were dominated by a league independent of Parliament.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question before the Committee is not the domination of the Government by an outside league, but the amendment moved by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley.

Mr. FERRICKS: He was endeavouring to show that it was necessary to bring these lessons before the representatives of the people. That league threatened that if the Government did not take action in a certain direction they would, at the first opportunity, take action against the Government; and the Government succumbed to the threat and brought forward this Bill. The crocodile sympathy which the Premier professed to show for the people who had their own schools for the education of their own children was not borne out in other respects. The Minister in reply to a deputation refused to permit the children attending Roman Catholic schools to be on the same footing as State school children with regard to passages on the railways, and the Education Department refused to allow them the same privilege of attending the technical colleges by qualifying for examination the same as State school children. How, then, could they expect hon. members in opposition to take the assurance of the Minister as to what would be done? They should not remit the selection of the lessons to three men who were responsible to nobody, but should leave it to the representatives of the people. There were two of the names mentioned who did not voluntarily act, and, as they were high up in the public service, it meant that if they were asked to do it they would have to act. A lady constituent of his wrote to him asking him what he was going to do about obeying the will of the people, and he wrote back saying that if he voted for the Bill he would cease to be a member of the Labour party.

At 11.46 p.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order No. 171 I call upon the hon. member for Musgrave, Mr. White, to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. WHITE took the chair accordingly.

Mr. FERRICKS: His letter was afterwards quoted by Archdeacon Garland at an intimidation meeting held at Fortitude Valley, and he did not quote it properly. He said that a member of the Labour party said that if he did not vote for the Bill he would be turned out of the Labour party.

Mr. ALLEN: Garland will do anything.

Mr. FERRICKS: The attitude of the Minister in not accepting the amendment was most unreasonable. He did not think the Premier had the power to accept an amendment without consulting the executive of the Bible in State Schools League. It was a recognised fact that the Ministry and the whole Government party were dominated by clerics outside, who threatened members with what would happen if they failed to do this or dared to do that. It would be a sorry day for Queensland if the Parliament allowed itself to be dominated by clerics and lodges; and if that happened it would be the present Premier who was responsible for it. Once the clergy got a footing in this matter, they would, to use the words of the official organ of the Government, drive home the wedge, and realise their ideal of a State church. Should that happen, the public life of Queensland would be dragged down into the gutter.

Mr. MULLAN considered it almost impossible to have Biblical teaching without sectarian teaching. In his opinion, scripture teaching and sectarian teaching were inseparable, but if there was any possibility of separating them, then Parliament, as the highest tribunal in the land, should have an opportunity of trying to separate them by reviewing the scripture lessons before they were submitted to the children.

Mr. COLLINS did not think that the five gentlemen who had been mentioned by the Minister could draw up lessons which would be satisfactory to the people of Queensland. In support of that view, he would give a brief quotation from a writer who was recognised throughout Europe as being one of the foremost thinkers of modern times. In his "Conventional Lies of Civilisation," page 47, Dr. Max Nordau said—

> Centuries will be required to produce a human being who from his birth up is prepared to comprehend life and the universe from the point of view of reason and natural science, without prejudice or superstitution, because a hundred generations before him had been convincing themselves of the correctness of this point of view.

His contention was that the man of science was in conflict with the theologian, and that Max Nordau was correct when he said that centuries must elapse before they would be able to shake off the old beliefs [12 p.m.] which were held to-day. Therefore, he contended that the five men nominated to select those Bible lessons would, perhaps unconsciously, be prejudiced by the influence of their ancestors. It was not the duty of the State to teach religion when theologians differed on the subject. They would be imposing an impossible task on any five men, if they asked them to draw up a series of lessons for the rising generation.

Mr. LESINA said that, as it was not possible to submit the lessons to the whole of the people, it was a question whether it would not be better to submit them to the seventy-two members of that House for approval than to the five officials referred to by the Minister. Probably it would take several days for hon. members to do that work.

At eight minutes past 12 o'clock,

Mr. MULLAN called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. LESINA, continuing, pointed out the difficulties of selecting suitable lessons, and referred to some of the results of Higher Criticism in regard to the books of the Bible.

Mr. THEODORE: The Minister's tacit disapproval of some of the lessons in the New South Wales Scriptural lesson books was one of the strongest arguments why the lessons should be submitted to Parliament. Hon. members might not be the best possible body of men for the work, but they would be in a position to exercise beneficial supervision. If the Minister wished to see the Bill productive of any good at all, he might accept the amendment.

At twelve minutes past 12 o'clock a.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Tolmie) resumed the chair.

Mr. MANN approved of the amendment. He referred to certain passages in one of the New South Wales lesson books to prove that it practically taught the children that the Almighty permitted the assassination of a certain Roman emperor because of his persecution of the Church. If such doctrines were taught in their schools, they might have some fanatic who had been educated in their schools attempting to assassinate the Premier of Queensland. A study of the Bible led him to believe that the Jews were more savage than some of the people they conquered. While there were some beautiful passages in the Bible, there were some objectionable ones, and suggested things that should not be placed before children.

Mr. ALLEN was rather surprised the Minister had refused to accept the amendment. The hon. gentleman had taken up a most unreasonable attitude. If he accepted the amendment, it would go a long way towards meeting the wishes of the people. Parliament was responsible to the [12.30 a.m.] people of Queensland for the lessons to be taught. The Minister had no guarantee that the gentlemen whose names he had mentioned would be prepared to draw up a series of Scripture lessons. They might shirk the task of attempting to draw up lessons which would not wound the susceptibilities of any of the numerous religious denominations. If they refused to undertake the work, the hon. gentleman might offer the job to Archdeacon Garland.

Mr. LESINA quoted a list of distinguished scientific and professional men in Great Britain who signed a declaration in favour of secular education.

Mr. MURPHY regretted the Minister had not accepted the amendment. The teaching of the Bible, as a whole, was good. It was proposed that certain gentlemen connected with the Education Department should select passages which they considered suitable; but those passages might not commend themselves to the parents of some of the children, and, if they withdrew their children from the school while the lessons were being given, it might lead to conflict among the children. If hon. members selected lessons that the people of Queensland did not approve of, they could reject them at the next election; but they could not express their disapproval in the same way if the work was done by the Education Department.

Mr. PAYNE said that the onus of selecting the lessons should be left to members of Parliament. If they did the work badly, they would have to take the responsibility.

Mr. LESINA: If the choice of lessons was left to hon. members, there was some certainty that some of the lessons in the New South Wales books would not be selected. He proceeded to comment upon some of the lessons which appeared in one of the New South Wales text-books, which he considered most unsuitable for use in the State schools.

Mr. LENNON thought the amendment a reasonable one. Lessons might be selected that would give offence to a certain section of the people, and that might be avoided or minimised by submitting the lessons to Parliament for approval. If the lessons were hashed up in the Education Department, the Minister would have a controlling voice in regard to them, and it was better that Parliament should be in that position. What qualifications had the gentlemen in the [1 a.m.] department to prepare Bible lessons calculated to meet with the acceptance of the people of the State?

Mr. FERRICKS: Besides Labour electors, a large section of the Nonconformist bodies were opposed to religious instruction in the State schools, and they should have some say in the selection of the lessons. When the lessons were drawn up, were they to be accepted without any revision? If the representatives of the people were not allowed to perform that duty, a privilege was being taken away from them.

Mr. COLLINS entered his protest against the Bible lessons because the result would be to cast a gloom over the minds of the rising generation such as was cast over Scotland in the seventeenth century by the domination of the clergy.

Mr. MANN: The hon. member for Burke was altogether wrong in his conception of the condition of affairs in Scotland. He protested against such a slander being hurled at his country. He was in favour of the amendment, and suggested certain parts of Scripture which could be selected.

Mr. MURPHY urged that the Minister should accept the suggestion made by a member of his own side, and submit a draft copy of the lesson books to Parliament. He suggested certain lessons which might be incorporated teaching children not to take advantage of their fellow-creatures. They might inculcate socialistic doctrines; and there were hon. members who would be only too pleased to collaborate with the Minister in placing before the children of Queensland truths which would make them better citizens.

Mr. ALLEN repeated that he was surprised the Minister would not accept the amendment. Every precaution should be taken to ensure that the lessons were free from sectarianism. He hoped the committee to whom the work was to be entrusted would pay heed to the suggestions made by hon. members. He suggested some lessons for incorporation in the text-books.

Mr. BARBER advocated the inclusion of lessons such as were dealt with in the pamphlets issued in England by the Moral Instruction League in England.

[1.30 a.m.]

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. McLachlan's amendment*)—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 21.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mann
,, Breslin	,, Maughan
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hardacre	,, Ryan
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Theodore
,, Land	

Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. Theodore.

NOES, 27.

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

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Walker.

PAIRS.

Resolved in the negative.

Ayes—Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mackintosh, and Mr. Douglas.
Noes—Mr. Hodge, Mr. Philp, and Mr. Cottell.

Mr. LENNON moved the insertion, after the word "denomination," in line 15, of the words—

And such instruction shall only be given immediately preceding the close of the day's work, and no child not receiving religious instruction shall be required to attend the school while such religious instruction is being given.

At eighteen minutes to 2 o'clock a.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN called upon Mr. D. Hunter, the hon. member for Woolloongabba, to relieve him in the chair.

Mr. D. HUNTER took the chair accordingly.

Mr. LENNON said the object of the amendment was to fix the most suitable time for giving religious instruction. By having it in the closing hour, those children who wished to remain could do so, while those whose parents did not wish them to attend the lessons could go home.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION thought the principal object in moving the amendment was to make it as difficult to get the Bill through the Chamber as possible. He could not accept the amendment, as the most suitable time for religious instruction to be given varied in different cases.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER thought the amendment was a very good one, and it would not have the effect the Minister suggested. Neither was there any ulterior motive in moving it. He did not care whether the first hour of the morning or the last hour of the afternoon was chosen, but one or other should be decided upon. Ministers of religion should not be able to come in at other times and upset the school work.

Mr. HAMILTON thought the amendment was a very reasonable one. It was only right that there should be a stated period of the day when the ministers could attend to give religious instruction, otherwise the lessons might be broken in upon to the disadvantage of the children.

[2 a.m.]

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: This will be in the hands of the committees.

Mr. MANN said that a clergyman having several schools to visit in country districts would be irregular in his visits unless some definite period was fixed for the Bible lessons. It would be better that the last hour of the day should be fixed for the purpose, as if there were several schools in the district, the minister might visit each school in rotation during the day, and there would be no certainty when he would get there. There were 800 country schools in Queensland with only one room, and was the schoolmaster to permit all the children who did not desire to take part in the lessons to go outside for the time being? It might be very awkward on a wet day.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In all the other States, if it were a wet day, the children are not asked to go out; the lessons are not held.

Mr. MANN: The same difficulty would occur if it was a very warm day, and there were no shelter-sheds. He hoped that even yet the Government would state firmly that they would not alter our good system of education.

Mr. LESINA: If the amendment were accepted it would mean that the clergyman would be able to enter the school at the close of the afternoon and give his lessons, but some children had to leave school, say, at 3 o'clock, to bring in the cows to be milked, and they could not attend at that hour. The same difficulty would occur to those children if the lesson were to be given before school hours, as they had a lot of work to do early in the day before school time.

Mr. ALLEN pointed out that if this amendment were accepted the teacher would be able to give the lesson at the close of the day, and his attention would not be distracted with other school work. If the religious instruction was not given at a definite time, a few children might be receiving instruction, while the bulk of the children would be playing outside and causing disturbance. He thought if the Minister were free to exercise his discretion he would accept this reasonable amendment, but he was bound down, and had to please Archdeacon Garland.

Mr. MULLAN said the amendment was most essential, but, unfortunately, the Premier and the Minister had got their orders and could not accept it. It was deplorable when a Government had to sink their independence in that way.

[2.30 a.m.]

Mr. LAND supported the amendment. He took exception to the statement of the Minister that the amendments were merely moved for obstructive purposes. He had heard many expressions of opinion as to what hour

of the day was most suitable for giving this instruction. Some people thought the school committee should decide, and they were certainly the most familiar with the conditions in the district. Some were in favour of the morning, as the children could best attend then; but others thought that just previous to the dinner hour was the best time, as most of the children were present. Others favoured the last hour of the day, as then all those who were not to receive the religious instruction could go home, and there would then be no friction caused. A lot of the children got up early to milk, and then rode 4 or 5 miles to school, and it would be impossible for them to receive the religious instruction if the class was held before the opening hour of the school. The amendment would do away with a lot of trouble, as it would fix the hour definitely. It would relieve the school committee from the responsibility, and there would thus be no local friction. He understood the Minister yesterday to say he would accept reasonable amendments; but what was the use of their moving amendments when the Minister declined to give them any consideration?

At 2.45 a.m.,

Mr. TOLMIE resumed the chair.

Mr. MURPHY contended that the House should have adjourned at a reasonable hour, so that they might have come back prepared to calmly consider the measure. Unless they specified the hour for the lesson, there was a possibility that the school committees would fix it at such inconvenient times that it would cause great friction between the committees and the parents. This applied especially to agricultural districts.

Mr. FERRICKS expressed his dissatisfaction at the tactics of members on the Government side in keeping members of the Opposition here during the early hours of the morning. The boys and girls engaged in the dairy industry had to milk the cows early in the morning before going to school, and it was these young people who would suffer if the amendment were not adopted. If the hour of instruction were fixed at the end of the day's work, it would enable the children to time the hour of their arrival and departure. He thought if the matter had been left to the Minister he would have accepted the amendment, but he evidently had not the power.

Mr. FOLEY argued that the amendment was most reasonable. Suppose the lesson was given at 11 o'clock, those children who did not receive the religious instruction would be kept about the premises simply doing nothing, and they would not be as fit for work as if they continued their studies without the break. The amendment would give a chance to the children who were debarred from receiving this instruction to get away from the school altogether, and would prevent the children from quarrelling and calling each other names.

Mr. ALLEN pointed out that Archdeacon Garland knew that if there was no pressure exerted there would be no attendance, and thus, in an indirect way, there would be compulsion; but the amendment would obviate that evil. Certain clergymen wanted to get into our State schools for the purpose of proselytising, and to further their own religious fads. He pointed out that there were 74,000 votes recorded in favour of the Bible teaching, and 56,000 against it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member must confine his remarks to the amendment, which has reference to the time of the day at which religious instruction has to be imparted.

Mr. ALLEN continued to argue in favour of the amendment.

Mr. LESINA could not add much to what had been so clearly put by previous speakers. The question was whether the [3.30 a.m.] lessons should be given at a prescribed time, and have it fixed in the Bill, as suggested by the leader of the Opposition, or whether to leave it to the school committees, as suggested by the Minister. He hoped the Minister would reconsider the matter.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER could see that a good deal of trouble would arise if the school committees were left to fix the hours, as they could not suit everybody; but all trouble would be obviated if the House itself were to definitely fix the time. They should be allowed to frame this legislation in such a way that there would be no doubt as to what was intended. He urged the Minister to reconsider the amendment.

Mr. MANN and Mr. LESINA again spoke in favour of the amendment.

Mr. COLLINS supported the amendment, as it would be in the interests of the children, though he thought religious instruction was of very little use to fight the battle of life with. There were about 800 one-room schools, and where were those children who did not desire to stay at the lesson to go during the lesson? When the children went to school fresh in the morning, let them have the benefit of secular instruction, and the religious instruction at the close of the day.

Mr. MURPHY contended that it was the duty of the Committee to insist on the insertion of the amendment, as although it was eminently desirable that religion [4 a.m.] should be imparted to the scholars, it was more desirable that they should be educated in such a manner as to fit them to take any position in life.

Mr. LAND: It was generally recognised that the best schools to-day were the Catholic schools, and in those schools the religious instruction was given at the close of the day, and the Protestants attending those schools were allowed to go home.

Mr. MURPHY pointed out that religious instruction was taught in the schools in Portugal in the morning, and that might have had some influence on the revolution going on in that country. If the Minister would give the amendment a little more consideration, he could not fail to come to the conclusion that it was a very desirable one.

Mr. BRESLIN said by giving the religious instruction at the end of the day, the children who did not wish to receive that religious instruction would be enabled to go home. He was sure that the country would endorse the Minister's action if he agreed to accept the amendment.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Lennon's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 22.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Land
,, Barber	,, Lennon
,, Blair	,, Lesina
,, Breslin	,, Mann
,, Collins	,, Maughan
,, Corser	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hardacre	,, Ryan
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. McLachlan.

NOES, 26.

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

Tellers: Mr. Roberts and Mr. Wienholt.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mackintosh, and Mr. Douglas.
Noes—Mr. Hodge, Mr. Philp, and Mr. Cottell.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. MANN moved to further amend the clause by omitting the word "moreover," on line 16, with the view of inserting "with the consent of the school committee." The only reason for the Bill was that the majority of the people had voted for religious instruction in the State schools, and he was seeking in another form to allow the majority of parents of the scholars to say whether religious instruction should be given in the school or not. He intended moving later on that the word "shall" be omitted in the same line, with a view of inserting "may," so that it would not be mandatory.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the amendment was another attempt to wreck the Bill. The question embodied in the Bill had been approved of by a very large majority of the people in the State, to whom it was referred, and on that account alone there was very little chance of him accepting the amendment.

Mr. MURPHY: It must not be supposed that because a member of the Opposition moved an amendment, it was moved for the purpose of wrecking the Bill. The members of school committees, who were elected by the parents, were entitled to some consideration in an important matter like the giving of religious instruction in the schools. He appealed to hon. members opposite to deal fairly with the school committees.

Mr. ALLEN asked why had the Minister stated the amendment was moved to wreck the Bill, when he had given the school committees, further on in the clause, greater powers than those asked by the hon. member for Cairns? Was this religious instruction to be rammed down the throats of the people of the North and West, who were almost unanimous in opposing it? The regulations at the present time prevented the school teachers from teaching religious dogmas outside the schools, and now it was proposed to ask him to teach religion in the schools.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to confine himself to the amendment, otherwise I shall have to call upon him to resume his seat for tedious repetition.

Mr. ALLEN said there were times when it was necessary to repeat arguments.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Mann's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.

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

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Thorn.

NOES, 21.

Mr. Allen	Mr Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mann
,, Breslin	,, Maughan
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hardacre	,, Ryan
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Theodore
,, Land	

Tellers: Mr. Foley and Mr. J. M. Hunter.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge, Mr. Philp, and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mackintosh, and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

At three minutes past 5 o'clock a.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order No. 171, I call upon the hon. member for Woolloongabba to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. D. HUNTER took the chair accordingly.

Mr. BARBER moved that the word "one," on line 21, be omitted with the view of inserting "half an." He thought half an hour would be quite sufficient to give religious instruction at one time, and he moved the amendment out of sympathy to the children.

Mr. MURPHY objected to gag the clergy, and, therefore, could not possibly vote for the amendment.

Mr. MANN did not believe in shortening the time allowed for religious devotion, and could not support the amendment.

At 5.28 a.m.,

Mr. TOLMIE resumed the chair.

Mr. MURPHY asked why should they try to limit the time allowed ministers of religion to give religious instruction?

Mr. ALLEN said half an hour was quite long enough for a lesson on any one subject. If half an hour was sufficient for a lesson on mathematics and subjects of that nature, it was also sufficient for a lesson on religion.

Mr. McLACHLAN was opposed altogether to any minister having the right to go into the schools and give religious instruction; and while he could not prevent that, he would do all he could to limit the time to half an hour.

He pointed out that under the West Australian and Tasmanian Acts a clergyman was only allowed half an hour in which to give religious instruction.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could not accept the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN asked why the Secretary for Public Instruction would not be guided by the experience of Western Australia? If half an hour had been found sufficient to give religious instruction in the schools in that State, it should be quite sufficient in Queensland.

Mr. MURPHY: After listening to the arguments adduced in favour of the amendment, he must confess he had changed his mind, and would vote for it.

Question—That the word proposed to be omitted (*Mr. Barber's amendment*) stand part of the clause—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 27.

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

Tellers: Mr. G. P. Barnes and Mr. Cribb.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Breslin	,, Mann
,, Collins	,, Maughan
,, Ferricks	,, Mullan
,, Foley	,, Murphy
,, Hamilton	,, McLachlan
,, Hardacre	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Ferricks.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge, Mr. Philp, and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh, Mr. Mackintosh, and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr. ALLEN said the Minister's refusal to accept amendments was getting monotonous. He had a most reasonable amendment to propose—one suggested by the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp.

[6 a.m.] He moved the omission of all the words after "hour," in line 21, down to and including "are," with the view of inserting "in each week on such school day as the head teacher is." The object of the amendment was to transfer the power of arranging the time for religious instruction from the school committee to the head teacher.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could not accept the amendment, by which it was proposed, in the first place, to reduce the time allowed for religious instruction to one hour a week; and, in the second place, to make the head teacher instead of the school committee responsible.

Mr. MURPHY asked whether the Minister would allow the power to be transferred from the school committee to the head teacher if the time allowed was one hour a day, instead of one hour a week?

Mr. ALLEN: He was prepared to alter his amendment by inserting "or school days" after the word "days." He wanted to have only one authority in the school.

Mr. BLAIR pointed out that, as the clause stood, the school committee might appoint one hour a month, or one hour a year, for religious instruction by clergymen; but the amendment would provide that one hour at least in each week should be allowed. It would be better to leave the matter to the discretion of the school committee, who represented the parents.

Amendment put and negatived.

Mr. FERRICKS moved the insertion after "appoint," in line 23, of the words "but in all cases the pupils receiving religious instruction shall be separated from the other pupils of the school." This provision was contained in the New South Wales Act.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the object of the amendment was already provided for in the clause.

Mr. FERRICKS contended that it was the duty of the department to separate the children. There would be a difficulty in the case of one-room schools, of which there were over 800 in Queensland.

Mr. LENNON supported the amendment. The variety of children in his electorate made it all the more necessary that this rule should be provided. If the proposed amendment to take religious instruction at the end of the school day had been accepted, there would have been no difficulty in this matter.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: In New South Wales there were 1,500 one-teacher schools, and the course followed was to take care not to sacrifice the majority in favour of any particular denomination. That course would be followed here. In cases where it was not practicable to separate the children, religious instruction would have to go by the board for the day.

Mr. BLAIR said that during the debate on the Address in Reply he referred to the one-room schools, and the Secretary for Lands gave an implied promise that religious instruction would be given at a later hour than the ordinary school lessons. The Minister might accept an amendment, providing that in all cases the pupils receiving religious instruction should be, as far as possible, separated from the other pupils.

Mr. MURPHY argued that what was practically a promise made by the Secretary for Lands, who might be regarded as the deputy leader of the Government, ought to be fulfilled.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION gave the assurance that, in the event of the Bill passing, all head teachers would be requested by the department to see that, when religious instruction was being given, the children whose parents did not wish them to receive those lessons should be kept as far apart as possible from the others.

Mr. ALLEN supported the amendment. It was not well to take the hon. gentleman's assurance in everything, because in three months' time he might not be the Minister.

Mr. B. F. S. Allen.]

Question—That the word proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Ferricks's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 18.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Hunter, J. M.
,, Barber	,, Land
,, Blair	,, Lennon
,, Breslin	,, Lesina
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, Payne
,, Hamilton	,, Ryan
,, Hardacre	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Murphy.

NOES, 29.

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

Tellers: Mr. Allan and Mr. Bouchard.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.
Noes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. THEODORE moved the insertion, after "appoint," in line 23, of the words—

Provided that no child shall receive any religious instruction unless and until the parent or guardian notifies to the head teacher in writing that such instruction is desired.

The object of the amendment was apparent. Even the Bible League never advocated that religious instruction should be given to children whose parents were not willing that such instruction should be given to them. The provision in the clause in this connection was a negative provision, and he wanted it to be made positive.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He could not accept the amendment, for the reason that in framing the Bill the object was to keep it in line with the referendum. Any parent or guardian could request that no religious instruction should be given to a child, and that request would be respected.

Messrs. COLLINS AND ALLEN supported the amendment.

At 7.45 a.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN said he would resume the chair at 9 o'clock.

The Committee resumed at the hour named.

Mr. LENNON argued that the obnoxious proviso in the clause was a drag-net one, and those who were engineering the Bill through would look on the children as members of the incipient State church. The teachers should not lay sacrilegious hands on the children to wean them away from their beliefs, or non-beliefs, if they did not have any belief. In the country the so-called neglected children and their parents would not submit to the patronage that was bestowed by professional philanthropists on the children in the metropolitan districts. The Minister would not accept the amendment, but it was their duty to show that they were a live Opposition. They had exhibited a watchfulness and a de-

[9 a.m.] termination to fight the Bill all the way, and if he had the physical strength he would fight every line and every word of it.

[*Mr. Theodore.*

Mr. MURPHY: They should deal with the clause without any warmth, and while he was not going to be annoyed over the Bill, he would go on fighting it all the way. When the Government's supporters asked for more money for the hospitals, the Government said, "No," so it was no wonder they said "No" to the reasonable amendments of the Opposition. It might happen that the parent could not write, and they would find the children writing notes, asking to be excused from attending religious lessons, so instead of the Bill doing the children good it would lead them to commit forgery by signing the names of the parents to the notes. Would the Premier look at the amendment from a shrewd, Scottish, financial point of view, and he would see that it was a reasonable one?

Mr. CORSER: People outside treated the matter seriously, and there was too much levity on the other side. He saw the Minister's difficulty about accepting the amendment, as it was at variance with the referendum. The question should have been raised at the time of the referendum; but, as the will of the people had been expressed, it was the Minister's duty to carry it out. He suggested that after the word "parent," in lines 25 and 29, the words "or guardian" should be inserted, and then any need for the amendment would largely disappear.

Mr. HAMILTON: The amendment was to make the Bill as acceptable to those who did not believe in religious instruction as it was possible to do. Not more than five who voted for the referendum knew they were voting to permit ministers of religion to enter the schools, but they thought they were voting just to permit the teachers to give Scriptural lessons. The Premier was like a Czar or Emperor, and since he had come on his throne he had not been so courteous or reasonable in accepting amendments as his predecessors in that office.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION pointed out that the amendment would practically override what the understanding was at the time of the referendum, and he could not accept any amendment that would have that effect. With regard to the one-room schools, he would see that regulations were issued so that children whose parents objected to them getting religious instruction would be removed as far as possible from the school, and every care would be exercised. The amendment defeated the whole scope and purpose of the Bill, and he could not accept it.

Mr. FOLEY did not agree with the Minister that the amendment was against the intentions of the Bill. The Bill had been drafted by Archdeacon Garland, and that gentleman had not been working for fifteen years on this matter without having all these amendments prepared. The Minister would not accept the amendment because he wanted to throw the onus of the children not receiving religious instruction on to the parents. The assumption by the Minister was that the children wished to have religious instruction because they did not bring letters from their parents. What man would be game to write to a teacher, asking that his child should not receive religious instruction? The Premier would not do it.

The PREMIER: My word, I would.

Mr. FOLEY: Such a man would be described as a heathen and an atheist, and it might prevent him from getting work. If a child refused to accept religious teaching, he should not be punished for so doing.

Mr. WHITE said the amendment was moved with the intention to destroy the Bill.

Mr. THEODORE: Was the hon. member in order in imputing motives?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: To impute motives at any time is not in order.

Mr. WHITE: They were told that Mr. Garland framed the Bill, but who framed the amendments and speeches of members of the Opposition? They were all framed outside.

Mr. LENNON: That is a deliberate misstatement, and you know it.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! I must insist on the Standing Order that members be heard in silence, being obeyed.

Mr. WHITE: The Labour party were asking for another referendum to give them another chance, but when the financial agreement referendum was carried the State Premiers did not ask for another chance, but accepted the voice of the people. Seeing that the referendum was a plank of the Labour platform, the Bill should have gone through in ten minutes.

Mr. MULLAN: The Premier interjected that if he did not want his son to be given religious lessons he would write to the teacher to that effect, but when the Premier signed the Labour platform, which he did not believe in, he did not send a letter along to the Trades Hall, saying he did not believe in it.

Mr. BLAIR refuted the statement that the amendments and speeches from [10 a.m.] the Opposition were drafted outside. He supported the amendment because it would improve the Bill. It threw the onus on the parent to write and say that he wanted his child to receive religious instruction.

HON. R. PHILP thought they should settle the matter without further delay. They were acting like a lot of children. There were seventy-two members in Parliament, supposed to represent the brains of Queensland, and what would the country think of them when they could not settle a small matter like this? The question had been settled by a majority of 15,000, a much bigger majority than Mr. Fisher got, and yet Mr. Fisher's majority was referred to as a glorious victory. He (Mr. Philp) promised to bring in such a Bill himself, and because he had not done it, the hon. member for Bundaberg said it was a broken promise, but that hon. member should be the last to talk about broken promises, as he promised to vote for the Bill and then voted against it.

Mr. MULLAN: In this referendum there was only one party active, but in the Federal referendum it was a big fight between two parties. They did not want another referendum, and would not accept it if it were offered.

Mr. BRESLIN was surprised at the Government members stonewalling the measure. The amendment was a reasonable one, and would simplify matters a good deal for the teacher.

Mr. McLACHLAN pointed out that it would have simplified matters if the Minister had accepted the amendment the previous night that the religious instruction would be given in the last hour of the day.

Mr. LAND contended that the amendment would be a great improvement to the measure if it were adopted.

Mr. J. M. HUNTER: The amendment was a conscience clause, and should be inserted in the Bill. The clause, as printed, was a semi-compulsory clause, as the parent must write asking that lessons should not be given to his child to prevent it being done. He (Mr. Hunter) had been a Sunday school teacher and believed in the Bible being taught to children in the Sunday school, but not in the State schools. It was a farce the way the Government carried out business, and a waste of money paying members of Parliament when no notice was taken of their suggestions. It would mean that an amending Bill would have to be brought in next year.

Mr. LESINA argued that members on the Government side were engaged in an act of vandalism in pulling down the splendid superstructure of secular education erected by the giant minds of the past. They were like white ants engaged in destroying that edifice, and the amendment was something in the nature of a "white ant destroyer." It was a reasonable amendment, and it was distinctly unchristian of the Minister to call it an obstructive amendment. The Government had reached the *ne plus ultra* of parliamentary existence, and any Bill introduced by them must go through as drafted, as no amendments would be accepted. The statutes were piled up with amending Bills which only a lawyer could understand, all because amendments were not received when Bills were being considered.

Mr. THEODORE saw nothing in the question submitted at the referendum that was contrary to the amendment now proposed. The people did not give a negative vote on the question that the parent should write and say he wanted his child to be given religious instruction.

Mr. MURPHY drew attention to the fact that the amendment was supported by Mr. Blair, who supported the second reading, and who was a member of the Government which agreed to submit the question to the people, and that ought to lead the Minister to accept it.

Mr. LESINA urged that the amendment should be accepted, on the ground that, in giving religious teaching, the teacher might wound the religious sus-[11 a.m.] ceptibilities of parents; and complained that the Minister was deaf to logic, to reason, to sentiment, and to appeal; and had made up his mind to refuse the amendment, no matter by what arguments it might be supported.

Mr. LENNON challenged any member to prove that the amendment was not a reasonable and proper one, deserving of the most serious consideration of the Government, and claimed that if Ministers acted in a statesmanlike manner they would embody it in the Bill.

Mr. ALLEN argued that the attitude of the Government towards amendments proposed by members opposed to them implied that, in their opinion, the Opposition had no right to move amendments. He protested against such assumption on the part of a gagging Government.

Mr. FERRICKS expressed astonishment at the obstinate attitude adopted by the Government towards all amendments proposed, and said he could only explain it by the fact that the whole of the members of the Cabinet were under some mysterious outside influence, and dare not accept any modification of their proposal.

Mr. MURPHY argued that if religious instruction was to be given to children attending primary schools, it should only be

done with the consent and at the bidding of their parents, and, therefore, the amendment was necessary.

Mr. ALLEN submitted that the amendment would protect the teacher from petty annoyances arising from scholars endeavouring to shirk ordinary class work by attending Bible instruction classes.

Mr. FERRICKS contended that if parents wished to have religious instruction given to their children they should ask for it, and that it should not be forced upon the scholars.

Mr. LESINA again complained that the Minister had made no attempt to answer the arguments of the Opposition.

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted (*Mr. Theodore's amendment*) be so inserted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 19.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
„ Barber	„ Lesina
„ Blair	„ Mackintosh
„ Breslin	„ May
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Ferricks	„ Murphy
„ Foley	„ McLachlan
„ Hamilton	„ Payne
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Theodore
„ Land	

Tellers: Mr. Breslin and Mr. McLachlan.

NOES, 29.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
„ Appel	„ Macartney
„ Barnes, W. H.	„ Paget
„ Booker	„ Petrie
„ Bouchard	„ Philp
„ Brennan	„ Rankin
„ Bridges	„ Roberts
„ Corser	„ Somerset
„ Cribb	„ Stodart
„ Denham	„ Swayne
„ Forrest	„ Thorn
„ Forsyth	„ Walker
„ Gunn	„ White
„ Hawthorn	„ Wienholt
„ Hunter, D.	

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Walker.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Keogh and Mr Douglas.
Noes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. BLAIR moved that after the word "parent," on lines 25 and 28, there be inserted the words "or guardian."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I accept that amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR moved that the following words be inserted after line 28:—

Provided also that any teacher may make and transmit to the Minister a statutory declaration under his or her hand, made before a justice of the peace, that he or she conscientiously objects to give religious instruction under the provisions of this section, and thereupon such teacher shall be exempted from the duty of giving such instruction as aforesaid and shall not be subject to any disability by reason only of such objection.

This amendment might well be termed a "conscience clause." It was not designed to defeat the Bill. It was simply an honest attempt to harmonise this proposed legislation with the wishes of the people, and at the same time protect those teachers who had conscientious scruples against imparting the instruction provided for by the Bill. In a previous part of the Bill the Government recognised that a parent might have conscientious objections to his children receiving religious instruction, and it would be illogical to refuse to recognise similar conscientious scruples on the part of teachers. Moreover, unless some provision in the nature of the amendment was inserted, there would arise in some cases the extraordinary anomaly that a teacher who had a son attending his own school who conscientiously objected to that son receiving religious instruction and withdrew him from the class during religious lessons, would still have to teach the lessons to which he objected to the children of other parents. The amendment was a logical and reasonable one, and would improve the Bill, and he hoped it would be accepted by the Minister.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: He could not accept the amendment, for three reasons. The first was that there was no such provision in similar measures in other States. The second reason was that the amendment seemed to be a covert attempt to defeat the effect of the Bill, as it would render its operation impracticable, since there were, so it was stated, 895 schools in the State in which there was only one teacher, and, if those teachers claimed exemption under the proposed amendment, no religious instruction could be given in those schools. The third reason was that teachers would not be asked to explain the Bible lessons read by the children. The lessons would be read without explanation or comment.

Mr. BLAIR repudiated the suggestion of any unworthiness of motive, and pointed out that he had made clear his position with regard to this Bill in his speech on the Address in Reply. He maintained that a conscience clause for parents having been inserted in the Bill, the necessary corollary to that was a conscience clause for teachers, who were only differentiated from other parents by the fact that they were employed by the department.

Mr. MULLAN contended that to compel teachers to teach religion was a repudiation of the contract the department had made with them, and that it would practically result in imposing a religious test on this class of public servants.

Mr. ALLEN supported the amendment on the ground that it was a poor religion which depended for its success on compulsory teaching by public servants, and scouted as sublime nonsense and ridiculous rot the suggestion that teachers could give a lesson in Bible reading without explanation or comment, if they complied with the requirements of the department.

Mr. MACKINTOSH favoured the insertion of a conscience clause for teachers, and was surprised at the Minister refusing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON urged that it would be useless to read Scripture lessons to children unless those lessons were interpreted to them, and that it would be foolish and wrong to compel teachers to give lessons on matters they did not believe in, and to the inculcation of which they had conscientious objections.

HON. R. PHILP expressed the opinion that if the amendment was carried they might as well drop the Bill, and contended

that, as the Bible lessons would be simply readings without comment there was no need for a conscience clause for teachers.

Mr. BOOKER was not prepared to support the amendment, because teachers would not be required to do anything more than listen to the children reading the selected Bible lessons, and because such a provision would nullify the object of the Bill.

Mr. ALLAN expressed surprise that those members supporting the amendment did not, if they were sincere in their professions, carry their objection further, and object to the Deputy Speaker, no matter what his religious opinions might be, opening the proceedings of the House every sitting with an invocation to the Supreme Being.

Mr. MURPHY pointed out that the amendment was not proposed because it was thought that teachers were irreligious, but because teachers might have conscientious objections to teaching religion.

At five minutes to 1 p.m.,

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

Mr. ALLEN asked the Acting Chairman: Do you consider the question has been sufficiently discussed?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do.

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

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Morgan
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stodart
,, Forrest	,, Swayne
,, Forsyth	,, Thorn
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt
,, Hunter, D.	

Tellers: Mr. Cribb and Mr. Forsyth.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. McLachlan and Mr. Ryan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the words proposed to be added (*Mr. Blair's amendment*) be so added—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 21.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Corser	,, Murphy
,, Ferricks	,, McLachlan
,, Foley	,, Payne
,, Hamilton	,, Ryan
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Theodore
,, Land	

Tellers: Mr. J. M. Hunter and Mr. Payne.

NOES, 30.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Morgan
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Cribb	,, Roberts
,, Denham	,, Somerset
,, Forrest	,, Stodart
,, Forsyth	,, Swayne
,, Fox	,, Thorn
,, Gunn	,, Walker
,, Hawthorn	,, White
,, Hunter, D.	,, Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. Morgan.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.
Noes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.

Resolved in the negative.

At ten minutes past 1 o'clock p.m.,

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The question is that clause as amended——

Mr. LESINA: Mr. Tolmie——

Mr. THEODORE: Mr. Tolmie——

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

Mr. LESINA rose to a point of order, and urged that the question had not been stated.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I do not think I stated the question. I will state it now. The question is—"That the question be now put."

Mr. ALLEN: Mr. Tolmie——

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

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

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Morgan
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stodart
,, Forrest	,, Swayne
,, Forsyth	,, Thorn
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt
,, Hunter, D.	

Tellers: Mr. Brennan and Mr. Swayne.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Ferricks and Mr. Land.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

The tellers having reported the numbers to be Ayes, 32; Noes, 20,

Mr. PAYNE called attention to the fact that there were only 31 Ayes.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN directed the tellers to recount the votes, which they accordingly did, and then reported "Ayes, 31; Noes, 20."

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That clause 2, as amended, stand part of the Bill—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 32.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
,, Appel	,, Kidston
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Macartney
,, Blair	,, Morgan
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stodart
,, Forrest	,, Swayne
,, Forsyth	,, Thorn
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Walker and Mr. Wienholt.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
,, Barber	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore
,, Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. May.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the Acting Chairman do now leave the chair, and report the Bill to the House with amendments.

Mr. LENNON said there was a grave reason why the Chairman should not leave the chair, and that was that important and necessary amendments had been rejected by means of the gag. He hoped the Bill would be recommitted for the purpose of further considering those amendments.

Mr. MURPHY hoped that when compiling the new reading-books the Minister would see that a lesson in courtesy was included in them. He objected to the Chairman leaving the chair until the gag was applied.

At twenty-seven minutes to 2 p.m.,

The PREMIER moved—That the question be now put.

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

AYES, 30.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
,, Appel	,, Kidston
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Macartney
,, Booker	,, Paget
,, Bouchard	,, Petrie
,, Brennan	,, Philp
,, Bridges	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stodart
,, Forrest	,, Swayne
,, Forsyth	,, Thorn
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt

Tellers: Mr. Gunn and Mr. White.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. J. M. Hunter and Mr. Payne.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Acting Chairman do now leave the chair and report the Bill with amendments—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Hunter, D.
,, Appel	,, Kidston
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Macartney
,, Blair	,, Paget
,, Booker	,, Petrie
,, Bouchard	,, Philp
,, Brennan	,, Rankin
,, Bridges	,, Roberts
,, Corser	,, Somerset
,, Cribb	,, Stodart
,, Denham	,, Swayne
,, Forrest	,, Thorn
,, Forsyth	,, Walker
,, Fox	,, White
,, Gunn	,, Wienholt
,, Hawthorn	

Tellers: Mr. D. Hunter and Mr. Roberts.

NOES, 19.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lesina
,, Barber	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore
,, Lennon	

Tellers: Mr. Lesina and Mr. Murphy.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The House resumed. The ACTING CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved—That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into consideration.

Mr. LENNON asked the Deputy Speaker if he thought it was the proper thing absolutely to ignore the common decencies of life and carry on business during the luncheon hour, practically starving members into submission. (Laughter.)

Mr. MURPHY took exception to the continuance of the sitting, and he appealed to the Deputy Speaker to announce that he would resume the chair at a later hour of the day.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no principle involved in the question before the House, which is always accepted as purely formal. If hon. members wish to rise, there

is no reason why they should not do so within the next five minutes, as soon as this motion is passed.

Mr. LESINA did not resent the lecturette that had been delivered by the Deputy Speaker as to the proper course of action in dealing with the motion before the House.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I shall not allow the hon. member for Clermont on any future occasion to make any remark regarding the Chair, which, in my opinion, is impertinent. I have asked him before not to do so; and, if such an impertinence is again directed by him towards the Chair, I shall ask hon. members on both sides to protect me. The deputy leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Croydon courteously asked me to consider the physical requirements of hon. members, and I merely suggested an easy way of satisfying those requirements.

Mr. LESINA apologised if he had been guilty of any seeming impertinence. He took his stand on the Standing Orders, which permitted him to discuss any question submitted by the Chair, and he rose to support the motion, and to resent the rather sordid spirit in which it had been regarded by the deputy leader of the Labour party and the hon. member for Croydon, who considered it merely from the point of view of the gratification of their carnal appetites.

Mr. ALLEN also desired to enter his protest against going on with business at the present time.

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

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

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Paget
,, Booker	,, Petrie
,, Bouchard	,, Philp
,, Brennan	,, Rankin
,, Bridges	,, Roberts
,, Corser	,, Somerset
,, Cribb	,, Stodart
,, Denham	,, Swayne
,, Forrest	,, Thorn
,, Forsyth	,, Tolmie
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt
,, Hunter, D.	

Tellers: Mr. Corser and Mr. Wienholt.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Collins and Mr. Ferricks.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the Bill, as amended, be now taken into consideration—put; and the House divided:—

AYES, 30.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Paget
,, Booker	,, Petrie
,, Bouchard	,, Philp
,, Brennan	,, Rankin
,, Corser	,, Roberts
,, Cribb	,, Somerset
,, Denham	,, Stodart
,, Forrest	,, Swayne
,, Forsyth	,, Thorn
,, Fox	,, Tolmie
,, Gunn	,, Walker
,, Hawthorn	,, White
,, Hunter, D.	,, Wienhol

Tellers: Mr. Bouchard and Mr. Walker

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
,, Barber	,, Lesina
,, Blair	,, Mackintosh
,, Breslin	,, May
,, Collins	,, Mullan
,, Ferricks	,, Murphy
,, Foley	,, McLachlan
,, Hamilton	,, Payne
,, Hunter, J. M.	,, Ryan
,, Land	,, Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Barber and Mr. Breslin.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I beg to move that the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

Mr. LENNON appealed to the Secretary for Public Instruction not to persist in his determination to rush the Bill through, but to recommit it for the purpose of reconsidering two very important amendments.

Mr. LESINA: If the third reading was taken when the House again met, the question would be discussed at considerable length to the detriment of those who wished to discuss the Estimates. He hoped the third reading would be put off until Tuesday.

The PREMIER: It will be purely formal. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: Every stage of the Bill would be fought, and would have to be marked by the brand of the gag, so that the pious folk outside, who were waiting expectantly for the measure, would see the brand of the gag all over it.

Mr. ALLEN rising to address the Chair——

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

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

AYES, 31.

Mr. Allan	Mr. Kidston
,, Appel	,, Macartney
,, Barnes, W. H.	,, Paget
,, Booker	,, Petrie
,, Bouchard	,, Philp
,, Brennan	,, Rankin
,, Bridges	,, Roberts
,, Corser	,, Somerset
,, Cribb	,, Stodart
,, Denham	,, Swayne
,, Forrest	,, Thorn
,, Forsyth	,, Tolmie
,, Fox	,, Walker
,, Gunn	,, White
,, Hawthorn	,, Wienholt
,, Hunter, D.	

Tellers: Mr. White and Mr. Allan.

NOES, 20.

Mr. Allen	Mr. Lennon
„ Barber	„ Lesina
„ Blair	„ Mackintosh
„ Breslin	„ May
„ Collins	„ Mullan
„ Ferricks	„ Murphy
„ Foley	„ McLachlan
„ Hamilton	„ Payne
„ Hunter, J. M.	„ Ryan
„ Land	„ Theodore

Tellers: Mr. Lesina and Mr. Murphy.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Mr. Hodge and Mr. Cottell.
Noes—Mr. Keogh and Mr. Douglas.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That the third reading of the Bill be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House—put; and the House divided:—

This division was identical with the previous one. "Ayes," 31; "Noes," 20.

Resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the House do now adjourn. The first business at the next sitting of the House will be Supply.

Mr. LENNON appealed to the Premier to state what time he would consider the next sitting of the House should commence.

The PREMIER: The Sessional Order fixes that. I have no more control over that than the hon. member has.

Mr. LENNON suggested that, taking into account the exertions of the past twenty-four hours, the Premier should fix 7 o'clock as the time at which the House should resume. By that time they would probably return refreshed, and would do much better work than if they reassembled at half-past 3 o'clock.

Mr. HAMILTON did not see why they should adjourn at all. The Premier had kept them there to suit his own convenience.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have, as the hon. member is aware, ruled that on the motion—"That the House do now adjourn"—the leaders on either side may answer one another, but a general debate is not permissible.

Mr. HAMILTON rose to a point of order. He considered that every member of the Chamber had a right to speak on the motion. The Deputy Speaker's ruling was wrong, and he ruled that he was out of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Then the hon. member must give notice of motion in the usual way that my conduct in the chair is not correct.

Mr. HAMILTON: He had a right to debate the question; he did not care what anyone said. He had been in that House for many years——

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must obey the ruling of the Chair. The question is——

Mr. HAMILTON: I move that your ruling be disagreed with.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is —That this House do now adjourn. As many as are of that opinion say "Aye;" the contrary, "No." The "Ayes" have it.

The House adjourned at twenty minutes past 2 o'clock p.m.