

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Council

WEDNESDAY, 2 NOVEMBER 1910

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

reading of the Bill, I had said all that I should be called upon to say on this question before the Bill went into Committee; but, by an amendment having been proposed, and many things having since been said in opposition to the Bill and its intentions, it seems necessary that someone should have something to say in favour of the Bill and against the amendment. I do not think it would be very difficult for anybody who really gives his attention to this question to say something contrary to this amendment. But before I deal with that part of the subject, there are some preliminaries which I must give to the House, with its indulgence. We had yesterday some extracts from letters, newspapers, and books, and various things presented to us to show that there had been something like misrepresentation of opinions held in some quarters with regard to this Bill. I have received since the sitting of yesterday a number of communications of one sort or another. Some I had received previously, but I think that these should, in all fairness, follow those which were presented to us yesterday, and which in the ordinary course will appear in *Hansard*. Something has been said about the Lutheran body, and a good deal of capital adverse to the Bill has been made from the fact that some very few ministers bearing that designation have expressed themselves in opposition to the Bill. I am going to give the Council two or three items also coming from the Lutheran body, or from representatives of that body—

Brisbane,

2nd November, 1910.

Dear Sir,—Though a stranger to you, I am writing to ask you to correct the unjust impression given of the Lutherans in Queensland by the letter of Messrs. Darsow and others, quoted by the Hon. A. J. Thynne in the Council. The writers of that letter represent a body of Lutherans known as the Missouri Synod in America, and, so far as Queensland is concerned, have, as far as I know, three ministers—according to the published list there are only two—I believe not half a dozen churches, and in the same list are announced as holding services only in seven small centres.

I am writing on behalf of the German Lutheran Synod of Queensland, representing the largest number of Lutherans in this State, having over fifty churches and twelve ministers. This synod has for years past consistently supported the Bible in State schools movement, and, by resolutions of the synod, unanimously decided to give its full and unreserved weight in favour of Bible in State schools as proposed. I do not know one of our ministers who differs from the opinion of the synod, nor have I heard of a single member of our church who did not support the proposal.

Members of Parliament who desire to be impartial will judge whether Lutheran opinion is for or against the proposal from these facts. If a mere handful not associated with the German Lutheran Church are to be quoted as representative of Lutheran opinion, the great body of German Lutherans should equally be quoted as in its favour.

Yours sincerely,

C. F. TREUZ,

Vice-President German Lutheran Synod.

To the Hon. F. T. Brentnall, M.L.C.

I am not going to make any comment on that letter—it speaks for itself. We have been told that a Lutheran Synod in Victoria had pronounced a decision upon this question. I do not know that it much concerns us what the Lutheran Synod in Victoria may do with regard to our State legislation; but this possibly is of some concern to us, because it refers to the Lutheran Synod of Queensland, which was held somewhere about 18th November, 1908, as the report appears in a paper dated 20th November,

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

WEDNESDAY, 2 NOVEMBER, 1910.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Arthur Morgan) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

ROCKHAMPTON HARBOUR BOARD ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

On the motion of HON. A. H. BARLOW, this Bill, received by message from the Assembly, was read a first time. The second reading was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

STATE EDUCATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

* HON. F. T. BRENTNALL said: I was hoping that last week, when I availed myself of the opportunity of speaking on the second

[*Mr. Land.*

1908. Without giving unnecessary details, I will just read the passages which bear upon the question—

The question was brought forward by the parish of Beenleigh as to what stand the synod should take on the referendum of the Bible in State schools. After some discussion it was decided unanimously that the synod should support the proposal.

On Monday night there was a well-attended meeting to hear Archdeacon Garland speak on "The Bible in State Schools." Pastor Langebecker presided, and introduced the subject and the speaker.

With regard to the Presbyterian Church of Australia, there has been a considerable diversity of opinion. There has been some apparent conflict of testimony as to what really is the opinion of the Presbyterian Church. The following communication refers to the Presbyterian Church of Australia, and not particularly to the Church in Queensland. It is written from St. Stephens Manse, Ipswich, and is signed "Peter Robertson"—

You are doubtless aware that the General Assembly of Australia, which met at Adelaide in September of last year, unanimously resolved—"That the Assembly approve of the use of the Scriptures in public schools, and of the access of ministers to these schools for the purpose of giving denominational teaching to the children of their own congregations, and hope that members of the church in Victoria and Queensland may use their influence to promote legislation in this direction."

Then there is a reference to the intention to submit the matter to a referendum during the following year, which I do not think I need read. On the 27th December, 1909, the following appeared:—

RE BIBLE IN STATE SCHOOLS LEGISLATION.

Dear Sir,—At the meeting of the General Assembly of Australia, held in Melbourne in September of this year, the following finding was unanimously recorded:—

"Approve of the action of the ex-Moderator in issuing a circular to the church in Queensland on the Bible in State schools question; commend the churches in the States in which the law permits to make full use of their opportunities for giving Bible instruction to our children in the State schools; and urge the ministers and people in Victoria and Queensland to aid to the full measure of their influence the securing of a like boon in their States."

Having regard to the great importance of this matter as relating specially to the State of Queensland, I have been instructed by the Public Questions Committee to issue a circular containing the foregoing finding of Assembly, and to urge upon the ministers and people in Queensland to act together in this matter, and to advance the efforts of all *re* endeavouring to secure Bible instruction for children in the State schools, so that the object aimed at may be speedily attained.

Allow me to emphasise the clause which was put before you by my predecessor—namely, that "the knowledge of the Word is the foundation of our Protestant faith and practice, and without such knowledge the work of the church is made increasingly difficult from year to year."

By the formation of a branch of a Bible in State Schools League in your district, or by supporting such branches already formed, and by other means which you may think of, you may be able to do effective work in your particular district for the advancement of the common cause.

With fraternal greetings,
I am, yours sincerely,

JOHN FERGUSON,
Moderator.

The next is a letter from the Manse, Esk. It is signed by William James Stevens, whose name has been mentioned here once or twice already in connection with this particular subject, and I am not quite sure that it has not been claimed by both sides.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: He is put down as "Doubtful" or "Views unknown."

HON. F. T. BRETNALL: I had to apologise the other day for my slight deafness, and I shall have to apologise again. I will just go on, and hon. members can correct anything I may have to say afterwards. This letter is dated 29th October, and was signed by William James Stevens, and addressed to the Rev. D. J. Garland, Brisbane, and reads as follows:—

Your wire of 26th instant only reached me this morning, as I have been away for a month's holiday. I regret this, as I should have liked to contradict Mr. Beirne at once.

However, I wired him this morning (at the same time that I wired you) contradicting his statement and assuring him emphatically that my entire efforts were heartily in support of the Bible League. I hope he will be honest enough to admit publicly his mistake.

Yours fraternally,

WILLIAM J. STEVENS.

The following is from the Ministers' Association of Brisbane churches between Breakfast Creek and Sandgate. I have received another letter on the same subject, which will cover the same ground. This is from the Rev. Cyril Mayhew, the vicar of Clayfield. It has been handed over to me, although not originally addressed to me. It is as follows:—

I have pleasure in forwarding you resolutions passed to-day at the local Ministers' Association, and wish to explain that it consists of Anglican, Baptist, Congregation, Lutheran, Methodists, and Presbyterian ministers working from Breakfast Creek to Sandgate, Pinkenba, Eagle Farm, Hamilton, Eagle Junction, Clayfield, Hendon, Nundah, Zillmere, Chermide, Deagon, and Cabbage-tree Creek. It is felt that no amendment ought to be passed, and that the will of the people as shown in the referendum should be carried out.

I have, etc.,

CYRIL MAYHEW, Vicar.

And I think he is also chaplain to the Defence Force. The resolution is as follows:—

This association, comprising ministers of all the Protestant churches between Breakfast Creek and Sandgate, view with concern the attempt of some members of the Legislative Council to thwart the will of the people so expressly shown in the recent referendum on the Bible in State schools as an unwarranted interference with our democratic government, and especially unfitting that gentlemen not elected by the suffrages of the people should attempt to render nugatory the direct mandate of the electors of Queensland, taken with such care and expense. The association earnestly urges the Legislative Council to pass the Bill as submitted to the voters of Queensland, unamended, and deprecate the sectarian spirit that may spread outside their Chamber if unauthenticated lists of names of supposed opponents and other methods be continued, and trust that the Council will be Divinely guided to act righteously and in the interest of future generations.

The following is from Warwick, and signed Canon Hay:—

Warwick branch league resent attitude in Legislative Council regarding Bill on which people have expressed their will Arranging meeting Inform Brentnall and others if strengthen their hands.

That telegram came down a day or two ago. The next communication is addressed to me directly, and reads as follows:—

The committee of the Bible in State Schools League of Toowoomba and district desire to record their strong indignation at the attitude of certain members of the Legislative Council in attempting to suppress the voice of the people in the recent referendum.

As representing a section of the State in which a heavy vote favourable to the introduction of religious teaching in State schools was cast, they desire

Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

to make it known that at the present time feeling here is running very high at the treatment of the Bible in State Schools Bill.

They therefore fervently hope that the Council will recognise the will of the people by passing the Bill without amendment.

That is signed by T. W. Cockell, as president, and then by two others, one of them A. G. Weller, who is a Baptist minister residing at Toowoomba. I have here three resolutions passed by three distinct Methodists' Synods last month, which was the month for holding these synods all over the State of Queensland. The first is for the Brisbane district, which was concluded in the West End Methodist Church on the 22nd October. The resolution, which was proposed by the Rev. W. H. Harrison, and carried unanimously, was as follows:—

That this synod expresses its appreciation of the action of the Government in relation to the Bible in State schools referendum in securing the passing of the Bill through the Legislative Assembly, and sincerely hopes that the Legislative Council will grant the wishes of the people by passing the Bill now under consideration in that part of the Legislature without amendment.

At the Wide Bay District Methodist Synod, a motion was unanimously carried expressing pleasure at the result of the Bible in State Schools referendum, and also with the action of the Government in taking steps to carry out the will of the people, and urging the Legislative Council to pass the Bill without amendment. At the Downs District Synod, which includes Ipswich, and was held at Ipswich, a resolution was passed "emphatically protesting against the attempt being made in the Legislative Council to amend the Educational Act Amendment Bill in such a way as to defeat the intention of the people as expressed in the recent referendum." The resolution was ordered to be sent by wire to the President of the Legislative Council. I suppose they did not quite know what was the proper procedure, and they adopted that as being the only procedure they did know. However, a telegram came to me the same day, and I made some inquiry about it, and the President was good enough to hand it over to me to be read here. On the evening of the day on which that resolution was passed by the Ipswich Synod, a public meeting was held in Ipswich, and several hundreds of people were present. At that meeting the following resolution was passed by a standing vote—

This public meeting strongly protests against the attempt to wreck the Education Act Amendment Bill in the Legislative Council, and urges that effect be given to the will of the people clearly expressed in the referendum.

I have another communication; it is from Warwick. It reads as follows:—

At a meeting held at St. Mark's Church at the end of last month the hope was expressed that the Bill would not be thrown out, and would not be mutilated by amendments. Evidently some members of the Legislative Council needed to be reminded of their functions. They were not there to thwart or block the expressed will of the people. Canon Hay also stated that in the near future a public meeting of those interested in the matter would be held.

I think that this will indicate to hon. members that a good deal is being thought, and a good deal is being expressed, on the opposite side to that indicated, by the letters and extracts which were read here yesterday and on one or two other days. It is quite manifest that the chief Lutheran body in Queensland is unanimous in their approval of this Bill. It is quite clear that the Presbyterian General Assembly in two successive years passed practically unanimous resolutions in

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall.

favour of religious teaching in State schools, and there has been no sort of communication between me and any section or portion or part of the body with which I am generally recognised to be more or less associated. I have had no communication with any of them, minister or the people. They have just done this on their own accord, without any instigation from me, and without any instigation from any other member of this Council, so far as I am aware. Those letters which I have read have been quite spontaneous, and they seem to indicate, or at any rate to confirm, what I indicated a week ago yesterday, that this question having been raised, and a kind of challenge having been thrown down, it would be taken up. I was quite certain it would be taken up. It was taken up the very day it was thrown down. On the evening of the day that challenge was announced here resolutions were passed at two important meetings expressing regret, and promising a further earnest and vigorous campaign in the future if this Bill were not allowed to pass Parliament this year. I felt certain, without consulting anybody, that would be the effect of speeches delivered here, and the effect is now pretty manifest. I ask the indulgence

[4 p.m.] two more directly personal matters

—not of my own provoking or my own bringing up, but, when I am alleged to have changed my views, I want some proof that on an important question like this I have changed my views. When I am accused of prevaricating, and pursuing a Machiavellian policy—that word was not used, but that was what it meant—when I am accused of twisting about in order to serve my own purposes, or the purposes which may be under consideration here, I repeat what I said to the face of the hon. member who made those accusations—that it is a libel. I say now what I said then, that that is not my practice. In the course of my life I have suffered a very great deal from my frank expression of opinion—from my outspokenness—from what I might call, if it were not a little vain—my blunt honesty. But I do not know that I was ever accused before of prevaricating—of evasion, of twisting things, and of making things appear in a different light from what I should make them appear. In order that I may justify the remarks I am making, I will read what was stated. The Hon. P. Murphy said—

Whether he is with me or whether he is against me, I like a fighter. The hon. member has a nasty habit sometimes of twisting facts to dovetail into his arguments, and that is not fair.

Hon. F. T. BRENTNALL: That is a libel.

Hon. P. MURPHY: I am sorry if I have hurt the susceptibilities of the hon. member, as I had no intention of doing so.

Hon. F. T. BRENTNALL: That is not my practice.

Hon. P. MURPHY: The hon. member did it on this occasion. The hon. member said, or the meaning of what he said was, that, when the agitation was being carried on before 1875 for the establishment of the present system of secular education, the Roman Catholic Church was fighting in support of the teaching of religion in the State schools.

Hon. F. T. BRENTNALL: I cannot connect it.

My trouble then was that the hon. member said I had made a certain statement, and I stated that I could not recollect it. He persisted, and I said, "I cannot connect it." I could not connect it with any part of my speech. It was not relevant to any part of my speech. Then the hon. member assured me that I should find it in *Hansard* when I came to look through the proof. Well, I have

read the proof of my speech twice, and I cannot find a single word in the report of that speech that bears any such construction as the hon. member put upon it. Now, I would like the hon. member to prove his words. Talk about my twisting things and misrepresenting things! When a man charges me—and appeals to me to confirm his charge—with having made certain statements which I never made, and which he cannot adduce a scintilla of proof that I ever did make, who is it that is twisting facts, I should like to know? I do not want to get angry or to make the hon. member angry, but really, when one's honour is touched in that way, it is enough to provoke one. But let us go just a wee bit further back. The Hon. Mr. Murphy said—

I may be permitted to say, shortly, that the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, in speaking on one point—I am not going to refer to any other point in his speech—was very ingenious. Nearly forty years ago, when this agitation was going on, if my memory serves me aright, the hon. member took up a very different position to that which he is taking up now.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I was not here forty years ago.

HON. P. MURPHY: The hon. member was here thirty-five years ago.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: That is true.

HON. P. MURPHY: I put it to the hon. member now. Did he take up the same position then that he is taking up now? He knows he did not. Yet he twitted the Roman Catholic people with taking up a different position now to what they did then. He twisted a fact, as it were, and twisted it badly to suit his own ends; and that is not a fair thing to do in a debate on an important question like this.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I have no recollection of doing anything of the kind.

With regard to the episode of thirty-five years ago, the hon. member accuses me of having altered my views, and changed my position, and taken up a different side on this question from what I did then. The event to which he refers was my appearance before the Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the condition of the educational system then in existence, with a view to bringing in a new Education Bill. I gave my evidence before that commission. I am accused by the hon. member of having changed my own views with regard to religious teaching in State schools. He also referred to State education and to a State church, and so on. I said I would vote against a State church. I must now, with the permission of the Council, clear up that particular accusation. During the series of questions put to me by the Royal Commission, of which the late Sir Charles Lilley was chairman, this question was asked—

Has any action been taken by that meeting—

A meeting of the ministers of the body in Queensland—

on the subject of education? Yes; last month we passed a formal vote on one particular aspect of education—that is, on the religious aspect of it.

Have you any record of the vote? We were quite unanimous in passing the following resolution:—

“That, in the opinion of this district meeting, the time has arrived when all State support to denominational schools should cease.”

I hold that opinion still.

HON. P. MURPHY: What was the next question?

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: The hon. member can read it afterwards if he likes. I am not going to read the whole thing. (Laughter.) Well, if the hon. member will give me the book I will read any questions he likes. (The Hon. Mr. Murphy handed the hon. member a volume

of “Votes and Proceedings”.) I thought it was only necessary to read those that were relevant to the accusations made against me. The question the hon. member wants me to read is not the next question. Somebody has been at this volume, picking out passages, and making little crosses in the margin, I suppose to indicate my weaknesses. It so happens that the very next morning I came here for some information, and in walking through the Chamber I found this handy little volume lying upon the very place where the Hon. Mr. Murphy sits. (Laughter.) I had the curiosity to look at it. It has some bearing upon some remarks made to me yesterday. I looked at it, and I found a mark at the pages where my evidence appears, and I found those marks in the margin. There is one at this question by Mr. Douglas—

I suppose you have a complete system for following up the religious education of your young people, apart altogether from that in the public schools? Yes; we are particularly careful about the religious education of our children by means of Sunday schools, etc.

The next question has a double mark against it—

But you would deem dependence upon such lessons as the Scripture and general lessons as insufficient? I think we should consider it advisable that our own children should be educated in what other people might regard as our own particular views of some portions of Scripture, but that would be not only to make them good Christians or good citizens, but to make them good Methodists.

And why should we not?

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Quite right.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: If I have children of my own, and they are baptised into the same church as I belong to, why should I not try to make them as good Methodists as I am myself? (Hear, hear!)

HON. P. MURPHY: There is another question. You have got a long way from the question I want you to read.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I will read any question the hon. member likes to point out to me. There is nothing here that I am afraid to read. There is a mark against this question put by Dr. Prentice—

I understand, then, that you disapprove of non-vested schools? Yes; we have not been able here to agree on the sentiment expressed in the second resolution; some of our people would, I think, go beyond it, and do away with religious teaching in the public schools altogether. I could not support such a proposition as that myself.

That is an answer to remarks of the Hon. Mr. Murphy about my having changed my views. It expressly confirms my views. I could not vote for the doing away altogether of religious teaching even now. The second resolution which I referred to was this: It was a resolution passed by the Educational Committee of New South Wales, because at that time Queensland had not a separate conference of its own. It reads as follows:—

That this committee could not recommend to the Methodist Church to accept any general system in which less religious teaching shall obtain than is found in the Scripture lessons now used in all our public schools because it believes that in a professedly Christian country provision ought to be made for teaching the general principles of the Christian religion taught in these lessons, and that any alteration in the Public Schools Act in this particular would be opposed to the best interests of the youth of the land, and to the good order and prosperity of the State.

That is the second resolution emanating from

Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

the Educational Committee of the Methodist Church in New South Wales. Mr. Douglas then asked—

Have you ever heard any complaints against the schools under the Board of Education on the ground that they interfered in any way with the religious opinions of the young people? "No, sir." Then, in that respect, the present system is satisfactory to your body? "I believe that our people generally are quite satisfied with things as they are in this colony in reference to religious teaching—I am speaking of the primary schools."

Is there any other extract from that book that hon. members would like? I think the extracts I have read pretty well confirm the attitude I am taking up now in regard to this Bill, and I think my evidence given in December, 1894—if I had had to speak and vote in the first month of the following year I could not have taken up a stronger attitude than I am taking up now; and I think, therefore, I have just reason to feel aggrieved that I should be accused, firstly, of changing my views, and, secondly, of having made some reflection upon the Roman Catholic body which I never did make. That is what I complain of. And, in the third place, I did not like to be accused of twisting about and ingeniously putting a different construction on words as has been done in this debate. If this debate is to be continued at all with good feeling, we must put away every kind of sectarian prejudice which is likely to interfere with our judgment. Let us act like honest men one towards another, and not make accusations against one another which we are not able to prove. I think I have said enough on that line. There are just two or three sentences I would like to say with regard to an expression I made use of at the close of my previous speech. I hope I may be permitted to refer to it. It was on the second reading of this Bill. I was drawing to the close of that rather lengthy speech—there were at least four frolicsome politicians all practising upon me with their popguns, and they were firing their shots one after another across the floor, and when a man is bombarded in that sort of way, or shot at, it is a little disconcerting. I did make one remark which, if correctly reported, I ought not to have made in that exact form. That is the one remark in that speech with regard to which I have to express a single word of regret. I have seen it reported in one of the papers that I said an alliance had been formed with socialists who were atheists. If the opinion was conveyed by that that I thought all socialists were atheists—nothing was further removed from my mind.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I know some of these men who are associated with the socialistic party and are socialists themselves, and they are just as good Christians and have just as much reverence for the Bible as any member of this Council.

HON. B. FAHEY: No such alliance as you mention exists.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I say it appeared in one of the daily papers, and I should be sorry for an expression of that kind to get about, as I am like some other hon. members, I do not think a man's religion altogether depends on the singing of psalms and the saying of prayers. That is the only explanation I wish to make. What is the purport of the amendment now before the Council? In dealing with that I am not going into any long, meandering speech. I do not think a second-reading speech is required of me. If other people think differently with

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall.

regard to this, I am not going to dictate to them, but I think we have had quite enough repetition of second-reading speeches during this debate. What I want to say is, I am not going to circle round the main question as sometimes mosquitoes circle round my head, draw a drop of blood, and then go away. Let us stick to the point, and let us understand what we are doing with regard to this amendment which is now proposed. If we carry it, we will delay the passage of this Bill, and delay it for a considerable time, because it must be well known to the clear judgment of the mover of this amendment and of those who are supporting him that, if the amendment were carried out, there is not the ghost of a chance of this Bill passing this session; and he knows it perfectly well, just as well as anybody else. If the amendment were carried somebody must appoint a selection committee. It will take a little time to make that selection. Then I would like to know where you are going to find four or half a dozen men competent to make that selection.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The committee has been appointed.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I do not know whether they are appointed or not. I go on the supposition that they have to be appointed or some new members added. Are you going to set these men to rush through the Bible—the whole of that series of books—within the next three or four weeks and make the necessary judicious selection of lessons for our public schools, and expect those lessons to be printed and submitted to us during the present session? We are now in the first week of November. In seven weeks we shall be at Christmas, and it is physically impossible, unless you mean those men to work all night after doing their day's work, to accomplish what this amendment proposes.

HON. B. FAHEY: It can be accomplished in one week.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I would not like to have to do it. The hon. member who has just interjected yesterday read—I say nothing about whether he acted with judgment, discretion, or wisdom—he read, as he said, an extract from the New South Wales book of lessons. I maintain with him that that was an improper lesson to be put before young children. I stated when I last spoke that there were many lessons in the New South Wales school book that I could not approve of, and I would not approve of putting anything into the hands and minds of children which is contrary to the beliefs of the age or the discoveries of science. Let us at least take the book for all it is best worth, and we can easily enough find lessons in that book which are good for our children as they are good for ourselves. If I were disposed to talk a little bit religious I would say that right in the very heart of that book there is one word, and it is a word which I and every other hon. member attaches great importance to. It is a word that we believe should regulate our daily life, our commercial life, and our moral life, and that one word is "righteousness," and it is there right in the very centre of the book; it is there in the first book and it is there in the last book. You will find it in one form or another from beginning to end—it runs like a silver thread through every book of the Bible. The word "righteousness" is there, and I take it it is the best word in the book so far as it can affect human conduct and human morality. What was said of Noah? That "he only was found righteous among men." And he was

put in the ark of safety. Then what was said about Abraham? That "he was upright and feared God, and would train his family after him in the right way." And when that old patriarch prayed for the salvation of Sodom. He asked, "If there were ten righteous men there, would the city be spared?" "Yes, it would be spared if there were only ten righteous men in it." I could take you right through the books of the Bible—through the Psalms where you scarcely find a page in which the word does not occur. Can we do any wrong whatever by selecting passages of Scripture which will impress upon the minds of our children the duty of righteous dealing towards their fellow-men and righteous conduct towards each other?

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: That is what the amendment proposes to do.

HON. B. FAHEY: The hon. gentleman's argument is in favour of the amendment.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I would give the Government or the Minister for Education credit enough for common discretion and common sense not to appoint men to make selections for our public schools that would be improper for our children to have. That is my position.

HON. B. FAHEY: That is what they did in New South Wales.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: In a matter of this kind we must leave something to the authorities. We do it with other Bills. How many Bills have we passed here and have left the regulations to be approved by the Governor in Council? I am told I am speaking in favour of this amendment. The wonder about this amendment is just this: That a number of members of this Chamber who do not want religious teaching in the schools at all, who do not want Bible lessons in the schools, who do not want selected lessons of any kind—

HON. P. MURPHY: In public schools.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Yes; I am speaking about public schools. I am not speaking of private schools or church schools. Why should hon. members who disapprove of these lessons come here and try to wreck this Bill by bringing forward an amending motion to produce these lessons in which they do not believe and never will believe?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: And then Parliament would have to revise them.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: If the lessons came here, every hon. member would want to have a hand in revising them, [4.30 p.m.] and it would take another session to get the Bill through. The Government are taking the right course, and I hope it will be persisted in. We find ourselves faced with this obstructive amendment, and are asked to take an action which directly flouts the people, and throws out of the window of the Council the expressed will of the people.

HON. B. FAHEY: The hon. member is taking an unrighteous stand.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I am taking the stand dictated by my own conscience, and my own view of what is right for the education of our children, and I presume the hon. member is doing the same, so that in that respect we may agree to differ. A constitutional process has been pursued for ascertaining the mind of the people, and that mind has been emphatically expressed; and, as some of these resolutions which I have

read have stated, it is not for this branch of Parliament, not elected, or sitting here by the suffrages of the people, to deny the people the right they have asked for and voted for. I know that sometimes it may be the duty of this House to reject an immature measure, unauthorised by public opinion.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is rejecting the vote of the people's representatives, who may misrepresent the people.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: The action all through was deliberate and constitutional. We were told last evening by the Minister in charge of the Bill that the referendum was authorised by a special Act of Parliament. It passed by majorities in both Chambers. It went to the people, and the people have expressed their views upon it. Is it for us to say to the people at this stage that they had no right to express their views, or, having expressed their views, they made a mistake, and that we are here to put them right, and to protect the country from the effect of that mistake? Is that our function?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: We dissent from the Assembly because we sometimes think the Assembly does not represent the people. Now we have the direct voice of the people themselves. That is a point that seems to be missed.

HON. P. MURPHY: Our contention is that this Bill was never before the people.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Yesterday the Hon. Mr. Fahey for some time referred to the paucity of this vote, and he sneered at a paltry 74,228 people carrying a motion like this out of 260,000 voters. If a vote of 74,228 was so paltry that no notice should be taken of it—if it is only fit to be kicked about as a worthless and worn-out football or something like that—what about the vote given to Mr. Givens?

HON. B. FAHEY: What has that to do with this?

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I will show the hon. member if he is patient. The vote given to Mr. Givens was 82,234, or 8,006 more than this. The vote for Mr. Turley was 81,719, or 7,491 more than this. The vote for Mr. Stewart was 80,339, or 6,111 more than the vote for this.

HON. B. FAHEY: This does not refer to the election of Federal members.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Did not the hon. member repeatedly sneer yesterday at the small number of votes that were polled for the referendum?

HON. B. FAHEY: Quite right, and I do here.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Now the hon. member wants to know what this has to do with it? It has this to do with it—that the highest of these three representatives of the Labour-Socialist party—whom some members of this House voted for—despite all the public meetings, all the harangues, and all the house-to-house canvassing for votes, only got 8,006 votes more than we got in this referendum.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Hear, hear! And the "Great Iniquity" was carried by 5,000 votes.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: What is the use of treating the decision of the people like that? It is their decision, not mine. There

Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

is another paradox which creeps in here, and that is that the decision of the people is being opposed by mean artifices by men who pose as leading democrats. I do not think I need enlarge upon that. I say deliberately that it is a mean artifice to try to defeat the will of the people by such an amendment as this—

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Because hon. members know that there is hardly the ghost of a chance of getting the Bill through if this amendment is passed.

HON. B. FAHEY: That is denied.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: The majority—whether it was good, bad, or indifferent—was obtained in a thoroughly constitutional way, and the referendum was on the specific issue of the teaching of religion in the State schools. Hon. members do not want to pass the Bill to give the Government the power to select the lessons and bring the will of the people into actual operation for the benefit of the juvenile portion of the people. Not a single member who supports the amendment believes in it, because they do not want religious lessons in the schools at all.

HON. B. FAHEY: That is the hon. member's opinion.

HON. F. McDONNELL: We want to make the Bill as little objectionable as possible.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: You want to defeat the Bill.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Yes; if possible, we do.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: The hon. member just brings me to what is, perhaps, the best climax. He wants to make the Bill as futile as possible, and, as an alternative, he would be delighted to throw it out altogether.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Of course we would. There is no doubt about that.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: We were exhorted last night to persevere with the debate until it came to a final issue, and until we either passed or rejected this amendment. If it is rejected I presume we shall go on with the second reading of the Bill; but I think there was a great deal of justice in the remark made by the Minister in charge of the Bill last night—that we are simply wasting time. I have carefully avoided making replies which I could have made to arguments which have been used by those supporting the amendment with regard to the education which is being given in certain denominational schools. I could sweep the whole continent of Europe, and give hon. members a series of replies to that argument, if it suited my purpose, but I shall not do that just now. There may be other opportunities of doing it, and I shall not hesitate to do it. I do not want to provoke any irascible feeling, as there is no necessity for it. Only do not be continually saying that there is no education on earth equal to that which you wish to continue.

HON. P. MURPHY: We believe in the education given under the present Act, and we do not want it altered.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: That is the view of one side. Hon. members supporting the amendment will not allow us to have our

[Hon. F. T. Brentnall.]

views. The people outside, by a very substantial majority, showed that they want this Bill.

HON. B. FAHEY: You insult the people by making that statement.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Who are the people?

HON. B. FAHEY: The people of Queensland.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: But I want to know who are the people?

HON. B. FAHEY: The whole of the people of Queensland.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: When you appealed to the people of Queensland to put members of a certain type of politics into the Federal Parliament, the highest of them only got 8,006 votes more than we got for this Bill. And this is a local Bill, not a Federal Bill.

HON. B. FAHEY: I have already informed the hon. member that this amendment has nothing to do with the Federal Parliament.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I wonder if the hon. member thinks I am such a dunce as not to know that without being told. I wonder whether we heard anything yesterday afternoon that had nothing to do with the amendment. That sort of thing comes very inconsistently from the hon. member. I agree with the Hon. A. H. Barlow that the time has come when the Council should come to a decision upon this matter, and the country expects us to come to a decision. That is evidenced by the resolutions and letters which I have read, and I think we are prepared to come to a decision, and the sooner we come to it the better. Some hon. members talked about amending the Bill, and I said, "We do not want to amend the Bill. We want to carry it; and, if we are not going to carry it, defeat us, and we shall be satisfied with the vote. If we can defeat you, play the man and be satisfied with your defeat." (Hear, hear!)

* HON. C. F. NIELSON: I shall endeavour to address myself particularly to the amendment before the House, and I regret I have to continue the debate, as I have had a very strenuous time during the last few days, and I do not feel at all well. I want it clearly understood that I am against the Bill *in toto*. I wish hon. members to understand I do not take up the attitude expressed by the Hon. Mr. Gibson last week. He said, "You can talk till doomsday and you won't convert me." That was a very uncompromising kind of attitude, and it is not a correct attitude for any hon. member to take up. What are politics, after all, but a matter of compromise. I am perfectly prepared to compromise so far as this amendment goes, and I was most astonished this afternoon to hear the Hon. Mr. Brentnall get up and tell us that he intended to give us reasons why the amendment should not be carried. I listened to the hon. member for an hour and a quarter, and I did not hear one reason why the amendment should not be carried, except this: He said, "If this amendment is carried, you are flouting the will of the people." I think I can explode that reason in a very few words. What was the will of the people, may I ask, so far as these particular lessons are concerned? Did they

know what lessons were to be taught? In the ballot-paper all they were asked to do was this: They were asked—

<p>Are you in favour of introducing the following system into State schools, namely:—</p> <p>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:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Any parent is entitled to withdraw his child from all religious teaching if he chooses to do so?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">YES. NO.</p>

Directions (to be printed in red ink).

If you desire Religious Instruction in State Schools, vote thus—

YES.
NO.

If you object to Religious Instruction in State Schools, vote thus—

YES.
NO.

What I want to know is this: Did the people, or did the majority who voted on this referendum, get any secret tip from the authorities that be, because there appear to be authorities that are above this Chamber and above the Government? Did they get a tip as to what kind of lessons were to be taught? I was not informed, and in that respect there is no such thing as the voice of the people, not even the voice of the majority who voted. I submit that there was not one person who had any idea of what was to be taught. I submit there was not 5 per cent. of the persons who voted who had any idea of the lessons being taught in New South Wales, and I am astonished at the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, after his speech on the second reading of the Bill—and in that respect I think the hon. member is particularly qualified to speak as to what portions of the Bible would be good or would not be good for State school children. The hon. member was satisfied that the New South Wales lessons were not well selected. He said—

For instance, I would not teach them the chronology of the Book of Chronicles. There might be some things in the Bible which it would not be a wise thing to include in the Scripture lessons, but that Holy Book contains lessons for human conduct and helps to the spiritual life of humanity which may be very well taught to the children of this State, no matter what particular creed they may belong to.

Then the hon. member wanted to know to which part of the Bible the opponents of this Bill objected. He said—

Is there any objection to the excellent doctrines and principles that may be taught from the Pentateuch? Is there any objection to the Decalogue? I should like to know from these hon. members who are opposing these Bible lessons what lessons they do object to? Do they object to the devout spiritualism of the Psalms?

Then he proposed that the Ten Commandments should be included in the lessons, and I believe if Bible lessons are to be given in the State schools that the Ten Commandments should certainly be included. When the Hon. Mr. Power spoke on this question, he suggested, before any amendment was proposed from this side of the House, that the

amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Beirne should be moved in Committee—that the lessons, after being framed, should be put before both Houses of Parliament, and passed by them before they were put into operation. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall made no objections to the Hon. Mr. Power's idea. Then we had more theological food from the Hon. Mr. Gibson, and he gave us an idea of the lessons which he thought should be taught. He said he would be satisfied to have the four Gospels. Therefore, we have an instance among our own members that there is a difference of opinion as to what ought and what ought not to be taught. So far as I am concerned, I am labouring under some disadvantage. I have not had the theological training of some speakers. I am not inundated with letters, petitions, and telegrams from various clerical bodies, or the heads of bodies, asking for my support. I stand here quite independent of any church or class or religion. I have my own idea in this matter, and I have also my own idea as to what is and what is not the will of the people. It is wonderful how the will of the people is a good thing to shield oneself behind at times. I want to know what is going to be taught before I consent to withdraw any opposition to the Bill, and I think I am entitled to know. When we come to reflect, this referendum is the second referendum which has ever been taken in Queensland. In the first referendum, which was taken ten years ago, we were asked to vote on the question of federation. What was the procedure adopted when the electors of Australia were asked to vote on the question of federation? A full copy of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia was placed in the hands of every elector. Every elector had full details, and if the Government in this instance—if they were really anxious and sincere in their desire that the children in our public schools should get Bible instruction—if they wanted New South Wales books, why not have ordered 200,000 copies, and placed them in the hands of the electors before they took a referendum on this Bill, and have stated, "We propose introducing these books into our schools"—or else have compiled a new set of books of their own, and placed them in the hands of the electors? After all, these books will have to be printed and distributed. If the people of Queensland had any indication at all of what it was intended to teach in the schools, they could only have had the indication that we intended to follow the New South Wales system, because that was preached by the Government in 1906—that was the gist of the Bill when it was in another Chamber at that time. The New South Wales system was preached incessantly—that great and glorious system was what was required. As I said before, that is the only indication of the quality of the lessons which the electors of Queensland could possibly have had. They had no opportunity as a body to see the New South Wales lessons. I venture to say, judging by the speeches I have heard in this House, that a number of members of this House have no idea of what is being taught in New South Wales. They have not taken the trouble to read the books which are being used in the New South Wales schools. What the Bill provides for is selected Bible lessons.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Exactly.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: If the Government did not choose, prior to taking the

Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

referendum, to compile the lessons proposed to be taught, then I am satisfied that we have no mandate from the people to allow anybody to choose lessons—it does not matter whether it is an inspector of schools or anyone else. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall suggested that the heads of the churches should come together and formulate the necessary lessons. So far as I am concerned, my attitude has been consistent on this question. I opposed it when I was in another place four years ago. I also opposed the referendum on this question, and I am opposed to this Bill also. When I was opposed to the Bill four years ago, I happened to meet in Queen street the leading person in connection with the Bible in State Schools League, the Rev. D. J. F. Garland, together with the Hon.

[5 p.m.] W. H. Barnes, and they tried to prevail upon me to withdraw my opposition to the Religious Instruction in State Schools Bill. I said, "If the heads of all the churches will come together and agree upon a set of lessons, and will formulate those lessons, I will reconsider my attitude on the question." What did one of those gentlemen say? "You know very well, Mr. Nielson, that they would never agree on a set of lessons."

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: That is right.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: Here is a lovely position. If ministers of religion could not agree on a simple set of Bible lessons, what is this going to lead to outside?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: It is going to lead to the lessons being compiled by men who are not ministers of religion, and who will agree.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: I want to know what particular qualifications those gentlemen possess?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: What qualifications do the ministers possess?

Hon. F. McDONNELL: They will be appointed by the Ministers.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: Have the people of Queensland voted for or against this Bill? As they had no opportunity of seeing the details, it is not only our privilege but it is our duty to settle the details.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: If they were not satisfied, they should have voted against the proposal.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: The amendment has been moved in the right spirit. I believe the suggestion came first of all from the Hon. Mr. Power. It was followed up by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, and, much to my surprise, this afternoon the hon. member opposed it. It was also followed up by others. The amendment is absolutely reasonable, and it is moved in that fair spirit of compromise which usually pervades the body politic. I believe it would do the Minister good to take the New South Wales books and read them.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I have read every word of them.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. gentleman has given us no indication of what the proposed lessons are to be. He has not referred to the books that are in use in New South Wales. Apparently they were not compiled in New South Wales. They are called "The Irish National School Books," and are printed in London and Glasgow. As we have no indication as to what is intended to be taught, there is a duty cast

[Hon. C. F. Nielson.

upon the Council to see that that part of the work shall be submitted to us. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall said it would be useless teaching the chronology of the Bible. That may be. I am not well versed in that matter myself. The Hon. Mr. Jensen proposed that the lessons should be read in a phonographic kind of style, because he proposed that they should be read without comment.

Hon. W. H. CAMPBELL: That is how the lessons are read in the churches.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: I do not know much about that. There are two of the New South Wales volumes taken from the Old Testament, and two from the New Testament. At the end of every lesson there are a number of the more difficult words. I presume they are selected to be explained to the children. Then there are questions on the lessons to ascertain what proficiency the pupils have in the particular lessons. Now let us take the Old Testament series. Volume 1 gives you the story of the creation. That I shall not comment upon. Even distinguished clergymen differ as to the story of the creation. I should like to know the views of the Minister in charge of the Bill upon that question. I am quite sure they are not orthodox.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I was not there, so I do not know. (Laughter.)

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: Then there is a lesson on the fall of Adam. Then you come to the first item which should not be taught to children, because it is of no use. It tells about Larnech—a brother of Cain, who was also a murderer—and was the first man who had two wives.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: But we are not proposing to teach from that book.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. gentleman has given us no information as to what is going to be taught, and we are entitled to know.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: The information I gave was that the referendum was carried by a majority of over 17,000 votes. I am satisfied with that.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: If that is all the information the hon. gentleman has to give, he is easily satisfied. Then we get on to Abraham and Isaac. It tells about the birth of Isaac, and of how they held the great feast when he was weaned. Prior to that, when he was a few days old, we are told that he was circumcised. The teacher is asked to explain that to the children. I want to know what would the Minister expect any young girl teacher in the bush to say in explanation of that rite?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I would not permit such a thing to go into the book, but I would not allow Parliament to tamper with the books.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. member says he would not permit such a thing to go into the book. Is the Minister going to select the lessons himself?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: If the Government allowed such a thing to go into the books, they would deserve to be turned out of office.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: That is a totally different question.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: We do not behold Ministers now. We turn them out of office.

Hon. C. F. NIELSON: We know perfectly well that the Minister is not going to have the right to make the selection.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: A much more religious man than myself is to have the right.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: There are religious men who would think that the relation of that very religious rite would be a very good thing to put in.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Oh, no.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: What guarantee have we that this particular lesson is not going to be taught in Queensland?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The guarantee is common sense, and Minister's responsibility.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It is the Minister's suggestion that the people who compiled these four books in use in New South Wales were possessed of common sense?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I do not think they were.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It is the hon. gentleman's suggestion that the Minister for Education and his colleagues in New South Wales who adopted these books were not possessed of a sense of Ministerial responsibility?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Well, they ought to have been brought to book for it.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It is too late to think of bringing them to book when this kind of literature has been taught for so long. Now is the time to see that, if our children are going to have Bible lessons, they should have something beneficial. The Minister need not be afraid that I am going to read the whole of these four books.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I am not afraid. They are very entertaining.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I have no doubt that to some minds they may be entertaining. I can show that this kind of thing runs through the books from beginning to end. This is not a solitary quotation that I have given. There could not be a worse selection.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I do not think there could.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Then it goes on to the time when Isaac grew up to be a young man. He met Rebecca at the well. The book tells how Rebecca was a virgin whom no man had known and who was beautiful to look upon, and how Isaac wanted Rebecca to become his wife.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: And then they were decently married.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Yes; after a great deal of difficulty Isaac had to wait seven years. (Laughter.)

HON. A. H. BARLOW: You are all wrong. That was Jacob. (Laughter.)

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Yes; I am thinking of Leah and Rachael. That just shows what I have already said, that I am very weak in theology. I was not taught it when I was a boy.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: There is something in the history that is taught in the school books about the wives of Henry VIII.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: If Henry VIII. got rid of his wives, he only had one at a time, according to English history. Then there is the story of Jacob. He agreed to wait seven years for Rachael, and to work for her father during the period. When the seven years were up, her father palmed off his other daughter, Leah, on to Jacob, and, as he still wanted Rachael, he had to work for another seven years. Then he had both

wives. Then the lesson tells that by these two wives and their two handmaids he had twelve sons.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: It was necessary to people the country in those days.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: That may be. These are not by any means isolated instances. I could give plenty of the same kind of thing out of these books. There are sentences which I could not explain. There is one which says "Circumcise, therefore, your hearts, and be no more stiff-necked." Fancy a girl teacher in a mixed bush school being asked by a boy, "Please, Miss, what is circumcised?" Is she to say, "I do not know"?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: You are making a protest against bringing in these books.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: We have no guarantee what they will be. We did not get one word from the Minister in favour of this Bill.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Yes; I said a majority of 17,577 were in favour of it.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. member simply informed the House and the country that last year we passed a Bill providing for a referendum. A referendum was taken, and a certain majority voted for it; hence this Bill. Then the Minister sat down, and that is all the information we got.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Because that is the only ground we have got for introducing the Bill—the will of the people, nothing more and nothing less.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Will the Minister inform the House what is the will of the people with regard to these lessons?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The people propose to trust the Government.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I submit that the people are not asked to trust the Government in a matter of this kind. The people should trust Parliament. That is where the trust should be reposed. If a referendum is to be taken at all, it ought to be taken in a complete style, and when it is taken in an incomplete manner, then it is for both Houses of Parliament to complete it, and not to have it completed by regulations by the Government or by outside influence. If the referendum is going to be a settled part of our Constitution, then I say either complete it outside, as was done at the time of federation, when every detail was placed before the electors, or else complete it by the people's representatives in Parliament.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I would not give Parliament the job of making up this book.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Because the Minister does not feel he is qualified to compile this religious book that does not say that in this Chamber there are not persons so qualified. I am quite satisfied, from the speeches I have heard here, that there are several members pre-eminently qualified to compile these books.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: And you would move a lot of amendments when the lessons were brought in.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I give the hon. member my promise that I will do nothing of the kind. I know nothing at all about theology, and I am satisfied if the framing of these lessons is left in the hands of this Chamber that nothing of the nature I have quoted would be included. My objections to leaving the lessons to be settled after we have

Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

passed the Bill are these: I want to make sure that there is nothing included in the nature of the extracts I have read which are not fit to be put into the hands of children. So far as any religious creed or religious belief goes, I have no predilections. It is perfectly immaterial to me. I can attend any church with equal equanimity—I have no prejudices in that respect at all; but I do not want improper literature to be placed in the hands of the children of Queensland, and I say, without any hesitation, that the books in use in New South Wales contain a great deal of improper literature.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: There is no doubt about that.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: A lot of useless stuff—something the children should not be taught at all—that the young mind is much better without. It is no good teaching children of twelve or thirteen years of age who is the first man who had two wives, or who had concubines. So far as the morality of the Bible goes, the Bible, as has been stated, contains the wisdom of all ages. There is no dispute about that. The question in dispute is this: As the whole of the Bible is not to be put into the schools—if the referendum had been taken on Bible reading in the schools—that the whole Bible was to be put in the schools, and it was to be left in the hands of the teacher in the school to select what he thought fit and proper extracts, it would have been all right.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: You would allow the teacher to select the lessons, and yet you will not allow the Government?

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Again, in the New South Wales book, in the New Testament series, you cannot teach some of the New South Wales lessons without teaching sectarianism. There, again, the lessons have to be selected in such a way that they can be explained to the children, and yet explained without any sectarian colouring. There, again, it is necessary that we should know who are to select the lessons and what the lessons are. I am certain if there were a set of lessons put before us now there are hon. members in this Chamber who could tell us whether there was anything in them which could come into conflict with the teachings of the various religious bodies. The Bill provides that there is to be no sectarian teaching by the teachers. The teachers are compelled to teach, and in order to teach they have to explain the lessons to the children. Each teacher will probably be an adherent of some church or another, although it has been said—I do not know whether it is so—that many of the State school teachers are freethinkers and atheists. Those teachers will probably do less harm in expounding the Bible, because they will have no sectarian influence. But each teacher will probably belong to some church or another, and the teacher could only explain those lessons according to the particular creed he has been taught, therefore he will naturally and unintentionally teach in a sectarian manner. These are all reasons why the amendment is a reasonable one, and why we should see the proposed lessons. Whether the amendment is carried now, or whether the Hon. Mr. Power comes into this Chamber when we are in Committee on the Bill and moves a similar amendment, should be absolutely immaterial. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall objected to the amendment on the ground that we are so late in the session—it would

[Hon. C. F. Nielson.

take so many weeks to compile these lessons and that by the time they were ready the Bill would be shelved. The Hon. Mr. Power promised to move a similar amendment in Committee.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is not the same thing.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It is exactly the same thing. The hon. member said he would move an amendment to the effect that these lessons should be compiled and approved of by Parliament.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Before they were put before the children.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Supposing the second reading of this Bill was carried, and these lessons were placed before us for approval, would there be any discussion on the matter?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Does not Parliament approve of the regulations? If Parliament said they were not fit they would have to go.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: There would be an opportunity of amending them.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: No; Parliament would have to take them or leave them—they would be laid on the table of the House.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: If there were any members here who were not in favour of the lessons they would naturally move that they be rejected.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: There could not be any amendment.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I do not want to move any amendment, as I would not undertake anything of the sort, because I think it would be presumption on my part to attempt anything of the kind. The Hon. Mr. Gibson stated he would like the children to be taught manliness, wisdom, and generosity.

HON. C. S. MCGHIE: They do that already.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: That may be so, but there are any amount of illustrations in the Bible—good illustrations, and if the hon. member wanted to make sure that those qualifications were taught to the children—manliness, wisdom, and generosity, and the other cardinal virtues—I say he would have a perfect right to demand to see the lessons before the Bill was passed. A good idea might be to elect a Select Committee of the House to approve of the lessons after they have been compiled, but to say that the people of Queensland had any idea of what was to be taught is sheer nonsense. The people of Queensland are not satisfied to take a leap in the dark, and allow the Government to appoint anyone they like to frame any sort of lesson they like.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Then why did they not throw out the Bill on the referendum?

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Because they have Parliament to look after their interests. They still have somebody to look after their interests. They do not leave it to the Minister or to the Government or to some persons appointed by the Government or some persons suggested or nominated by any political person or any outside influence; they absolutely depend on Parliament to see that their interests—that the peace of the State and the good feeling at present existing—are safeguarded and would not be jeopardised by the inclusion of objectionable lessons. We would be shirking our duty if we did not insist [5.30 p.m.] on the compilation of the lessons before we pass the second reading of the Bill. But if the Minister will give me an assurance that he will accept an

amendment of this nature in Committee, I will sit down, and deal with the question when we get into Committee.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I cannot do that, because I want this piece of paper to pass into law.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. member wants this piece of paper to pass into law, although that it is nominally a non-party House, and that hon. members are supposed to exercise their own judgment without being intimidated or threatened by such telegrams or letters as the Hon. Mr. Brentnall read this afternoon. Some of those letters actually told hon. members that if they did not pass this Bill without amendment they could say good-bye to this House.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: There is a great deal of truth in those assertions.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It does not worry me in the slightest.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: It might suit you.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It might suit me, but it would not worry me a bit if the Bible in State Schools League and some political outsiders joined forces to sweep away the Upper House. You will not find me standing in the road with a bludgeon. That should not worry any hon. member.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: No; it is a plank in a certain platform.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Yes; and they are getting good adherents from the hon. member's friends. We are told that if we do not accept this Bill without amendment there will be another great force outside. I cannot understand where the hon. member finds the will of the people, so far as the lessons are concerned, expressed in his figures.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The lessons are not referred to. General principles only are referred to in the referendum.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: We have a duty and a right to deal with more than general principles. Take the hon. gentleman on federation. What a beautiful thing it would have been if voters on that question had simply been confronted with one question—"Are you in favour of federating with the other Australian States?"

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: We had to swallow the whole Bill, and we were not permitted to make one amendment in it.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: We were asked, "Are you in favour of federation as contained in the Bill which has been passed?" That Bill contained several hundred clauses, and embraced a multitude of questions. If 5 per cent. of the people objected to one clause, fifteen to another, and so on, it would have been absolutely impossible to carry a Bill of such magnitude; yet, despite the magnitude of the measure and the diversity of subjects, the Bill was carried. That was a wonderful thing. It is nothing very wonderful that this referendum was carried.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The point is that the Hon. Mr. Brentnall and the Hon. Mr. Barlow refused to accept the will of the people on the question of federation.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I take no notice of hon. members making use of the expression "will of the people." I have seen their political history for a great number of years, and I know that is merely playful expres-

sion, and that they do not use it sincerely. I do not think the will of the people bothers them very much. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall—not that I object at all—assumes the rôle of lecturer of this Chamber. He knows perfectly well that it is impossible for me to object to the Bill and support the amendment. He says it is paradoxical. I am totally opposed to the Bill. I shall speak on the question later. So far as the amendment is concerned, it has been moved in a spirit of compromise such as I offered to accept four years ago. But we will get no compromise from certain hon. members—they have said so. I hope that the Hon. Mr. Brentnall will see fit to compromise, if an amendment similar to this is moved in Committee by the Hon. Mr. Power. I should be perfectly satisfied to accept any lessons which the hon. member would suggest. I should be perfectly satisfied to let the hon. member select the lessons for my children.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: Why will you not allow the committee to do it, then?

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. member forgets that I am not here to get lessons for my own family. I am here to see that the whole of the people of Queensland get a set of lessons to which no objection can be taken on conscientious grounds. From my knowledge of the Bible, I do not think there could be any difficulty in framing such a set of lessons; but there are some people who want to double-bank the thing, and to impart a church flavour to it, and to select lessons which will be of no real benefit to the children as a good exercise in English or anything of that kind. In that respect I submit the amendment is a most reasonable one. When the Hon. Mr. Power and the Hon. Mr. Brentnall spoke, I had no idea that this amendment was going to be moved. I would not be surprised if it had been moved through the suggestion made by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, who said that the lessons in New South Wales were badly selected.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I said so this afternoon. The West Australian lessons are vastly better.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I have not had the privilege of seeing those lessons. The Hon. Mr. Gibson also suggested lessons. After the suggestion that fell from the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, I was surprised at his opposition to the amendment. The hon. member read a threatening communication from a certain religious body—a piece of presumption, I consider it—from St. Mark's Church, somewhere or other. The opinion expressed was that the Council should be reminded of their function, and that they were not here to thwart the expressed voice of the people. They failed to remind the Council of what their function was. I do not know whether the hon. member read the whole of the letter.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Don't insinuate anything of that kind.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I certainly failed to hear any function mentioned. I am trying to remind hon. members that it is our function, and the function of the other Chamber, to settle the details of this Bill, which the electors had no opportunity of settling. That is our function and our duty, not our right. It is our duty to settle these details. The hon. member objects to that, and the Minister has given us no reasonable objection to the amendment.

Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Yes, I have. It is absolutely obstructing the wishes of the people.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: That is no reason—that is a mere expression of opinion, no doubt strengthened by similar expressions of opinion by irresponsible persons outside. No doubt the Minister gets his ideas from them.

HON. B. FAHEY: He gets inspired by them.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The Minister says you can take this Bill or leave it—he did not advance one reason in favour of it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Yes, I did—the referendum.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Yes; the hon. member said, "Here it is. I do not believe in it myself. It has nothing to do with me. The people want something. Here is the Bill; you can take it or leave it. I will have no amendment. The Bill provides for something I do not know anything about, and I won't allow you to alter it."

HON. A. H. BARLOW: If I can help it.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: That is not a correct position to take up. The Minister should be ready to assist hon. members in making very necessary amendments.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: And destroy a Government Bill.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The Bill is absolutely incomplete. This Bill is supposed to be *verbatim et literatim*—the net result of the mandate which the Government got at the recent referendum.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: And put into parliamentary language.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I hope it will never be varied from that. If this Bill was complete, it should have the selected Bible lessons included in it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is begging the question.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: What did the persons who voted for this referendum do? They voted for the teaching of Bible lessons to be selected for that purpose. We are now trying to complete the matter by insisting that the Bible lessons should be selected before we pass the Bill.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is where we differ.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: It is not that I distrust the Government—I say the Government do not trust themselves. They are passing this duty on to somebody else altogether. The Education Department does not want to take the responsibility.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: They will be approved by the Governor in Council.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: They will be approved, because the department will shelter themselves behind the fact that the lessons were selected by independent persons.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I do not want to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like to point out—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Mr. Nielson has possession of the floor.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I have no objection to the Minister interrupting me if I gain any information from him. At the same time, I wish to say the Minister is apparently purposely withholding information.

[Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

If he has no information to give, then I say it is time he obtained some. I again submit that this amendment is absolutely fair, and it is a compromise which ought to be accepted by the Minister, and it certainly ought to be accepted by those who have spoken so strongly in favour of the Bill. It ought to be accepted by all sides, and if that were done, I am quite satisfied that the progress of the Bill will be much greater than it has been during the last few weeks. I do not wish to speak at any greater length on this amendment. If the amendment is rejected—and I trust it will not be rejected—I shall again speak to the motion.

HON. W. V. BROWN: I have no intention of making a long speech on this vexed question, but I wish to say a few words to justify the vote which I am going to give. I shall certainly vote against the amendment and in favour of the Bill. I am not going to enter into the religious aspect of the question at all beyond mentioning that my information is to the effect that a similar provision exists in three of the Australian States, and it has been found beneficial, and I am told on very good authority that the clergy of all denominations have visited the schools and instructed the children. And I am also told on very good authority that the Roman Catholic clergy visit the schools, and that in New South Wales during the last five years the aggregate visits of the Roman Catholic clergy reached thousands. I am of the opinion that what is good for the other States is good for Queensland, but I do not intend to follow the speakers over the ground they have taken in discussing the religious aspect of the question, because I do not consider that that is a question we ought to consider. We have had some very lengthy and important speeches from either side of the House, but I really think the question before us is one whether we should abide by the referendum. We know in past years the Council has frequently rejected important measures, and we at times have been severely criticised for doing so. What was our justification for rejecting those important measures? We have justified ourselves on the ground that the measures had been passed by the Legislative Assembly without having been submitted to the people for their consideration. But we cannot plead any such justification in this case. The referendum was passed in 1908, and it was then decided to submit the matter to the people for their consideration, and the result was a majority in favour of the Bill. In the year 1909 there was a general election, and the same Premier that passed the Referendum Bill in 1908 was returned to power. I think the fact that the general election took place after the Referendum Bill was passed shows sufficiently that the people of Queensland were in favour of Bible lessons being given in State schools. Then we have the voting giving a considerable majority in favour of this Bill. Some hon. members contend that the majority was insufficient. I cannot agree with that view for a moment. I do not think it is within our province to consider what the majority was. The fact remains that we submitted the matter to the people by a referendum, and I consider it is the duty of Parliament to give effect to the wishes of the people as expressed at that referendum. That is all I have to say on the matter.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I am sorry to learn the hon. member is not very well, but I distinctly stated last night that I would ask the House to sit to-night. We have had a great number of speeches, and we are likely to have a great number more. Business is coming out from the other Chamber. We have the Local Authorities Bill before us, and we expect the Land Bill. I must therefore ask the House to negative this motion and go on with work to-night. I do not want to ask the House to sit to an unreasonable hour, but I do ask the hon. member to withdraw the amendment, as I gave fair notice yesterday, and it is not a fair thing to spoil my work.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I think it is too important a Bill to be rushed through in the way you intend.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: There is no rushing about it. This Bill may last a considerable time—it may last a week. When we have disposed of this amendment we have the second reading to consider, and when the second reading is over we have the Committee stages, and goodness knows when it will be finished. Really, the business of the country demands that we should go on. I dislike sitting at night as much as anyone, but I gave fair notice last night, and it is not fair to spoil the arrangements. If the hon. member will not withdraw the amendment, I must ask the House to negative it.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I think with regard to the business before the Council—the Local Authorities Bill—that is a measure which will not take very long. I have gone very carefully through it, and I think there will not be much objection to it in this House. I do not know that there is any other measure of importance on the business-paper, and I think it would be very much better if we took a day or so longer on this Bill, so as to allow members to speak fully and freely on the matter. They feel very strongly on it, and let them let a little steam off.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is what I want them to do.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: The Hon. Mr. Gray has not had an opportunity of expressing his views, and I think that hon. member is a gentleman who is likely to throw additional light on the matter.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: It is taking the business out of my hands, and I cannot permit it.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: No one wants to take the business out of the hon. member's hands. I make this appeal, not to oppose him in any way whatever in what he proposes to do. I make it with the very best intention on my part. This is a matter which requires a thorough investigation, which it has not had yet. There is a good deal more to be said on it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The hon. member is a past master in that sort of thing.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: If the hon. member chooses to take it in that way, then he will have to accept the consequences of any attitude members may take towards him. But I do say the Government representative is making a very great mistake in refusing to give an hon. member like the Hon. Mr. Gray and other hon. members an opportunity of continuing the debate at their own pleasure.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I am not refusing—he can speak to-morrow.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: On this motion?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Nobody thinks this will be settled to-night.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: If it is not to be settled to-night—

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: Can you give any guarantee that there will not be a division on this motion to-night?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I will not give any guarantee.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I think the hon. member, in respect to the minority if not to the majority, should extend the courtesy asked for to the Hon. Mr. Gray.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: If I had not made this arrangement last night, I would not have objected. But I made this arrangement, and my friends are here at considerable inconvenience, having put off engagements to be here. The Hon. Mr. Gray will have an opportunity of speaking to-morrow; and why should the control of the House be taken out of my hands?

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member has already spoken.

HON. F. McDONNELL called attention to the state of the Council.

Quorum formed.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I would like the permission of the Council to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT: Is it the pleasure of the Council to let the hon. gentleman be heard?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I desire to say that this Bill deals with a very important but not a complicated question. It has been debated—second reading unfinished and amendment unfinished—on Tuesday, 18th October; Thursday, 20th October; Tuesday, 25th October; Wednesday, 26th October; Tuesday, 1st November; and Wednesday, 2nd November, which, I think, is an unprecedented time for such a Bill, and I do not think that the debate should go on *ad infinitum*.

[7.15 p.m.] I wish to say, with all respect to the Council, that if this debate is adjourned to-night the House will be held by the Government to have rejected the Bill, for which rejection the Government will accept not the slightest responsibility.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman has stated that this debate has occupied six sittings, and viewing the importance of the measure I do not think that is too long a time. So far as the debate has gone, the speeches have been confined to the subject, and I strongly protest against the statement that a stonewall has been set up. It is unbecoming on the part of the hon. gentleman, who, on more than one occasion, has fought for the rights of minorities on this Council. It is unfair, knowing that he has a majority behind him, to take up such an attitude, and I am sorry he has not accorded to the opponents of the measure the consideration which they should have received. The Hon. Mr. Gray, who is not at all well, wishes to speak to this amendment, and he asked for an adjournment of the debate; and I am sorry that hon. gentleman has not received that consideration which his position in this Council and the country deserves. The Hon. Mr. Barlow, by the force of numbers, is forcing on this debate against what I may term all good taste. He has threatened this House that if the debate is

[Hon. F. McDonnell.]

not finished to-night the Government will regard it as a defeat. Why should this House be gagged in this way? We know that the Government do not believe in this Bill. I do not believe that there is a member in the Cabinet, with one exception, who believes in it, and there are not half a dozen members in the other Chamber who believe in the Bill. Who is compelling the Government to take up the attitude they are taking up to-night? The hon. gentleman knows that a great deal more could be said on the question, and that the attitude he has taken up will not conduce to the debate being carried on in the spirit in which he would desire it to be carried on. The hon. gentleman has a majority behind him, and can do what he likes. I have heard him asking the indulgence of the House from time to time, and I never heard that indulgence refused. If this attitude is going to be taken up on this question, I do not think it will be conducive to the best conduct of the business of the House in future. If the hon. gentleman had agreed to the adjournment, no time would have been lost by so doing. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman inferred in his statement that the second reading should be taken to-night. If that is his intention, I am sorry there are not half a dozen members here to speak till next week on the question if necessary. The attitude the hon. gentleman is taking up does not reflect credit on him. I believe if he had his own way he would act differently. I do not believe he has his own way on this question; I believe there is an outside influence pushing him on against his will, or he would be prepared to give the Council an opportunity to fully and freely discuss this important question. We can see that a pressure which reflects very much on this House has been used. Letters have been read in this House, and the pulpits of the churches have been prostituted to coerce this House; and to-night we have the representative of the Government issuing his ultimatum that this Bill must be disposed of this evening.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I did not say that. I said "if the debate was to be adjourned."

HON. F. McDONNELL: That means the same thing—that this question has to be finished this evening. The hon. gentleman knew that the Hon. Mr. Thynne had an important social engagement, and some consideration should have been given to that hon. gentleman. The appeal of the Hon. Mr. Gray also should have met with a more sympathetic reception. On a very important question like this it would be a bad thing to adopt the tactics adopted in another place, and that is all the more reason why this motion for the adjournment of the debate should be accepted.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I think it was most uncalled for for the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to say that, unless [7.30 p.m.] the Bill was got through this evening, he would take it as a defeat of the Government.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No.

HON. F. McDONNELL: That was the substance of what he said.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I will read what I said—"If this debate is adjourned to-night, the House will be held by the Government to have rejected the Bill, for which rejection the Government will accept no responsibility."

[Hon. F. McDonnell.]

HON. G. W. GRAY: That is substantially what I said. I never heard such a statement from any leader of the Government in this Chamber. The hon. member is not in sympathy with the Bill. He has not expressed his views on the Bill at all or on the referendum, and we know that neither the hon. gentleman nor his colleague, the Attorney-General, is in sympathy with the Bill.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. G. W. GRAY: I would like to ask the President on what grounds he calls me to order?

The PRESIDENT: On two grounds—first, that the hon. gentleman is departing from the question before the Council; and secondly—what I should have said primarily—because he has already spoken on the question before the Council.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I have not spoken on the question.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member must excuse me. He moved the motion for the adjournment of the debate, so that he has already spoken on it.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I moved the adjournment of the debate, but I have not spoken on the question.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will excuse me. The hon. member moved the motion, and therefore spoke to it, and he has therefore no further right to speak upon it. I called him to order because he was departing from the motion, and was proceeding to speak on the general question of education. He has no right to do that on this motion.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I was under the impression that we had decided the question of the adjournment of the debate, and I beg the President's pardon.

HON. P. MURPHY: The leader of the House has taken up a most arbitrary attitude. He introduced it in such a way as to lead everyone to believe that the Government were not in favour of the Bill. By and by, when some other Bill comes along, he will not be likely to get much assistance from the other side. He has cringed to them on this question. This question is attracting not only the attention of hon. members of this Council, but it is attracting a great deal more attention in the country than it did at the time of the referendum. The leader of the House is preventing the Hon. Mr. Gray from speaking on the question. That hon. member has just returned from Sydney, where he was lying on a sick bed, and has been unable to prepare his speech; and, because we desire to give the hon. member time to make some preparation, we are threatened with pains and penalties for taking the business of the Council out of the hands of the representative of the Government. At this early period of the session it is not usual to ask hon. members to sit in the evening, but we are forced to do it on this occasion. I believe, when the discussion started, 50 per cent. of the people of the country were opposed to the Bill. I am inclined to think 75 per cent. are opposed to it now, and by the time we are finished with it I firmly believe that 90 per cent. will be disgusted with the whole thing. Not more than four or five members out of twenty who are in favour of the Bill have spoken. Why are the others dumb, and why are we forced to discuss it in this manner? The Government are taking an unreasonable stand.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Didn't I point out last night that we would sit to-night?

HON. P. MURPHY: There was no arrangement. The hon. gentleman simply said that we should do so-and-so, whether we liked it or not. During the six or seven years I have been a member of the Council I have given the hon. gentleman as much assistance as I could in getting his measures through, and other members on this side have done the same. This is the gratitude we are getting the first time we ask for something reasonable. Probably the hon. gentleman will be able to force us to submit, but I would remind him that there are other Bills to come before us this session. We have a right to more consideration and more consistency from an hon. gentleman with such large parliamentary experience. At one time he tells us we are the best fellows in the world, and at another time he jumps on us and tries to put a thing down our throats in a most unreasonable way. I hope the hon. gentleman will abandon this attitude. In courtesy to the Hon. Mr. Gray, who has before now occupied the position of leader of the Council, I think the hon. gentleman might allow the debate to be adjourned. I am not going to put up with coercion from the hon. gentleman. I do not think any hon. member has ever had to put up with any coercion from me. I cannot complain of the hon. gentleman's treatment of me so far, but on this occasion he appears to be very arrogant and unbending.

* HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I think it is due to the leader of the House to call attention to the fact that he distinctly stated last night that he wished to go on with the Bill till a later hour to-night, and he appealed to hon. members to attend and assist him to do it.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: Did hon. members consent? He said he wanted to do so.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I hope the hon. member will not be perverse. The Minister appealed to the members to make a House so that business could be proceeded with.

HON. F. McDONNELL: To those who were in favour of the Bill.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I say it was a fair appeal, and no objection was taken to it. If there were members of the Council who did not wish to sit to-night and who did not wish to go on with business, they should have objected last night and opposed the hon. member's appeal. So far as the Hon. Mr. Gray is concerned, he was not here, but those who are on the same side as that hon. member, and are supporting the amendment before the Council, did know.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I want to call attention to the fact that this is not a party House at all. When I speak, I speak on the merits or demerits of any particular question irrespective of any party.

THE PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Brentnall is in possession of the House.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: I do not know what the Hon. Mr. Gray is driving at. I was not speaking about any party at all. I was saying I thought the Hon. Mr. Barlow made a fair appeal to members of this Council last night. He asked hon. members, as far as they possibly could, to be here to-night to do some business. That was the position. I do not know any party in the matter. The Minister spoke to some of us last evening. I know that somebody asked me, not the Hon.

Mr. Barlow himself, but somebody asked me—if I was willing to stay after dinner that night. I said, "Yes, if necessary, but I would much rather not. I would rather sit to-morrow night and go home that night." The Minister made the arrangement to meet the views of some hon. members, and consented to adjourn at 6 o'clock yesterday, with the distinct understanding that we were to sit after dinner to-night.

HON. P. MURPHY: Yes; he invited all members in favour of the Bill to sit to-night.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: He did not appeal to those in favour of the Bill any more than to other hon. members—he openly asked hon. members to make a House to-night and go on with business. In response to that appeal the Minister has a good House, and he wants to go on with the business. It is a part of the bargain, and the Hon. Mr. Murphy and others may talk as much as they like against it, but there was a distinct understanding last night that if we did not sit after tea yesterday we would undertake to be here to-night.

HON. B. FAHEY: It is not often we have the phenomenon in this Chamber of seeing the Hon. Mr. Brentnall patting the leader of the House on the back.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Stick to the question.

HON. B. FAHEY: We have seen that to-night. What manner of man is this who leads this House? He blows hot and cold just as it suits him. He wants now to oppress a minority. He brought this Bill in and dealt with it in a manner that no Bill has ever been dealt with in this House before. He looked at it, threw it on the table as if it were an unclean thing, and indicated to hon. members of this House that he had no sympathy whatever with it; and it is a well-known fact that a large majority of his colleagues in the Cabinet have no sympathy with it. He wants now to prevent this House adjourning and to force this Bill upon us whether we like it or not. I assure hon. members that I am not going to stonewall this subject. (Laughter.) I am going to exercise my rights in this House whether it pleases hon. members opposite or not. I am a free man in a free country, and I hope in a free Parliament. The Minister led the public, as well as members of this House, to believe he had no sympathy with this Bill.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is not a fact. I never said I had no sympathy with it.

HON. B. FAHEY: The hon. member has led every member of this House to believe that he has no sympathy with it, and he has told people outside of the House he has no sympathy with it. He poses in fact, as the joker of this Council, and let me tell the hon. member—

THE PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. B. FAHEY: He told this House—

THE PRESIDENT: Order, order! Will the hon. member permit me to recall him to the question before the Council—that is, that the debate be now adjourned. His remarks should be confined to that question.

HON. B. FAHEY: I am simply commenting upon the inconsistency of the leader of this House in standing up in his place and opposing the adjournment of the debate. I have stood beside the hon. member here when he was in a minority, and he cannot deny it. When we wanted this House made and kept in action—kept in battle—nine of us stood beside him here and fought thirty hon. members on the other side. He cannot deny that I

Hon. B. Fahey.]

on those occasions and on every occasion gave him my strongest aid and assistance. The hon. member now insists in oppressing the very minority that assisted him on those occasions.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I was under the harrow then.

HON. B. FAHEY: And we helped to plough his furrow. The Minister knows that he has a majority at his back on this occasion. He is making a personal matter of it, and he is oppressing his best friends. Yes, he is doing it at the instance of one or two hon. members on the other side, and they are doing it at the instance of a few people outside. This country and this House has done without this Bill for the last thirty-four years, and now that the Bill is brought before us the hon. member will not allow us to discuss it. He insists that it shall be forced upon us whether we like it or not. I can assure the hon. member that this Bill will not conduce to the peace of this State, and yet he now insists in forcing it through in one evening, before even the public have had an opportunity of considering the arguments that have been adduced against it in this House—and unanswerable arguments, too. Neither the hon. member himself nor his colleague nor any hon. member on the other side has attempted for a moment to controvert these arguments. The hon. member says, "I gave you due notice last night." Whom did the hon. gentleman consult when he gave that notice?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The House.

HON. B. FAHEY: He consulted his newly-found friends, and, as he usually does, makes use of them, as he said yesterday, "to compel this Council to sink beneath the gutter."

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I said it would fall beneath the contempt of the people, not the "gutter."

HON. B. FAHEY: If any hon. member is calculated to put this House beneath the gutter it is the hon. member who is our nominal leader by his inconsistency, and I am not going to tolerate anything of that kind from him or from anyone occupying his position in this House.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I rise to a point of order. I refer the hon. member to *Hansard*, and he will find there was nothing said about the gutter. What I said was, "If the House refuses to pass this Bill it would sink almost beneath contempt."

The PRESIDENT: I hope the Hon. Mr. Fahey will accept the explanation.

HON. B. FAHEY: I may be permitted to read what the hon. member said as reported in this morning's paper.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: What are you reading from?

HON. B. FAHEY: From the *Brisbane Courier*, which states—

Mr. Barlow said if the House refused to pass that Bill it would sink below the level of the gutter.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is absolutely untrue.

HON. B. FAHEY: I also read it this evening in the *Telegraph*, so that there must be some truth in it, and I can endorse it, as I heard it stated. The hon. gentleman has frequently interjected while other members have been speaking, but he has never favoured the

[*Hon. B. Fahey.*]

Council with his views on this amendment, and I think in common courtesy he should allow other hon. gentlemen to ex-

[8 p.m.] press their views. I am not stonewalling; I do not intend to stonewall; but I intend to make my protest against the unkind and unwarrantable attitude which the Hon. Mr. Barlow has assumed in regard to this amendment. He is practically making a personal matter of it. Does the hon. gentleman imagine that because he happens to be nominal leader of this House we are to do his bidding as if he were a Czar, and attempts to convert this House into a Czardom? I have come here to do my duty, and as long as I am here I intend to support that which I consider to be right. I will support the hon. gentleman when he brings forward anything of which I approve, but I am not going to be a slavish follower of the hon. gentleman, and never have been.

The PRESIDENT: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to again recall him to the question before the Council, which is "That the debate be now adjourned"?

HON. B. FAHEY: To us who are supporting this most important amendment this is a very serious matter, and it is a serious matter to thousands of people in this country who are not of my religious persuasion. It is important that every opportunity should be given for the consideration of this Bill, and that if we cannot defeat it we should have the opportunity of making it as harmless of evil and equitable as we can. The hon. gentleman may resist as many adjournments as he likes, but he will never exhibit in this House his latent despotism at my expense with impunity.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I wish to make a personal explanation. I have here a copy of *Hansard*, and I give the House my word of honour that I have not communicated with the shorthand writers or doctored the report in any way. Here is what it states—

Let me say, with all respect, that, if the Council permits this question to be talked out or obstructed, the Council will lose its prestige. (Hear, hear!) And the way will be made clear for the abolition of a House of Legislature that is incapable of ratifying the will of the people. If a House refuses to ratify a referendum with a majority of 17,500 votes, that House will sink almost beneath contempt.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I would like to appeal to hon. members to put an end to this absurd discussion, because I think it will have a tendency to make the Council lose prestige. The motion for adjournment is a most unreasonable one. Because the representative of the Government will not allow the business of the House to be taken out of his hands, he is charged with ingratitude, and with using coercion, and is threatened with divers pains and penalties. The amusing feature is that this motion for adjournment is supported in the interests of the Hon. Mr. Gray, for whom an extraordinary amount of sympathy has been shown by members, who have suddenly taken a great interest in his health. I do not suppose that any hon. member is more astonished at the amount of sympathy manifested than the Hon. Mr. Gray himself. I may point out that the Hon. Mr. Gray's chance of speaking on the Bill will not be interfered with by the debate going on, and that he will have plenty of opportunity of speaking. As the representative of the Government has explained, the second-reading debate has been already taken on six days, which is a most unprecedented time for a second-reading debate in this Chamber; and we are only

now on the fringe of the subject, judging by the attitude taken up by some hon. members. The measure is a perfectly simple one, and it is not the first time it has come up for discussion. The Referendum Bill was passed two years ago, when the question was discussed not only here but in the other Chamber and in the country; and there is no aspect of the measure with which hon. members are not perfectly familiar. After the second-reading debate had gone on five days, the representative of the Government last night did a perfectly fair thing in pointing out the length of time that had been occupied and in making an arrangement practically that we would sit to-night after tea, and go on with the measure as far as we could. Hon. members in supporting this motion for adjournment are practically asking the representative of the Government to commit a breach of faith with members who have given up engagements and country members who have remained in town to be here to-night. Under the circumstances, it would be absolute folly for the hon. gentleman to allow the business to be taken out of his hands. Moreover, anyone who has listened to the discussion must come to the conclusion that the reasons given for the adjournment are not serious, and that the real object is to prolong the debate. I hope hon. members will not further prolong the discussion, but will allow us to get on with business.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Mr. Gray that the debate be now adjourned. No reason has been given by the representative of the Government for rushing this Bill through; and as a reason for the adjournment of the debate I may draw attention to a statement made by the Premier which appears in *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: I will not read from *Hansard*, but I may say he made the statement that the 25th October was the date he fixed for himself in advance for taking this Bill in Committee in another place. In the ordinary course of events, it would take a fortnight to go through Committee; in that case we could not get through the Bill in time for it to reach the Assembly on that date. Another reason in favour of the adjournment is that the Bill was guillotined in another place and did not receive that careful consideration which its importance demanded. For that reason it requires very much more consideration here than it would have received if it had got the consideration it ought to have got in another place. The leader of the House stated, as a reason for continuing the debate, than an arrangement was made last night. Now, these are his words—

I ask those hon. members who desire to see the Bill carried out to attend from to-morrow in sufficient numbers and with sufficient regularity to enable me to carry this matter to a finish.

I really see no reason why the debate should not be adjourned, and I sincerely hope that even at this eleventh hour the hon. gentleman will reconsider his position, and allow the debate to be adjourned until to-morrow.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: Taking all the circumstances into consideration, the leader of the House has taken up a harsh, unreasonable position. There is a certain amount of coercion about it. This measure is the most important that has been before the Council since I became a member, and the speeches made in favour of the amendment have thrown

a great deal of light on the subject; but I venture to think that the people of Queensland want to have the question still more fully discussed. There has been an attempt made to associate me with a certain section of this House, but it must be patent to every hon. member that there is nothing in it. We have not unduly prolonged the debate on the amendment, which affects one of the most vital points in the Bill. I would not like to be a party to any political crisis.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: A crisis here! (Laughter.)

HON. A. A. DAVEY: Yes, a crisis. I have every sympathy with the good work that has been done by the Government, and I would not like to take any action that would hinder the continuance of that good work, but that is no reason why the debate should be hurried through. I did not understand that there was any arrangement entered into about sitting late to-night. The leader of the House certainly said that he wanted to finish the debate to-night, but there was no "deal" about it.

HON. F. T. BRENTNALL: Nobody objected.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: So far as I am aware, there was no arrangement made. I intend to support the motion for the adjournment of the debate.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I am surprised at the Minister in charge of the Bill attempting to deal with the Council in a dictatorial and high-handed manner. I think the motion is a perfectly fair one. The Attorney-General came in in a meteoric fashion—he has not been here all the afternoon—and said that it would be a good thing for us to go on working. He said this was a perfectly simple measure. If he refers merely to the wording of the Bill, he may be correct, but it involves very serious questions. The Hon. Mr. Barlow has refused to throw any light on it. As to the Attorney-General's plea on behalf of country members, I come from as great a distance and at as great inconvenience as any hon. member, and I give as much time to the matters coming before the Council as I can afford; but I do not want the House to sit late at night because I come from a distance. When the Hon. Mr. Gray moved the adjournment of the debate, the "Whip" of the Government whispered to supporters of the Bill that they must oppose the motion. He made a mistake, because he whispered in my ear, too. (Laughter.) I do not think it is at all fair that we should be coerced into sitting here in this way. Members from the Gympie, Maryborough, and Bundaberg districts, and from further North, cannot get home on Thursday. At the beginning of the session we sit on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, and we would just as soon sit on Thursdays, as we cannot get home. Thursday has now been made a sitting day, too, and now the Minister wants us to have night sittings in addition. If the Minister would enlighten us on the subject, I would not mind listening to him, but he desires that those who are opposed to the Bill should exhaust themselves so that he can get the Bill put through at once.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: That is the A B C of parliamentary tactics.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: Then the sooner we get a new alphabet the better. The measure has been reasonably discussed by those who have spoken, but there are many hon. members who have not spoken at all. There is any amount of material to be supplied upon which it would be well for the Minister to reflect. I think the amendment is a very reasonable one, and

Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

[8.30 p.m.]

yet not one word have we got upon the subject from either Minister. The hon. member told us of the dire results that will follow if we do not go on with this Bill, but we are not here altogether to consider what may be thought of our actions in this House so far as crises go.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I am here to consider the results of my own actions so far as taking part in the business of this House—

The PRESIDENT: Order, order! The hon. member is departing from the question. The question is that the debate be now adjourned.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I say those who are in favour of the adjournment of the debate are entitled to some consideration. We are not pleading for very much. We are not asking for anything unusual. It is most unusual in the history of this House to sit after tea at all, except at the end of the session when an accumulation of business is before the House, and it is necessary to get it through in order to come to a final point of parliamentary business at the same time as another place. Until that time arrives I do not think that it is a fair thing to ask hon. members to sit after tea.

HON. C. S. MCGHIE: I am in favour of the adjournment of the debate, and I would point out, as has been stated by the Hon. Mr. Nielson, that some hon. members have come some distance to do the business of the House, and in the earlier stages of the session, during the first five or six weeks, it was simply adjournment every time. Now we are asked to stay after tea and sit till a late hour. Why? I think it is very hard on those hon. members who come a long distance, and really the matter under consideration could very well bear a good deal more discussion. Certainly hon. members might throw very much more light on the subject, and it is unfair to ask them to come here at night, and also to come another day in the week, and I think it is very reasonable that the House should adjourn.

Question—That the Council do now adjourn—put and negatived.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I am distinctly obliged to hon. members for their expressions of sympathy towards myself. I asked for the adjournment as I would have preferred an opportunity of speaking on this question to-morrow instead of to-night. I have not had an opportunity of being present at the debates since the Bill has been before the Chamber, but what surprises me more than anything else is the absence of any seriousness on the part of the Minister in connection with this measure. From my point of view it is one of the most serious measures—the most contentious and fraught with more serious consequences to the people of this State than any measure that has ever been before this House previously. One would naturally expect that when the Minister introduced the measure he would have afforded us some explanation as to the necessity of the Bill. So far as the referendum is concerned, that is simply a machinery matter; but as to the Bill itself, it has been termed “a simple measure.” I do not consider it a simple measure by any means. I look upon it as a dead serious measure, and one which we should consider in all seriousness, perhaps more so than any other

[Hon. C. F. Nielson.

measure that has ever been placed before us. The Minister simply read the clauses of the Bill, and at the finish of his remarks said—

The effect of the clauses I have read to hon. members is to provide for this religious instruction and the sweeping away of the word “secular” wherever it is contained in the Act.

That is to say, the secular clauses of the Education Act are swept away. It is a matter I have been brought into touch with a good deal. I took exception to the referendum measure, and I consider I have every right to do so now that we have the Bill before us. The Bill is to make provision for religious instruction in State schools. Such a thing was never contemplated when the Education Act was brought in in 1873 by Sir Charles Lilley. Since that time we have spent over £8,000,000 on education. I have taken the figures out year after year and I have them in my possession. We are dealing with a very important department, over which my hon. friend has presided for many years, and he proved himself an able Minister. I paid him that compliment before, and I do it now. What he takes in hand he does well. To sweep away one material point in that Act—the word “secular”—is, to my mind, one of the most serious things ever contemplated since we have adopted State education. I only had the Bill placed before me yesterday, and I notice that it provides for Bible lessons being read by the pupils in the State schools, and that the ministers of religion of the various denominations may teach religion in the schools, and also expound their ideas in connection with those particular subjects. There is nothing in the measure itself with regard to what lessons are to be taught, nor has it been explained what those lessons are and what limits are to be placed on this religious instruction in the State schools. When I read the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Beirne, I took it to mean that if we adopted the amendment we might come to some understanding between us as to the questions to be dealt with by the teachers and the ministers of different denominations. It is a very serious thing to think that that power is to be given away, and during the discussion it was admitted by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall that there are questions in the text-books of New South Wales that should not be included in the lessons given to children. We would like, under the circumstances, to know some details as to what the teaching is to be. In ordinary Bills we permit regulations to be made by the Governor in Council. That we are naturally bound to do, but this is too serious a measure to leave it subject to regulations. The lessons ought to be defined. It is the first time we have ever had before us a question of this sort dealing with all the denominations throughout Queensland, and the seriousness of it is evidenced by the rampant way in which the actions of members of this House have been dealt with by persons outside the House before members have had an opportunity of speaking. I think better taste ought to have been displayed by the heads of these denominations or churches when a measure of this sort is before us. I took the trouble to look up a few facts which justify me in taking the view I do against this measure. My experience goes back to 1873, and I hold in my hand a speech of Sir Charles Lilley, then Mr. Lilley, on the question of State education. To that gentleman, we all know, belongs the credit of pro-

viding for secular education in this State. We were the first colony of the Australian group to bring that about, and to Sir Charles Lilley we owe a lasting debt of gratitude. This is what he said—

If you can settle among yourselves certain general principles which all alike can receive, I will allow the State school teacher to impart them to the children; but if it cannot be carried out, why, then, I contend we have no other course to pursue than to give secular education to all, and let the religious instruction be given by recognised teachers of religion, in their churches, the homes of the pupils, or their Sunday schools. I would, moreover, grant to them the right of going to the National schools at certain hours, imparting to the children of their own faith their special religious teaching. These are my views on the question.

All that opportunity was offered, and since 1873 up to the present time what religious denomination has taken advantage of it? All the school buildings are available for the different religious denominations to teach the children.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: There is a good deal of advantage taken of it after school hours.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I think the latitude permitted under Sir Charles Lilley's Bill was ample, and it is a serious thing to make any change. It was enacted that religious instruction might be given by ministers of religion, but it must be before or after school hours. That has continued up to the present time; and the effect has been that the State schools of Queensland are freer from secular feeling than the State schools in any other part of Australia. I have often heard it remarked that we are freer in Queensland than they are in any other State from any feelings of that sort, and I hold that if this schedule is adopted sectarianism will date from that day. That is the position that I take up here. Here we have in the schedule a schoolmaster permitted to teach religion—it goes one better than the Bill itself. I think, under the circumstances, it would be improper to allow teachers to impart religious instruction, and I hold it should not be done except in mixed schools. I look upon this as a very serious measure, especially in view of the sectarian agitation which has already started outside the House. Never has this House been attacked over any measure as it has been over this measure. I took the trouble some four years ago to prepare statements regarding expenditure, and I have brought it up to date. In 1908 it stood at £7,500,000; it now stands at over £8,000,000; and of that sum 25 per cent. has been contributed by the Catholics of Queensland. In addition to that, not being able to take advantage of Sir Charles Lilley's Bill, they commenced building their own schools; and between sites and buildings, from first to last, their expense has been not less than £500,000. Now it is proposed to completely annul that and devote the whole of the State schools of Queensland to teaching religion and giving a free hand to religious denominations to exercise the right during schools hours. It certainly requires some amendment in Committee, and I rather favour the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. Beirne, because I think if this is delayed we might meet together and consider some teaching or lessons that would meet with general approval. There are several denominations taking the same view as the Catholics in connection with this measure—they object to their children being taught religion in schools.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: There is a conscience clause.

HON. G. W. GRAY: There is a conscience clause certainly, but these lessons are to be imparted by people who are not trained to give instruction in this subject; and I would like to see it made obligatory on the head master to remove the children not of that particular denomination when religious instruction is going on.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Any child can refuse to go and be taught.

HON. G. W. GRAY: But it should be made compulsory on the head teacher to see he is not taught. I do not see any objection to the amendment, which will give an opportunity for submitting lessons. You have the text-books of New South Wales.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Put them behind the fire.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I am inclined to favour the amendment.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: The only objection is that it will kill the Bill.

HON. G. W. GRAY: I do not go so far as that, but I have a serious objection to the measure. Already sectarian feeling is rampant outside; and what will it be when the Bill is put into operation? I have been brought a good deal in touch with Sir Charles Lilley's Act, and I regret that such a Bill as this has been brought before the Queensland Parliament. I know that the Hon. Mr. Barlow feels more keenly than anyone else in this Chamber the seriousness of this question, and I appeal to him now to seriously consider the motion, and give us an opportunity of coming to an understanding with regard to the text-books which we may fairly allow to be put into the hands of children attending State schools; otherwise I fear that very much harm will happen. I will only add that I seriously regret that I have had to take part in the proposed alteration of the existing law with respect to education in Queensland.

* HON. F. McDONNELL: I regret that at this late hour I have to offer a few remarks on the amendment, and before [9 p.m.] commencing to do so I would like to ask the leader of the House if he will consider at this juncture the advisability of adjourning the debate.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I am sorry I cannot do that. I am not struggling for a victory, but I cannot allow the business to be taken out of my hands.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I regret that I am forced into the position of either speaking on the amendment to-night or of losing my right to speak. The amendment is the most vital point in the Bill, and I would again ask the hon. gentleman if he will consent to an adjournment of the debate.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I do not wish that we should sit till an unreasonable hour, but I think we might very well hear the hon. member till 10 o'clock.

HON. F. McDONNELL: If the hon. gentleman will agree to allow me to continue my speech to-morrow if I move the adjournment of the debate at 10 o'clock, I am prepared to go on till then, but I do not think I can finish by that hour. If I sit down now, will the hon. gentleman agree to the adjournment of the debate?

Hon. T. M. HALL: No.

Hon. F. McDonnell.]

HON. F. McDONNELL: I am asking the leader of the Government.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: We were asked to attend this evening, and we put off our engagements, and we have a right to a voice in the matter.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: In justice to the hon. members who have come here to support me, I cannot consent to an adjournment at this early hour.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I am sorry the hon. gentleman cannot see his way to agree to my request, and I suppose I must go on and make the best of it. The amendment is the most important feature in the whole Bill, and on it will arise the whole question of sectarianism. The leader of the Government has not been able to give us any information regarding the persons who are to compile the lessons.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The Secretary for Public Instruction said in the Assembly that his present intention is to appoint two inspectors—Messrs. Canny and Kennedy—two teachers—Messrs. Exley and Papi—and Mr. E. W. H. Fowles.

HON. F. McDONNELL: There is nothing satisfactory before us. All the gentlemen mentioned, with one exception, are officers of the Department of Public Instruction, and, with two exceptions, I have no confidence in them. The two to whom I would not object are Messrs. Canny and Fowles. It is well known that at least two of the other three have strong feelings on the question. Assuming that these gentlemen are appointed, what right will this House have to review their work? There is no court of review, and one or two members of the committee will be overruled by the other three; and we know that officials may think it advisable, in their own interests, to compile lessons which will be in unison with the views of the Minister.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The Minister does not care anything about it.

HON. F. McDONNELL: But that is a natural position for officers of the department to take up. I do not wish to say anything derogatory to the hon. gentleman at the head of the department, but I am justified in not having any confidence in him from the fact that within the last two years he stated in another place that the Premier was drummed out of his native town of Falkirk, and, although the statement has been proved to be untrue, the hon. gentleman has never yet either withdrawn it or apologised for making it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: He will not put that into the lesson-books.

HON. F. McDONNELL: But suppose he superintends the compilation of the lesson-books.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: He will have no more to do with the work than you will.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Then who will?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Mr. Roe, Mr. Story, and the committee.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman did not mention Mr. Roe and Mr. Story outside. There is a very strong league of that this movement has been worked from outside. There is a very strong league of clergymen of a certain denomination and of ladies who have great influence. Does

[Hon. F. McDonnell.]

any hon. member think that that league and those ladies are not going to have a big say in this question?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: They are not going to have any say at all.

HON. F. McDONNELL: They have a big say now, as the league is running this Bill and the Government, too.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: No; it is not.

HON. F. McDONNELL: We know that every member of the Cabinet, with the exception of one, is opposed to the Bill, and that there are not half a dozen members in another place who are honestly in favour of the Bill on principle. But so much coercion and intimidation have been used that the Government are forced against their will to go on with the Bill; and I contend that the league and the ladies are not going to allow anybody to compile the lessons unless they have a finger in the pie. That is one of the reasons why the amendment has been moved. Those who are opposed to the Bill have been accused of moving the amendment for purely obstructive reasons. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall to-day, with that Christian charity which always characterises him, has stated that the amendment has been moved for the purpose of wrecking the Bill. We look upon the Bill as tyrannical, and to make it less objectionable, this amendment has been moved. The leader of the Government, both here and in another place, has sometimes been strongly opposed to Bills; but, when he has known that those Bills will be carried, despite all his opposition, he has moved amendments of this nature. Then why should hon. members supporting this amendment be accused of desiring to wreck the Bill? I do not deny that I shall do everything in my power to defeat the Bill; but we know that we shall not be able to defeat it on the second reading, so we are endeavouring, by means of this amendment, to remove much of the objection to the Bill. I am sure hon. members are not aware that the lessons in Western Australia—where the lessons are not open to the same serious objections as those in the New South Wales series of lessons—were submitted to Parliament. The lessons that were to be taught in the schools were submitted to Parliament. At the present time there is an agitation in New Zealand for the introduction of religious teaching in State schools. It has not been carried yet. What has the Bible League in New Zealand done? They have drawn up the lessons which they propose shall be adopted, and they have published those lessons broadcast. That, I think, is a wise precaution. But, coming nearer home, what do we find? In Victoria, in 1900, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into this question, and that Royal Commission drew up a series of lessons that were to be embodied in a similar Bill to this. Those lessons were tabulated and placed before Parliament. A referendum was held in 1904, and that referendum was rejected in Victoria, but in Victoria even the Bible League did not oppose the universal desire of the people that they should know what lessons were to be submitted to the pupils of the schools. What are we doing here at the present time? Hon. members who are supporting the amendment are simply following in the footsteps of New Zealand, Victoria, and Western Australia. Is there anything unreasonable in our request? I think the Bible League themselves, with all their power, if they want to disarm the opponents of this measure

—if they want to show the country that they desire purely Bible lessons which have no proselytising effects to be introduced into our schools—should gladly welcome an amendment of this nature. But, no; they have told the Government they are going to have the whole hog or nothing, and I believe myself from the knowledge I have of members of the Government if they had their way—which they have not in respect to this question—they would be prepared to accept an amendment of this nature. We must not think for a moment that Queensland is the whole world. This particular question, as I stated before, has been dealt with in Victoria within the last four or five years, and the referendum that was submitted there was rejected on a vote of the people, but as late as the 26th of October last this question was again submitted to the people in Victoria, and I think I am justified in placing before the House the attitude taken up by the Victorian Parliament. An Education Bill was brought before the Victorian Parliament, and a gentleman there who was a Minister in the late Government, Mr. Swinburne, introduced an amendment to the Bill. I ask hon. members to bear with me while I read the terms of that amendment, in order to show the wide difference between the attitude taken up in Victoria and the attitude taken up in Queensland. Mr. Swinburne moved the insertion of a new clause, providing for a referendum to be taken on the question—that is, the introduction of religious instruction into the State schools, and this is the form of the amendment—

Are you in favour of unsectarian Scripture lessons being given in State schools during the school hours to those children whose parents do not object, and by State school teachers who have no conscientious objections?

There is a wide difference between our Bill and the Bill that was introduced in the Victorian Parliament, which provided for unsectarian Scriptural lessons, and a definite proposal was made that the conscientious scruples of the teacher as well as the child should be respected. What is the position here? The Bible in State Schools League tells us that if any amendment of that nature is introduced here the Bill will be lost.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: They did not say so.

HON. F. McDONNELL: They undoubtedly said that. They stated in that important manifesto that has been issued to the people of Queensland—that manifesto that has promised all the pains and penalties that will be inflicted on this House if they dotted an "i" or crossed a "t" in this Bill—we dare not bring in any amendment that will provide for the conscientious scruples of the teachers. In what manner was this proposal of Mr. Swinburne's dealt with? There you have a Government, I am glad to say, that is not under the thumb of any sectarian society. At all events, they showed their independence, and the Minister for Education in Victoria received Mr. Swinburne's amendment in this manner—I am now reading from the *Melbourne Argus*—

Mr. A. A. Billson replied that Mr. Swinburne had submitted his new clauses to the House in a manner which they all must admire. (Hear, hear!) It was a question upon which the Government bore an open mind, and upon which members could vote with regard only to their individual judgment. It was a question which could never be satisfactorily settled by a referendum. He was not one to scoff at religion. He regarded the Ten Commandments as the basis of all morality, but he knew that upon the broader question opinions were divided, and not least the opinions of the clergy themselves.

And that is a fact here in Queensland, too; in fact, I know clergymen myself who are opposed to this Bill—

There were believers as well as unbelievers, and the effect of the proposed teaching would be to withdraw the children of the unbelievers from the schools. True liberty recognised the right to believe or not to believe, and the present proposal was one which would interfere with that fundamental principle. The church had its appointed place, and the Bill was so framed that it should not interfere with the conscience of anyone. It has been said that all that was required was an expression of the opinion of the majority, but in the present case the matter was to be looked at from another point of view. Was the question one which ought to be submitted to the people? What was the meaning of the word "unsectarian" itself? Was the State going to obtain by this suggested means any richer result than it did under the present system? Did Mr. Swinburne think that the mere reading of cold print would lead to any better result? He listened in vain for the voice of any member of the House who would say that our boys and girls were not now obtaining the education which would make the best of them. Such things were being said, but he was glad to say it was outside the House, and he would add that any Minister who did so was degrading the office entrusted to him. Could it be said that the opinion of the majority could be upheld? Where conscience was the governing principle, majority rule could not be upheld. Rights of conscience were individual and several. There was no reason why special moral lessons should not be prepared in connection with the State schools; for instance, in the form of the singing of hymns and songs. That would strengthen our schools without offending anyone. The State should be so conducted as to build up good men and good women. Religious instruction, to be effective, must appeal to the emotions, and, moreover, could not be given unless by teachers who thoroughly believed in what they taught. If parents were going to call on the State to impart religious instruction it was a lamentable confession of failure and shifting of responsibility. He was prepared at once to give instructions for the preparation of such lessons as he had indicated. Music, properly cultivated, struck at the chief and best elements of humanity. It was because he thought such a thing was possible under the present Education Act that he was going to vote against the new clauses.

What was the result of Mr. Swinburne's amendment in the Victorian Parliament? I do not wish to read the remarks of other members which were even stronger on the point of conscience and the rights of the minority. After a debate a division was taken, and Mr. Swinburne's amendment was defeated by 31 votes to 23. That was the attitude that the Victorian Minister for Education took up in regard to the referendum, and that is the attitude that we who are opposing this Bill take up at the present time, and I think we are in very good company indeed. To show you what the feeling of Victoria is on the matter, the *Melbourne Argus*—which I think cannot be considered for a moment to be particularly partial—had a leading article on this debate the following morning. I think the *Melbourne Argus* is looked upon as one of the leading papers in Australia, and this is what the *Melbourne Argus* stated—

Though no democrat will deny that in the ordinary affairs of government the majority should rule, there are subjects to which majority rule has no proper application. Where matters of conscience are involved majority rule may be tyrannous. This was clearly stated by Mr. A. A. Billson, the Minister for Public Instruction, in the course of his excellent reply last night to Mr. Swinburne's appeal for still another referendum on the subject of Scripture instruction in State schools, an appeal which was rejected by 31 votes to 23. The issue raised by Mr. Swinburne was, more emphatically than any other, one governed by conscience. When, in 1872, Parliament decided that State education should in future be free, secular, and compulsory, it had very good reason for its action, and no one

Hon. F. McDonnell.]

who remembers the rancorous bitterness which characterised the old sectarian days can be supposed willing to risk a return to those conditions.

I would remind hon. members that we had a similar state of things in Queensland before the present Act was introduced. We had Scriptural lessons for fifteen years in the State schools in Queensland, and so unsatisfactory were they shown to be—so much sectarianism was aroused through those lessons—that not one single member of Parliament, when introducing the present Education Act in 1875, even the father of the Bill, Sir Charles Lilley, attempted to introduce no provision for the continuance of that system. The *Argus* continues—

In what must be admitted to have been an earnest and moderately-worded speech Mr. Swinburne contended that by the word "secular" Parliament meant nothing more than "undenominational," and that for some years after the Act was passed that was, in fact, the meaning given to it in actual administration. We venture to assert that this was not the view held at the time, and the statement by one Minister of the day (Mr. Langton), even if correctly interpreted by Mr. Swinburne, did not accurately represent the feeling of Parliament or of the people. The intention was to leave religious instruction to the churches, and to confine the State schools' work to instruction on other subjects. Broadly speaking, this is the position to-day which is being attacked. The force at the back of the present campaign is, it must be allowed, highly organised and skillfully directed. Every argument that can be adduced in favour of what are called unsectarian Scripture lessons has already been urged times without number. The only one with even an appearance of newness used by Mr. Swinburne last night was entirely specious. It was anomalous, he said, that a country which required the foster parents of wards of the State to give their charges Scriptural instruction, or at the very least to see that they received it from others, should exclude Biblical instruction from its own schools. But the State has never for a moment denied that children should be instructed in the Scriptures. That is one of the few duties it still leaves to the parent, who may either give the teaching himself or have it given in the Sunday schools. Mr. Billson's announcement that, while he was inflexibly opposed to anything calculated to sap the existing principle of purely secular instruction, he is prepared to have lessons of distinct moral and ethical instructiveness included in the curriculum, and even to let the classes sing hymns in school, ought to go a long way towards satisfying such people as are not obstinately determined to accept no compromise.

This is the particular part of the article to which I would like hon. gentlemen [9.30 p.m.] to give attention, because it applies to the position in Queensland to-day—

If Scripture instruction were made a feature of State school work, no matter what conscience clauses and what safeguards for dissenters were provided, the demand of the Roman Catholic Church for a capitation grant in respect of its denominational schools would gain immensely in strength. Is this a position which even those who are most insistent in their demand for a referendum are prepared to face? Judging by the language they have used whenever such an alternative to the present system has been presented to them, they will never grant it. And in this at least, the position they take up is a perfectly sound one. It would be the height of impolicy for the State to encourage anything calculated—as State-endowed separate schools would be calculated—to give support to any church by public money. It cannot, of course, prevent Roman Catholic citizens from providing their own schools out of their own pockets, but short of this it should do all it can to foster a spirit of union and nationality in the people. Then, again, the advocates of Scripture lessons show no real consideration for the teachers upon whom they wish to impose the duty of giving them. It is all very well to provide that no teacher with conscientious objections to adding this to his ordinary work would be required to do so. But no one who has lived in the world with his eyes open can be ignorant of the many ways in which such an objection might react against him. In country districts more especially a

[Hon. F. McDonnell.

teacher would refuse at the risk, not only of his personal repute, but also of his personal comfort, and possibly of his professional prospects. Narrow-minded or bigoted people could, if they chose, render his existence exceedingly unpleasant for him without being guilty of anything that could be called an overt act of annoyance. The *esprit de corps* and *morale* of the service would be impaired, and the usefulness of the whole educational system seriously discounted.

I think this discussion in Victoria is very opportune, and I think it should induce hon. gentlemen, if their minds are at all open on this matter, to give sympathetic consideration to this amendment. Other States have tabulated their lessons, and submitted them to the people; but in Queensland our mouths are shut, and we will have no opportunity, once the Bill leaves this Chamber, of discussing, amending, or rejecting the lessons proposed to be placed in the hands of the children. I think the subject is of such importance that it should be considered free from prejudice. If the Government said to the Bible League, "We are responsible to the people of Queensland, and we are going to give the representatives of the people the right to review the lessons," then much of the opposition to this Bill would be removed; but the humiliating position at the present time is that they dare not bring down lessons to be submitted to Parliament. It seems as if the Government has lost all moral fibre in connection with this question; and if they have lost all sense of decency in connection with this matter, it is for this House to insist that the rights of the people shall be protected. If Parliament does what is wrong—particularly another place—they are responsible to the electors; and if they put into the hands of the children lessons that are not acceptable to the people as a whole, the people will have an opportunity of dealing with them. It is proposed to amend an Act of Parliament that has stood the test for thirty-five years; and I ask, Is it reasonable to revolutionise our State Education Act without giving us the right of reviewing a most vital part?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: Any member can have these things laid on the table.

HON. F. McDONNELL: No provision is made in the Bill that the regulations shall be submitted to Parliament; and Parliament is justified in asking that they shall have the final word. The Hon. Mr. Barlow and also the Hon. Mr. Brentnall pooh-poohed the idea of the lessons being submitted to Parliament. They said it would lead to interminable discussion. Weapons have been forged in the other House whereby interminable discussions are impossible; and in this House I do not think it has been characteristic to have an undue amount of discussion. But if this House has co-ordinate powers with another place, why should we not have a voice in important questions of this nature? I cannot understand how the Government can consistently oppose such an amendment as this. When the calm atmosphere of this Chamber becomes so disturbed through simply discussing the Bill, what is it going to be outside? I may have shown as much heat as any other hon. member, but it is because I feel it is a matter of such great importance to Queensland that if it was my last word I would utter it in opposition to the Bill. The only argument the leader of the House made when asked about amendments, was that there was a majority of 17,547 in favour of the Bill. The hon. gentleman has not always held those views about majorities. When certain Bills were introduced and passed in another place some years ago, they were practically kicked out of this House with very little ceremony, and the Government had to go to the country on them. The hon. gentleman, with the assistance of the

members who to-day are fighting for the preservation of the liberties of the people, carried those Bills, and the Government went to the country and got a majority, and then the democrats on the other side accepted them. The hon. Mr. Brentnall referred the other night to the fact that in 1899 I accepted the verdict of the referendum on federation. When we were discussing the Federal Constitution Enabling Bill, I stated that, if the Bill was accepted by the people, I would be prepared to accept the will of the people. I worked as hard as I could against the acceptance of the Bill; but I was defeated, like the hon. gentleman himself. I kept my promise because it was a national question, upon which the people had a right to give their opinion. In that case a Bill was brought down and submitted to the people, who were told, "This is the contract we ask you to accept." It was not like the present referendum, which simply gave a bald outline, and which deprives us of any voice in selecting the lessons. How did the democrats on the other side accept the referendum in regard to federation? How did the hon. gentleman who talks about a majority of 17,457 accept that referendum? Did he accept the will of the people in those days? Did the Hon. Mr. Brentnall—that great democrat, who to-day speaks of the will of the people—bow to the will of the people then? No, they refused to accept it. The Hon. Mr. Barlow—and I think it was the most creditable act of his life—retired from the Government as a protest against the action of the Government in submitting the question of federation to the people. The hon. gentleman went further than that. The referendum was carried by 38,488 votes to 30,996, so that practically the ratio was about the same as the vote on this Bill. At the opening of the next session, when an address was moved for presentation to Her Majesty, the hon. gentleman moved an amendment, despite the fact that that referendum dealt with a national question. His amendment will be found on page 297 of *Hansard* for the second session of 1899. A portion of that amendment reads—

That while the Legislative Council of Queensland is supposed to be the guardian of the liberties of minorities of Your Majesty's subjects, which minority in this case numbers 30,996 against the majority of 38,488, we feel difficulty in this instance in exercising this function, because the departure from Queensland, at this most important juncture, of Your Majesty's representative, the Right Honourable Baron Lamington, K.C.M.G., has placed every executive authority, which includes the power to appoint new members to this Legislative Council, in other hands.

That while we must admit that the acceptance of the Federal Constitution has been assented to by a legal and technical majority of the electors, we are still of opinion that the large minority of 30,996 votes includes the votes of many thousands of Your Majesty's loyal and dutiful subjects who believe that they will suffer serious loss and damage by the enactment of the Federal Constitution—who have had no share or voice in framing the Draft Federal Constitution—who have never, by the votes of their representatives in the elected House of the Parliament of Queensland, authorised or directed the Prime Minister of Queensland to confer with the Prime Ministers of the other colonies—whose interests have not been sufficiently protected in any such conference—and who have never had an opportunity of voting at any election of members of the Legislative Assembly at which the question of the surrender of the collection of the whole of the Customs revenue and of a large portion of the powers of legislation of the colony, in obedience to the will of the Central and Northern districts of the colony, has been even mentioned.

That was a national question—a question upon which, above all others, the people had a right to vote. Yet the hon. member was not prepared to accept the decision of the people on that occasion.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: I am delighted to hear the story of the old fight.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I am sorry the hon. gentleman has not been consistent. He and the Hon. Mr. Brentnall have made frequent references to the majority of 17,547, and it is just as well to remind the hon. gentleman of what he did in the past. On page 294 of the same volume the hon. member said—

I differ from my late colleagues, and upon which I have severed my political connection of many years' standing in order to be where I am. I am glad now that I know what the position and what the functions of this Legislative Council are. I have understood from my hon. friend opposite—and it was put into an epigrammatic form by my hon. friend, Mr. Morehead—that this Council is a place of registration, and we are invited to bow and pass in silence and with acclamation these things that are put before us. For my own part, I was sent here by virtue of a slip of parchment to give advice and consent to the making of laws for the peace, welfare, and good government of the colony.

That is exactly our position to-day. Why should hon. members who are supporting the Bill taunt us because we have taken up precisely the same attitude in respect to this Bill? Have we not rights? Why should we be denied those rights?

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid the hon. member is departing from the question of the amendment. I have allowed him considerable latitude, but I hope he will address himself to the amendment.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I only wish to say further that those who voted against accepting the mandate of the people on that occasion were the Honourables A. H. Barlow, F. T. Brentnall, W. F. Taylor, A. Raff, and J. Cowlishaw. It is very difficult to understand how any hon. member who took up that attitude then can object to our taking up the same position now. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall referred to another referendum on this question, which was taken in 1902. I think it was a clerical referendum, conducted by Archdeacon David. It was a referendum of the parents of children who were attending the State schools; but it was proved that only parents who were agreeable to the introduction of religion were asked to take part in the referendum; and it was pointed out that not only did the parents sign the voting papers, but the children also signed them. The result of that referendum was submitted to the then Premier, Mr. Philp. I think Sir Arthur Rutledge was his Attorney-General. The Philp Government brought down regulations permitting clergymen to enter the State schools during school hours to give religious instruction.

The PRESIDENT: I am afraid the hon. member is getting away from the amendment, and is discussing the general question, which is not open to discussion. I must ask him to address himself to the amendment.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I would like to be permitted to refer to what is rather a personal matter, which was introduced by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member is entitled to make a personal explanation, but he must do it as briefly as possible, and then address himself to the amendment.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I opposed those regulations, and we proved that they were *ultra vires*. I said then that the question had never been dealt with by the people, either at a general election or in any other way, and that they should be heard on the question. My action then was in complete harmony with the action I am taking to-day. The Hon. Mr. Barlow has stated that these lessons will be compiled by a committee appointed by the Secretary for Public Instruction.

Hon. F. McDonnell.]

HON. A. H. BARLOW : I said it was his intention to appoint that committee, but he may have changed his mind for all I know.

HON. F. McDONNELL : We accept that as the position. Assuming that the present Minister for Public Instruction is all that he ought to be, and the lessons are drawn up

[10 p.m.] under his supervision, I would ask the House what is to prevent a new Minister who may succeed the present Minister, coming in and altering those lessons? For instance, the time may come round when the Labour-Socialist Government throughout Australia will be hurled from power, as the Hon. Mr. Brentnall prophesied the other night, and that he so ardently desires, and the Hon. Mr. Brentnall himself might occupy the position of Minister for Public Instruction. Is that not possible? And from the hon. member's speeches here, do you think we will not have lessons that are hot and strong? I think so, at all events. I am quite satisfied that any Minister of Public Instruction who has any objections to the lessons that are in existence when he comes into power will have the right to alter those lessons. Does a Government not go into power to alter the whole policy of their predecessors? And supposing, for instance, we had a Labour Government in power in Queensland, and perhaps Mr. Lesina occupying the position of Minister for Public Instruction—that gentleman has publicly announced that he is an agnostic, and do hon. members think for one moment that Mr. Lesina, as Minister for Public Instruction, would not alter those lessons?

HON. A. H. BARLOW : Probably his colleagues would not allow him.

HON. F. McDONNELL : I say there is no possible reason why a Minister should not change the entire policy in reference to Scripture lessons. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall, when speaking on the Bible lessons, asked what objections had we to the Bible, and so forth. I would like to mention that there is a great difference of opinion in regard to the Bible. There is what is termed the authorised version and also the Douay version. Do hon. members know that in the authorised version certain books of the Scriptures are omitted which are contained in the Douay version; and therefore certain lessons might be taken from the authorised version that might be particularly offensive to a certain section of the community? We were told to-day that we should discuss this question in a brotherly-love fashion. I think that that is the spirit with which I have approached the question. I am at peace with all men; but at the same time I am very desirous, if this Bill is to be passed, to make it a Bill that will be shorn of a great deal of the objectionable parts that may be attached to it in connection with these lessons. It is said that there will be no sectarian feeling aroused under this Bill, but I might state that during the debate on this Bill in another place the Premier referred to the fact that sectarianism was bound to creep in and to exist the minute this question was introduced into the State schools. The Hon. Mr. Nielson read to the House to-day a few of the objectionable lessons included in the New South Wales book, and the Hon. Mr. Barlow has stated that those lessons will not be accepted. But can we take the hon. member's word on that matter? Every single lesson in the New South Wales book to which so much objection has been taken may be embodied in the book that is to be placed in the hands of the children of Queensland, and at the present time we are practically signing a blank cheque in respect to this matter. We are giving the Government absolute power to include whatever lessons they desire. I might say in this connection

[Hon. F. McDonnell.]

that there is a gentleman in the Education Department to-day in whom I have every confidence in respect to compiling these lessons, and that is the present Under Secretary. I believe he is a man who is absolutely fearless, and would be just in matters of this sort, but Mr. Storey will not remain for ever as Under Secretary for Public Instruction. I do not wish to keep the Council any longer, as I have a great deal of sympathy with hon. members who want to get away. Do I understand the Minister wants a vote on this to-night, or is he prepared to accept an adjournment? We have been rather harshly criticised for debating this amendment, and of course I am getting the lion's share of it. However, that does not make the slightest difference to me. I would like to take the opportunity of saying that the criticism which has been offered outside, which reflects on members of this Council, is one of the greatest possible arguments that could be adduced in favour of this amendment.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL : Do you wish to say that we are influenced by them?

HON. F. McDONNELL : I only wish to say that the criticism levelled at members of the Council in regard to this particular Bill is one of the most potent arguments that can be adduced in favour of the amendment. The intolerable action of certain dignitaries of the different churches at public meetings in denouncing this Council and in issuing threats should warn this Council and Parliament that nothing should be left in the hands of those men, and that Parliament should have a big say in the matter. What has one of the reverend gentlemen done to inflame the minds of the people outside? He has actually stated to the people of this State that it had been said the Catholics have not spoken on this question, and he asked how that could be so when the deputy leader of the Labour party had spoken, and he was a Roman Catholic, and 75 per cent. of the Labour members are Roman Catholics. When that statement was made here yesterday, I interjected during the Hon. Mr. Thynne's speech that that was a deliberate lie.

HON. A. H. BARLOW : It was a palpable mistake.

HON. F. McDONNELL : It was not a mistake; it appeared in all the papers. I believe the Rev. Mr. Rowe, who made that statement, must have known the religious opinions of the members of the Labour party. There are twenty-seven members of that party, and only ten of them profess the Roman Catholic faith. Was that a fair statement for the reverend gentleman to make from his pulpit? I say it was a lie; it was untrue; and I hope I am right when I say the Rev. Mr. Rowe must have been mistaken; but I am afraid the reverend gentleman was possessed of more accurate information, and he should have given the truth from his pulpit. What was the use of making the statement but to bring the question into the category of Catholic against Protestant? That was the object of it—to inflame people's minds.

The PRESIDENT : Order, order!

HON. F. McDONNELL : If I may say so, it was to intimidate this Council and to prevent us from discussing reasonable amendments like this: to give an idea to the country that there was only one section of the people fighting this iniquitous measure. I say it is an infamous measure. These statements have been made, and I was astonished to find that a gentleman who occupies a high and honourable position in his own church, Archbishop Donaldson, should have addressed a large gathering in the Exhibition Hall, and should have descended to tactics which ought only be credited to Archdeacon Garland. I was surprised that that high

dignitary should use intimidation and coercion in respect to the attitude of a certain section of this Council with regard to this measure.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order! I am afraid the hon. gentleman is departing from the amendment, and getting back to the general question, to which he has already addressed himself. I must ask him to confine himself to the amendment.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I will try and do so. I would only like to say that we who are opposed to the Bill are the people supporting a national system of education; and by the introduction of this amendment we are trying as far possible to safeguard not only the children, but the whole of the people of Queensland. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall read out some questions and answers from the report of the Royal Commission on Education; but there is one question he omitted to read, and which I think I am at liberty to read. Under this Bill, without any amendment of this nature, dogmatic and sectarian lessons will be introduced in the schools. The question to which I refer is No. 2357, as follows:—

Then you would not be dependent upon that sort of religious teaching mentioned in the resolution—namely, the Scripture lessons? No; we should still have our Sunday schools; we strongly object to have sectarianism in the public schools; we do what we like in our schools on the Sunday, but we do not wish to have sectarian dogmas or church catechisms introduced into the public schools of the colony.

That was the reply of the Hon. Mr. Brentnall to a question asked by Mr. Douglas, a member of the commission. At that time the hon. gentleman objected to sectarianism or religious dogmas in the State schools; he objected to the introduction of church catechisms into the schools. But what is he doing to-day? By opposing this amendment he is giving power to the Bible in State Schools League to introduce church catechisms into the State schools.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: They cannot do it.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Nothing would prevent them from doing it but the adoption of an amendment like this. They have forced the Government to take up a position to which they are bitterly opposed; they have forced the Government party in the other House, with the exception of a few members, to vote for the Bill through terrorism and intimidation; and if they can do that, have they not power to get their own lessons taught in the schools of Queensland?

HON. A. H. BARLOW: No.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I say the action they are taking up to the present time justifies me in making that statement. The whole business from start to finish has been run by the Bible in State Schools League, and if another religion took up the same attitude as the league has taken up there is not a newspaper in Queensland that would not be denouncing them day after day. I hope even at this juncture the hon. gentleman will consider the matter with his colleagues in the interests of good order and peace and concord. I would ask him to consider the attitude taken up by the other States, which is a good example to follow. May I ask him, if he has not the power to do it himself, to use his influence in the Cabinet and put before his colleagues the advisability of accepting an amendment of this nature. If the Government are going to wield any power in Queensland, if they can be called a Government in any sense of the word, surely this is the time for them to use their power and see that the rights of minorities are protected. I know that the people outside who are running the show have announced that they are not going to accept a single amendment in the

Bill; but what right have they to make such a statement? What right have they to usurp the power of this House? What right have they to put a blunderbuss to the face of members and say, "You will have to give us this Bill, or—." It is like a missing word competition. (Laughter.) If the Government are not prepared to do as I suggest, let them consult with the Bible in State Schools League; let them have the courage to tell the gentlemen running the business that in the interests of the people of Queensland this amendment should find a place in the Bill. If they do that they will be able to show the people that they have not lost all backbone or all consideration for the rights of the people, and that they have some respect for the conscience and indi-

[10.30 p.m.] vidual liberty of the people of Queensland. I hope and trust that even at this late hour the Government will have sufficient backbone to take up some stand, and show that they are not compelled to pass the Bill without accepting amendments. That would make it more acceptable, or less objectionable, to the people of Queensland. (Hear, hear!)

HON. C. S. MCGHIE: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 8.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. F. McDonnell
" A. A. Davey	" C. S. McGhie
" B. Fahey	" P. Murphy
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor.

Teller: Hon. T. C. Beirne.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. T. A. Johnson
" W. V. Brown	" P. MacPherson
" W. H. Campbell	" C. F. Marks
" F. Ciewett	" B. B. Moreton
" J. Cowlshaw	" A. Norton
" H. L. Groom	" T. O'Sullivan
" T. M. Hall	" E. H. Smith
" M. Jensen	" E. J. Stevens

Teller: Hon. W. V. Brown.

PAIR.

Content—Hon. A. J. Thynne.

Not-Content—Hon. P. T. Brentnall.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. C. S. MCGHIE: Every hon. member understands my position with regard to this Bill. I am totally opposed to it, and I was opposed to the referendum being taken, as I contend that it is no function of the State to take a referendum on a matter of conscience. The taking of the referendum makes no difference whatever in my position. If every elector in Queensland had voted for the Bible in State schools, I would still be opposed to it. The Hon. Mr. Barlow has told us that we must take the Bill as it stands, and that there must be no amendment. Surely that is a most unreasonable attitude to take up, having regard to the consciences of parents who do not desire their children to have Bible lessons, and also having regard to the consciences of the teachers. Last session I said it would be a calamity to take a referendum on this question. I believe the Hon. Mr. Barlow still believes that it will be a mistake to have Bible lessons in the State schools. That is my opinion; and I speak with an intimate knowledge of the teachers in my district. I have had a large family, who have gone through the State schools. I have no children at school now, but I am still interested in regard to the second generation. It has been held by those who are responsible for this agitation that our schools are godless, and that there is no religion being taught. Now, our boys and girls are being taught lessons in morality, and

[Hon. C. S. McGhie.]

the very highest principles are inculcated in the State schools. The amendment is so necessary that it will be a calamity if we pass the Bill without it. We do not know anything about what the regulations may be, and I consider that they will be the most important part of the Bill. I have no doubt the Minister will have the power to alter the regulations in such a way as to make them objectionable to a large section of the people. I have had but little opportunity to make preparation for this speech, but I think nearly all has been said in regard to the amendment that can be said. If an amendment similar to this is moved in Committee by the Hon. Mr. Power, and it is carried, we shall have some guarantee that the lessons will be as little objectionable as possible, and, at all events, the highest court in the land—that is, the two Houses of Parliament—will have a final say in the matter.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I would like to ask the leader of the House if he is going to accept that motion.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Go on!

HON. F. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman made a promise during my speech that 10 o'clock would be considered a reasonable hour for adjourning.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: My friends will not agree to adjourn.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Surely the hon. gentleman's friends are not going to prevent him keeping his promise! Hon. members on this side were under the impression that the hon. gentleman was going to carry out his promise. We sat on our seats silently, and no one got up to urge the adjournment of the debate, and to our horror a division was called. The promise that the hon. member gave was broken, and I am very sorry that the hon. member has broken faith with this House and has been forced into this invidious position.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: Your tactics are decidedly unfair.

HON. F. McDONNELL: It is decidedly unfair for hon. members to place the Minister in the position he has been placed in to-night. The hon. member got up here and said he was willing to adjourn.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: No.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The Minister said he was prepared to accept an adjournment at 10 o'clock. I was prepared to sit down at that time, and when the adjournment was moved by the Hon. Mr. McGhie the Minister was forced to go on the other side and vote against the adjournment, as an hon. member called "Divide."

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: Are you prepared to come to a division?

HON. F. McDONNELL: We have had one division to-night.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: You have spoken four times this afternoon.

HON. F. McDONNELL: Have I not a right to do so? The hon. member himself appears to be tongue-tied.

HON. W. H. CAMPBELL: You have tied us.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I am very sorry if I have tied the hon. member. I think hon. members should recognise that a fair fight has taken place, and that it is a fair thing to allow us to adjourn at this hour. We are not going to

[Hon. C. S. McGhie.

allow this position to go on without making a request, at all events, that the House should adjourn.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I am going to sit here as long as my friends will sit with me.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Sit all night.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I must congratulate the hon. member on sticking to his friends, and only hope that that friendship will continue, particularly when some of those democratic measures come to this House which the hon. members are not so sweet on. I ask the Minister to keep the promise he made to the House.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I deny I made any promise.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The Minister stated he was willing to adjourn at 10 o'clock.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I said I thought it was a fair thing to adjourn at 10 o'clock, but you continued the debate after that hour.

HON. F. McDONNELL: I do not wish to labour this question, but I hope again that the hon. member will consider the fact that members of this House have worked very hard to-day. We are not in a fit condition to go on any longer with this debate, and there are one or two members absent who intend to speak on this amendment, and in a fight like this the Minister should be prepared to give every member an opportunity of expressing his opinions. It is now five minutes to 11 o'clock—a most unheard-of procedure on the part of the Council—and I thought the Minister would have had more backbone and carried out the promise he made.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: I think the attitude of the Minister is a most unwarranted one, seeing that he has promised to adjourn the House.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would point out to the hon. member that the Minister has repeatedly denied that he made such a promise, and his denial should be accepted.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: The hon. member admits that he stated he thought 10 o'clock was a reasonable hour, and he infers that the speaker who had possession of the floor at 10 o'clock ought to have stopped automatically, and because he did not stop at 10 o'clock, that is a reason why we should now go on at the pleasure of the hon. member and his friends. He told us on a previous motion for adjournment that he was in charge of the business of this House, and would not allow any member to take the business out of his hands. Now he tells us he is in the hands of his friends. I submit we have done a reasonable day's work, and it is a fair thing that we should now adjourn. Several hon. members who are now absent did not anticipate that a vote would be taken on the amendment to-day, and it is known that some of those hon. members desire to speak to the amendment. Very few members have addressed themselves to the amendment, and simply because certain members do not desire to speak at all the Minister is prepared to prevent anyone else from speaking. I do not think that is a fair thing to hon. members who are prepared to speak, and who have reason to believe the debate would be continued to-morrow. Early in the evening the hon. member said so long as he had time to catch his train he was satisfied. Now he wishes to miss his own train in order to please those friends who do not wish to adjourn. I plead particularly on behalf of members who have given close attention to the business of the Council. There is no reason why [11 p.m.] they should sit here on account of the prejudices of members who will not get up and voice their opinions.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: May I explain that I asked those members who desired that the Bill should be carried to attend in sufficient numbers and with sufficient regularity to enable me to carry this matter to a finish. (Hear, hear!)

HON. B. FAHEY: I think we have witnessed this evening the most humiliating episode ever enacted in any Legislature in Australia. The hon. gentleman who takes upon himself to inform the public that he leads this House and protests against the business being taken out of his hands—what has he done? He made a promise this evening—

HON. A. H. BARLOW: No.

HON. B. FAHEY: I do not think my ears deceived me.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I rise to a point of order. A perpetual misstatement is made about me.

The PRESIDENT: The Minister has repeatedly denied having made the statement which the Hon. Mr. Fahey has attributed to him, and the Minister's denial must be accepted.

HON. B. FAHEY: I acquiesce in your ruling, Mr. President; but evidence of ear is against the hon. gentleman. There was another passage yesterday in the hon. gentleman's utterances indicative of the hon. gentleman's inconsistencies and indiscretions of speech in this House.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the debate be adjourned; and the hon. gentleman must address himself to that question, and not go outside of it.

HON. B. FAHEY: I only want to confirm my statement that the hon. gentleman is not telling the truth.

The PRESIDENT: I call upon the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement.

HON. B. FAHEY: I do so because I understand it is unparliamentary. At the same time, one cannot exactly dissociate himself from the evidence of his own ears.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I must request the President to ask the *Hansard* staff whether I interfered with the proof of my report in any way. The hon. gentleman has charged me with having doctored *Hansard*. I never did anything to it, and the statement is unworthy of the hon. gentleman.

HON. B. FAHEY: It is strange that the same thing appeared in two newspapers of this city.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. B. FAHEY: I say that the conduct of the leader of this House is humiliating. It is discreditable to the House and to himself. I as a member of this House feel humiliated.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. gentleman has made that statement on two occasions, and it has been denied by the Minister. I have told him he must accept the Minister's denial. I repeat that, and I trust he will not disobey the ruling of the Chair again.

HON. B. FAHEY: He has placed every member of this Chamber in a false and unenviable position, and there is no reason why the request for an adjournment in common courtesy should not be complied with. It would have been if he had not placed himself as an instrument and an unworthy tool in the hands of members opposite.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. B. FAHEY: No Minister in any Legislature in Australia would have dared to degrade his position as he has done without censure.

The PRESIDENT: I ask the hon. gentleman to address himself to the question before the Council, and not go outside of it.

HON. B. FAHEY: There are members here doing their duty manfully in resisting the action of the Government in trying to pass a measure which will be oppressive to 130,000 people of this State.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. gentleman is not addressing himself to the subject before the Council. If he persistently disregards the ruling of the Chair, I shall be obliged to ask him to discontinue his speech.

HON. B. FAHEY: I have no desire to disregard the ruling of the Chair. I suppose no hon. gentleman who ever held the position here or in another place knew his duties better or carried them out with a greater degree of courtesy than the present occupant of the position, and I would be very sorry indeed to do anything wilfully to disregard the decision of the Chair. I do not appeal in any *ad misericordiam* spirit to hon. gentleman opposite, who seem to have the business of the House in their possession. I only put it as a very reasonable request that at this late hour hon. gentlemen should be permitted to retire after a good day's work. But they seem determined to oppress us and insist on doing what they believe to be in pursuance of what they call a principle. I say it is unworthy of those hon. gentlemen opposite to assume an attitude of this kind towards members who are here doing their duty. I am prepared to remain here until 6 or 8 o'clock in the morning if necessary, but I say, with the greatest respect to the Chair, that the Minister has placed this House in a most humiliating position this evening, as well as by improper remarks he made yesterday, and which were reported in the local papers.

HON. A. A. DAVEY: I am sorry to be here at this hour for more reasons than one. For a number of years I have been in the habit of going to bed early, because in order to fulfil the ordinary duties of life I think one should have a reasonable amount of rest. I think it is a fair thing to allow gentlemen who are getting into the sere and yellow leaf to go home and have a rest, and the leader of the House would be performing a gracious act if he agreed to the adjournment. My impression is that the Minister said he thought 10 o'clock was a reasonable time to adjourn. I supported the previous motion for the adjournment, and it was pointed out then that we were allowed to go home early last night on the understanding that we should sit a little longer this evening. The question was asked of the Minister what he thought was a reasonable time, and he said he thought a reasonable time was 10 o'clock, and I am sure hon. members are not unreasonable when they say they took that as a promise. I believe hon. members opposite could come to no other conclusion than that it was intended to adjourn at 10 o'clock. I support the motion because I believe we have not had a sufficient opportunity of properly discussing the Bill. The stand that has been taken is very harsh. We know that the Minister is anxious to dispose of the amendment to-night because he is sure of his majority. I have always understood that it is the function of the Council to check hasty legislation; but certain hon. members appear anxious to prevent anything further being said on the question. I enter my protest against the continuance of the debate. The action taken is arbitrary and unusual, and I believe the time will come when hon. members who have taken up this position will be very sorry for what they have done.

[Hon. A. A. Davey.]

HON. P. MURPHY: I think this is a very reasonable hour at which to finish our work. The Minister has denied that he made a certain promise, and it is our duty, in accordance with the rules of the House, to accept his denial; but while the Hon. Mr. McDonnell was speaking he said there was an understanding that the debate should be adjourned at 10 o'clock, and the Minister said, "My friends over there will not allow me to adjourn." I do not think the hon. gentleman will deny that. The hon. member's new friends—the self-constituted champions of democracy—are compelling the Minister to prevent free discussion on one of the most important questions that has been discussed in Parliament this session or last. It is unreasonable to expect us to continue the debate while the supporters of the Bill remain silent. Sitting on the benches opposite there are seven members who are going to support the Bill, and not one of them has yet spoken. Ten or twelve members on this side have carried on this heavy debate for a number of days, not for the purpose of stonewalling or inconveniencing other members, but for the purpose of educating the great body of Protestants, who perhaps at present have not taken any very great interest in the question, and do not quite understand the injustice which may be done to another section of the community.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. P. MURPHY: It is now within half an hour of midnight, and surely it is not too much to ask the Minister in charge of the Bill to approach his new friends and try to persuade them to adopt a more reasonable frame of mind. I have not yet spoken on the second reading of the Bill; and, if this adjournment is not granted, and we are compelled to place our views before the country at this late hour, it will be a very serious loss to the whole of the people of the State. I do not think that the debate has been carried on in a manner which has been offensive to hon. members. I enter my protest against being compelled to speak any more at this hour of the night. If hon. members opposed to us, who have a large majority, are determined that the debate must proceed, then I say advisedly that it is not fair. It is most unusual, except just at the close of the session, for the Council to sit till such a late hour. Certainly up to the present time we have not got from him any reasonable excuse for his action on the present occasion. The recent additions to the ranks of democracy—the defenders of the will of the people—surely they will have some consideration for their fellow-members who happen to have different opinions to them. Surely they will have some consideration for the employees of the House who have to sit here and write down all we say.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member is not addressing himself to the question before the Council. I must ask him to do so.

HON. P. MURPHY: I think it is a reasonable request to adjourn this debate until tomorrow afternoon.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE: I rise to support the motion for the adjournment of the House, as I do not see what is to be gained by prolonging the debate at this late hour. It is admitted on all sides that members are very tired and weary and they cannot possibly bring that intelligence to bear on this great question that they can give it at other times. No hon. member has given any reason why the House should not adjourn, and I sincerely hope that the reasonable request of Dr. Taylor, that the debate be adjourned, will be acceded to.

[Hon. P. Murphy.]

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 9.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. C. S. McGhie
" A. A. Davey	" P. Murphy
" B. Fahey	" C. F. Nielson
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor
" F. McDonnell	

Teller: Hon. F. McDonnell.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. T. A. Johnson
" W. V. Brown	" P. MacPherson
" W. H. Campbell	" C. F. Marks
" F. Clewett	" B. B. Moreton
" J. Cowlishaw	" A. Norton
" H. L. Groom	" T. O'Sullivan
" T. M. Hall	" B. H. Smith
" M. Jensen	" E. J. Stevens

Teller: Hon. T. M. Hall.

PAIR:

Content—Hon. A. J. Thynne.

Not-Content—Hon. F. T. Brentnall.

Resolved in the negative.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: I regret very much that the officers of this House and members of the *Hansard* staff should be kept here till this late hour. I did not come here to-day prepared to speak on this amendment, and I shall be very brief indeed in my remarks. I moved the adjournment of the debate in the hope that that courtesy which is always extended to hon. members would be extended to me. This amendment has my most hearty approval. In speaking on the second reading of the Bill I foreshadowed several amendments that I intended to move when the Bill was in Committee if the Bill passes the second reading, but if we accept the amendment now before us the amendments I suggested will not be necessary, because it will remove one of the great objections some hon. members have to this measure. We have been told what sort of religious teaching the children of New South Wales get. I have not had an opportunity of reading the books used in New South Wales, but I was present on one occasion—something like twelve or fourteen months ago—in a West End Church when the Rev. D. J. Garland delivered a speech on this subject, and the rev. gentleman then said all that was wanted was the introduction of the New South Wales system. He went further, and I understood him to say he simply wanted the New South Wales books. That was all they wanted and that was all they were going to ask the people to vote for. I won't say that it is the fault of the system or that the system has anything to do with the matter, but the fact remains that in no State in Australia is larrikinism more prevalent than it is in New South Wales.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN relieved the President in the chair.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR: A conference of the Women's Liberal Association was held in Adelaide, and at this meeting a Mrs. Taylor said the number of children who roamed about the streets in New South Wales was a [11.45 p.m.] disgrace. That is what exists in New South Wales, where religious instruction has been in vogue for many years. Would we like that sort of thing to occur here? No one has been able to tell us yet by whom the selections from the Bible are to be made. The Bible in State Schools League are determined to have their finger in the pie; and as their organising secretary spoke in favour of the New South Wales system I should think it is intended to introduce something of the same sort here. The only safeguard we have that the children should be taught what they ought to be taught, and not taught what they should not be

taught, is to have the intended teachings incorporated in the measure. Who is better able than Parliament to judge as to what ought to be taught? At the time Sir Arthur Palmer was President of the Council, it was the fashion to pass skeletons of Bills, and leave many things to be provided for by regulations. That gentleman objected to what he called "government by regulations," and insisted that intended legislation should be contained in the Bill itself instead of being left to be embodied in regulations. Here we are asked to pass a most important Bill, and to take it for granted that the right thing will be done. I say we are more competent than people outside to say what shall be taught in the schools, because we can approach the subject with unbiassed minds, and incorporate such lessons as will give the children a true conception of the Deity. If the Bill goes through now, hon. gentlemen will be sorry for it. I have often been in a minority in this Council, and I never had occasion to regret my action. On one occasion I fought very hard with the minority; and we have lived to see many of those who were against us then regret the action they took. This is one of the gravest subjects that has come before Parliament, and I ask you to deal with it with unbiassed minds, and uninfluenced by outside reports or meetings or threats. I may be permitted here to correct, as far as I can, an impression to the effect that Mrs. Besant does not approve of Christianity. Mrs. Besant was asked to give an address on the subject of religious education to children in the Wesleyan Albert Street Church some two years ago, and if Mr. Rowe had the slightest doubt about her being favourably disposed towards Christianity he would never have invited her to lecture in his church. No doubt she has her reasons for not approving of Christian missions, but that is another matter. Mrs. Besant knows more about religions than any person in this Chamber. She has made a study of all religions for many years, and she knows that the object of all religion is to bring man nearer to God. I would like to read a short extract from an article of hers on "The Brotherhood of Religions"—

In all times, throughout human history, man has been searching for God, and the various religions of the world are God's answer to the search, made through men in whom more of Himself was manifest than is the case in ordinary people. These men are variously called Prophets, Rishis, Divine Men, Sons of God, and they may be thought of as composing one great spiritual brotherhood of God-inspired men, the guardians and teachers of humanity. We should think of all of them with reverence and admiration, whatever may be the particular religion to which we belong, for every one of them brought the same Divine message to the world, taught the same fundamental spiritual truths, proclaimed the same changeless moral law, and lived a noble and inspiring life. They put the one message in different ways, each choosing the way which would most help the people to whom He came, and which would develop in them the quality which the world most needed at the time of His coming. At one time it most needed a sense of duty and order; at another purity; at another righteousness; at another beauty; at another knowledge; at another individuality to be followed by self-sacrifice; at another the recognition of the Divine Sovereignty. For this reason religions are different, but all the differences go to the making of perfection, and to the enriching of the world as a whole. They are not, therefore, differences to be regretted, but to be utilised, and while we love our own religion best, we should be ready to learn what any other religion has to teach us. To the people of each religion the founder of that religion is the dearest and most honoured, and should be loved and revered above all others. But all the founders, and all the great teachers who followed them, are worthy of our homage.

I think hon. gentlemen will see from that that she has no objection to Christianity. But where

she finds pure religion, pure faith in God, she sees no reason why that faith should be disturbed by outsiders. I thought it advisable to make that explanation, because I do not want it to go forth that Mrs. Besant is antagonistic to Christianity. I am sorry we have sat so late to-night. I did not move the adjourn-

[12 p.m.] ment in any spirit of obstruction; and I trust that if the amendment is thrown out, members will recognise that it is our duty to see that the children attending our State schools get the religious instruction we wish them to get.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the question (*Hon. T. C. Beirne's amendment*)—put; and the Council divided:

CONTENTS, 15.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. T. A. Johnson
" W. V. Brown	" C. F. Marks
" W. H. Campbell	" B. H. Moreton
" F. Clewett	" A. Norton
" J. Cowlishaw	" T. O'Sullivan
" H. L. Groom	" B. H. Smith
" T. M. Hall	" E. J. Stevens
" M. Jensen	

Teller: Hon. W. V. Brown.

NOT-CONTENTS, 8.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. F. McDonnell
" A. A. Davey	" C. S. McGhie
" B. Fahey	" P. Murphy
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor

Teller: Hon. P. Murphy.

PAIRS:

Contents—Hon. E. T. Brentnall and Hon. A. Gibson.
Not-Contents—Hon. A. J. Thynne and Hon. C. F. Nielson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

HON. P. MURPHY: I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

At eight minutes past 12 o'clock,

The PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

HON. C. F. NIELSON said he must again protest against the action of the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill, and on this occasion he did not hesitate to say that his refusal to accept the motion for the adjournment of the debate was a distinct breach of faith. When the previous motion for the adjournment was made an hour earlier, the Minister distinctly promised that he would go on until the amendment was disposed of; but, so far as they now knew, he now wanted to go right through the Committee stage of the Bill. Personally, he was tired out, because he had been in the train from early on Monday night until early that morning, and, in deference to the wishes of himself and others who wished to speak, he hoped the Minister would not take advantage of the fact that he had a majority behind him. He (Mr. Nielson) simply pleaded for justice to hon. members, and to the hon. gentleman himself that, when he made a promise, he should keep it.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I made no promise.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: He did not know what constituted a promise in the mind of the hon. gentleman, but he (Mr. Nielson) depended upon a promise that had been made being kept, and he heard the hon. gentleman say that he desired to dispose of the amendment before adjourning.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: But there is an opportunity for disposing of the Bill.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: He did not know what kind of opportunity the hon. gentleman

Hon. C. F. Nielson.]

might have. He did not take any notice of such tactics, because they were tactics that should not be adopted. Apart altogether from the question of unfairness to hon. members, they were not the right sort of tactics to shorten the debate. The attitude of the Minister was most unworthy of the hon. gentleman and of the traditions of the Council. He had never heard of any Minister in charge of a measure in that Chamber using the same kind of tactics. He did not wish to say one word that he would afterwards regret having said, but he emphasised the fact that the hon. gentleman was meting out unfair treatment to a certain section of the members of the Chamber, and was taking a most unwarranted stand. He (Mr. Nielson) would stay there, even if he went to sleep there; but, if he was forced to stay, he would not be able to do justice either to himself or to the subject under discussion. He hoped some hon. member would give a valid reason why the House should not adjourn. The Minister had no right to break faith with the House in that way.

Question put.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The Minister was acting as a bit of a tyrant because he had a big majority behind him. The hon. gentleman had got the amendment knocked out, and he ought to be satisfied. He was waiting to hear hon. members on the question.

Hon. W. H. CAMPBELL: You have gagged us.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman who interjected had taken the business of the House out of the hands of the Minister and had already spoken on the matter. He wanted to hear the Hon. Mr. Groom and the Hon. Mr. Stevens on the question. The people of Toowoomba were entitled to know the Hon. Mr. Groom's views.

Hon. H. L. GROOM: What was the vote on the referendum at Toowoomba?

HON. F. McDONNELL: He did not remember.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I hope the hon. gentleman will keep to the question before the House.

HON. F. McDONNELL: The Bill was being put through in a manner only a little milder than the means adopted in another place. It was being forced through in a disgraceful manner.

The PRESIDENT: Order, order!

HON. F. McDONNELL: The Council by their action to-night was placing on record the worst possible advertisement that the Bible in State Schools Bill had got. They should adjourn in order to allow members who had paired to record their votes in *Hansard*. The hon. gentleman representing the Government should not forget his old friends who had stuck to him in the past, just because he had got a number of new-found friends round him, who were only using him to suit themselves. The report in *Hansard* would be severely curtailed, and it was, therefore, unfair to continue the debate. There were other members opposed to the Bill, and it was unfair to expect them to make second-reading speeches at this hour. He asked the Attorney General to adjourn now and continue the second reading to-morrow, when he had no doubt it would be completed. They would then have time to get their amendments ready for Tuesday. He thought the Minister was doing a very unwise thing in forcing the Bill through to-night.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: This was one of the most unique positions the Council had been placed in. There was a humiliating element

[Hon. C. F. Nielson.

in it. The Minister had been accused by the Hon. Mr. Nielson of a breach of faith, and he sat silent and accepted the charge without objection.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: What nonsense!

HON. A. J. THYNNE: It was on the strength of what the hon. gentleman said that he paired with the Hon. Mr. Brentnall for the evening, but he happened to be in the neighbourhood and saw the lights and came on. He should not have paired if he had known the House would have sat after 10 o'clock. It was unfair to him because he should not be able to vote although he had the privilege of speaking. When the division took place at 10 o'clock the hon. gentleman assured the House distinctly that he had no wish to sit to an unreasonable hour, and when he was asked what was an unreasonable hour, he said 1 o'clock in the morning. Was this an attempt to force the Bill through without a full discussion? He trusted the hon. gentleman would listen to the appeals which had been made to him. He asked for the adjournment of the debate in the interests of the whole House, and in fulfilment of the promise which the Minister had made to the House.

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: No such thing.

HON. B. FAHEY: He little thought that the Minister would oppose the motion for the adjournment of the debate when they reached 10 o'clock. The Minister and those who opposed the adjournment must take the responsibility, and the day would come when they would regret it, but unfortunately the Minister had allowed himself to be made a willing tool in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

HON. W. G. GRAY complained that the Hon. Mr. Barlow had not fulfilled the promise he had given earlier in the sitting that he would adjourn at a certain stage of discussion, and that the hon. gentleman had not offered any explanation of his opposition to the motion for adjournment.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The reason was that he wished to pass the second reading of this Bill to-night. If they passed the second reading now he proposed to adjourn over to-morrow, and take the Committee stage of the Bill on Tuesday.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE did not think it fair to go on with the second reading of the Bill at that late hour, especially as two hon. gentlemen desired to speak, and were not prepared to continue the discussion at that hour of the night, and even if they did speak their remarks would not be reported.

HON. A. A. DAVEY argued that it was an improper thing for the supporters of the measure to use their power to force it through the House without giving any reasons for their action, and without allowing those members who wished to debate the proposal ample opportunity to express their opinions regarding such a radical change in our educational system. He had understood from statements made in the House that the Minister in charge of the Bill agreed first to adjourn at 10 o'clock, and afterwards to adjourn when the amendment was disposed of, but neither promise had been observed. There were a number of hon. members asleep, and they could not be expected to listen to the arguments which were being brought forward. Therefore, why should they put forward these arguments?

Hon. A. H. BARLOW: Why not pass the second reading and go home?

HON. A. A. DAVEY: He supported the motion for adjournment, as it was reasonable that they should adjourn at that hour.

Question—That the House do now adjourn—
put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 8.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. F. McDonnell
" A. A. Davey	" C. S. McGhie
" B. Fahey	" F. Murphy
" G. W. Gray	" W. F. Taylor

Teller: A. A. Davey.

NOT-CONTENTS, 15.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. P. MacPherson
" W. V. Brown	" C. F. Marks
" W. H. Campbell	" B. B. Moreton
" F. Clewett	" A. Norton
" H. L. Groom	" T. O'Sullivan
" T. M. Hall	" R. H. Smith
" M. Jensen	" E. J. Stevens
" T. A. Johnson	

Teller: Hon. E. J. Stevens.

PAIRS.

Contents—Hon. A. J. Thynne and Hon. C. F. Nielson.

Not-Contents—Hon. F. T. Brentnall and Hon. A. Gibson.

In division,

HON. F. McDONNELL: Mr. President,—I call attention to the vote of the Hon. Mr. Groom. He called "Divide" for the "Contents," and he is now voting with the "Not-Contents." I claim his vote.

HON. H. L. GROOM: I would like to make an explanation. I paired with the Hon. Mr. Hinchcliffe on the second reading, but on all other divisions I claim a free hand.

The PRESIDENT: That is not the point raised by the Hon. Mr. McDonnell. The point is that the hon. member gave his voice for the "Contents," and his vote is claimed in accordance with the rule that the vote follows the voice.

HON. H. L. GROOM: If that is so, I will walk outside the Chamber.

After a pause,

HON. F. McDONNELL: Mr. President,—I again call your attention to the fact that you gave the question in favour of the "Not-Contents," and the Hon. Mr. Groom called "Divide," and I claim his vote.

The PRESIDENT: The hon. member will observe that I restated the question in order to determine whether the Hon. Mr. Groom called "Divide" under a mistake. I think obviously he did. In order to give him an opportunity to correct his position, I restated the question and he registered himself with the "Not-Contents."

HON. F. McDONNELL: I will let it go at that. We will let him off this time.

The PRESIDENT: "Contents," 8; "Not-Contents," 15. Question resolved in the negative. The question is that the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. P. MURPHY protested against the unreasonableness and the tyranny of the Minister in compelling him to commence his second-reading speech at almost 2 o'clock in the morning on a question of altering our secular system of education for a sectarian system. He quoted from the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Power delivered this session and two years ago, when the Referendum Bill was before the Council, and asked on which occasion Mr. Power attempted to mislead the Chamber? He did not consider that the referendum was put properly to the people. It should have been put as it was done in Switzerland.

At 2 a.m.,

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN relieved the President in the chair.

HON. P. MURPHY: The people were led to believe that if they voted for the referendum and it was passed, the Bill would contain a conscience clause relieving teachers from giving the lessons if they had conscientious scruples against doing so.

At 2.5 a.m.,

Hon. A. J. THYNNE called attention to the state of the House.

Quorum formed.

HON. P. MURPHY: A Minister of the Crown, before the referendum took place, promised that the Bill would not force any school teacher to give these lessons contrary to his own wish. This Bill was never brought before the people, and he believed if it was put before them it would be rejected. He did not feel himself bound, just because the referendum affirmed the mere principle, to vote for the Bill. They wished to give the people the opportunity of saying "Yea" or "Nay" on the question if it was properly put before them. There had been no complaint about our secular system of education which had served Queensland well for thirty-five years, and statistics showed that we were much better off than other countries which had adopted these Bible lessons. If the Bill was passed it would sow the apple of sectarian bitterness among the people. That had been the result in other places where they had religious training.

HON. F. McDONNELL rose to a point of order. He would like to ask whether the *Hansard* reporters were reporting the hon. gentleman's speech, or whether they had got directions not to report any further this morning.

The PRESIDING CHAIRMAN: They are reporting the speeches in a condensed manner.

HON. P. MURPHY: He was anxious that his views should be placed before the country. He quoted the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Brentnall on page 616 of *Hansard* for the present session, and said that an impression had got abroad, owing to the speeches delivered in this House, that in some way or other Catholics were averse to the Bible, but the very hint was an insult to them. No other church in the world had done as much as the Roman Catholics to preserve the spiritual truths contained in the Bible. He quoted from the evidence given by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall before a Royal Commission on the education question prior to the passing of the State Education Act of 1875, in which that hon. gentleman, as the representative at that time of the Wesleyan Methodists in the district of Brisbane, stated that the Wesleyans were then unanimous in passing the following resolution: "That, in the opinion of this district meeting, the time has arrived when all State support to denominational schools should cease." He expressed the opinion that Presbyterian ministers in Queensland at the present time were equally divided on the question of Bible reading in State schools, and argued that, apart from all other considerations, the present proposal was unjust to Roman Catholics, inasmuch as under the Bill they would be compelled to pay for religious teaching that their consciences would not allow them to take advantage of—which meant that they would be compelled to pay for the religious instruction of other people's children. He then read an extract from the evidence of the Rev. Edward Griffith, given before the Royal Commission already indicated, to the effect that Congregationalists were then in favour of a free, secular, and compulsory system of education under State control, and that the adherents of that body would make ample

Hon. P. Murphy.]

provision for the religious instruction of their children in their denominational Sunday schools. When he said he would oppose the Bill at every stage, he meant in a political sense and not in a sectarian sense, and he was within his rights in taking advantage of all the rules of the House in obstructing its passage at every stage. When Mr. Brentnall talked about throwing down the gauntlet and digging up the hatchet, and putting 75 per cent. of the population against 25 per cent., it meant nothing else than that the 25 per cent. of Irish Roman Catholics in Queensland were to be crushed out of existence. The time would come when men of all religious sects in the Empire would have to stand shoulder to shoulder in fighting for their rights and liberties against outside oppression. They remembered the early disasters in the South African war and how the Irish Roman Catholic soldiers turned the tide of battle in favour of Britain, and how Queen Victoria recognised their action by allowing them to wear the shamrock, their national emblem, on St. Patrick's Day. They thought then that the hatchet was buried for ever, but the Protestants who were pressing this Bill through Parliament had gone back on that understanding.

At 3.20 a.m.,

The PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

HON. P. MURPHY advised hon. members to read the speech of Sir S. W. Griffith, who was a member of the Education Commission and who was Attorney-General on the Education Bill of 1875, and they would then have the opinion of one of the brainiest men in the Commonwealth. When the Education Act was passed in 1875, the *Telegraph* newspaper took the same stand in support of secular education that it was taking now. The Hon. Mr. Brentnall and the Hon. Mr. Cowlshaw were large shareholders, and yet they were both supporting the Bill, while Mr. George Cowlshaw was managing director of the company. That fact showed that brothers were divided on the question, so that it could not be cast as a slur on Roman Catholics that the Hon. Mr. Power was opposed to other members who belonged to the same church. (The hon. member then quoted from the evidence given before the Royal Commission which sat in 1874, by the Rev. Matthew McGavin, Presbyterian minister, in favour of secular education.) Mr. McGavin's evidence showed that the Presbyterians were then as divided in opinion as they were now. The Protestants of Queensland were not carrying out the guarantee that was given to the Roman Catholics by the action of Queen Victoria that they were to be regarded as on an equality with all other sections of the community. They were obliged to pay from their own pockets for the religious instruction of their own children, and under this Bill they would be compelled to contribute, in addition, to the religious education of Protestants in the State schools. He refused to believe that his Protestant neighbours were less generous than their co-religionists in England, who paid large sums for the religious education of their children. He thought the fault lay with their church organisation in Queensland. (He further quoted from the evidence of Rev. Mr. MacGavin in opposition to Bible teaching in the State schools.) If the Protestants knew what was being done, they would not permit this mean injustice to be perpetrated upon the Roman Catholics, and he would speak for twenty-four hours, if necessary, to prevent it. (The hon. member next quoted from the evidence of Rev. Dr. Hay, another Presbyterian minister, in favour of the existing system of education.) The original statistics were said to show that

[Hon. P. Murphy.]

morality in Queensland stood higher than in New South Wales, where religious education was imparted in the State schools.

At twelve minutes past 4 o'clock,

HON. T. C. BERNÉ called attention to the state of the Council.

Quorum formed.

HON. P. MURPHY quoted further from the evidence of the Rev. Dr. Hay. If a board consisting of leading members of the largest Christian denominations were appointed, as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Brentnall, it would mean that the Roman Catholic members would be only about one-fourth of the total number. As they used a different version of the Bible to that used by all the Protestant churches, they would be in a minority, and lessons would be chosen to which the Roman Catholics could not agree. It was nothing short of a crime to seek to alter the present excellent system.

At twenty-five minutes past 4 o'clock,

HON. F. McDONNELL rose to a point of order. He wished to know whether the members of the *Hansard* staff were following the practice which, he believed, was followed in connection with debates in the other Chamber, of fully reporting second-reading speeches after midnight.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order, and the hon. member was not right in interrupting the hon. member who was in possession of the floor. I understand that the practice followed in the Assembly on occasions when the sittings are protracted beyond midnight is being observed, and only a condensation of speeches is being made in the official report. The practice is being observed without any directions by me. Had it been desired to make any departure from the usual custom, I would have endeavoured to obtain a more extended report to a later hour than usual, but no request was made to me by any hon. member. The Principal Shorthand Writer informed me about 3 o'clock that the report which is being made is only a condensation.

HON. P. MURPHY (continuing) claimed that the Bill would inflict a cruel injustice on Roman Catholic children by robbing them of a portion of their school life through the teachers being engaged in giving Bible lessons to the other children for an hour a day. So much dissatisfaction would be caused that the time would come when the measure would be swept off the statute-book into everlasting oblivion. The public were beginning to recognise the propaganda work that was being done by the members of the Council who were opposed to the Bill. He did not believe the measure would confer much benefit upon the children in whose interests it was supposed to be introduced. (The hon. member again quoted from the evidence of Dr. Hay.) Hon. members should pay grave attention to the opinions of the cultured clerical witnesses who appeared before the Royal Commission, and not let their fanatical enthusiasm for their own creeds run away with their better judgment. Many churches would be led to depend upon the State schools to give a sound religious education to their children, but they would be sadly disappointed, and the churches which provided religious teaching in their own schools would be crowded to the door. Some of the clerics appeared to want to discover a short cut to heaven for their children. They wanted everybody to work but themselves, and let the other fellow pay all the time. The advocates of the Bible in the State schools were not the same class of men as the clergy whose evidence he had read. It was an unfor-

givable sin on the part of any Christian sect to leave the duty of giving religious instruction to the young to the State schools. He regretted that he had not the physical ability to continue his protest against the passage of the Bill until the sun, which was just rising, set in the West.

At twenty minutes past 4 o'clock,

HON. C. F. NIELSON hoped the Minister in charge of the Bill would not object to his moving the adjournment of the debate. The hon. gentleman could have terminated the debate through the application of a Standing Order if he had chosen to do so, but it had not suited him to do so. In addition to that, the hon. gentleman had not made provision that the speeches of hon. members should be fully reported.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I have no power. The matter is in the hands of the President.

HON. C. F. NIELSON pressed upon the hon. gentleman the advisability of adjourning, if only for an hour or two, as a matter of compromise.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. member must either move the adjournment of the debate or address himself to the question before the Council.

HON. C. F. NIELSON: With all deference, he had moved the adjournment of the debate at the outset of his remarks.

HON. F. McDONNELL said that one of the finest speeches delivered in this House had been deliberately suppressed.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. gentlemen is making a statement which is a reflection on the officers of the House. The Hon. Mr. Murphy's speech has not been deliberately suppressed. The regular practice in regard to reporting the proceedings of the House when they are protracted to a late hour of the night, or an early hour of the morning, has been followed in this case.

HON. F. McDONNELL apologised for making any reflection on the officers of the House. At all events, the leader of the House had not protected the interests of hon. members by arranging with the Principal Shorthand Writer to have the speeches delivered on the second reading reported fully. The daily Press was not in a position to publish an extended report of the speeches, and the only source they could rely on was the *Hansard* report, and the readers of *Hansard* had been deprived of the information.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The hon. gentleman is not discussing the question before the Council, which is that the debate be now adjourned. He must confine himself to that.

HON. F. McDONNELL: He was just going to say that one of the reasons why this debate should be adjourned was that the public would lose the whole of the benefit of the intellectual speeches which would be delivered on this subject. Was it not a reasonable request to adjourn the debate at this early hour, as no arrangement had been made for the debate to be fully reported in *Hansard*? The bulk of the people would be with them in this matter, as they were fighting for the liberties and rights of the people of Queensland. He was anxious to have something to eat, and the best thing was to agree to the adjournment and continue the debate in the afternoon. He knew the Minister himself was anxious to make a speech in reply, and he would not like the speech condensed in such a form that it would not go to the country verbatim.

Question put.

HON. A. J. THYNNE deprecated the silent attitude of the Minister, who had not given

hon. gentlemen who had spoken an opportunity of getting their speeches recorded in *Hansard*. He did not know that they had ever before in this House had the experience of the past night, and he hoped hon. gentlemen would be enabled to get the rest they required and prepare themselves for putting their views before the House and the country. He joined with the Hon. Mr. McDonnell in his regret that the splendid material put before the House by the Hon. Mr. Murphy had not been recorded.

HON. B. FAHEY: They were here doing their duty and advocating the claims of those who were not here, and demanding that justice should be extended to them in a matter that was as dear to them as their lives—their religion. He regretted that such valuable material as the Hon. Mr. Murphy had brought before the House had not found its way into the columns of *Hansard*. As a member of the House he felt humiliated at the attitude of the Minister. There was no justification for the charge that they were attempting to kill the Bill by stonewalling, as they were all in earnest in their opposition to a vicious law. An hon. member had charged them with maliciously introducing sectarianism into the debate—

The PRESIDENT: Order! May I ask the hon. member to return to the subject before the Council. He is not at liberty, in discussing this question, to roam at will over all that has transpired during the evening, or to enter into debate with members upon the general subject. There is one specific question before the Chamber now, and that is that the debate be adjourned. I ask the hon. member to address himself to that.

HON. B. FAHEY: He thanked the President, but he had been unconsciously and unintentionally led aside by interjections. He concluded by again asking hon. gentlemen opposite, who seemed to have taken charge of the business of the House, to concede the request for an adjournment.

HON. W. F. TAYLOR said they had had a record debate, and they could not benefit much by continuing, as they were all very tired. The result was inevitable, and the hon. gentleman might just as well defer it for a few hours as force it on now. Under the circumstances, it was a fair thing to adjourn the debate, and meet again in the afternoon, when, after some refreshment, they would be able to proceed in a calm and deliberate manner, and hon. gentlemen would be able to get their speeches reported in *Hansard*, so that the general public would know what they had to say. He regretted, with others, that such an able speech as that of the Hon. Mr. Murphy would not be fully reported. The evidence given before the Royal Commission in 1874 was applicable today. It was a mistake to force this Bill through by sheer force of numbers, and he earnestly hoped an adjournment would be agreed to, and that they would meet again in the afternoon and settle the matter in a fair and amicable spirit. As an old member of twenty-four years' standing, he regretted that such a spirit of discourtesy had prevailed, and such a spirit had never been exhibited before.

HON. T. C. BEIRNE did not think the Minister would gain anything by opposing an adjournment at this hour. The Hon. Mr. Nielson and the Hon. Mr. Gray wished to speak. Mr. Gray had not been in a fit state of health to speak on the amendment, and how could they expect him to speak on the main question? He hoped the Minister would give them the adjournment, and they would promise that he should lose nothing by it.

HON. A. A. DAVEY felt called upon to enter another strong protest against this inhuman conduct. There was no ground for objecting to

Hon. A. A. Davey.]

the adjournment in view of the possibility of their coming this afternoon and concluding the debate.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put; and the Council divided:—

CONTENTS, 9.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. C. S. McGhie
" A. A. Davey	" P. Murphy
" B. Fahey	" W. F. Taylor
" G. W. Gray	" A. J. Thynne
" F. McDonnell	

Teller: Hon. P. Murphy.

NOT-CONTENTS, 16.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. T. A. Johnson
" W. V. Brown	" P. MacPherson
" W. H. Campbell	" C. F. Marks
" F. Clewett	" B. B. Moreton
" J. Cowlishaw	" A. Norton
" H. L. Groom	" T. O'Sullivan
" T. M. Hall	" R. H. Smith
" M. Jensen	" E. J. Stevens

Teller: Hon. T. M. Hall.

PAIR.

Content—Hon. C. F. Nielson.

Not-Content—Hon. A. Gibson.

Resolved in the negative.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put.

HON. G. W. GRAY said they were indebted to the Hon. Mr. Murphy for the evidence he had adduced in his admirable speech. It afforded additional material and justified the position they were taking up in reference to this question. It was a fair thing to ask the Minister to give some justification for the measure. He felt that the hon. gentleman had treated the matter right through with levity and discourtesy, and regretted he had not treated them in a more liberal spirit.

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

CONTENTS, 15.

Hon. A. H. Barlow	Hon. P. MacPherson
" W. V. Brown	" C. F. Marks
" W. H. Campbell	" B. B. Moreton
" F. Clewett	" A. Norton
" J. Cowlishaw	" T. O'Sullivan
" T. M. Hall	" R. H. Smith
" M. Jensen	" E. J. Stevens
" T. A. Johnson	

Teller: Hon. C. F. Marks.

NOT-CONTENTS, 9.

Hon. T. C. Beirne	Hon. C. S. McGhie
" A. A. Davey	" P. Murphy
" B. Fahey	" W. F. Taylor
" G. W. Gray	" A. J. Thynne
" F. McDonnell	

Teller: Hon. B. Fahey.

PAIRS.

Contents—Hon. H. L. Groom and Hon. A. Gibson.

Not-Contents—Hon. A. Hinchcliffe and Hon. C. F. Nielson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: In moving that the Council, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next, I beg to say that I feel no spirit of elation in this matter, and if I have in any way exceeded the bounds of debate, or hurt the feelings of anybody, I express regret. I thank those gentlemen who have seen this Bill through, and I trust that by Tuesday next any feelings of asperity, if there are any such, will have entirely passed away. These incidents are common to parliamentary life; they are in no sense per-

[Hon. A. A. Davey.

sonal—at least, they never are with me. I beg to move that the Council, at its rising, adjourn till Tuesday next.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: I beg to move that the Council do now adjourn.

HON. A. J. THYNNE: I should be glad to know what course of business is to be entered upon next Tuesday.

HON. A. H. BARLOW: The committal of this Bill. I may be allowed to say that while I regret being compelled to resist amendments, if amendments are submitted I trust they will be printed, as it makes the work so much easier.

Question put and passed.

The Council adjourned at fourteen minutes to 7 o'clock a.m.