

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1924

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

TUESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER, 1924.

The SPEAKER (Hon. W. Bertram, *Maree*) took the chair at 10 a.m.

QUESTIONS.

GRAZING HOMESTEAD AND GRAZING FARM SELECTIONS, 1923-24.

Mr. KING (*Logan*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. How many blocks were selected during the year ended 30th June last, with their respective areas, under grazing homestead and grazing farm tenure?”

“2. What was the number of applicants, respectively, for each block?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“1. Grazing farms, 104; area, 1,485,274 acres. Grazing homesteads, 232; area, 2,946,097 acres.

“2. The number of applicants for each block is shown on the list tabled herewith.”

NUMBER OF TEACHERS ON BASIC WAGE, AND PUPIL-TEACHERS.

Mr. WARREN (*Murrumba*) asked the Secretary for Public Instruction—

“1. Will he state the number of teachers on the basic wage?”

“2. Will he state the number of pupil-teachers admitted into the service during the current year.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. F. T. Brennan, *Toowoomba*) replied—

“1. 971.

“2. 73.”

SALARY OF MANAGER OF WHEAT POOL.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“1. Is the present manager of the Wheat Pool paid a salary for his services; if so, what amount per annum?”

“2. What was the salary paid per annum to the late manager (Mr. Morgan)?”

“3. Was the late manager a full-time or part-time officer?”

“Is the present manager a full-time or part-time officer?”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) replied—

“1. The salary of the present chairman is £500 per annum.

“2 and 3. The salary paid to the late chairman (Mr. Morgan) was £800 per annum for the first two years while he was full-time officer. For the third year he was a part-time officer, and was paid an allowance of £300 per annum.

“4. There are no conditions as to hours worked, but he is expected to give whatever time is necessary to such duties.”

NUMBER OF SELECTIONS TAKEN UP IN BURNETT AND CALLIDE AREA.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Public Lands—

“1. How many farms in the Burnett and Callide area have been opened for selection?”

“2. How many have been taken up?”

“3. Have any of the selectors abandoned their holdings; if so, how many?”

“4. Have any of such holdings been reselected?”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. W. McCormack, *Cairns*) replied—

“1. 1,381 portions.

“2. 697.

“3. Yes; 102.

“4. Yes; 60.”

DAIRY PRODUCE STORED IN ROMA STREET COLD STORES IN 1923.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

“1. How many tons of dairy produce were stored in the Roma Street Cold Stores during 1923?”

“2. What was the total amount of revenue received for same?”

“3. Taking quantity stored during 1923, and assuming a similar quantity for 1924 and same periods of storage, what increase in revenue will be received under the lately increased rate of storage?”

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*) replied—

“1. 8,065 tons.

“2. £13,032.

“3. Approximately £2,804 per annum.”

ATHERTON MAIZE POOL BOARD—AMOUNT BORROWED FOR ADVANCES, AND ESTIMATED CROP.

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*) asked the Secretary for Agriculture and Stock—

“1. What amount has been borrowed by the Atherton Maize Pool Board for the purpose of making advances this year?”

“2. Has the money, if any, been borrowed from the Treasury?”

“3. If not from the Treasury, from what bank and on what terms of interest?”

“4. What advance per bushel has the Pool Board made to date?”

“5. What is the estimated total crop in the district this year?”

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE AND STOCK (Hon. W. N. Gillies, *Eacham*) replied—

“1 to 5. As a complete answer to these questions necessitates information being secured from the Pool Board, I have wired to the Atherton Maize Pool Board for the information asked for, and this will be supplied when received.”

PAPERS.

The following papers were laid on the table, and ordered to be printed:—

Report and balance-sheet of the Public Curator for the year 1923.

Annual report of the Department of Public Lands for the year 1923.

Report by Government Analyst and Chief Inspector of Explosives for the year ended 30th June, 1924.

SOUTH BRISBANE-KYOGLE-GRAFTON RAILWAY AGREEMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Larcombe, *Keppel*): I beg to move—

“That the Bill be now read a third time.”

Question put and passed.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE—ELEVENTH ALLOTTED DAY.

(*Mr. Pollock, Gregory, in the chair.*)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

CHIEF OFFICE.

Question stated—

“That £25,212 be granted for ‘Chief Office.’”

Mr. KERR (*Enoggera*): Before this vote goes through, I would like to ask the Secretary for Public Instruction to make a clearer statement as to what he intends to do in his new role of censor in connection with the State school papers. But even without the hon. gentleman's explanation we have got something to go on. In the first statement made by him he said he would exclude from the school papers anything likely to inflame the minds of youths with an ambition for war. His next statement was that he would rather explain the causes of war and the capitalistic influences that brought about war.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is part of the same statement.

Mr. KERR: We must all recognise that there is an international movement now to end war without arms or bloodshed. Whilst we are all deeply interested in that international movement, we are also deeply interested in the statements of the Minister as to whether he intends to foist his opinion on the children of Queensland per medium of the school papers. We must also examine what the Minister has said in regard to the policy of the Labour party in that regard. I do not think that the Labour party in Queensland have any plank or policy in their platform in that connection, but they have in Victoria, and the Minister, apparently, has followed Mr. Lemmon, the Minister for Education in that State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I am not following him.

Mr. KERR: The Minister for Education in Victoria said that it was the policy of the Labour party that no articles relating to or extolling wars, battles, or heroes of past wars be printed in the State school papers or books. The nearest I can find to that in the policy of the present Government of

[*Mr. Kerr.*

Queensland—which is much nearer home—is a resolution passed at a conference held last year. The resolution, which was unanimously passed by the Labour party at that conference, reads—

“Revision of school books; to cut out all militaristic teaching.”

Logically, we have to assume that the Minister intends to carry out this policy of his and of his party in regard to Universities and private schools. Logical reasoning would lead us to believe that if children are brought up in ignorance of war and of faith in peace, the world will be a brotherhood of peace. Byron's definition of war was—

“The feast of vultures and the waste of life.”

While these are happy thoughts, we must realise that it is impossible to bring such an ideal about. Political parties to-day are very rarely made; they more or less happen. So it is with war: it is not made; it just happens. War is just as old as human nature. If the Minister wishes to bring about his desires, he will have to act, so far as I can see, as a censor of the Old Testament. There would be very little left in the Old Testament if the Minister were to attempt to carry out his policy and cut out every reference to war. He will not only need to restrict teaching in the State schools, but he will also have to restrict the teaching in the churches in this State if he wishes to carry out his ideal. I am not going to anticipate what the Minister might say, as he has his own explanation to give, and I hope he will give it to this House. Mr. Lemmon, Minister for Education in Victoria, said he would not interfere with existing literature. Perhaps the Minister will say he will not follow Mr. Lemmon in that regard. Does he intend to interfere with existing histories and text-books? The question of whether we like or dislike war does not arise. Very few people have any time for war. We all look forward to time of peace. Every reasonable man must come to the conclusion that peace is the method by which we must all live.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: How is that going to be accomplished?

Mr. KERR: That is the question—How are we going to accomplish it? The hon. gentleman has his own way, but his ideal can be accomplished by other means. It is not a question of liking or disliking war. This is what Napoleon, the greatest soldier in history, said—

“It is the trade of barbarians, where the sole art consists in being strongest at a given point.”

We cannot eliminate war from history merely because we dislike it. There have been great earthquakes in Japan in recent times, but to eliminate the record of them from history will not do away with the earthquakes in that country. We have had Black Plagues in various countries, but to eliminate the record of those events from the school books, merely because they are not nice to read about, will not be of any benefit. If we eliminate the mention of war from history, it will have a tendency to falsify history. We might as well propose to eliminate religion and other factors which have helped materially to mould civilisation. Religion and war have more or less moulded civilisation. What does the poet Emerson

say in regard to the achievements made by war—

“War disorganises, but it is to reorganise.”

That is plain.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Are you advocating war?

Mr. KERR: I am not advocating war. I am saying that it is impossible to eliminate war from our history, otherwise history will be falsified, and that it is not in the best interests of the community. The hon. gentleman may refer to Abraham Lincoln, who declared war on behalf of the United States against the Southern States. What was the result of that war? Is it not a fact that the slaves of America were freed? War does certainly disorganise, but it has a tendency to organise. Emerson says again—

“Nothing can bring you peace but yourself. Nothing can bring you peace but the triumph of principles.”

Britain is a peace-loving nation; Australia is a peace-loving nation; but there is food for thought in what great men have said. Washington said—

“To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.”

Longfellow said—

“War is a terrible trade, but in the cause that is righteous sweet is the smell of powder.”

Bacon said—

“Providence for war is the prevention of it.”

Dr. Porteus said—

“War its thousands slays.
Peace its tens of thousands.”

Colton said—

“War kills men, and men deplore the loss, but war also crushes bad principles and tyrants, and so saves society.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Are you advocating war?

Mr. KERR: Nothing of the kind. I have never advocated war. Peace is the fairest form of happiness—peace, in my opinion, is the masterpiece of reason.

The Minister has quoted the statement of Sir Ian Hamilton in support of his action, so I take the liberty of quoting from the diary of Sir Ian Hamilton in regard to the Gallipoli campaign—

“Only the vastness of the stakes, the intensity of the effort made, and the grandeur of the sacrifice still stand out clearly when we in dreams behold the Dardanelles.”

This is the message which Sir Ian Hamilton sent in the middle of the activities on the Peninsula—

“Well done, 29th Division and 156th Brigade. Am watching your splendid work with admiration. Stick to it, and your names will become famous in your homes.”

Sentiments such as these cannot be forgotten by any civilised people. The blessings of peace have been inculcated all through the ages. War has not been confined to civilised peoples. Some of the most ferocious wars have been fought between coloured tribes. You would take away from us a measure of national pride and would rob us of an ideal

and of much that we hold most dear in this world. Even the Turk has some conscience in this matter. In the Gallipoli campaign the Turkish commander issued this order regarding the surrender of some trenches—

“I hope that this will not occur again. I give notice that, if it does, I shall carry out the punishment. I do not desire to see a blot made on the courage of our men by those who escape from the trenches to avoid the rifle and machine gun fire of the enemy.”

Referring to that order, which fell into his hands on the Peninsula, Sir Ian Hamilton, who was quoted by the Minister, had this to say—

“There is a savage ring about these orders, but they are, I am sure, more bracing to the recipients than laments and condolences over their losses.”

The time has arrived when the issues and the facts should be placed before Australia. What are the facts? Just shortly I propose to outline them. Let us look at the naval programme of a coloured nation for 1924, whose losses through the earthquake amounted to 91,500,000 yen, or £9,150,000 sterling. She estimates her naval expenditure for 1924-25 at £23,800,000—with a special amount for naval defence of £10,000,000—and proposes to build in one year two cruisers, fifteen destroyers, and seventeen submarines. Where do we stand? Can we hope to succeed in defence by preaching the gospel of peace?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do you think we should spend £9,000,000 in Queensland?

Mr. KERR: God forbid that we should; but Australia should make provision for her defence.

The CHAIRMAN: Will the hon. member connect his remarks with the vote?

Mr. KERR: I am coming to the vote. So long as the Minister insists on the teachings which he has propounded in the school books, so long will it be difficult to maintain our white Australia. That policy would not be worth a moment's consideration in the face of such odds. So long as it is proposed to eliminate from the school books all teachings of war history, so long will it be difficult to protect this great country of ours. I hope the Minister will keep on explaining for the next generation the causes of war and the capitalistic influences which bring it about. Capitalistic influences! Rather does he prefer—

“Demagogues who preach peace, combined with unrelenting class war. They have no use for the lives of great apostles of freedom.”—

Men who have taken the most prominent part, not in disorganising society, but in organising society after disorganisation. Some of the most advanced legislation has been the result of disorganisation at one stage.

The Minister has attempted to infer that—

“People of the British Empire who suffered through the war would have been saved had the British Cabinet decided not to enter the war.”

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Enter what war?

Mr. KERR: That is his inference—it is surely there. Let us look back to the time

Mr. Kerr.]

when the British Cabinet decided to enter the Great War and try to imagine what would have happened if they had decided otherwise. It was a war with tyrants. Was it not necessary to put the tyrants down? Had there been no capitalistic system, nobody can say what would have happened in a war between a tyrant nation and our own nation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Germany's ideal of world conquest was the cause of the war

Mr. KERR: Other nations entertain the idea of the conquest of Australia, and we should educate our nationhood to defend ourselves. During the war Australia fought shoulder to shoulder with the mother country, with right on our side, for the maintenance and upholding of justice. According to the poets that I have quoted, we fought to defend high principles which have to be maintained in every civilised English-speaking country to-day. Tyrants are only held in check by defensive means. We know that men in every walk of life in all English-speaking communities have taken part in war. They must have had some good reason to prompt them in such a matter. It has been frequently stated that many men entered on war as a pure adventure, but there must have been some other reason that enabled them to carry on so well after the spirit of adventure had cooled down. The children of Queensland should be taught those things more in line with the aims and objects of those men who banded together after the war. I will not read all their aims and objects, but one states—

"To preserve the memory and records of those who suffered and died for the nation."

It is absolutely essential that we teach such sentiment in Australia. They also provided—

"To inculcate loyalty to Australia and the Empire and secure patriotic services in the history of both."

Such sentiments will not lead to war.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They should look after the returned soldiers.

Mr. MAXWELL: They are looking after the returned soldiers better than the hon. gentleman has done. He never did look after them.

Mr. KERR: If we inculcate the sentiments that I have quoted, they will lead, not to war, but will have a tendency to promote peace. No one advocates war to-day, but you cannot deal with an enemy by turning your back on him and walking away. If he is a tyrant he will follow you. If we are going to follow the ideals of Mr. Lemmon, the Minister for Education in Victoria, and the ideals of the Secretary for Public Instruction in Queensland, then there is going to be a bad outlook for Australia. The sentiments are entirely wrong. War is an international movement, and is not going to be prevented merely by certain articles in school books. Australia entered the Great War, and the Australians became perhaps the bravest men in the world at the time. There was some fear that at Gallipoli they might not withstand shell fire, but they subsequently became the leading storm troops of the world on the side of the Allies. Those who returned glory in the brave deeds

[Mr. Kerr.]

of their comrades, and it is absolutely wrong to prevent those glorious deeds being passed down to the children of Australia and Queensland. Queensland alone sent nearly 50,000 men to the front, and the story of their brave deeds should not be allowed to be forgotten in this State. The Minister proposes to inculcate such sentiments as will cause those deeds to die in the minds of future generations, and he should be absolutely ashamed of himself for even considering such a question.

Mr. COLLINS: (Bowen): I have no complaints to make on this vote respecting my own electorate, as everything is fairly satisfactory. Schools are being built, and the children are being taught. I am very pleased at the attitude taken up by the Minister in connection with the teaching of the children of Queensland.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COLLINS: It is all very well to say that Queensland has only a small population of 800,000 people and that that is only a drop in the ocean. The hon. member for Enoggera made some remarks in connection with history, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that there has never been a true history of the world yet written. It remains to be written. It is true that Osborne Ward, in his work, "The Ancient Lowly," has attempted to write—I would not say has written—a history in connection with the struggles and trials of the working population of the various countries of the world, and there is no more painful reading than those two volumes. We all know that war

has always been engineered by a [10.30 a.m.] few persons who at different periods of history have controlled the destinies of the nations of the world. It has never been the great mass of people who have favoured war. They have always been merely pawns in the game. It is to prevent them being the pawns in the game in the future that, I take it, the Minister—and all honour to him—is endeavouring to replace in our school papers and books the present war lessons with the statement that we have outlived war. At the present moment in Europe, according to Mr. E. D. Morel, more men are under arms to-day than there were in 1914. Already the great capitalistic Governments are preparing for another great war. We were told during the last war that it was "a war to end war." That is what we want to teach our children. Why then all this hypocrisy and cant? The leading Liberals and Tories in different parts of the world said again and again that it was "a war to end war." Of course, that was only a pious sentiment so far as they were concerned. It was a popular phrase to use at the time. In my opinion, the only way to end war is to teach the children of the different nations to abhor war. Some nation has to start out in an effort to bring that about. We, as a small State, backed up, I am pleased to say, by one of the largest States in the Commonwealth, namely, Victoria, have started out. I was surprised at a man like the hon. member for Enoggera—who has been through the war, and who has seen what war really is—standing up in this Chamber practically defending war and claiming it was necessary in the interests of civilised society. How can men call themselves civilised when they go on to the battlefield to kill each other? They have not learned the rudiments of

civilisation. We are out to teach our children what civilisation really is, and that is to carry out the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." Why the hypocrisy of it all? Why should we send our children to our schools, teaching them the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," and then in the same breath tell them they are justified in killing on a wholesale scale? I am not one of those who are going to be carried away by the League of Nations. It may be all very well in its way, but, in my opinion, the only way to stop war is by the masses of the people taking the matter in hand themselves. By the masses of people I mean the working classes in the various countries. I believe in the words of Count Tolstoy, that war will cease when the workers refuse to fight. We all know that the commercial crowd, or the people who control the destinies of the earth, will not go on the battlefields to do the fighting, but so long as they can get the working classes to become pawns in the game, wars will go on. I have in my hand a beautiful publication, entitled "The Healing of Nations," by Edward Carpenter, in the course of which he says—

"One cannot but realise that the fighting men in all these nations are the pawns and counters of a game which is being played for the benefit—or supposed benefit—of certain classes; that public opinion is a huge millstream which has to be engineered; that the Press is a channel for its direction, and money the secret power which commands the situation.

"The fact is sad, but it must be faced. And the facing of it leads inevitably to the question, 'How, then, can healing ever come?' If (it will be said) the origin of wars is in the diseased condition of the nations, what prospect is there of their ever ceasing? And one sees at once that the prospect is not immediate. One sees at once that Peace Societies and Nobel Prizes and Hague Tribunals and reforms of the Diplomatic Service and democratic control of Foreign Secretaries, and Quaker and Tolstoyan preachments—though all these things may be good in their way—will never bring us swiftly to the realisation of peace. The roots of the Tree of Life lie deeper."

The writer goes on to point out that the hope is amongst the masses of the people. I have already pointed out that Mr. E. D. Morel indicates that all Europe is practically an armed camp at the present time, looking forward to another war. We all know that the present British Labour Government have endeavoured to effect a treaty with Russia, and that they are being opposed by the Liberal and Tory sections in Great Britain, possibly with a view later on to attacking Russia. I shall quote another extract from this book—

"At this juncture, then, all over Europe, when the classes are failing us and by their underhand machinations continually embracing one nation with another, it is above all necessary that the mass-peoples should move and insist upon the representation of their great unitary and communal life and interests. It is high time that they should open their eyes and see with clear vision what is going on over their heads, and more than high time that they should refuse

to take part in the quarrels of those who (professionally) live upon their labour. It is indeed astonishing that the awakening has been so long in coming; but surely it cannot be greatly delayed now. Underneath all the ambitions of certain individuals and groups; underneath all the greed and chicanery of others; underneath the widespread ignorance, mother of prejudice, which sunders folk of different race or colour—deep down the human heart beats practically the same in all lands, drawing us little mortals together."

"Drawing us little mortals together"—that is, drawing the masses of the people in all lands together. That is the only way, so far as I can see, and I am pleased to think that we are going to start out in that direction here in Queensland. When this vote was under discussion last year I had the pleasure of quoting several authorities against war. I quoted Edward Carpenter, and Sir Philip Gibbs's "Realities of War." We all know that there have been some splendid writers against war in the different periods of the world's history. We have a valuable work in the shape of the novel, "The Shadow of the Sword," by Robert Buchanan, a Scotsman—one of the greatest novels against war that was ever written. There are many others, such as "The Conscript" and "Tolstoi's Sevastopol," which I could quote, dealing with the subject of war, and pointing out its evil effects. I just want to sound a note of warning in regard to the fact of Europe being practically an armed camp. Carpenter says—

"Or again, the millions and millions of Great and Little Russian peasants. Big-framed, big-bearded, patient, friendly, with a great natural gift for association and co-operation, peacefully minded and profoundly religious; yet superstitious and capable of rising at any moment en masse to the call of the great crusade or 'holy war'; it might seem that they hold all Western Europe in the hollow of their hands. Indeed, they constitute not only a hope and promise of deliverance to our modern world, but also a considerable danger. All depends on how we dispose ourselves towards them. Should the nations of Western Europe rouse their hatred by chicanery and mean treatment, the result might be fatal. If their flood once began to move, no battle array of armaments would be of any use—any more than a revolver against a rising tide—the flood would flow round and over us. But if, on the other hand, we could really reach the heart of this great people, if we could treat them really generously and with understanding, we should create a response there, and a recognition, which would remove all risk to ourselves, and possibly help to free Russia from the great burden of political servitude and ignorance which has so long oppressed her peasantry."

I am very pleased with those sentiments, because there lies, as it were, the cure with which we may deal fairly and squarely with the people, and, if we do, it will be one great step towards doing away with war. Then we have men like Walt Whitman dealing with the civil war in the United States. Just think of it! Hundreds of thousands of lives had to be sacrificed to

Mr. Collins.]

bring about the emancipation of the negro—to do away with slavery! Think, too, of all the sacrifices that were made long before the Civil War by men who set out in some cases single-handed, like Lloyd Garrison with his little printing press in Boston, standing alone against the millions in the United States of America. Later he was backed up by some of the intellectual forces of that country who realised that slavery was wrong. But, notwithstanding all the agitation that took place, it required the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of human lives to bring about the emancipation of the negro. Teach that lesson in our school books by all means. Let the children be taught to hate war. Let them be taught to understand what is upright and true. Let them be taught the best that is in our literature in connection with the condemnation of war. Let them be taught all these things. Let them be taught that, while the emancipation of the negro was brought about by education on the one hand and the sacrifice of human life on the other, we still have to bring about the emancipation of man from himself, or, in other words, the emancipation of man from man. That can only be accomplished by commencing in our schools. It may take a long time. But when one reads the history of the past, when one reads the story of the fight that took place in different nations for constitutional rights—for the right to govern themselves by constitutional means—when one realises the long struggles of the past, there is no need to be disheartened at all.

I want to congratulate the Secretary for Public Instruction, the Government, the party in general, and the Labour movement in general, upon having the courage to attack one of the curses of mankind and to make one step forward to do away with that horrible state of affairs that we recently saw in Europe, when 7,000,000 of the youth of Europe were sacrificed—for what? Let hon. members opposite answer that question! For what? To bring about the regeneration of the human race? If that were so—just the same as the sacrifices on the battle fields of America—it may have been justified. But, if it is not going to bring about the regeneration of the human race—if it is only going to bring about war upon war—then what was the use of that sacrifice? What was the use of the sacrifice of the flower of Europe? The hon. member for Enoggera quoted Napoleon. It would have been the best thing for Europe had Napoleon never lived. Napoleon destroyed the youth of France, and no one to-day can tell what France would have been if she had been able to build up from the youth of France instead of having had to build up from the decrepit, the old, and the unfit. If wars should continue we shall go on destroying civilisation and we shall have the historians of the future writing of the decay of modern civilisation. I have no time for men like Napoleon—no time for men who are always anxious to destroy the youth of a nation. Too many of our youths in Australia were destroyed in the Great War. A young country like ours sacrificed 50,000 of the brightest of our youth in the European war. We could not afford it. If, by putting the lessons in the school papers which he proposes, the Minister can help to do away with what we know as war, he will have accomplished a great deal, and

[*Mr. Collins.*

his name will go down in history as that of a man who has had the courage to attack one of the diseases that exists amongst mankind.

Mr. CORSER (*Burnett*): The hon. member for Enoggera has contributed some very wise remarks, and we owe him a debt of gratitude for expressing himself in the way he did. I must object to the insinuation of the hon. member for Bowen that the hon. member for Enoggera by his remarks supported war. He did not. He pointed out the necessity of defence, and that preparation for war was more likely to prevent war than the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Bowen—that we should leave ourselves open for attack, and that that was the best way to prevent the other fellow from coming along. If that is the case, how is it that the hon. member's friends in Russia believe in the conscription of the whole of their man power, not only to defend themselves against outsiders, but to defend themselves against their foes within? The hon. member for Bowen looks at the Opposition with a scowl, as though they were responsible for the European war. He has lectured us for some twenty minutes because he blames us for the war that took place on the other side. If we are blamable for such a thing, how is it that his great leader, Mr. Andrew Fisher, said that Australia would find her last man and the last shilling to defend Australia and the Empire against the attack that was being made at that time? We believe that those who fell for that cause fell in fighting an attack against democracy. We believe that they fought for a noble cause. We are not going to listen to an attack on those who lost their lives and gave the best that was in them, and an attack against those homes which gave a sacrifice which can never be repaid to them. We cannot allow it to be said to-day that the people who went to the war did something against humanity, when we know that they took up the responsibility for us who are here to-day enjoying the peace which is made possible by the sacrifices that they made.

We know, too, that their own leader, the late Mr. Ryan, said "One recruit to-day is worth two recruits to-morrow." There we had Labour's own leader at that time urging young men to go away, and telling them that one man in the ranks to-day was worth two men to-morrow. Why does the hon. member for Bowen scowl at us as if we are responsible for something which was imposed on us by the enemies of Christianity?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CORSER: Why does the hon. member say that an hon. member who addresses himself to this debate is advocating war, when he is advocating the principle that he is out to curtail war and make it impossible for a foreign foe to attack us? The hon. member for Bowen says that we should not know anything of war and the use of means of destruction of mankind. Who was responsible for our citizen force being organised and trained in Australia but the Labour party?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. CORSER: The Labour party introduced our defence scheme. The very scheme we are to-day working under throughout the Commonwealth of Australia found its birth in the Labour movement. The Labour party are responsible for the military training

which is going on. The big men in the Labour movement, who saw the necessity for it and who started it, are responsible, and they showed their wisdom in that regard. Yet an individual member of that party in this Chamber gets up—and the Secretary for Public Instruction will probably do the same—and says that we should exclude from the minds of the children that which has been placed there by capitalists in capitalistic countries. We all know that those who wish for peace most are those who are prepared to say that we should be in a position to defend ourselves against a foe.

It is all right for us to teach the children about the horrors of war; but is that the teaching which will fit us for a struggle with the hordes of Asia, if it should occur? Are we in any way defending ourselves against the Japanese, the Chinese, or anyone else by laying ourselves open to attack? Are we preparing ourselves for the hordes in Russia who may some day come along under a Soviet Administration in an endeavour to conquer the world? Are we to pave the way for such a catastrophe by laying down our arms as an example to them? That is the inference that must be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks; but no sentiment has been expressed by supporters of men on this side or by hon. members here along the lines suggested by hon. members opposite. It is not fair to try to place the blame for the Great European war on the individuals who occupy the Opposition benches at the present time.

The hon. member for Bowen also stated—if I heard him correctly—that more men are under arms in Europe to-day than there were in 1914.

Mr. COLLINS: That is so.

Mr. CORSER: Yet hon. members opposite have claimed that Europe to-day is practically democratic and is in the hands of the workers. It is contended that the great power of the Czar and the Kaiser and many of the autocrats of the past is gone.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member endeavour to get somewhere near the vote?

Mr. CORSER: I am trying to localise the question. I am dealing with the criticism of the hon. member for Bowen. He claims that we should educate our future people of Queensland as to the necessity of not going to war, teaching them about the horrors of war and instructing them in the idea that it will not be necessary at any time to defend our shores, provided we inculcate in our children a horror of war. It seems curious that the whole of the debate on this vote should be absorbed by such a discussion, but, of course, we must blame the Minister in charge of the department for the trouble he has caused in so misrepresenting the case, because we know that the necessity for the defence of one's country and an appreciation of the great sacrifices of those who have gone are always great things to teach the children. We all should realise that it is essential to let them know that the peace and freedom which we hope will be theirs have been won by the sacrifices of others. There is never any harm in telling them that.

To get more closely to the vote itself, I want to say that the Department of Public Instruction is hampered by the fact that it does not control the funds appropriated by Parliament to carry out its schemes. If

some expenditure on a school is approved of by the Department of Public Instruction, that department is dependent on another department for the expenditure of that money. I really do not believe the Department of Public Instruction will come into its own until it has the management of the spending of the funds which it requires for the building and the reconstruction and improvement of schools. Hon. members will realise that justice cannot be done to this department until it is placed in that position, and I hope that the Minister will take upon himself the duty of determining that he will exercise in his department complete control over the expenditure of the money granted to him, and spend it in such a way and at such a time as he and his officers think best, instead of allowing the business to be managed by an outside department.

I want to pay a tribute to the permanent heads of the department. The heads of the various branches are responsible in no small degree for the high esteem in which the department is held by members on both sides of this Chamber. While saying that, I want also to add that unfortunately we do find very large buildings being constructed in the metropolitan area while some of our country districts are being starved in that respect. No less than nine schools have been applied for to date for the Upper Burnett and Callide Valley district, to provide educational facilities for the children of the new settlers who are settling there. Up to the present it has not been possible to secure those buildings, possibly because the money is not handled or controlled by the Department of Public Instruction, but is controlled from outside. I sincerely urge that everything possible should be done to provide educational facilities for those children at the earliest opportunity. Recently I had the honour of going through my electorate with the late Secretary for Public Instruction, and I regretted to see that many promises that he had made in connection with improvements, etc., had not been fulfilled, and the improvements that he saw were necessary have not yet been attended to. The late Secretary for Public Instruction did not make those promises wildly, and I hope that provision will be made for educational facilities to relieve the overcrowding of schools that the late Minister witnessed for himself. There is an increase of £5 for the head of one of the sub-departments. I do not know what is the reason for such a small increase.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Whom is that for?

Mr. CORSER: For the building and sites clerk. That seems to be a very small increase in salary.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I believe the position requires to be re-classified.

Mr. CORSER: It is to be hoped that the Minister will re-classify the new position.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a matter for the Public Service Commissioner. I will recommend that.

Mr. CORSER: I am glad to hear the Minister make that remark. Hon. members are a considerable worry to all branches of this department, and we naturally want to feel that no injustice is being done to a man by way of salary. If he is fully paid,

Mr. Corser.]

then we do not mind getting at him properly. I hope the Minister will consider the question of renovating and enlarging the various schools in my electorate, and the question of providing additional schools in the Upper Burnett district so that the children in that area can be educated.

Mr. BEDFORD (*Warrego*): The report of the Department of Public Instruction shows two items specially demonstrative of the Government's desires to extend educational facilities to those far-off parts of Queensland which are not immediately open to schools in the ordinary way. The itinerant teachers, numbering fourteen, travelled 63,376 miles and visited 1,737 children during 1923. Unfortunately, owing to the small amount available, the result has been that in many cases the itinerant schoolmaster has been able to make only two visits a year, or two visits in fifteen months to the same set of children. That has to a large extent been replaced by the department's scheme for correspondence tuition. The general position as to that is that 1,035 children are being taught by correspondence by nineteen teachers. This is a matter that might well be extended, and it can only be extended by discovering those children in the far-off places in Queensland who are not only out of the reach of schools but out of the reach of the itinerant teachers.

[11 a.m.]

Generally the whole scheme of education requires altering or modifying, because we are still subjected in education to the conventional lies of our grandfathers. It is easy to recognise in all communities in which there is a conspiracy to keep the truth out of history that necessarily hypocrisy will be carried on the education in the schools. It is quite easy to see that the fear or fancy of the potentate of the time has made the historian generally a hypocrite and a liar. It would be almost too much to ask for the true story of any time in the Middle Ages. No historian of the time dare tell the truth of Henry VIII., of his being a sadistic murderer, when he had a chopping-block to answer any criticism levelled at him. That habit of hypocrisy has extended to our own times, and we even find in the time of a great poet like Tennyson, when it was not necessary for a man to be in fear of his life, but when it was necessary for a man who wished to be the Poet Laureate to watch his steps, that Tennyson told comfortable lies to the people who had the job in their gift. His works are starred with the shocking lie that Queen Victoria was pre-eminent in grief because her husband had died, when, as an actual fact, she did not lose her meal ticket when she lost her husband. Right throughout history, and extending into our school books, hon. members will find lie on lie, based on the alleged glories of war. I am not a man who believes that war or the necessity for war will be wiped out by a stroke of the pen, but I am thoroughly satisfied that war will depart from this earth because of two reasons—firstly, because death will become so absolutely certain that it will take every chance of escaping out of war; and secondly, that the general masses of the working people of the countries who in the past have formed "cannon fodder" will refuse to be made "cannon fodder" any longer.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

[*Mr. Corser.*]

Mr. BEDFORD: That time may be a long way off. The old superstitions have been taught for the last thousand years. It would be a bad thing if the happy civilisation growing in Australia was suddenly wiped out by a more warlike and less civilised force. For the time being we must regard war as ever being a possibility, but in teaching the history of war to the children in the schools we should avoid teaching them that all nations who fought Britain were scoundrels, while Britain remained the pure merino. We should teach them that the Boer War was one of the worst acts of spoliation of a little nation by a big nation on record. We should teach them that Britain forced war on China in order to force on that country the opium trade of British growers in India. We should teach them that in every war British bishops asked the Almighty to protect the pious English with machine guns against the unrighteous heathen who were armed with clubs. The effect of these lies has permeated life to such an extent that we will not tell our children the truth. We leave to the Bible the job of giving children false ideas of life; glorifying the mean Jacob, the adulterous, murderous David, the panderous Abraham. We will not tell the true story of Esther and Ahasuerus, nor teach the salient biological fact of sex in decency and order. Instead, it is taught nastily by the Bible, with the incest of Lot and the rape of Tamar. Instead of telling them distinctly and honestly the facts of life, we still hypocritically lead them to believe until the age of puberty that they were brought into this world by the doctor and the stork. The whole system of education is rotten and wrong. For instance, in one Royal Reader, out of 115 items no less than twenty-five were in glorification of war. Not any war has produced any great piece of literature; for, strangely enough, just as it is destructive of man so it is destructive of thought. If you talked the truth of war children would be told that the poem, "The Battle of Hohenlinden," was all piffle, and that when old Kasper said of the Battle of Blenheim, "But 'twas a famous victory," it was meant as gentle satire. The Commonwealth censors, by the way, during the war censored that out of publication, just as they censored the Sermon on the Mount.

Every hon. member must know that people are engaged for at least 10 years of their lives after leaving school in unlearning the lies that were put into them there. It is patent that the passion for academic study closes the mind to every new truth. We still teach children that twelve pence make one shilling, twenty shillings one pound, and three barleycorns make one inch. The teaching of the metric system in the schools would lessen the learning of the children by one half, and it would considerably reduce the labours of accountancy and commerce.

Mr. HARTLEY: The present system trebles the cost to the manufacturer.

Mr. BEDFORD: The teaching of that rubbish to the children is merely a tribute to the fact that it was the system taught of old, and therefore it must continue to be taught.

Mr. KELSO: You would like the children to be taught how to make sliding panels. (Laughter.)

Mr. BEDFORD: No, not unless it would make a sliding panel to cover the hon. member for 200 years. (Laughter.) Education has to be looked on with a new eye in consequence of the miseducativeness of the newspapers. The "Daily Mail" only discovered Boorooloola the other day, although it had been in existence for forty-five years. The "Courier" apparently only knew of the existence of Alice Springs, although it was in existence fifty years ago, after Steffansen, Arctic explorer and polar bear fancier, visited there recently.

Mr. KELSO: Some of your articles in the "Bulletin" are practically tripe.

Mr. BEDFORD: The intelligence of the hon member would naturally make the "Blundah" from Nundah say that. This is the kind of stuff that these tremendously intelligent Imperialists wish to keep going in Australian school books—

"The north wind doth blow,
And we shall have snow."

(Laughter.) That is not true. "The north wind doth blow; and we shall have the best wool in the world." Again—

"The rabbit is a pretty animal with long, soft ears"—

like the hon. members of the Opposition. Or, again—

"We love to watch them in the clover,
but cruel men kill them with a gun."

Again—

"Come out, 'tis now September,
The harvest moon is done,
And thro' the wheaten stubble
Is heard the distant gun."

We all know that is not true. (Laughter.) For the advanced scholar we require a new and true Australian history. When the wild Imperialist addresses the school children, and says, "Dear old England gave you this country. Dear old England made this country," we require to tell those students that the adventurers, the strong and discontented of all the world, came to this country and made it, that they were led here by the lure of gold, and, therefore, Australia has not been made by "Dear old England," but by Australian gold and the adventurers of all the world; that our liberties have not been graciously given to us as an emperor gives a last year's robe on a platter to a slave. We require to tell the young Australians that if revolution was ever a great and glorious thing, it is proved by the defence of Eureka Stockade, and that, although the patriots who fought there seemed to fail, they really succeeded, because to-day we have all the things that Eureka stood for.

We should tell Australians the truth so that we may make them better men, and so that they will not have to put in eight or ten years of their manhood in forgetting and correcting most of the early lies which were driven into them. They would then be so much better fitted for the business of life. They would learn to love their own country—which is the only country worth living for—more than before, and they will learn, for instance, when reading of "the last man and the last shilling"—that historic slogan of Andrew Fisher's—that Australia has really finished with that quotation so far as assisting foreign countries in war is concerned, that we kept our word and gave to foreign war the last man and the last shilling it shall

ever have from us. True Australian history should be compulsory in our school papers because it will assist in building up the character of our nation, in teaching the child to develop himself by not being cluttered up with lies, and would give him that self-knowledge, self-reverence, and self-control which so many of us now so sadly lack.

HON. J. G. APPEL (*Albert*): The vote for the Department of Public Instruction is one of great interest to those who represent country electorates, for the reason that, when settlement is taking place in those electorates, the necessity for school accommodation is continually arising. It is to the Department of Public Instruction that we must look, and it is to that department that we are compelled to look, so that we may secure the facilities for the early training of our children, and assist in the settlement and development of our State. I quite agree with the statement made by the hon. member for Burnett that in many instances the Department of Public Instruction realises the urgency of particular cases and approves of the construction of a school. Naturally, the school committee then think the whole matter is at an end, and that the school will be erected. Unfortunately, that is only the commencement of trouble, because another department steps in, and it is a question whether that other department will honour the approval of the Department of Public Instruction, however urgent the case may be. I urge that the Department of Public Instruction should have a greater amount of administrative authority in connection with the expenditure of money necessary to erect schools which have been approved by the department.

Another matter I would like to impress upon the Minister is that I understand no more shelter-sheds are to be erected in country schools—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The galvanised iron only will be supplied.

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am glad that at least something is being done. It is a very unfortunate position, because in some instances the schools—which are only small ones just able to accommodate the pupils who attend—are not built sufficiently high from the ground. The result is that the children are compelled to go into the schools under certain weather conditions, and that is not conducive to good discipline, because a certain amount of disorder takes place when children have to play in the schoolroom. They must either go in that schoolroom or be exposed to the prevailing weather conditions. I am glad that something is being done in the way of supplying shelter-sheds, but I am still of the opinion that complete shelter accommodation is absolutely necessary for our children in the country districts, and it should be treated as an urgent matter.

We must realise the fact that imperfect country school accommodation tends to add to the influx into our large centres of population. In our large centres—take Brisbane for instance—there is a multiplication of first-class scholastic establishments. The contrary is the case in the country. We are faced with the fact that it is urgently necessary that our people should go on the land, yet we do not make it attractive by providing that school accommodation which is so essential.

Hon. J. G. Appel.]

So far as the permanent staff of the Department of Public Instruction are concerned, I must pay tribute to them, that so far as lies in their power they do everything they can to assist hon. members. The courtesy which has been shown to me by the Under Secretary down to any junior official with whom I have come into contact, is such that deserves every commendation. I am very pleased indeed to take this opportunity of thanking the officials who do, and strive to do, all they can to assist in accomplishing that which should be the object not only of every hon. member in this Chamber but of every member of the community—the furthering of the education of our children, no matter where situated.

I notice that a very considerable discussion has taken place in connection with a certain pronouncement or edict which has been promulgated by the Secretary for Public Instruction. This morning I heard different speeches made upon the subject of whether or not all references to the wars in which the Empire has been engaged should be eliminated from our school books.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That statement was never made by me. You must keep to the statement I made.

HON. J. G. APPEL: What was it?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That we should eliminate from our school books anything that is likely to inflame the mind of youth with a desire for war.

HON. J. G. APPEL: That makes it rather a difficult proposition. I fail to realise how the hon. gentleman is going to draw the line. Probably the position which has been taken up by the Minister for Public Instruction in Victoria has had a reflex action upon the Secretary for Public Instruction in the State of Queensland.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No; he backed down in the matter.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Yes, and it appears that the hon. gentleman proposes to back down also.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I do not. Make no mistake about that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: Whether the hon. gentleman is genuine or not I am not prepared to say; but, considering the principles he has no doubt inherited, probably he is genuine, and pressure has been brought to bear upon him.

It is a somewhat difficult question, and I would like a little information from the hon. gentleman as to how he is going to deal with the matter. What portions of these historical records is he going to eliminate? I know that as a school boy I took a great interest, in common with my fellow school mates, in such things as "Deeds that won the Empire." Going back into ancient history, it was with the greatest interest that we read of the fine defence of the pass of Thermopylae by Leonidas, the Spartan king. Is it suggested by the Minister that all these historical facts will inflame the minds of the youth, and does he propose to eliminate them?

Then, in connection with our secondary education. Take the classics. Take Cæsar's "De Bello Gallico" and his "Commentaries." How is he going to deal with them? Is it proposed to eliminate those works from the educational subjects? Then,

[Hon. J. G. Appel.

what about Homer's famous "Iliad"? Is that to be eliminated from our classics? Then what about Virgil's "Æneid" and those famous lines commencing—

"Arma virumque cano Trojaeque."
(I sing of arms of men and Trojans.)

Will those works inflame the minds of our youth?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: State school boys?

HON. J. G. APPEL: I am talking about secondary education. Is that to be eliminated—you teach Latin in your secondary schools, do you not? If you do eliminate all these matters, what will be left? That is what we want to know. I am not here to object to the decision which has been made by the Minister, because it does not matter how much I object, if he has been instructed that these matters are to be excised from the school books, they will be excised, no matter what we say or how we say that they cause a patriotic feeling when we are at an impressionable age. I am only inquiring what is going to be left if you excise all these matters, because there is not a history in which the patriotic deeds of the particular people are not described. You will have nothing left. There is not a classic that does not deal with the subject of war.

Mr. BRUCE: Teach the history of modern times.

HON. J. G. APPEL: If you deal with modern times you will get still more of it, because the history of our own age is replete with war and warfare. If you are going to eliminate that, what is left? It will be just a skeleton. It will have no backbone, no legs, and nothing else. It will simply be a phantom.

Mr. BRUCE: War will be eliminated.

HON. J. G. APPEL: What is war?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Have you ever been to a pacifists' meeting?

HON. J. G. APPEL: No.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, that is war? (Laughter.)

HON. J. G. APPEL: What is war? Does it comprise alone the meeting of men who are trained to arms, or does it likewise include men who are incited, as I have heard them incited by the hon. member for Bowen, to engage in class warfare? If that is going to be cut out, then I will give the Minister my support. I have heard the hon. member for Bowen, who most eloquently discussed this matter this morning, preach class warfare and class consciousness. Mr. Pollock, I dare say you have heard him yourself, and we all heard the words that fell from the lips of the hon. member this morning. After those remarks I cannot realise that he ever advocated internecine and class warfare, which, to my mind, is equally as bad, so far as this community is concerned, as the meeting of men to fight for their own country against the impositions or otherwise of men of another country. It is most unfortunate that the hon. member for Bowen introduced the question of Sovietism.

Mr. COLLINS: I never mentioned the word "Sovietism."

HON. J. G. APPEL: The hon. member mentioned the régime which governs Russia at the present time, and quoted from a book which was written before the doings of the present Government of Russia were initiated

In criticising the actions of certain hon. members of the Liberal party in objecting to the treaty with Soviet Russia, does the hon. gentleman approve of that Government dealing with their opponents in the way they do—shooting them down wholesale? Does he approve of that? It shows the hollowness and the farce of the whole thing, when in supporting the actions of the Soviet Government hon. members on the other side ignore the cruellest acts of the men whom they support.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Do you want more war stories in the school books?

HON. J. G. APPEL: We do not want more mere war stories, but no man in the community should be ashamed of the "Deeds that Won the Empire."

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No one is ashamed of them.

HON. J. G. APPEL: All deeds of arms are due to the courage of the sons of the Empire. Then what about that lecture on the flag? Is that going to be cut out, too? In one of the old school papers there is a full description of the flag and of the heroic and patriotic actions which led to the building up of the flag—the emblem of our country? Is that to be eliminated? I have no doubt the hon. member desires to be honest in his condemnation of war. I do not think there is a member of this Committee who desires to see war, or who approves of war, or who would not like to see war done away with. The statement of the Minister that all these deeds are to be eliminated from the historical records of our schools is like the action of the ostrich which is said to hide its head in the sand.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Eliminate all matters that are likely to inflame the mind in favour of war.

HON. J. G. APPEL: We do not want to inflame the mind. But, as was said by the hon. member for Enoggera, you must be prepared for war.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Who said you must not?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Historians tell us that the battles of Great Britain have been won upon the playgrounds of our public schools. Is the Minister going to forbid football, cricket, and other games?

[11.30 a.m.]

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I will put bowls there, too, if you like.

HON. J. G. APPEL: What about boxing? Is that going to be eliminated?

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I am going to encourage that.

HON. J. G. APPEL: This seems to me to be something of a paradox. I think the Minister is going to be tangled up. He was tied up with regard to silos at one time, and I am afraid that he is going to be tangled up in this matter. (Laughter).

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You got tangled up in your name at one time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

HON. J. G. APPEL: No, my name stands, and it has stood for centuries. It is a name I am proud of. Perhaps the Minister who has interjected is not so proud of his. However,

that is only by the way. Has the Minister gone into this subject yet? Has he got a school paper in which he has exercised his censorial pen? I think it would be well if the members of the Committee had an opportunity of seeing what is left in that case. We had a very learned dissertation from the hon. member for Warrego, who apparently has been pursuing his studies in divinity, because he appears to have delved deeper and deeper into biblical history. I can only say, as I said on a previous occasion, that if he pursues his studies still further, it may do him no harm. However, apparently he has not yet arrived at that period in his studies where an improvement may be effected. There is another paradox here. How is this country to be preserved as a White Australia, with nations around us which have not got the aspirations which we have, if we are not prepared for war, and our children in the coming generation are to be taught to regard war with horror? While we may teach them to regard war with horror, to my mind, if our White Australia policy is to be preserved—if we are to keep this great land of ours for a pure white people—then it is absolutely necessary, when occasion offers, to be prepared to meet attacks by those who have already cast covetous and longing eyes upon the fertile areas of Australia and tropical Queensland particularly. If our children are not to be inspired by the deeds of their forefathers—if they are not to obtain an inspiration from what has been done by their forefathers in preserving the integrity of the race—what will the position be? However much we may deplore war or whatever may be the cause of it—I am not going to analyse that question—what position would we have been in to-day if it had not been for those sons of the Empire, many of whom perhaps might be stigmatised to-day as criminals, freebooters, and pirates, but who went forth in their ill-found vessels and who acquired for the Empire those areas which are being settled by a free and independent white people, the descendants of the people of the motherland? Are we, who are enjoying these great privileges in this great Commonwealth of Australia, going to condemn the men who by their adventure and courage obtained this fair land for us? The whole thing to my mind is a burlesque.

MR. COLLINS: What about India?

HON. J. G. APPEL: Have all these matters to be eliminated from the school papers? If all references to the valiant deeds of the men who made the Empire are to be eliminated, then not a skeleton but a mere phantom only will remain of that glorious patriotic and stirring literature. I would impress on the Minister the necessity of including in the school papers such matter as will cause better feeling to obtain amongst the classes in place of the class consciousness which the hon. member for Bowen and others have continuously endeavoured to propagate; and to endeavour to impress upon the children that, if we are to succeed in this country, it will only be by united effort and working hand in hand to accomplish that which will be of mutual benefit to every member of the community and to the State itself.

MR. DUNSTAN (Gympie): In speaking on this important vote for Education, I do not intend to follow the example of some writers and observers, or even that of one noted educationalist of recent date in thinking that

Mr. Dunstan.]

a cursory survey makes the basis for a dogmatic judgment. All I ask is that there shall be rational and clear thinking and common-sense in regard to the development of our educational system. I particularly ask for that clear and rational thinking and common-sense in regard to the treatment of the subject of peace and war in our school literature. I am certain that the Secretary for Public Instruction will carefully treat those matters in the changes he proposes to make in our school readers. The reply he gave recently to a question asked in this Chamber shows the necessity for the present generation of having such views of war from leaders of public thought put into our school literature.

The discussion that has been aroused on this important matter brings us to this question: Shall we present to the youthful mind in our schools the horrors and brutalities of war, the sordid realities of international strife, the awful consequences that follow in the wake of war, the hypocrisy, greed, and self-aggrandisement that promote war, or shall we completely ignore the subject, and imagine like the ostrich that an inch of obscurity makes for a whole measure of concealment? Personally, I am in the ultimate neither a pacifist nor a jingo. My attitude is best illustrated by the story of the prominent London pacifists during the late great conflict. While they were holding a peace meeting in a public hall they were assailed by hostile jingoes, who hurled bricks at them through the windows. What did those pacifists do? They stood it for a little while, but not for long. They hurled those bricks back. They hurled them back vigorously, effectively, and with great spirit, and in that they were not inconsistent. They were merely natural. Believing truly in pacifism, they were ready to fight for it.

That brings me to this question. In picturing war as it really is or in avoiding the discussion of it, shall we refuse to acknowledge or praise those high qualities of human kind—courage, self-sacrifice, and service—which can even give the glamour of glory to an evil thing? Are we to ignore the subject, or are we to seek to exalt and extol those high attributes of independence, courage, self-sacrifice, and service, which have already made their mark in the part which has been taken by Australians in the great world conflict. I ask that the question should be presented to the youthful mind in a picture of a man of high ideals seeking noble service and following noble thoughts, desiring only to live in amity with his fellows, and by example and by wisdom to lift them to a higher plane of thought and conduct, yet not scorning preparation for the enemy without the gate. Should he be at all times for peace? Would he be wrong to resist and fight, and, if necessary, to slay? Some will say that it will be wrong for him to do so. Better for him, they would cry, to lay down his life for a principle than to live by doing wrong. But is self-defence wrong? And, if it is not wrong, is preparation for defence wrong? What should a noble living man, martyr-like in regard to his own life, do when an enemy, with blood-dripping bayonet, assails the vitals of his wife and family and seeks the destruction of his home? What should he do if some barbarian with a club assails his brother, his mate, or some weak and helpless human creature within his ken? What action should he take? Should he merely cry "Peace. Peace!" when there is no peace? These are

[*Mr. Dunstan.*

questions which must necessarily be treated when dealing with the question of war and peace in instructing the minds of our youth. I say that if we exalt these high attributes that make for manhood and for nationhood, we are not to be charged with the glorification of war. When I say that the deeds of Australians in the late great conflict made the name of Australia great, set with the lustre of gems and glory ineffaceable, am I to be charged with glorifying war, or merely with extolling those attributes of Australian manhood which must and will prevail when peace is established amongst the nations and "the war drums throb no more"? That, of course, expresses the idea I have in my mind—a fair and accurate presentation of these subjects in our school literature. Personally, I can say that I, like the London pacifists, am strongly for peace—peace with honour—at any rate, peace with certain reservations.

The subject of psychology teaching, so capably discussed by the hon. member for Rockhampton, is one that must demand the full attention of the modern educationalist, but it must also be recognised that such teaching brings certain implications. If there is to be in the Department of Public Instruction a number of trained teachers—trained in the psychological understanding of the mentality and capacity of their pupils—it necessarily follows that there must be more individual teaching on the part of those who staff our schools—high schools especially—as distinct from collective or class teaching. That in its turn means smaller classes, which in their turn mean more teachers; and more teachers mean more expenditure on education. More expenditure means more funds must be provided by the people of this State, so that in the ultimate, if the people of Queensland want more and better education, they must be prepared to pay for it.

Mr. FARRELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. DUNSTAN: There is also this circumstance to be considered—that, whilst teachers may be trained in psychology, the scholars themselves possess a very large natural fund of it. In most cases they are able to sum up the teacher long before the teacher has his pupils assessed. One of the chief difficulties which beset the teachers, especially in our higher schools, is that scholars quickly come and go and sojourn for but a little while under the tutelage of any particular teacher. So that, if we are to develop character through psychology in our public schools, we are also bound to face the consequences of some change in the staffing of teachers as well as in our expenditure. Many of us remember with affection and respect some of those old teachers of our youthful days, not because they were great educationalists or because they were great disciplinarians, but because they were kind, because they were fine types of men and women, because they sought to make us not merely educated but also endeavoured with words of wisdom to lead us to a better life and become good citizens of the Commonwealth. More than all this, we remember them because they understood us and helped us, or tried to help us, to a better understanding of the things that matter.

Which leads me to say in conclusion that, whilst the influence of the teacher psychologically trained must be great and profound, his responsibility also must be very great

but that, whatever may be the responsibility of the teacher, the responsibility of the public in understanding the teacher's responsibility is greater still.

Mr. KELSO (*Yundah*): This is a most important vote, but the statement which has been made by the Secretary for Public Instruction seems to have overshadowed the importance of the department itself. The discussion this morning has been on lines which I think are unprecedented in the history of this vote, and the hon. gentleman—whether he is doing it for notoriety or not I do not know—has certainly concentrated the debate on himself this morning.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Why not keep quiet and let us get to work?

Mr. KELSO: I am making my own speech in my own way, and, if the hon. gentleman desires, I shall be able to give him something to think about in a minute or two. It is very pleasant to find that the people of Queensland will not object to the money which is being spent on education—especially on primary education. We find that this year about a million of money is being spent. We are warned of the danger of the lack of education in a community by the example we have had of Russia for many years past. It has been said that the greatest danger to any State is an uneducated democracy. We know perfectly well that years ago the franchise might have been given to the Russian nation had it not been for the fact that intellectually they were mere babies and could not understand the movements going on round them.

The report of this department has been of great use to us. It has come in time for us to look through it before we had to discuss this vote. One matter to which I wish to refer in particular is the fact that most of the school inspectors in their very illuminating reports deplore the fact that history is not taught as it should be, and that there is not enough attention given to it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not to Australian history.

Mr. KELSO: One of the inspectors suggests that the teachers themselves have not read widely enough on history to impress the children.

Mr. LLOYD: The same could be said of some of the inspectors.

Mr. KELSO: I am in favour of the suggestion that Australian history should be taught more and more. We ought to know the history of our own land, but we cannot know our own history properly unless we know the history of other lands.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The children in New South Wales are writing to me for information about Queensland.

Mr. KELSO: Every hon. member on this side is of the opinion that it is a good thing that the children should be taught Australian history; but it is impossible to teach even Australian history unless you teach the history which goes further back from that. We cannot understand our own times unless we know the history of other times in order to make a just comparison. In teaching history it is only a fair thing that both sides should be given in order that the children may grow up to under-

stand the true position. That is where the Minister has made a mistake.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: It is not necessary to give both sides. It is only necessary to give the truth.

Mr. KELSO: It is not a question of truth at all; it is a question of fact.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Fact is truth.

Mr. KELSO: Hon. members on this side do not believe in war any more than the hon. gentlemen says he does not, but, if you are going to study the history of Australia, you must relate the facts as they are and allow the children to draw their own deductions. The hon. gentleman cannot question that. It is a fact that many undesirable things have been recorded in history. One hon. gentleman the other day suggested that the lives of the kings and queens were not above suspicion.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There are no two sides to the truth.

Mr. KELSO: I am pleased that we have Bible teaching in the State schools. I do not know whether hon. gentlemen agree with that or not. What is the nature of the history contained in the Bible? Are all the great characters that we read about in the Bible represented as being saints? Is it not a fact that the frailties of some of the greatest men in the Bible are set out in just the same way as their virtues? Is it not a proper thing that that should be so? Unless you put the full facts before the people, you do not set before them the real facts of history. Considering the money we are spending on primary education, it is to be deplored that, when children leave school, there seems to be a disinclination on their part—whether it is due to the care-free air of Australia or not I do not know—to continue their reading, and thus continue the education they have received in the primary schools, and by the study of literature become cultured people.

Unfortunately the tendency of the time seems to be to pay too much attention to sport. Many children, after leaving school and up to the age of twenty, can glibly recite to you a lot of statistics about racing and other forms of sport; but, if you ask them an intelligent question on political economy or even in connection with this Chamber, they are all at sea. They will tell you frankly that they are too tired to study politics.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: I do not blame them.

Mr. KELSO: I do not condemn the newspapers altogether, but it is a pity that our great dailies do not devote more space in reporting political matters. We know perfectly well that many people travelling in the trains often ask what is going on in Parliament. They naturally depend on the papers for that information, but when we open our morning paper we find two or three pages devoted to sport of every description.

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: I suggest that they report members verbatim for a week. They would not ask for any more reports.

Mr. KELSO: I want to quote from the "Courier" to show that a certain gentleman in the Victorian Parliament—Mr. Lemmon—proposed to do the same as our Secretary for

Mr. Kelso.)

Public Instruction in connection with the school books.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not the same.

Mr. KELSO: A similar thing.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: You are absolutely wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No—different altogether.

Mr. KELSO: I want to quote the "Courier" to show that the Labour party in Victoria are not going to follow on the lines suggested by our own Minister. The report states—

"In view of Mr. Brennan's design to eliminate all reference to war. . . ."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is untrue to start with. The "Courier" lied when it said that.

Mr. KELSO: The hon. gentleman will have an opportunity of dealing with the matter later on. The article continues—

" . . . and war heroes from the school papers and books, it may be interesting to note what is being done in Victoria, where a Labour Minister for Education (Mr. Lemmon) has been credited with a similar purpose. Apparently, Mr. Lemmon's ultra pacifism has been exaggerated. At a recent meeting of the Victorian Council of Education, Dr. Alex. Lepper, moved a comprehensive resolution, which indicated that the Minister has no intention of emulating or inspiring Mr. Brennan. The resolution, which was seconded by Miss Montgomery and carried unanimously, was as follows:—'That this Council is relieved to learn that the order reported to have been issued by the Minister for Education (Mr. Lemmon), instructing officers of the department that no article relating to or extolling wars, battles, or heroes of past wars, should be printed in the State school papers, or books, has no foundation in fact. The Council sympathises with Mr. Lemmon in the wide-spread misrepresentation to which he has been subjected.'

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to connect his remarks with this vote.

Mr. KELSO: I am connecting my remarks by showing that apparently it is the policy of the Labour party through the mouthpiece of the Minister to do certain things in connection with the school papers, and I want to show what the Labour party in another State is doing. I think I am perfectly entitled to do that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. gentleman cannot continue on those lines.

Mr. KELSO: If that is your decision, Mr. Pollock, then I must stop. What will be the effect if the Minister gets his way? He suggests that he is going to remove from the school papers anything that is likely to inflame youthful minds in warlike ways. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that all the school books shall be withdrawn and new school books issued, which will mean great expenditure? Does the hon. gentleman suggest that all school libraries should be gone through by some censor, who will see whether there is any mention of war in those libraries, and, if there is the slightest mention of war, the books must be taken

[*Mr. Kelso.*

away? Does the Minister suggest that any minister of religion teaching Bible history in State schools shall be instructed that on no account is he to allow one word from Holy Writ to be mentioned which is likely to inflame the minds of the youth? Does the hon. gentleman suggest that it will be a criminal offence for a parent to have books in the home to which the children might have access and which contain something about war? Does he suggest that legislation should be introduced to prevent the newspapers speaking of war because the children might read them? If not, his suggestion to eliminate all reference to war from school books is mere hot air and an advertisement for himself. The hon. gentleman has adopted the role of a certain Mrs. Partington, who tried to mop up the Atlantic Ocean. The job is too big for him, and the hon. gentleman has not the capacity to take on big things. If this principle of interfering with the school books is approved, it is possible that it will be extended further, and we might find political articles in the school papers, and we might have the late leader of the Labour party, the hon. member for Bowen, asked to contribute articles on elementary political economy, more especially on the lines of Karl Marx.

Mr. GLEDSON: Worse than that could be done.

[12 noon.]

Mr. KELSO: The Minister might make full use of the talent on the front bench. He might ask the Treasurer to contribute to the school papers an article on "The Impossibility of Squaring the Financial Circle, or How to Make Deficits." The Secretary for Agriculture might be asked to contribute a paper on "Why I am a Convert to Ratoon Cotton." The Secretary for Public Lands might be asked to contribute a paper on "The Relative Merits of Water and Beer as applied to Irrigation." The Secretary for Public Works might be asked to contribute a paper on "How to Live Within the Ambit of the Basic Wage on £20 a Week." The Attorney-General might be asked to contribute a paper "From Post Office to Attorney-General or How to Become a General without Becoming an Attorney." The Secretary for Mines might be asked to contribute an article on "Why I am an Optimist." The Home Secretary might be asked to contribute an article on "Talismans as a Menace to Queensland." The Assistant Minister of the Home Department might be asked to write an article for the children on "The Secrets of the Golden Casket." Possibly, in time the latter article in the school books might overshadow that famous story for children, "Treasure Island," by R. L. Stevenson.

Mr. LLOYD: It is time you spring a joke after all that. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: I can compliment myself on the fact that I at last have wakened up the hon. member for Kelvin Grove.

Mr. LLOYD: Let sleeping dogs lie. (Laughter.)

Mr. KELSO: Last, but not least, the hon. gentleman might ask the Speaker to contribute an article on "The Propagation of the Haggis as a Means for Destroying Prickly-pear." Does not the hon. gentleman see that he is tackling a job that is absolutely impossible? Hon. members on this side are not in favour of war. We are in favour of

peace. I would like to ask him, as a pacifist, what attitude he would take if the Japs came to this country and captured Brisbane? Does he advocate that we should sit down with folded arms and allow Brisbane to be captured by the Japs? (Government interjections.)

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask hon. members to obey my call to order, and not to interrupt an hon. member when he is speaking. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. KELSO: The Secretary for Public Instruction said a few minutes ago that he was in favour of boxing. He is a devotee of the Sadium and enjoys a good fight; but the whole principle of his actions, to be logical, is against what he is suggesting. It is pitiable to think of an ephemeral politician tackling a job like this. I earnestly ask him to consider the words contained in Isabel's words in Shakespeare's "Measure for Measure"—

"Bu' man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most
assur'd—
His glassy essence—like an angry ape,
Plays such phantastic tricks before
high heaven.
As make the angels weep."

At 12.5 p.m.,

Mr. DUNSTAN (*Gympie*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. FERRICKS (*South Brisbane*): I wish to compliment the Secretary for Public Instruction on the action he is taking to expunge from the State school literature all reference to the glorification of war. Such an action has been long overdue by this Labour Administration. The Minister was charged by an hon. member on the other side with having changed his sentiments or opinions in laying down his new policy. The Minister is not the only person who has changed his opinions on that question since the termination of the war. In fact, some of the highest military authorities throughout the Empire, in their statements which have been published by the Minister, have shown that their opinions have undergone even greater changes. It would be quite right in teaching the youthful minds in our State schools to endeavour to teach or explain to them the genesis of wars between nations—to explain to them that the people of the respective countries have no say in the creation or the commencement of war, and no say in the cessation of war. They should be told that the people of Great Britain and Germany, in the recent world war, were not consulted in the least. The people should be told the truth. The truth in connection with all capitalistic wars is that the people as a whole have no say in the matter. A privileged few have thrust upon them the awful responsibility of bringing about wars between nations. They sit in secret conclave. I regret that a recent announcement in the newspapers showed that it was intended to extend and establish this system in Australia. The children should be told the truth about the late war, and that is, that the diplomatic representatives of Great Britain in collaboration with the representatives of other nations secretly arranged the war. They made an agreement behind the backs of Parliament and

the people, and when war was eventually announced, those secret agreements embroiled Great Britain in the war. The children should be told that two months before the declaration of war the question was asked in the House of Commons whether it was a fact that Great Britain was tied up with a secret naval agreement with France, and the answer given was "No"; and that eight months after the declaration of war the question was asked in the House of Lords whether it was a fact that Great Britain had been tied up diplomatically and by treaty with France prior to the war, and the answer was "Yes."

Mr. KING: Gladstone forecasted the war.

Mr. FERRICKS: The iniquity of this agreement was that it was made behind the backs of Parliament. Great Britain was secretly tied up with France as far back as 1912, and the British people and Parliament did not know anything about it. Then, again, the children should be told that, although they have been taught that there were wars of aggression and defence, there is really no distinction between them. Both parties have been aggressors by their preparation. An hon. member spoke of the defence of Australia, and said that the children should be taught that lack of preparation for defence is the surest way of bringing war to Australia. As a fact, it is well known—and the department and Minister would be quite within their rights in telling the school children through the school literature—that, so far from either side in the recent war having been the aggressor, both sides had been preparing for it for years. Such preparations must inevitably lead to a clash. It should be made public that the Russian Grand Council, presided over by the Grand Duke Nicholas, passed a resolution before the outbreak of war saying that, owing to the extension of German affairs to the Straits and to Constantinople, Russia must get control of that portion of Europe, and that the only way to get that control would be by carrying on a world war. There can be no harm in telling the children that the British Government endorsed that view, and at the request of the Russian Czarist Government gave their full assent to the annexation of Constantinople and the Straits by Russia. The British Government were praised by the Russian Prime Minister for endorsing to the full and so completely the desire of Russia to annex the Straits and Constantinople. There is no harm in the children being told these matters, now that people have had their eyes opened and are not being gull'd any further. In fact, there have been millions of converts to anti-warism since the termination of the war, and this has been so in no greater proportion in any section of the community than amongst the soldiers who took part in the world war.

Reference has been made to a pacifist war, and what could one do under certain circumstances. Those who are pleased to ridicule the idea of pacifists, or those who prefer peace to war, must remember that the pacifists say they are witnesses amongst themselves when there is a difference one against another, and they fight it out, but if one nation wars against another, the workers—the people—have to carry on the war. It is made for them and they have to go along and fight out the difference.

These are all phases which should receive a greater publicity and dissemination. The

Mr. Ferricks.]

minds of school children should not be inflamed by the glorification of war and of things pertaining to war.

I remember seeing, three or four years ago, a little pamphlet which contained illustrations and which was circulated through our State schools. It could be purchased for 1d. or any sum above 1d., and the money was regarded as a contribution to some patriotic object. The pictures endeavoured to show the children all the glories achieved by Australian and other Allied soldiers in the Great War. Amongst the glories of these achievements, as illustrated and broadcast throughout our schools, was a picture of an Australian with a bayonet thrust through a Turk, and another Australian throwing a Turk—or the enemy, whoever he was—over his shoulder. This pamphlet was broadcast under a Labour Administration.

Mr. LOGAN: Would the hon. member prefer to see it the other way about?

Mr. FERRICKS: I am prepared to say what I said in 1914—not what might be a change of front eight or ten years afterwards—that I would like to see taught in our State schools the policy that the workers of the world should have sufficient sense to tell those who caused the wars to go and do the fighting themselves. Then there would be no war.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FERRICKS: It is all very well for our children to be brought up on the glorification of these things, but they are encouraged in their glorification and advised to do all these things and to go along these lines—to cheer the ensigns and standards and all the rest of the humbug—by people who are not going to take any part in the business themselves. Those people are going to call “fly” if they are asked to do it, as we used to do in the game of “Fly the Garter” at school. They are excluded for one reason and another, but that does not prevent them “sooling” on the other chap to fight for them.

There is this difference also between a war between two people and a war between nations. In a war between nations, who gets the benefit on the victorious side—if there is any victory in war? Do the people at large get the benefit of the capture of territory or the extension of trade? Not they. The privileged few on top, who are in a position to cause these wars, reap the benefit. I deprecate very strongly the spirit which has been infused into our Australian school literature, including that of Queensland, during recent years. I remember reading in a journal which was not circulating through the State schools, but which naturally would have a great influence by reason of being copied from and having extracts made for the composition of articles for school papers. It was a military journal published in Melbourne just prior to and in the early stages of the war. It was a very elaborately got-up publication having as its keynote the spirit of jingoism and militarism. According to a passage which I believe was copied from it to our school books in the other States of Australia, persons who took up the profession of arms should not revolt against the idea of a war occurring, because they should realise that war provides the only avenue of promotion for the person taking up the profession of arms. And the article went on in

that strain. I have quoted the matter in many places. It stated—

“War is an oasis in the desert of a military man's life.”

What a fine spirit to inculcate into the minds of the youngsters! These and other facts were seized upon by many people in various parts of Australia, and were used to such effect that they brought about the cessation of the publication of that military journal, which was withdrawn on the plea of economy. It was giving the show away too much. That fact should be borne in mind; and when a Minister endeavours to carry out a policy which should be, if it has not been in the past, the policy of the Labour Government, no hon. member opposite is justified in saying that these are the Minister's own views alone—that the hon. gentleman, like Dame Partington, is claiming that he is going to achieve this or that. I am pleased that the Secretary for Public Instruction has been instrumental in giving this movement a start in Queensland, and it redounds very greatly to his credit.

Mr. KELSO: Does the Cabinet agree with the hon. gentleman's suggestions?

Mr. FERRICKS: The hon. member must address his question to the Cabinet. The hon. member must realise that I am not the Cabinet. Once the hot air of hon. members opposite has blown away and it is recognised that the utterances of the Secretary for Public Instruction are for the benefit of our youth, the public generally will deprecate the glorification of all these deeds of war and agree that they should not be driven into the minds of our youngsters. When the time is ripe for another clash between the workers of the world the school boys of to-day will then be our workers, and the school girls of to-day will probably be mothers, with a very important function to perform during the war. The mother's function, of course, is to bring into the world boys so that they may take their place in years to come as soldiers and to receive the contents of a gun. A noble prospect for that mother. A young mother brings forth her first-born—a boy. What a glorious prospect it must open out to her if, when the first time she kisses the babe, she thinks that some day it will supply fodder for cannon—not for any concern of her own, but at the behest of a combination or opposition of peoples he must go and fight for them. I want to repeat a very sound dictum that I once laid down, and one which I hope will be taught in the schools. I laid it down in 1914, when I was before the electors seeking votes, that those who wanted a war should go and do the fighting, and, if I had my way, I would see that those who caused the war were in the front firing line while the workers took on the business of waving flags, lighting fires, beating drums, and cheering them on. I want to refute the charge of inconsistency levelled by hon. members opposite against this side—that we preach class-consciousness and endeavour to make the working class as class-conscious as our opponents. Unfortunately the working section of the community has not reached that high state of organisation or of class-consciousness that is possessed by our opponents. We are told the workers should be content. This is the difference in class warfare—that those who indulge in it are fighting for the betterment of their own conditions. At least they are fighting for

[Mr. Ferricks

themselves; but in the ordinary international wars they are not fighting for themselves—they are fighting because they are told to fight.

Mr. KELSO: You would like the school paper made into a Labour paper?

Mr. FERRICKS: I would like to see it made into a paper for the teaching of the truth. That is all we ask. Hon. members cannot deny the facts that I explained this morning about Russia setting out in 1913 with the determined effort to get control of the Dardanelles and of Constantinople, and with being backed up by Great Britain.

Mr. KELSO: I thought you had finished with that.

Mr. FERRICKS: I am coming back because the hon. member raised the point.

Mr. MOORE interjected.

Mr. FERRICKS: I am talking about war, and I may tell the hon. member, who is one of those who would like to see in the school books all this glorification about war and all this hot air, that our friend Mr. Hughes used to bel-low forth about the great reward and the noble sacrifices of the Australian soldiers at Gallipoli—that they fought that fight in the interests of freedom and peace; that they were going to make this war the last war; and, before the tears of the widows and sisters and mothers of the soldiers had dried and Lloyd George had practically committed Great Britain to another war, Mr. Hughes declared war for Australia against the Turks without consulting Parliament—without consulting the people—and the Australian people were supposed to fall in behind that sort of thing. Mr. Hughes, without consulting Parliament, committed Australia to a second war before the tears of the widows and sisters and mothers had dried. It was too bad for people to applaud that sort of thing. We were told that the great war was fought to secure the freedom of the Dardanelles and the freedom of Constantinople. It is a fact which cannot be disputed that Russia had determined to annex the Dardanelles and Constantinople, with the full concurrence of Great Britain, before ever the war took place.

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*): Before I get on to the subject of the teaching of war or of the glorification of war in the school books, I would like to bring under the Minister's notice a communique from the battle front of the Bremer. The Bremer constituency is a growing constituency, and it has been attended to by the department in a way that I cannot find very much fault with, but I would like to point out that the northern portion of Booval is a fast growing suburb. There are a number of schools in the district—the Silkestone school and the East Ipswich school, in particular—which to-day are overcrowded. The children are being taught on the verandas, under the school, or anywhere where children can be placed. Booval North is a big portion of Booval, and it has a school population of from 160 to 200 children, and that portion of the Bremer electorate could easily be served by a school situated so as to meet the needs of North Booval and East Ipswich. Although there is a report in the department against the establishment of a school there, I trust the Minister will go into the matter and see if he cannot do something to relieve the congestion in that portion of the State where a new school is very urgently needed.

I have been very interested, as we all have been, by the speeches that have been made as to elimination of the glorification of war from our school papers and our school books. I have been very interested in some of the utterances that have been made by these persons who believe we should not encourage war to the effect that we ought to cast the beam out of our own eyes before we take the mote out of someone else's eye. The beam in our own eye appears to be that we have some sort of class trouble; that we have egged people on, and egged them on, and helped them to make conditions better for themselves. We go so far as to call it a class war, and, because it is called a class war, we are told we are inconsistent; that, while we encourage war between employer and employee, we denounce war between nations. The things are by no means parallel. They are not in the same street whatever, and people who say they are have an entire misunderstanding of the situation. More particularly might I refer to a telegram that has been published in Australia, stating that Archbishop Lees, of Melbourne, attacked the Trades Hall Council in Melbourne because they asked the good Archbishop to join with them in a denunciation of war on Peace Sunday. He told them to overcome all their domestic troubles, to eliminate class trouble, to lie down with the lion and be at home with him before they attempted to stop war between the nations. The whole position is that the good Archbishop is engaged, or ought to be engaged, in a class struggle himself. He has been struggling for years against what he calls the "powers of darkness"—the powers of evil, sin, and unrighteousness. Would I be in order to advise the good Archbishop to fraternise with the devil and come to some arrangement with him to settle their differences—to go on peaceably and amicably and not disturb the people? Would I be right? Of course I would not be right. The good Archbishop, in his endeavours to rid the world of sin, is on the same plane as members of this party who are endeavouring to get rid of suffering and want and the things we stand against. Our good friends opposite—no matter what they may say—are all out for international war; and, when war arrives, they can wave flags better than anybody else; yet they advise us to keep still and say that the workers should be satisfied to remain in the state to which it has pleased God to call them. While the war was on I was wearied to death by the fact that I could not get hold of a book by the German philosopher Nietzsche, who had written a book extolling war. On every platform we were told what a wretched man this Nietzsche was. I was keen on finding out what sort of a double-dyed villain he was, but it was not until the war ceased that I was able to get hold of a copy of his book. After reading his book, I could almost imagine that Nietzsche was sitting opposite, as his sentiments are so like those of those hon. members.

[12.30 p.m.]

Listen to this little extract from his book—

"It is mere illusion and pretty sentiment to expect much (even anything at all) from mankind if it forgets how to make war. As yet no means are known which call so much into action as a great war that rough energy born of the camp, that deep impersonality born of hatred, that conscience born of murder

Mr. F. A. Cooper.]

and cold-bloodedness, that fervour born of effort in the annihilation of the enemy, that proud indifference to loss, to one's own existence, to that of one's fellows, to that earthquake-like soul-shaking which a people needs when it is losing its vitality."

All the things which the Opposition have been standing for—the doctrine that war brings forth all that is good and great and noble in man—I find Nietzsche advocated ten years ago.

Mr. KELSO: We never said that on this side.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Hon. members opposite could not say it as well Nietzsche said it, although their sentiments are the same as those of Nietzsche. I find another German, who led armies—the German War Lord, Count Von Moltke—said—

"Perpetual peace is a dream, and it is not even a beautiful dream. War is an element in the order of the world ordained by God . . . Without war the world would stagnate and lose itself in materialism."

I place that side by side with many of the statements we have had from the Opposition, not only to-day, but on other occasions in regard to war. I cannot understand how anybody can look upon war as a thing to be admired, or as a thing even to be taught or urged. If the Minister goes on with his policy of showing up the cruelty of war, showing its baseness and its evils, showing that it is waged not for the sake of humanity or for the good of the people at large, but for the interests of the few—if he will go on showing that to the children and giving them the truth of things, there will be no trouble on this side of the Chamber. I cannot understand anybody grumbling about showing the children the iniquities of war—there is nothing good about it—and, if the Minister will do that, he will earn the gratitude of everyone on this side of the Chamber. What we should do when we meet the enemy, personally, I do not know, but I have always had a certain admiration for two people I have read about, one of whom was a Pilgrim Father, who was crossing the ocean, when the ship he was on was attacked by a pirate ship. They tried to put a gun into his hand, and he said, "No. I take no man's life." He refused to handle the gun, but he stood by the rail of the ship, and, when the pirate vessel came alongside and a pirate put his hands on the rail, the Pilgrim Father grabbed an axe and cut the pirate's hands off and said "Take thy hands off what does not belong to thee." (Laughter.) I have a certain admiration for that man. I have no time for those who say that the best means for ensuring peace is to be prepared for war. I might mention that I had some canvassing to do on one occasion and I went to a house, where I saw a wife with an iron in her hand and the husband putting a piece of wood into the stove to make the iron hot. I thought that things were all right there. I tried to be nice, and I used the old quotation and said, "The Lord dwells in this house." The husband turned round from the fire place, and said, "We have peace, perfect peace here. If she heaves that iron at me, I will lay her out with this chunk of wood." (Laughter.) That has never appealed to me as the best means of securing peace.

{Mr. F. A. Cooper.

A GOVERNMENT MEMBER: It is preparation for war.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Exactly, and it would lead to it. Rather am I with the general who stayed with the army all day till 6 o'clock and then retired, saying, "I am going to retire now because I am a bit weary." (Laughter.)

Mr. DEACON (*Cunningham*): If there is to be any alteration made in the school books, I would prefer, after listening to the debate, to abide by what the hon. member for Gympie would do rather than the Secretary for Public Instruction.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DEACON: Let me advise the Minister, not with any unfriendly feeling, that a lot of reputations have been wrecked by men doing things they did not know much about. (Opposition laughter.) I would advise the Minister to read much more and write less. I do not want to pay too many compliments to the members of the Government this morning, but I believe that as a body they preach more humbug in a given time than any other body of men I have ever listened to. (Opposition laughter.) I heard the hon. member for South Brisbane preaching about the early history of war and referring to the worker. Let me remind the hon. member that in the beginning of the Great War the socialists in Germany were well behind the German Government for the war.

Mr. COLLINS: They voted against the first credit vote.

Mr. DEACON: The leaders of the socialistic movement were behind the German Government in the Great War. That has not been forgotten yet in socialistic circles on the Continent. If the Minister will read the utterances of the leaders on both sides of the question, he will find that the greatest opposition in Germany to the war came from the bankers and commercial people, because they feared ruin from the war. The British Cabinet also met with opposition from bankers and commercial people because they feared that ruin would ensue from the war. It was the same in France, where the Cabinet met with similar opposition from those interests. Nobody in this country ever wanted war. Let me point out to the Minister that, although there may be hon. members opposite who want war, he has nothing to fear from hon. members on this side. If he does not want to go across the water to look for people who want war, let me suggest that he should start a war in the Cabinet in regard to some things that are required for the Department of Public Instruction. There are some Government departments which have more money than they require, and it is all at the expense of the Department of Public Instruction.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The expenditure in the department in 1914 was £600,000, and now it is £1,250,000.

Mr. DEACON: We have to remember that the cost of everything is double what it was then.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Wages have not doubled—not the basic wage.

Mr. DEACON: During the war the department had necessarily to hold over many improvements, and to neglect buildings to a certain extent, but six years have

elapsed since the war and the Government have not yet made a single attempt to finance the department and allow it to catch up with the arrears of work. There are schools all over the country which have not been painted for years.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: In the cities, too.

Mr. DEACON: You can find them all over the country. There are some in my electorate as well as in electorates of other hon. members. A lot of schools badly need painting, and some buildings are being attacked by white ants. All this injury is done because the Government do not give the Department of Public Instruction sufficient money to enable the work to be kept up to date.

At 12.40 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. DEACON: It is not that we do not raise the money, because we do, but we spend too much foolishly in other directions, and I therefore hope that the Minister will take that war to the Cabinet and make his crusade there in favour of his department.

Like many other hon. members, I have had every consideration from the officers of the department. There are some very capable men in the department, and I hope the Minister will take heed of their views, and not act so much on his own impulses. (Laughter.) He ought to recognise that the men who have been carrying on responsible work in the department are likely to know much more about it than a man who has been there only a short time.

Mr. COLLINS: You do not believe in representative government. We represent the people.

Mr. DEACON: So do I. Let me borrow a quotation from the hon. member for South Brisbane. I say that in these things the people have no voice. Things are done about which they know nothing. I hope that some endeavour will be made—the responsibility rests on the members of the Government and their political followers—to bring this department up to the state it should be in. It has been starved. There has never been any attempt in the last six years since the war to put the schools on a proper footing. There are many other things I would like to talk about, but there is one in particular to which the Minister ought to give serious consideration. I refer to the opening and closing of country schools. There is a rule that there must be a certain number of children before a school will be opened—there must be nine or ten. I think we ought to give children the opportunity of education if any number at all is available; at any rate, we should make an effort in that direction. The people in the country are so anxious for the education of their children that they are willing to put them into a shed or any other building so long as they can get them taught. I know that the department is teaching children by correspondence, and that a lot of good work has been done in that respect; but correspondence schooling is not all that can be done, and I hope that in any future consideration of the expense involved of teaching in small areas, some attention will be given to that question. The people who go out to the land provide all the wealth of this country. The primary producer—whether he be farmer, grazier, or miner—produces all

our wealth, and in this respect he needs more encouragement than he is getting to-day. We know that the department has done a great deal. We all say that it is a good department—nobody can deny that—but it could be much better. It is pitiable that the Labour party, who above all others should stand for education, have neglected their opportunities. It is a disgrace that the department should be treated as it is. The Minister tells me that it costs more now than it did some time back, but much of the extra cost is not going to the children, and I hope that something will be done in that direction.

Mr. LLOYD (*Kevin Grove*): On this vote I propose to confine myself to the general policy of the Department of Public Instruction, with special reference to the question which has been raised in a certain statement by the Minister as to references to war in the teaching of history in our State schools. There is no proposal to eliminate all reference to war from the school books. We are not responsible here for the report which reached us the other day of what the Minister for Education in Victoria said about this matter, or for what was in his mind when he said it—if he did say it. We are considering only our own policy, as declared by the Secretary for Public Instruction in Queensland, and I do not see in it any proposal to cut out all reference to war. What we do propose is to show war forth in its true light. The glorious side, the glamour of it, is, so far as I know, invariably presented by men who have never seen war. I happen to be one of the men who have not seen war myself, but I must admit, judging by the speeches of hon. members on the Opposition benches and on this side who have really seen war, that this glamour of war is never held up to admiration by men who have been there and have seen what really happens. It seems to me that it has always been an unreal atmosphere created by those who have not seen war from what other people have said or because they allowed their imagination to get the better of their commonsense. There are certain articles in our school readers and papers which do convey to the children this false glamour of war, which makes many a man think that the noblest thing in which he can possibly engage is a fight, irrespective of the merits of the side which he is taking. There is nothing wrong, so far as I can see, in that feeling, which is inherent in every man, of fighting against what he considers to be intolerable wrong, and I do not think it is the policy of the Minister or of the Government to do anything that will diminish that spirit; but there is something decidedly wrong when men are prepared to come forward and tell us that it is right for men to risk their lives in a fight when they are not particularly concerned in what they are going to fight about. So long as it is possible for men to recruit for fighting service in ignorance without any question as to the merits of the cause which they are espousing, so long is there something which it is the special business of modern education to eradicate. That, I take it, is the purpose of the Minister in revising the school readers and the school papers. It is quite wrong to imagine that a desire for world peace will create a helpless community—a community which has no desire to fight for

itself. The desire for universal peace on the part of citizens of a community will not in the slightest degree diminish that quality which we call courage. The quality of courage is not an elementary quality. It is compounded of several impulses, and the one about which we are mostly concerned is the impulse which prompts a man to forget himself in time of danger. A great deal of nonsense is talked about the fighting spirit. It is supposed to be a primitive instinct inherent in man. Even a superficial study of the history of the human race will disprove that.

Delight in war is not a primitive instinct. With the most primitive tribes in the world there is no such thing as war. There are unseemly scraps over personal property and over women, but organised war is a thing that does not begin until man has reached a certain degree of social organisation. To go further back than that, man on the evidence of his physical structure was not originally a killing animal, and to those who believe in evolution there is the evidence that the nearest relative to man amongst the less developed types of life is not a killing animal either. War is something that has grown out of the temporary necessities of a certain stage of social organisation, and when we have completed the work of social organisation the desire for war ought to disappear. What we call a desire for fighting is simply a desire for intensity of experience—a desire which is more in evidence in the civilised man than in the savage. It is erroneous to suppose that, with peaceful conditions and higher ideals, courage diminishes. The civilised man of the present day has more courage than the man of primitive communities right back to the beginning of time. Let me digress a little on this matter. At the present time men are flying. I speak with regard to actual flying without propulsion by engines. In France a record has been put up for eight hours in the air by a man on a glider without any engine at all. The appliances that are used for that purpose could have been built in the days of the Roman Empire. They could have been built in the days of ancient Egypt, and the reason why flying was not accomplished in the early days was because man had not developed the courage to do it. Take the case of the ascension of our highest mountains. It is a little more than a century ago when the highest mountain in Europe was first ascended by man. That could have been done in the days of the Roman Empire, and the only reason why it was not done was because man had not then developed the courage to do it. This courage would not be obliterated if we put more human ideals before the younger members of the community. That feeling is there, and when it is required, it will be called upon. It is nonsense to say that, if we do not keep constantly showing the young children of our schools the glamour of war, if we do not constantly keep them smelling blood, the quality of courage will die out. History has shown that the quality of real courage has increased with civilisation, and that it does not diminish, and there is absolutely no danger whatever in putting more peaceful and more humane ideals before our younger generation.

There is the view that this impulse which makes men fight, and makes them take a gamble on war will remain there, and men

[*Mr. Lloyd.*

will fight because of the desire for this intensity of experience. But that again is wrong, because there are many other directions in which those impulses can be diverted. The same quality that makes a brave soldier makes the missionary, the martyr, the inventor, and the explorer, and more particularly those who take great personal risks in their efforts to achieve advances in science. There will be plenty of outlet for that spirit, and it is the business of the educator to point out to the rising generation that there are better outlets for this impulse than there are in war.

In the teaching of history I do not think very much can be done by a mere excision or simply cutting out the different parts dealing with the glamour of war. There is too much else outstanding which will undo the negative results of excision from the school books. There must be positive teaching on the matter. We must teach the pupils what nearly every thinking writer in the civilised world at present professes to believe in. That is, that another great war has a very big chance of leading to the extinction of civilisation. Those are the facts that we must put before the pupils. We are accused on this side of not giving sufficient recognition to what has been done by previous Governments. That is one of the charges, just or not, that I have certainly never been guilty of. I think that I can make out the best case for this Government by putting on one side everything that has really been done by past Governments, and by putting on the other side everything that has really been done by this Government.

In connection with this matter I will go back to twenty years before the virus of the great imperialistic reaction contaminated the teaching in our schools. I will read something from one of the official readers of twenty years ago—possibly twenty-five years ago—to show how war was presented to the children then, and I propose to resume the same lines now. These are some verses that appeared in a "Century Reader" which was taken out about a quarter of a century ago. It is entitled, "A Little Soldier." There is a picture here of boys evidently playing soldiers, one boy in front with a drum, and another boy behind with a flag. Other boys have something representing weapons. Above it there is a picture of something which is apparently the boy's mind, and which is the official representation of a battlefield. These are the verses—

"Drumming away,
Merry and gay,
Johnny goes merrily,
Drumming away,
Marching along,
Sturdy and strong,
Merrily drumming,
And singing his song.

"When he's a man,
This is his plan,
He'll be a soldier,
And do what he can,
Marching away,
Happy and gay,
Merrily, merrily,
Drumming all day."

The third verse deals with the reality of war. There is a man lying down on the ground apparently disabled, and about to be

crushed by the wheels of a gun carriage.
The verse goes on this way—

“ Johnny my son,
War isn't fun,
'Tis a terrible thing
When once it's begun;
Famine and woe,
For high and for low,
And a great deal more,
Than drumming, you know.”

I will give past Governments credit for something they put before the children in the “Third Century Reader.” I am not going to worry hon. members opposite with the pernicious productions of pacifists. I am going to give them something that was done by their predecessors. This is what appears in the “Third Century Reader”—

“ A TALE OF WOE.

“ The apples are ripe in the orchard,
The work of the reaper is done,
And the golden woodlands reddened
In the light of the dying sun.

“ At the cottage door the Gardsire sits,
Pale, in his easy chair;
While the gentle wind of twilight
Plays with his silver hair.

“ A woman is kneeling beside him,
A fair young form is pressed
In the first wild passion of sorrow
Against his aged breast.”

The verses depict that after the battle had ended this couple had all that was dear to them taken away from them. Verses like that, without showing up the gruesome features, tend to show children the realities of war as they apply to those who take part in it and the realities to those who are affected without taking active part in it.

This is one of those subjects on which a great deal has been said and on which there is a great deal of danger of digression. As I intend to speak on other votes, I have done my best on this occasion to confine myself to the general aspects of the policy of the

Minister. There is a tendency [2 p.m.] in debates to speak diagrammatically. I do not know whether I am coining that expression, but its meaning is obvious to those who know what a diagram is. When a lecturer is giving a lecture on, say, the surface features of a certain country, he puts a diagram on the blackboard, upon which all heights and depths are greatly exaggerated, because, if he put a representation true to the scale, his line would be indistinguishable from a straight line. There is a tendency in debate to speak diagrammatically. That is to say, to exaggerate on every side—to give a wrong impression of what we attack and of what we are advocating. Many speeches delivered this morning would have indicated to a stranger that one side of the Chamber was advocating an implacable policy of blood-thirsty aggressiveness, and that the other side was advocating a reckless policy of lie-down pacifism. That is not the position at all. A few temperate speeches that were delivered this morning showed that we are all concerned in the solution of the worldwide question as to how to bring war to an end. In that matter we are simply at one with all the great thinkers who write on such questions at the present time.

I was impressed with the first part of the speech of the hon. member for Albert. If

something had happened to interrupt him in the last five minutes of his speech before he got into a very perfunctory jingoism, it would have been one of the best speeches, if not the best speech, delivered on this question. The hon. gentleman's contribution to the debate, however, was a valuable one. The hon. gentleman did not come forward with argument, but he came forward and gave evidence. The hon. gentleman told us of the impressions made upon him as a boy by certain literature; he told us of the impression made on him by his reading of Virgil. Evidently, the hon. gentleman was a boy who made good progress in Latin to have got to a stage at which reading that language made any impression, because, unfortunately, to most boys Latin is only a cipher which they translate into English, and they think in English while doing so. The hon. gentleman spoke of the impression made on his mind by Fitchett. The writings of Fitchett, especially in that work of his “Deeds that Won the Empire,” are the most misleading and pernicious literature that could be put before young people. The fact that a cultured gentleman like the hon. gentleman could have been misled in his early youth by rubbishy literature of that kind, with the result that he now comes forward and describes it as something of the best—something which it would be deplorable to deprive boys of—is one of the surest pieces of evidence that we should be careful as to what we put before our children.

All hon. members are pretty well agreed on the undesirability of war, but hon. members opposite are in doubt as to the practicability of securing universal peace, of what steps we are going to take, of how we shall meet aggression in the future. I am not going into that at all. I recognise the necessity for being prepared to enable reforming communities to resist Fascisti violence, whether from within or without. I recognise that something must be done to try and get in touch with the other peoples of the world and to get them to think the same way as we think; but, first of all, we must agree amongst ourselves as to the right method. It is the duty of the Secretary for Public Instruction not only to go in for the excision of what we think detrimental to our youth, but to substitute suitable propaganda in return.

I shall make only one more remark, and presume to give a little advice to the Secretary for Public Instruction. We hear a great deal about a certain class of men trying to get in touch with Mars. I advise the hon. gentleman to do something on the same lines, but something far less pretentious and far more practicable, and that is to try and get in touch with the other Australian States and endeavour to achieve some unity of aim in the teaching of our Australian children. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. PETERSON (*Yormanby*): There is no question that this has been a most interesting debate in connection with the utterances made by the Secretary for Public Instruction a little while ago. I do not intend to criticise those utterances, as enough has been said on the subject by hon. members on both sides. When we view this war-feeling aspect that may be inculcated into the young, we should try and raise ourselves a little above the subject, and realise that there are other matters

Mr. Peterson.]

affecting the community which are almost as sordid and gruesome as war itself. Recently I read some statistics that had been compiled. Take for instance the question of "Spanish Flu," or what was known as pneumonic influenza. We find from the records published that twice as many people died in Europe from that scourge as were killed in the Great War. Then we have the statistics of America, published the other day, where it was shown that twice as many people were killed by motor cars in America last year as there were Americans killed in the Great War. Then we have a greater scourge than all of these put together. Our statistics have repeatedly warned us of the danger that is rapidly creeping over the Commonwealth of Australia, including Queensland, in connection with venereal disease. What has been done in regard to venereal disease and its effect upon the young people in the community?

Hon. M. J. KIRWAN: Five hundred thousand people in Australia are suffering from it.

Mr. PETERSON: The Assistant Home Secretary bears out my contention. While we may stand for high and noble principles so far as war is concerned, as the hon. member for Kelvin Grove pointed out, let us not try to aim at Mars—at something intangible—let us try and do something within the realms of possibility. We can do something through our school system to impede the onward march of this scourge. I have spoken in this Chamber before on this matter. I have pleaded as one individual that it is the function of the State at the earliest possible moment, through its valuable educational system, to do something in this direction. I do not say the whole of the teachers should be responsible for education of that kind, as many of the teachers are overworked at the present time. But there should be a sex hygiene class for boys and girls when they reach the age of puberty, where they could be instructed in the dangers that surround them if they are not properly warned of these dangers. I have here a book which I obtained from the library called "Sex Education and National Health," by C. Gasquoine Hartley, and on page 87 he summarises his conclusions in this way—

"Some such plan as I have advocated is a reform in our educational programme that, I think, must come. Classes, in which the work is specially arranged and quite different from the ordinary school course, will be attached to every efficient school. Girls and boys, before the onset of puberty, will enter these classes, which will prepare them, when their sexual health is established, for the harder work of the higher school. Perhaps even a better plan would be to have special adolescent schools provided, preferably in the country, where all work and play could be done out of doors, which the boys and girls will enter at the approach of puberty. The teachers for such schools will need to be specially trained; they also ought to have had a much wider experience of life than is usual to the teacher. One of the staff should have been trained as a doctor. The difficulties of the establishment of such schools, of course, are numerous. For one thing, the expense would necessarily be great, and it may be thought

that this alone makes the plan impracticable. I can only answer that any expenditure which will produce fit fathers and fit mothers for the race is an expense that would be met by a wise nation, when it learns to understand the folly of our waste of the youth of each generation by our bungling attempts at education."

I do not know what he means by the words "our bungling attempts at education," but probably he is referring to the teaching of sex hygiene. We have heard a lot of truth, no doubt, of the huge waste of human life in war. There is no denying that fact, and may the time speedily come when the workers and others concerned will say that war is to be no more. Let us hope for that time, but in the meantime we have a paramount duty, as a Parliament and as a Government, to see to it that the young who pass through our hands are given an opportunity to get away from that system of ignorance, which has been in existence since time immemorial. I make no apology for bringing this subject before Parliament. The statistics on this matter are so appalling that the time is ripe when the Government should do something in the matter. I am sure the hon. gentleman in charge of the department will earn considerable gratitude from the community at large if he will take steps in the direction I have suggested, so that it can be said that Queensland is the first State in the Commonwealth that has embarked on a campaign of this nature. I feel sure that the expenditure involved in such a laudable undertaking, which would result in great benefit to those concerned, would be willingly met by the community at large. I do not intend to dilate any more on that matter other than to say that there are other causes besides war which bring about great loss of life.

I wish to touch upon one or two little matters in connection with the policy of education generally. We have to admit that our system of education in Queensland, generally speaking, is all that one could desire. I have never had any occasion to find fault with it, but I do find fault—and not in a trivial way—with the policy that has been in operation for a long time past, both by previous Governments and by the present Government, where large areas of land are thrown open for settlement. I had experience of it myself in the Dawson Valley. People residing in these areas with their children have had to wait for very many years for school facilities. In the Dawson Valley it took me nearly five years, in some instances, to obtain schools for settlers in various parts of the districts. I thanked the Minister at the time, and I have been thankful ever since, for the school facilities which were provided. This is the point I wish to emphasise: Is it not possible, when the Government embark on gigantic land settlement schemes, and where they know they are going to get a good number of settlers, to put up schools on the area before the settlers go there? If we take the optimistic forecasts of Ministers into consideration, I think it is a fair thing to have the schools built in anticipation of the families who go there. Many a settler has come into my electorate, and first of all inquired about school facilities, and if the facilities have not been there they have gone away to other districts where school

[Mr. Peterson.

facilities were provided. There is nothing wrong in making the suggestion that it would be a wise policy on the part of the Minister to see that schools are erected in new areas that are to be thrown open before the settlers go on the ground at all.

We have had the hon. member for Burnett complaining about schools in the Upper Burnett area. We were told, when that scheme went through, that there were to be schools built in the Upper Burnett in anticipation of settlement, but those schools have not materialised, nor have they materialised in any part of my electorate. Take the soldier settlement at Calmorun, in my district. Those men have been settled six years there, and it was only three months ago that a school building was provided. I think it would be a wise policy on the part of those responsible to see that schools are provided in anticipation of settlement. It is not a fair thing to deprive the children of the settlers of the benefit of education for four or five years. I am not one of those who think you can put up schools where there are only two or three children. That is not feasible, nor is it possible to finance such a scheme. I trust that the Minister will see fit to give some expression of opinion with regard to the suggestions I have put forward.

Mr. HARTLEY (*Fitzroy*): As far as the general policy of the department has gone, it has been satisfactory, with one exception, that is, in regard to the technical college at Rockhampton. I think that the State educational system is a sound system. It has been well thought out, and up to now it has been carried out efficiently to the advantage of the children and in the interests of the manufacturing and commercial industries of the State. Our objective always was that the whole system of education should be entirely State-controlled and State-supported. The only way in which that can be achieved is by linking the State primary schools with the high schools and the technical colleges and the university, but so far as Rockhampton is concerned, there is a very bad break in the progress from the State school to the university in that the department has recently decided that pupils studying for the senior university examination shall no longer receive tuition at the high school and technical college in Rockhampton. That decision has been made on the score of expense, and I want to point out to the Minister that a very fallacious reason is put forward for it. At the present time we endow the grammar schools and secondary denominational schools where they take scholarship pupils, and I cannot for the life of me see why senior students should not be allowed to continue their studies at the technical college and high school in Rockhampton. It simply means that, if the Government are going to say that on the score of expense only a few pupils are to be taught and they are to be sent to a grammar school or some denominational school, they admit that the education of the children of the State beyond the junior university standard is impossible under the State system. If they, nevertheless, subsidise and depend on grammar schools for education to the senior university standard, they take up a very fallacious attitude. There is an examination for students for the senior university examinations coming forward, and I hope that before that time a

rearrangement will be made whereby it will be possible for them to be educated in the technical college and high school. It is no use saying that we have not the staff, because a great number of our grammar school teachers were State school teachers and, so far as my experience goes, the very best education that can be given has been and is being given by the State school teachers. I do not intend to go any further except to make it quite clear that I do not approve of the department's present method of keeping down expenditure or with the departure from the system of State education which this system involves. Seeing that we have scholarships, I cannot see why students for the senior university examination cannot be taught in our own high school at Rockhampton.

With regard to the question of what we shall teach and what we shall not teach in our State schools with regard to history and war, I believe that, if a man is proud of his country and if he thinks that it is the best country in the world, with the best institutions, and giving the widest and greatest freedom of any country, it is worth fighting for if necessary. On that definition, then I am a militarist. If a man believes in his country with its institutions and its blunders and its mistakes, whether it was to blow open the door of China for the opium trade or, as the hon. member for Warrego mistakenly said, the assault on little Transvaal—if any of these things are worth having, then they are worth fighting for and worth maintaining in the present system of society, and therefore I make no excuse for saying that at the present time I am a jingo.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: Now, what are we going to do? Are we going to teach in school histories that war is at times unavoidable and necessary, or that under all circumstances it must be regarded as a thing of horror? Any man with any sense knows that no soldiers welcome war.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: No matter what their training or what their environment has been, they look with stern seriousness and earnestness for a way to avoid war short of lying down and saying to the other fellow, "Kick me."

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: That is the only position that any nation can ever take up which follows on the lines that have been so soundly laid down by the Labour party and honestly administered by a Tory Government for a short period which put Australia in the position she was in at the outbreak of the last great disastrous war. We were taught to stand by the country we belong to, and if we go down, we shall go down with it. How is the Labour movement going to turn round now and teach a different doctrine from what was taught since 1909, when the Fisher Government introduced the Defence Act embodying compulsory training? Since we undertook in 1914 to take part in a campaign which justified the wide vision of nationhood on the part of a Labour Government and our claim that we not only had an army in Australia ready to defend Australia, but because of the far-sighted policy of the Labour Government, the Australian coast and the Queensland coast were safe because we had the battle cruiser "Australia" and

Mr. Hartley.]

the cruisers "Sydney" and "Melbourne" to defend them, and these same cruisers safeguarded the Pacific Ocean from experiencing the horrors of war, are we now going to teach that that policy was wrong? It was with pride that we went forward in the election of 1915 and claimed that the Fisher Ministry's war policy was our policy, and are we going to turn round now and say in the school books that this policy was a bad policy, and should never have been carried out? We cannot do it.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Where does the hon. gentleman get those sentiments?

Mr. HARTLEY: I want to ask the Minister how he is going to teach in the school books that we should not glorify war. You cannot help it. If we mention war at all, we must mention the deeds that have been accomplished; we must mention the victories as well as the defeats. You must say whether they are right or whether they are wrong. Since 1914 we have said that we were right—that we wanted an Australian army to defend Australia, and that we wanted an Australian navy to safeguard our coasts. From the very inception and by the very acceptance of that policy we commenced to build a navy, and we are to-day training more young men of the ages of sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen than we ever trained before. The very acceptance of that policy goes to show that we believe that there will be war, and that we admit there is no getting away from war. I ask the Minister then, what is the sense of training, as we have trained, 700,000 men between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five, of whom more than 550,000 are not married and have never been married—what is the use of having a policy like that, and then on the other hand teach the growing generation that the policy previously adopted was wrong and something abhorrent, and that the teaching of brave deeds is abhorrent?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is not suggested.

Mr. HARTLEY: I am not blaming the hon. gentleman in a personal sense for what he has said. I am blaming the wisdom of his policy in attempting to create this feeling, especially in this nation amongst all nations of the world, which is so open to attack under certain circumstances.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Should we not know when we are going to be attacked?

Mr. HARTLEY: It does not matter whether we know or whether we do not; I want the hon. gentleman to realise that I view his policy as mischievous interference with sentiment in attempting to teach that doctrine now. I admit that it will be a glorious thing when we can trust each other and get down to bedrock to such an extent as to be able to say to the men

[2.30 p.m.] in Germany—whom I hold at the present with very deep contempt—to the men of America, and possibly the workers of Japan, "Yes, we will make no more guns; we will build no more warships, and we will build no aeroplanes for warlike purposes." When we come to that stage there will be a union of international brotherhood of the world. We then shall be able to say that in absolute faith and trust. When we can be assured that there will be no violation of that agreement, then, and not till then, we shall be in a position

[Mr. Hartley.

to teach what the hon. gentleman wants to teach in the school books of Australia. But until such a time arrives we would be very foolish to do anything that would temper with national sentiment. Australia is part of the Empire and is under that flag, and we should stand solidly behind the policy we are at present pursuing.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. KING: We shall have to await a reconstruction of human nature.

Mr. HARTLEY: I am quite sure that at the outbreak of war in 1914, 200,000 out of the 329,800 men who went from Australia had not the faintest intention of engaging in war when first war broke out, but they went because they realised as that war progressed that they must go. It was not because they belonged to the militaristic class that they wanted to go to war. I am quite sure that those 200,000 men had not the faintest idea beforehand of hurting anyone; but as the war progressed their own consciences or something within them told them to go and be trained to become soldiers and fight in that war, because they felt within them an irresistible impulse to defend the principles of right; and they put their lives and their bodies between the horrors of Europe and the homes of Australia. They did not go, as was contemptuously said by the hon. member for Warrego, to be made fodder for cannon. They did not go because their minds had been inflamed previously by teachings of war. They went because the national spirit had become awakened in their minds. That sentiment compelled many thousands of men to go and see as far as possible that not only the undertaking of Andrew Fisher that Australia would be there to the last man was carried out, but also to avert defeat of the Empire. War is a natural sequence following on the failure of appeal to reason. When moral force fails, the only method of adjusting or overcoming a dispute is by appealing to force.

Mr. RIORDAN: Why not appeal to reason?

Mr. HARTLEY: Would the hon. member appeal to the reason of a man if he came into his house and commenced to break up the furniture? He would not say, "Well, comrade, I do not think this is right." (Opposition laughter.) I would not like to be the burglar. (Laughter.) There is a time when no appeal to reason is possible, and force only must be used.

Mr. RIORDAN: The appeal to reason in that case would be by the burglar to me, but there was no appeal to the reason of the workers when the war broke out.

Mr. HARTLEY: I say that the hon. member is wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The burglar started ten years before war broke out.

Mr. HARTLEY: A State election at which this party came into power was held about eight months after war broke out, and I and many other hon. members on this side on that occasion extolled the far-sighted policy of Andrew Fisher and the Labour Government in having an Australian navy. We extolled his declaration that Australia was in the war to the last man and to the last shilling. We said the war would be pursued on that policy. I did not hear of any candidate repudiating our going into the war. I say that the public

then had the chance to choose. They could have rejected us then because we were advocating a wariike policy. After this lapse of time and after the war is won, it is no good saying that we were not consulted in the progress of that war.

If we are not to have an appeal to force when the law of moral suasion has failed, why do we continue our police force to-day?

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. HARTLEY: Why try this medicine on the children in the State schools?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You cannot teach an old dog new tricks.

Mr. HARTLEY: I am afraid the hon. gentleman cannot teach me much on this subject.

Mr. KERR: He will not be there very long.

Mr. HARTLEY: I hope the hon. gentleman will be there a long time. I hope hon. members opposite will not think I am animated by anything of a personal nature in my remarks. I want the Secretary for Public Instruction and hon. members opposite to understand that I speak out of regard for the feelings of many who were affected by the war, and whose feelings may be deeply hurt by these new views. I do not think there are many homes in Queensland or Australia that have not lost a son, a brother, or some other relative. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. RYAN: Cut out the "sob stuff."

Mr. HARTLEY: I am not going to cut out the "sob stuff," because I believe one of the big factors in keeping our race together and making it one when it has to face such a difficult situation as arose through the recent war is true sentiment. What is said about this war now must wound many hearts that have not yet ceased to grieve for the loss sustained by them through the recent war. If it is a good thing to abolish all war, and the road to abolish it is simply to ignore any of the effects or possibilities of war, why should we not to-day, as reasonable and grown men, set an example and abolish the police force? (Hear, hear!) That would be a sensible example. What is the difference between the criminal who wants to break into my house, or who wants to offend some of my womenfolk, and who refuses to comply with the law of society and the law of the land and the ruler or Government who precipitate a war and have their troops trample through such a country as Belgium in order to reduce the power of France? There is no difference.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There is a big difference.

Mr. HARTLEY: I wish the hon. gentleman would show me the difference.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I will show you afterwards.

Mr. HARTLEY: It would be just as sensible to abolish the police force, because, after all, it is only an army in miniature. We only use a military army in times of war, but this miniature army is used at all times, so that we may compel men to obey the moral law by the law of force. That is why we have nations to-day keeping armies, because at certain times the only sentiment that carries any appeal is the sentiment of force—compelling people to submit.

As to who shall edit this history and who shall print it, I heard the hon. member

for Warrego make one of the most foolish mistakes that a man could make when speaking on a public question. The hon. member spoke of the Boer war as a war of aggression against a small nation! If ever there was a nation that had reason to thank Great Britain, it was the Transvaal nation, because in 1880 that nation was saved from extinction through being overrun by the Zulu forces; and in 1884 an agreement was made with England to accept a suzerainty or a sort of overlordship of the Transvaal. The Transvaal agreed to that suzerainty. The hon. gentleman would not teach that in his history. He would teach that that was a mere act of aggression. So far as my experience and knowledge go, there was nothing more justified than the prevention of the petty system of tyranny that was being exercised in those days by the President of the Transvaal. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not teach that to the children in the schools?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: If it had not been for the gold and diamond mines, there would not have been any trouble.

Mr. HARTLEY: It did not matter whether the gold and diamonds were there or not. If they accepted the capital of Britishers, as they did, to get that gold out of the country, surely they were entitled to give proper conditions and safeguards for that capital and equal rights to the people who were using it to get that gold out—the right to live under decent conditions. That is what they would not do. If a history is to be written for the school books of that Transvaal war, then they should put into it that Englishmen were not allowed to buy their dynamite where they liked, but had to buy it from those people who had a monopoly for the sale of dynamite. They did not permit Englishmen to go into any hotel they liked. There were certain hotels set apart for Kafirs and Englishmen, and it was only the highly favoured Englishmen who could go to the other hotels. Numerous other injustices might be mentioned. Here is a parallel to the sentiment expressed by the hon. member for Warrego, as regards his remarks on the votes for immigrants. The representatives of Englishmen or Australians—Uitlanders—could not get a vote, no matter how long they had been in the country or what work they were doing there. It was for these things that the war was fought. Would it be well to put this in: that Com Paul Kruger, the President of the Transvaal, was so determined that a Dutch population should grow up to develop the Transvaal that he encouraged a system of daughters having children by their fathers. It was these things that led to the Transvaal war. If the history of the Transvaal war is going to be taught, then I hope it will have a different editor and a different censor to the hon. member for Warrego. We seem to have forgotten the horrors mentioned in the report of Lord Bryce's Commission on the atrocities in Belgium. It is all very well to talk about the horrors of war and the cruelties of the soldiers here and there. The thing that is forgotten is that in time of war non-combatants generally suffer most, and the people of the defeated nations suffer most of all.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. Hartley.]

Mr. HARTLEY: Have I exhausted my whole twenty-five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. HARTLEY: I am sorry that I did not hear the bell go.

Mr. MOORE (*Aubigny*): I would like to congratulate the hon. member for Fitzroy on the sentiments he has expressed. (Hear, hear!) It was a treat to listen to the hon. member after all the humbug we had to put up with during the course of the morning. I quite agree with the hon. member. His speech was in accord with the best sentiments expressed in the world to-day. I agree with it. Even if a man is courageous, if he is not taught what he has got to fight for and is not taught how to use arms, it is no good pitting him against an aggressive nation that has been trained to fight. We know that it would be murder in a case like that. It is all humbug to talk this nonsense about cutting out from the school books anything about war under present world conditions. We have only to look at what is happening in the world—to see what Russia is doing. The Bolshevik Government in Russia are endeavouring to bring into subjection by military force all who are opposed to them, and to make them submit to them in everything because they think it is right. It is a war of aggression, and the weaker party has to submit. Murder, aggression, and victimisation are going on in the very country which is hailed by hon. members opposite as an example to follow.

Mr. COLLINS: The Czar did nothing for the people.

Mr. MOORE: We have worse things practised by the régime which put the Czar out of the way because they considered he was tyrannising over the people, but the present régime are practising worse tyranny to-day.

Mr. COLLINS: Quote your authorities.

Mr. MOORE: He who runs may read. You have only to read the descriptions in the papers to-day and to read Mrs. Philip Snowden's account to see that.

Mr. COLLINS: You get garbled cable accounts.

Mr. MOORE: You have only to read the account of Mrs. Philip Snowden, the wife of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in England, to find out the conditions which are obtaining in Russia. I strongly object to the cheap sneers which are thrown at the leaders of the nation in saying that they drew the people into war, and that, if they themselves had to go and fight, they would not have started the war. Has any evidence ever been given that these men who accepted the responsibility for the people were not actuated by the best motives? They were put there by the votes of the people. What right has anyone to say that, if they had to fight, they would not have caused the war? We know that these men were prepared to accept the responsibility of their position. I think that the responsibility which they took was far greater than the responsibility of taking their place in the ranks of the army. They accepted the responsibility in all humility and did what they considered was best. After all, the people had a say about Australia going into the war. The Government were elected by the people. What is the good of saying that the war was caused through back-door diplomacy and secret

agreements? The Cabinet took the full responsibility for their actions, and the people were prepared to stand behind them.

Mr. COLLINS: What effort did the Czar ever make to benefit the people?

Mr. MOORE: We are talking about Australia. We are talking about what is necessary to avoid mawkish sentiment in the school books to-day, or whether we should train up the children to leave war to the privileged few. We are talking about whether it is right for the Minister, who happens to be in power for a few months—a neophyte in educational matter—to put ideas into the children's heads which will be detrimental to Australia. I quite understand that the Minister just happens to be in the Cabinet. In my opinion it would be far better for him to be in a position he has some claim to—that is the position of Attorney-General. We would not then have the spectacle of a Minister of the Crown defending prisoners in court. If the Minister was Attorney-General, he would be in the place where he ought to be, instead of putting experimental regulations on the statute-book. As Secretary for Public Instruction he is quite out of place. I think he is going to be a danger to the children and to the State. We have to recognise the position in the world to-day. I do not want to see individuals interfering with articles in the school papers. Those articles have been successful in their effect, and the department has been conducted on sound lines. The children have been brought up to be good men and women and to take up the responsibilities of citizenship when called upon to do so. But now all that is to be altered merely at the whim of the Minister. That is absolutely wrong. We are told that he is going to write articles on industrial heroes and tell the truth. What is going to be the truth in these matters? Is it not going to be the truth as one individual sees it? It is not going to be the truth as proved by history and experience, but the truth as one individual likes to think it is, as seen through a pair of spectacles made to suit his own eyes. I would like to quote a little from the "Teachers' Union Journal" of 18th August, which gives a warning of what we may expect to find in the school papers, under the heading of "Pirates!"—

"Aren't we all"—and are we very much better off in the present days? Do not the strong still prey upon the weak? Of course, it is not now those who are physically strong, but those who are strong in cunning. They do not break the laws, they make them. That is a much surer and safer way for the few knowing ones to prey upon the many simple timorous ones. Though there are many authentic accounts of gallant, and, occasionally, successful resistance to these robbers of the sea, peaceable merchantmen going about their lawful business were usually at the mercy of the pirates

"In our last issue we referred to the infliction upon teachers of the 'Embargo', the '5 per cent. reduction', etc. The recent removal of the embargo has been hailed with joy by many. But we would advise those to moderate their transports. The Salaries Act of 1922 has not been repealed, and we have no promise that it will be. While that stands in the way, any relief we might get from the Arbitration Court will still be subject to the limitations of that Act. Those who

make the laws ever have us at their mercy, and we are powerless to resist them, however much we may resent the injustice.

"We would not, of course, call them pirates. Oh, no; rather in the language of Mark Antony, we would assure you, 'So are they all, all honourable men.'"

That is the sort of thing that would be put in the school papers—not the truth from their point of view, but the truth from the Minister's point of view.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: Tripe!

Mr. MOORE: The truth as the Minister wants to put it in, which, as the hon. member for Bremer says, is just tripe.

Mr. F. A. COOPER: First-class tripe, uncleaned and unwashed.

Mr. MOORE: We are likely to get the same sort of stuff in the school papers.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Wait and see.

Mr. MOORE: I do not want to wait and see. I want to stop it before it goes in. I do not want the children to be taught in that way, but in the way they have been taught during the past few years or during the time the department has been in existence, because we know that that teaching has been effective. We know that children taught in that way were able to take up the highest duties of citizenship when it was necessary. There is no use in pretending that they were misled. They were not. If Australia is worth having, it is worth defending.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Who said it was not worth defending?

Mr. MOORE: We know that they are going to edit the school books and put in a lot of nonsense making out that every war is a capitalistic war and a war of aggression, and that the children should not be taught to countenance it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is what you are saying.

Mr. MOORE: That is what hon. members behind the Minister have been saying all the morning.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Members on your side.

Mr. MOORE: No. Those are the sentiments which have been expressed far and wide, and I say that that system is wrong, and I want to see the present curriculum adhered to, and the present system—which was established by educationists who had the welfare of students at heart and experience in the writing of articles and in training them in the best way—maintained. I do not want to see the children experimented upon merely at the whim of the Minister because he happens to be in his present position for a few months and therefore able to dictate as to what they shall be taught. If the system is going to be changed now, and it is going to be changed in a few months' time, it is going to make for disorganisation. It is a question of the Minister taking upon himself the editing of the school books and saying what shall be put in them and what shall be cut out, so that an agreeable brand of history may be put before the children—a brand to suit his ideas and not to suit the truth.

I want to make one or two remarks with regard to the State school vote. I see that

the vote for "Agricultural Education, Rural and Vocational Schools," has been reduced from £11,000 to £6,500. On that point the report of the department has this to say—

"In addition to the rural schools, and apart from technical colleges, vocational instruction has been given at Dalby and Chinchilla; Emerald, Clermont, and Blair Athol; Charleville, Morven, and Mitchell; Longreach, Aramac, and Barcaldine. In all these centres domestic science has been undertaken, and in Charleville, Emerald, and Longreach instruction in woodwork has also been given."

There are numbers of other places in which vocational classes have been given. I have in mind Oakey, Pittsworth, Crow's Nest, Geham, and Haden. I understand that there are many more. To-day the vote is cut down from £11,000 to £6,500, and no mention is made of a number of places in which classes are already being given. I would like to know from the Minister whether it is the intention to cut out a number of classes that are now being held. In many of those places it was only the enthusiasm and the public-spiritedness of the parents that enabled those children to be taught. They put up their own buildings and contributed towards the cost of equipment, and it is only right that they should be allowed to continue, and, if possible, extend their operations. I would like to deal with the attitude taken up by the Queensland Teachers' Union in not allowing the schools to exhibit school work at the various shows. To my mind that is unwarrantable interference, and the Minister has no right to allow dictation from an organisation such as that to override the policy of the department.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Did the hon. gentleman read the Governor's speech the other day in connection with school exercises?

Mr. MOORE: I was at the dinner, and heard the speech. I am not talking so much about school exercises. I am dealing with the question of not allowing the children to exhibit work at the various shows. I would particularly stress the case of vocational classes at Geham. Those classes carried out such magnificent work and the people were so pleased with the work and with what had been taught that they were encouraged to do more on those lines, and a good deal of money was collected in the different districts. Rooms were constructed in which classes could be held, and the children were encouraged, and there was created a spirit of enthusiasm among them which induced many others to join the school. I was at the opening of the Crow's Nest show the other day, and I asked why the work of the vocational classes was not being exhibited, and I was informed that the teacher did not like to exhibit the work because he had been notified that it was unprofessional conduct to allow the children to exhibit their work at the show.

Mr. FARRELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: Evidently the hon. gentleman agrees with that. I think it is only right to encourage the children to compete so that it can be seen what can be done by them. There is no objection to children being allowed to show their work, yet we find that the exhibits at the various shows are being gradually cut out. Why? Not

Mr. Moore.]

because the Minister objects, but because the Queensland Teachers' Union says that it is unprofessional conduct to allow the children to exhibit their work.

Mr. FARRELL: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: Why then, is it not unprofessional conduct on the part of a man who exhibits a prize cow?

Mr. FARRELL: It is not the same as the case of a fat pig or a prize pumpkin.

Mr. MOORE: The principle is the same. The classes are there for educational purposes, so let it be shown what can be done. If you are going to debar one section of the community from showing their work because it is considered unprofessional conduct to do so, why have any shows at all? It is only the same principle carried right through to its logical conclusion.

[3 p.m.]

Mr. FARRELL: It is not.

Mr. MOORE: In my opinion it is. The spirit of competition enables children to see what children from other districts can do, especially in regard to the vocational classes. It is absolutely wrong for the Teachers' Union practically to issue an order that if a teacher allows a child to exhibit, he stands a risk of being kicked out of the union and losing his job. We all know in these days of preference to unionists what that means. The union has no right to dictate to the teachers in that manner. It is for the Minister or the Cabinet to decide what is professional or unprofessional conduct, and the union should not be allowed to interfere in that regard. Such interference is to the disadvantage of the children of the State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You disagree with Professor Adams, who does not agree with cramping the child.

Mr. MOORE: I am only pointing out that in the length and breadth of Queensland there is competition in every one of the shows. There is competition even in education.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The shows are an education.

Mr. MOORE: Then why debar the children from competing?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Because the experts say that it is undesirable.

Mr. MOORE: The children are not allowed to compete because of the petty jealousies that would be created between teachers. If one head master showed his children's work to better advantage than another, he might be hauled over the coals. There is a certain amount of vindictiveness in that policy. We have another example of that spirit contained in a resolution passed at the last conference of teachers. It is to be found on page 5 of the journal, and reads—

“That the department be asked not to give the percentage results of the scholarships for the high school entrance examination.”

That is another little straw showing which way the wind blows. That is merely another attempt to level down the children to make it appear that every child is on the same level. Outside dictation and interference

[Mr. Moore.

with the Department of Public Instruction wants to be cut out, and the Minister should set his foot down firmly and say that he will give directions to the teachers as to what is or is not to be done. This is a very serious question, which affects the welfare of the children. The Government should not sit down supinely and allow public servants to be dictated to as to what they shall or shall not do.

Mr. COLLINS: But you want to dictate to Russia as to what she shall do.

Mr. MOORE: I do not, neither do I want to be put in the position of having to lie down at the dictation of any other nation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MOORE: I want to be in the position of being ready when we are attacked.

Mr. COLLINS: Tell me what sacrifice you made during the war?

Mr. CORSER: He had his son over there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. MOORE: I am not making this a personal matter between the hon. member for Bowen and myself, but what I am endeavouring to point out is that, if this country has something to protect, and if it is worth protecting, then it is worth teaching the children what they have to protect.

Mr. COLLINS: You would be the last man to protect the country a scrap.

Mr. MOORE: That is the same sort of irresponsible statement we have been listening to during the debate. Hon. members opposite have been making groundless charges which they have no possibility of proving. We have heard the statement made that, if those who accepted the enormous responsibility of declaring war had to fight, there would be no war. There is no proof of that. Any man who accepted such a responsibility would be perfectly prepared to accept his share of the responsibility of protecting what he believed to be right. It is merely endeavouring to cloud the issue and to throw mud at people who have no means of protecting themselves. When hon. members opposite make statements like that, they have absolutely no means of proving their case. We know that Ministers of the Crown took every responsibility and did everything they could to protect the welfare of the nation. It is wrong for hon. members opposite to be getting up to-day and throwing mud at those Ministers because they accepted the responsibility and did the best they could for the nation. It is a deliberate wrong to teach our children that these men failed in their duty to the nation.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is a deliberate misstatement, and you know it.

Mr. MOORE: The hon. gentleman seeks to control the writing of articles for our school books to suit his own point of view. The hon. gentleman seeks to garble the truth—not necessarily arising from his own mind, but from what the hon. gentleman's idea of the truth is. We know that different people have different points of view. We have had the hon. member for Fitzroy pointing out the wrong and futile statements of the hon. member for Warrego, and saying that the hon. member did not know what he was talking about, saying that, if the hon. member had to write articles for our school books, they would be wrong and untrue. I want

to see articles in our school books that will allow our children to look at both sides of the question.

Mr. BEDFORD: The hon. member might write an article on how Mr. Fowles prattled about rabbits, or "How to bribe the Secretary for Mines to buy a coal mine."

Mr. MOORE: The hon. member has the advantage of me.

Mr. BEDFORD: I have, in every way.

Mr. MOORE: I have had no information about bribing the Secretary for Mines to buy a coal mine. It is probably another skeleton in the cupboard.

Mr. BEDFORD: That is what Mr. Fowles did, and he was charged on the floor of the Legislative Council by the Secretary for Mines himself.

Mr. VOWLES: What has that to do with the question of war?

Mr. MOORE: I do not know what that has to do with the question of education or with what articles should appear in our school books, and who shall write and edit them. I want to see articles written by people who look at both sides of the case—people who look at the truth and would put in our school books what is right for our children. I want to see matter included in our school books that will encourage our children to become useful citizens and to see both sides of the case. I do not want to see articles that will merely prejudice the minds of our children, and probably prevent them from growing up in the way they should grow and becoming good and useful citizens.

Mr. BARBER (*Bundaberg*): I am not at all concerned as to whether I may be called an optimist, a pacifist, or anything else, but I ask the present Secretary for Public Instruction to stand firmly by the attitude he has taken up. I submit that no hon. member on the other side of the Chamber has got anything on your humble servant, Mr. Pollock, as regards work performed during the war period. I think hon. members opposite should be very thankful to the Secretary for Public Instruction for giving them an opportunity once more to show what I would call their ravenous desire to prove that they are the only friends of the members of the A.I.F. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. MORGAN: Not at all. We know what you did, and we are quite satisfied to let you off.

Mr. BARBER: I am not going to be drawn off like that. Hon. members opposite have lived on this game long enough. They have played it for all it is worth, and it is about played out. They should not pull their own legs any longer, nor should they attempt to pull the legs of the boys who went to the war. The present Secretary for Public Instruction has to accept the full responsibility for the statement which he made some time ago, and, if I know anything about the hon. gentleman, he is quite prepared to do that. He has placed himself in a position exactly similar to that of the Labour Minister for Education in Victoria, Mr. Lemmon. The great danger, as I see it, that confronts both Mr. Brennan, the Queensland Secretary for Public Instruction, and Mr. Lemmon, of Victoria, is that these two men have made known what their intentions are if they are left in charge of the department. It is not what these men have said. The trouble is owing to the

treacherous, contemptible insinuations and innuendoes, and vile Press propaganda that has been carried on against both of these men. Practically every statement that they have made has been distorted by the Tory Press. What has happened in Victoria? Immediately Mr. Lemmon made a clear statement in Parliament of what he actually intended when he made the statement complained of, he was at once accused by the Melbourne "Age" and other journals of having climbed down. Immediately the Secretary for Public Instruction in Queensland makes a clear and definite statement of what he intended to do the Tory Press of Brisbane and most hon. members opposite consider that the hon. gentleman has got the wind up, and that he is going to climb down. If I understand the attitude of the Secretary for Public Instruction, he has no intention in the future of preventing training for defence purposes amongst the school boys at a reasonable age, because he has sufficient common sense to know that it is very necessary. I hold that opinion too. Much as I abhor war, I think it is necessary that we should have some system of defence training here. Anyone who is familiar with defence work at all—I have had nineteen years and seven months in the naval branch of the service—and attended at the training camps during the early period of the war could tell at once that, although the young fellows had not done any drill for six months or for from two or three years, they were half-trained men, and immediately the orders were issued to them those men fell into line and were soon up to the proper standard. Too much capital has been made out of this business altogether. We have the same result from the conservative Press propaganda and from hon. members opposite, who work themselves up into a white passion, as happened about the alleged insult to "the dear old flag" during the war period. They became obsessed with the idea that members of this party and supporters of the movement with which we are connected were disloyal because we did not see eye to eye with them and did not do what they thought we should do. They tore their hair—what little they had—in telling the people that we were disloyal. I remember suffering the infliction some year or two ago of listening to the hon. member for Toowoong, who was addressing a meeting at a picture show. He was shouting himself hoarse. Every second word was about the "red flag," as against the "dear old flag of England." Certainly there was not a very large audience there. The bald-pate brigade were jammed in the front seats, like you find them at a high-kicking vaudeville show.

Mr. FRY: Where were you?

Mr. BARBER: I was right at the back. (Laughter.) It seems to me that the declaration of the Minister has been well thought out. If my opinion was asked, I should be quite prepared to eliminate from the State school books every reference to war. I hold that you can do that with advantage, and that our young people would not be any worse off. This question of developing a lot of red-hot young jingoes is largely a matter of environment. While our poets have their war songs, our youngsters can learn with more benefit the sentiments for which we in Australia stand. I doubt whether anyone will agree with me on that matter,

Mr. Barber.]

but that is my opinion. The question that a lot of people are asking to-day—and it was only a small number, comparatively speaking, who were asking it at the end of the war period—is why there should be war at all. I am reminded of the poem we learned as school children about the battle of Blenheim. The poem runs something like this—

“It was a summer’s evening,
Old Kaspar’s work was done,
And he before his cottage door
Was sitting in the sun.”

The old chap was telling a couple of youngsters about what a tremendous victory they had had at Blenheim, but when one of the shrewd kids asked what it was all about, the old man said—

“‘Why that I cannot tell’ said he,
‘But ’twas a famous victory.’”

Hundreds and thousands of people, if they had been asked what the last great war was about, would not have been able to tell. We all have our own ideas on this subject, but none of us seem to know. One of the worst features of our teaching in our schools is that the British race to which we are proud to belong is superior to all other nations. Probably we have good reason to believe that. My pater died in the undefiled faith that a Britisher, fortified with three pints of three X Yarmouth ale and four tots of Jamaica rum, is equal to any four men of other nationalities. I want to say that I am satisfied that 95 per cent. of the young men who left Australia for the great war did not come back with that idea. They appreciated the fact that there were good men in other nations of the world as well as in Australia. That seemed to me to be one of the worst features of that kind of teaching, that it imbued our young people with the idea that they were a sort of superman. We can hold our own, and there are others who can do likewise. After all, we have as much to give away in these matters as they. I have said in this Chamber before, I have said it outside, and I say it here to-day, that as a land pirate in different parts of the world you cannot beat the Britisher. He has a good idea of what is what—and, by the way, he has a pretty good idea of the perpetual lease system, because he has held on to a big portion of the world ever since he got it. It is true that we, as Britishers, have got a good portion of the world, but what I have to ask is this: If the other fellow had got in earlier and grabbed it, what would we have done? Would we have been as well off as we are? Would the world have been any better off? I do not think we would. Consequently John Bull has sometimes come out all right. I say that, if we teach our boys what is contained in British song and story, the boys who are descendants of the British race will always remember the sentiments incorporated in them. The boys, whether they be in Great Britain or in Australia, will always remember the sentiment contained in “The Battle of Blenheim” and “The Battle of the Baltic”—he will be reminded by a few lines of our great naval heroes. But there are other things, too. Then there is the story of “General Wolfe”—he is remembered in song. He will be reminded by Tennyson—

“Not once or twice in this our island story,

The path of duty’s been the path of glory.”

[Mr. Barber.

All these things, in my opinion, go to build up in the minds of our young people an idea of what is right and wrong. He will be reminded in the poem by Alfred Newbolt, entitled “Drake’s Drum”—

“Take my drum to England; hang it by
the shore,
Strike it when your powder’s running
dry,
And if the Dons sight Devon,
I’ll quit the port o’ Heaven,
And drum them up the Channel as we
drummed them long ago.”

That is the kind of sentiment contained in British song and story, and that, in my opinion, would have a far better effect on the minds of our young people than so much blood-curdling and blood-thirsty detail as they may read in respect of some of our wars. I have forgotten a good deal of history as taught us at school, but I remember one of the striking remarks of “Queen Bess”—just a few lines—when it was reported to her that the Spaniards were about to invade England with their Armada—

“I know I have the body of a weak
and feeble woman, but I have the heart
of a king, and a king of England, too,
and scorn that foul Parma or Spain
should dare to invade the borders
of my realm.”

That is the kind of thing that is being lived up to, in my opinion, among our young people, and I am glad that it is.

Another thing that strikes me on this question is this: People abuse the Labour party and talk about “the flag.” They took advantage in a way that I consider they should not have done. We are acquainted with the old nautical song—

“Britains never, never, never shall be
slaves.”

but to us who have gone through the industrial turmoil and social, economical, and political hardships, as millions of people have done in the old country, it is nonsense. We do not believe it. I do not, at any rate. The flag for which that stands, and on which is the cross of St. George, has nothing at all to do with a lot of things that anti-Labour people claim it has. Just a line or two on that—

“Set every stitch of canvas
To view the freshening wind,
Our bowsprit points to Cuba,
The coast lies far behind,
Then run aloft St. George’s Cross,
And boldly let it wave,
For underneath the British flag
There never treads a slave.”

That song was specially composed during the campaign for abolition of the slave trade, and has been used and distorted by the capitalistic section of British society all over the world. To say there are no slaves whatever in the British industrial world is all moonshine and humbug. I am asked what I think of our present method of school teaching or the teaching of our children. You cannot put a lot of this stuff over young Australians. They laugh at it. Some years ago, when I tried to put it over some of the younger ones at home, I found I had struck a “dud.” They would say, “Come off, dad.” They did not want to hear it. You cannot put over the Australian-born that which you could put over the boys and girls in Europe or the old countries of the world. If you want to teach them anything here,

they want to know all about it. They question you. Years ago, when I had to give instruction in seamanship and many other things, it would not be long before I would have fifty hands up wanting to know what it all meant. As kids in the old country we were told certain things, and we had to sit there and swallow them. A kind of "open your mouth, and shut your eyes, and see what God will send you." You will not find that spirit in the Australian-born. It will not work. If you are giving instruction on the manufacture of black gunpowder and brown gunpowder, and you stated that it required a certain percentage more of charcoal, saltpetre, and sulphur for one than for the other, they would want to know why such was the case. You cannot put this war stuff over our young Australian-born people the same as you can with the children from older countries, consequently it is largely a question of environment. If I had the right to compile some of the school lessons, I would endeavour to give the youngsters what I considered a fair go. Give them the truth. The lessons are all too serious. I would give them a touch of humour with them. I would have them read something along the lines I was compelled to read at school, such as "Battles on land and sea." I read the book over and over again. I read the account of Private O'Sullivan, who made history at the battle of Sebastopol. One cold night when the army were camped near the heights of Alma, and the enemy were practically starved out, Private O'Sullivan—he was only a little chap—went out amongst the Russians and brought in seventeen men, all of whom were twice as big as himself. He ushered them into the guard room. There was a regimental parade in the [3.30 p.m.] morning, and the colonel called out Private O'Sullivan to promote him. The commanding officer said, "O'Sullivan, before I promote you, tell me how you managed to capture these men, all of whom are bigger than yourself?" O'Sullivan saluted and replied, "Please sir, I surrounded them." (Laughter.) The statement that one man could surround seventeen other men, all of them larger than himself, would appeal to the children. Another story which might be included in our Australian school books occurred at the battle of Quatre Bras. The French army was in retreat, and the Highlanders were pursuing them. An officer, sword in hand, was at the head of the Highlanders. A poor wounded French officer was met on the road, and he cried out, "Quarter, quarter." The officer said, "Toot, toot, mon, I have nae time to stop and quarter you the noo; I'll just split you doon the middle for the time being." (Laughter.) I am quite sure that all the boys would see the humour of such stories. I could go on reciting such humorous incidents. That is the kind of thing that should be worked in with the very heavy reading matter about war that is put into school books. As hon. members have said, if an attempt is going to be made to import war history with all its sordid details into the teachings of our young people, the whole truth should be told concerning it. They should be told, too—and I hope that if the Minister remains in his present position for any length of time, he will do so—matters that will start inquiry in the minds of the youngsters as to what the people were fighting about.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BARBER: During the late war I saw a very fine picture in one of the London illustrated papers. Side by side on the battlefield, after one of the battles in the early part of the war, lay typical British and Prussian soldiers. They were sorely wounded and dying. The British soldier passed over his waterbottle to the enemy. As their eyes met their was a look in the eyes of the Prussian soldier which seemed to be asking the question, "What are we fighting for?" Let us cut all this glorification of war out of the lesson books altogether. If such articles as I have suggested replaced them, it would do the children more good and encourage and stimulate them to fight if required in the hour of Australia's need.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Toowong*): The hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat said that, if he were entrusted with compiling history for boys and girls of Queensland, he would do so in order that they might ask themselves the question—"What are we fighting for?"

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL: The reason for the late great war is common property. It was fought simply because a militaristic, bombastic emperor tried his very best to run riot over innocent people. He tore up a scrap of paper, and having done that, he tried to overrun France. What was the result? It is well known that Great Britain, being an ally of France, came and lent a hand.

Mr. COLLINS: It was a commercial war.

Mr. MAXWELL: I cannot understand the attitude of some hon. members opposite, unless it is that they have read and sympathized with a document which has been circulated throughout the length and breadth of the British Dominions by the Germans for propaganda purposes. It is called—

"The Unrepentant Northcliffe.

"A Reply to the London 'Times'
of 19th October, 1920.

by

"The Unrepentant Hun,
Ferdinand Hansen,
of New York."

This is a sample of German literature and propaganda that is being sent out in goods received by Brisbane merchants from Germany. This is the class of matter which is sent out—

"I should require the pen of a Macaulay or a Tolstoy were I to write adequately of the crimes which England has committed, not only against her former enemy, but against humanity at large—crimes so appalling and so cold-blooded that it seems more like insanity than hypocrisy that England should dare even to breathe a word against the actions of Germany in war or level one accusation against the Bolsheviks."

It is that class of rubbish that some hon. members opposite, at any rate, have been reading, and with which they are trying to permeate the minds of hon. members on this side of the Chamber. There are hon. members opposite who were prepared when the war was at its height to furl themselves in the flag that they deny the children the right to salute. They were not game to stand by that flag, and some ran away to Perth.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Maxwell.]

Mr. MAXWELL: I am connecting this with the vote. The Secretary for Public Instruction has stated that nothing appertaining to war must appear in the history book of our State. I am going to point out that it is necessary. Is the hon. gentleman prepared to put into the school books the details of the conference held in Perth at a time when Field-Marshal Haig said, "We have got our backs to the wall"? That meant nothing to those men; they did not mind. They sang "The Red Flag," which the hon. member for Bundaberg talked about. They said, "Make the best bargain you can," meaning with the Prussian monster.

Who is going to write this history?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not you, I hope. You would be too jingoistic.

Mr. MAXWELL: Is it going to be the hon. gentleman, or is it going to be left to his departmental officers? I have the greatest faith in the officers of the Department of Public Instruction. How is the history of a nation going to be written if we are not to write about wars and the deeds that our men performed, which enable us to live and to retain our liberty? I am not a believer in war.

Mr. COLLINS: The hon. member will keep a long, long way from it.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Bowen will keep a good distance from it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to confine himself to the vote.

Mr. MAXWELL: Again, we have heard that the class of history that should be taught is the history of Peter Lalor in connection with the Eureka Stockade. I have nothing to say about that. Some of his admirers placed a statue of Peter Lalor in Sturt street, Ballarat, and later "Red Ragers" tried to blow it up. One day they were prepared to bow down and worship him, and the next day they did not believe in him at all. I desire to know whether the Secretary for Public Instruction has made up his mind when to introduce this subject that he advocates. I do not believe in it, but I think the sooner the hon. gentleman starts the better it will be for the people outside. They will then know what they have to put up with.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Hear, hear!

Mr. MAXWELL: They will know what sort of Secretary for Public Instruction and Government they have.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They will know what sort of "dope" you give them.

Mr. MAXWELL: They will know the anti-Englanders by their speeches to-day. (Government dissent.) It is reprehensible to hear the speeches that have been made by hon. members who have sworn loyalty to the King. Those hon. members have made speeches which are reprehensible and derogatory to the welfare of the King and his dominions.

Mr. HYNES: You did something disloyal when you assisted that delegation to go home and damage the credit of the State.

[Mr. Maxwell.]

Mr. MAXWELL: I did not do that, nor did I call out the police to shoot down the people of Townsville.

The CHAIRMAN: I will tell the hon. member what he is not doing. He is not dealing with the vote.

Mr. MAXWELL: The hon. member for Kelvin Grove quoted something from the "Third Century Reader" that he attributed to a former Government, and I just want to point out that the author in writing that poem showed first what was the amusing side of war and then he showed the seriousness of it. In this verse he shows its seriousness—

"Johnny, my son,
War isn't fun,
'Tis a terrible thing
When once it's begun;
Famine and woe,
For high and low,
And a great deal more
Than drumming, you know."

So you see there was no misleading on the part of the Government that circulated that poem. We want to know if the Minister is going to prevent any reference in the school papers which are circulated throughout Queensland and all over Australia to the deeds of the Anzacs and the members of the A.I.F.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: And the War Service Homes scandals, too.

Mr. MAXWELL: I would not trust the Minister to write a history of the deeds of the Anzacs, but I would trust his officers. Is he going to put this in his school papers?

"They shall not grow old, as we who are
left grow old,
Age shall not weary them, nor the years
condemn.
At the going down of the sun, and in the
morning,
We shall remember them."

He does not want to remember them, and there are members on the other side who do not want to remember them. They do not believe in memorials. Some of them have told me so. They have asked, "Why don't you abandon all these memorials? Why don't you build hospitals instead of putting up memorials?" These memorials are built as an example to the rising generation of the sacrifices these men have made in order that this country of ours shall be fit for men to live in, and fit for a Minister such as the hon. gentleman opposite and others who express themselves in the way they have done to attempt by regulation to deal with in the school papers. Here is another little poem that I would like to have inserted in the school books while the hon. gentleman is about it—

"And let us remember the sons of the
nation who gave their lives that right
and not might shall prevail."

For—

"The long, long road which all must
tread
Far down its tortuous windings to the
end,
Will boast of none more valiant than
you—
The honoured dead."

The only way for that to be done is to teach the children what these men did—what they gave their lives for. One hon. member

on the other side asked what would a woman think if she knew that her first-born was going to be made fodder for cannon. It is not a very nice subject to discuss, but the women of Queensland and the women of Australia never grudged what they gave. One hon. member in this House asked the leader of the Opposition, "What sacrifice did you make?" I might ask that hon. member, "What sacrifice did you make?"

Mr. HYNES: We never tried to exploit the war sentiment as you are doing.

Mr. MAXWELL: It is no good trying to reply to inane interjections like that of the hon. member for Townsville. I would like to quote what Professor Scott, of the Melbourne University, said was likely to eventuate if war notices were eliminated from the school books—

"To eliminate war as a factor in national development—and, indeed, as a very substantial factor in national progress—would be to falsify history deliberately. You might as well propose to eliminate religion, economic considerations, personality, the influence of thought on events, or any other of the great forces which have moulded the civilised world. No true history can be written without estimating the influence of war. There is no state upon this planet which has not been fashioned largely by war."

Several Government members interjecting,

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have already asked hon. members to obey my call to order, and I trust that they will do so.

Mr. MAXWELL: I want to know whether the Minister proposes to eliminate from our school books matter such as I have read out. Is there going to be inculcated into the minds of the children in the schools a spirit of patriotism? I say that it is absolutely essential to teach the children what their brothers, fathers, and relatives fought for in the great war to enable them to live in a community such as this. I certainly hope that the Minister will not be given the opportunity to put into operation this new idea of his. As the hon. member for Wynnum pointed out, new brooms sweep clean, and the Minister wants to make more history. I believe that he wants to get ahead of Mr. Charlton, the leader of the Labour party in Federal Parliament, whose utterances at Geneva have just appeared in the Press. The Minister wants to get kudos for himself. The people of Queensland are not going to stand for that kind of thing, as the hon. member for Fitzroy pointed out this afternoon. There was scarcely a family which did not have some of their members at the war, and they will have something to say in connection with this matter.

There was one matter which was stressed by the hon. member for Rockhampton in dealing with this vote. He referred to educational authorities who visited our city to give lectures, and pointed out that teachers in Brisbane were able to get better opportunities than were given to those in the Northern, Central, and Western districts. I am quite in accord with the hon. member on this subject. If teachers from Northern, Central, and Western districts are prepared to travel to different centres to attend lectures by these educational authorities, it is the duty of the Government to give them

every opportunity to attend: I do not believe that anything good of this description should be confined to Brisbane or other cities, but should be spread as far as possible all over the State. If it is possible to get lecturers to go to Rockhampton and give free passes to teachers in other parts of the State to enable them to attend and benefit by those lectures, we should certainly extend the system.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Why not in other districts, too?

Mr. MAXWELL: I do not mind. It is only right. It stands to reason that these lectures must be worth paying attention to, or the Minister would not arrange for their coming here to give us the benefit of their knowledge. If men and women associated with the teaching staffs in our schools are prepared to make a sacrifice to attend these lectures—and the time involved in travelling to and fro and in attendance at the lectures would mean a certain amount of inconvenience and expense—it is only fair that these advantages should be afforded to them.

In conclusion, I would ask the Minister whether he is going to eliminate from the school books stories from English history. I cannot understand how some hon. members opposite have got the ideas they have in connection with English history, but some people naturally see the bad side of a thing. One of the finest books we can read is Macaulay's "History of England." There are others, but there seems to me an idea permeating the minds of our friends opposite to take history and put the wrong construction on it, and on every occasion to throw that bad up at us, exposing it to the public eye and the view of the country. That is the only construction I can place on the actions of hon. members opposite.

Mr. HYNES: You are endeavouring to kill the credit of the country.

Mr. MAXWELL: I am not, and I am not going to allow the hon. member to put words into my mouth. I ask the Minister whether he wants to eliminate from the school books some of Burns's poems, such as "Scots Wha Hae Wi' Wallace Bled"? Would he eliminate Macaulay's "Ballad of the Armada"? Would he eliminate Campbell's "The Battle of the Baltic"? There is only one ray of sunshine that I can see, and it lies in the probability that the hon. gentleman will not reign very long.

Mr. GLEDSON (*Ipswich*): I want to have a word or two to say on this important work of education and of the forward move we are making in the work with our boys and girls, particularly in our technical colleges and State schools. The department have gone ahead in educational work, and I have to congratulate them on the standard of education they have set up in our technical schools and trade schools. They have made the standard the junior university examination, and have given the boys and girls who attend these schools the opportunity of going through the junior course and of either qualifying for a trade or a profession. That is a part of the educational system which should be developed, and which the Minister should push on as far as he can.

Another matter I would like to notice in passing is the move that has been made in the building of domestic science railway

Mr. Gledson.]

cars and sending them out to the furthest part of our railway system to give the girls there an opportunity of getting some knowledge in domestic science. I had the opportunity of seeing the cars which were built in Ipswich, and also when one was stationed at the last Brisbane Exhibition, and I am sure that everybody who took the opportunity of going through it—and there were crowds of men and women who did so—could not but be impressed with the possibilities of education for our girls in out-back places. I understand that now a car is to be fitted up to give trade instruction to boys. That is a good move which will commend itself to everyone. Boys then will be able to do vocational work in the out-back centres of our State, and no better work could be engaged in. I think the department would be well advised to extend the system. The railway does not reach quite a number of centres, and I think that a motor car could be equipped without any more expense than a railway carriage, and it could go out into the remote centres where railways do not reach and take practical education to the boys and girls in the back-blocks. No better work could be undertaken by the department.

The bulk of the speeches which have been made have centred round the statement of the Secretary for Public Instruction as to his intention to reorganise the State school readers with reference to the glorification and extolling of war. It has been made the subject of an attack on the Minister and a general exhibition of the flag-waving propensities in which the members of the Opposition have indulged from time to time.

I take it that the thing boils down to what we are going to instil into the minds of the boys and girls of this State. That is the main thing to be taken into consideration. We have not to consider what the adults are to be told, as we are dealing with boys and girls, and really dealing with babies. Under our educational system we have the opportunity of creating an impression in the minds of the boys and girls that is going to be with them all their lives, and is going to be the means, practically, of carving out their future walk in life. What is the idea behind the Minister in his recent pronouncement? Not to discredit anything that anyone has done for Australia, and not to discredit anything that has been done by the men who have fought for Australia. Nothing was further from the hon. gentleman's mind. That is only a mean attempt by the Opposition to bring that phase of the matter into the discussion. The idea behind the Minister and the Labour party is to take out of all articles in our school literature such things as will inflame the minds, especially of our boys, and practically brutalise them and place them in a position of desiring fight all the time.

Mr. KERR: It will mean taking out something that is not there.

Mr. GLEDSON: It is there.

Mr. KERR: Tell me where it is.

Mr. GLEDSON: Last week I listened to an address by a school teacher. He said, "I have had an opportunity of teaching boys for a number of years. I had fifty boys under my care at the top of the school. I also had an opportunity of dealing with 600 junior cadets. What is in the minds of those boys? What do they think a hero is? In nearly

every case a boy's conception of a hero is the one who has the strongest muscle or the one who can knock the other one down." That was just last week, not dealing with this question, but on another matter altogether. That was the opinion of a Queensland school teacher who is not now in the service but has taken on other work.

Mr. MORGAN: That is the Australian spirit.

Mr. GLEDSON: He said that was the idea in the minds of the boys of Queensland. What we have to do is to teach them that there is some higher ideal than how you are going to knock somebody on the nose and make his nose bleed, or knock him over.

Mr. KERR: That is very bloodthirsty.

Mr. GLEDSON: The idea of our educational system is to see that the impressions in the minds of our boys and girls will cultivate such a line of thought as will enable them to take their place in life and become good citizens of our State, and not become soldiers of the future, and not become men who will all the time be looking to see whether there is going to be a war or not, and whom they can fight. We want to adopt every possible means to see that the impressions made on the minds of our boys and girls in the early stages are such as will lead them to higher ideals of life, and will teach them that there is something higher for them than fighting one another, and we should imbue them with the idea that brotherly love should continue, and that there is something greater in life than killing one another.

At 4 p.m.,

Mr. F. A. COOPER (*Bremer*), one of the panel of Temporary Chairmen, relieved the Chairman in the chair.

Mr. KING: That is class-conscious teaching. That comes later on.

Mr. GLEDSON: The whole position in connection with this matter is that once we educate our boys and girls up to such a standard there will be no need to teach class-consciousness because they will be sufficiently class-conscious to decide the matter for themselves. But I am not going to be drawn off the track to deal with the question of class-consciousness. Hon. members opposite have been trying to point out that the school papers and literature should be written in such a manner as to induce boys and girls to rush into war without asking any questions at all.

Mr. KERR: You are wrong.

Mr. GLEDSON: The hon. member for Bundaberg quoted from the poem "The Battle of Blenheim." It is just as well to remind some of our people how this affects us. If this was in the school books, it would do no harm. I wish to quote from the eighth verse—

"With fire and sword the country round
Was wasted far and wide;
And many a childing mother then
And newborn baby died;
But things like that, you know, must be
At every famous victory.

"They say it was a shocking sight
After the field was won;
For many thousand bodies here
Lay rotting in the sun;
But things like that, you know, must be
At every famous victory.

[Mr. Gledson.]

"Great praise the Duke of Marlbro' won
 And our good Prince Eugene.
 'Why, 'twas a very wicked thing!'
 Said little Wilhelmine.
 'Nay, nay, my little girl,' quoth he,
 'It was a famous victory.'

"And everybody praised the Duke,
 Who this great fight did win.
 'But what good came of it at last?'
 Quoth little Peterkin.
 'Why that I cannot tell,' quoth he,
 'But 'twas a famous victory.'"

That poem will not incite the minds of children, but it will show just what has been attempted to be shown by hon. members on this side—that in nearly every war the combatants do not know what the war is about. They are only asked to go into battle. We have that exemplified in Tennyson's poem "The Charge of the Light Brigade."

"Theirs not to reason why;
 Theirs but to do or die.
 Into the jaws of death
 Rode the six hundred."

That is the same right through every war that has taken place. In the history of the world we find that those who were actually the combatants had nothing to do with the reasons for the war or its cessation. Hon. members will say, "What is the reason for all this talk in connection with the matter?" We find that in connection with the agitation for the abolition of slavery someone had to start it. The hon. member for Enoggera stated that there was a war to secure the freedom of slavery in America. That was because of the greed of the Southern planters, who were prepared to retain their slaves for cheap labour as long as they possibly could. The slaves did not want to remain slaves, but the planters in their greed for commercialism wanted them. Yet the hon. member for Enoggera quoted that as an example of why one war had to be brought about. We find that in every reform someone had to start it. If by our literature we can impress on the minds of the boys and girls that there are higher things in their lives than war, and that there is such a thing as brotherly love, then when they grow up into men and women these ideas will be so implanted in their minds that they will see no reason for going to war. We have been told that hon. members on this side of the Chamber are prepared to sit down and let some foreign nation come in and ride roughshod over us. There is nothing of the sort. If you train a boy to box—"the gentle art of self-defence," as it is termed—the first thing he wants to do when he gets out is to go and have a go at somebody and try his proficiency. The same thing applies in this case. We have to get away from that sort of thing. An effort is now being made to get away altogether from war. Members of the Opposition say, and I think rightly, that they individually do not want to see any more war. I believe they are honest in that, and that they would do all they possibly could to stop war. If that is so, let us start now and so train our boys and girls that they will have a horror of war and do what they can to prevent war.

Just to see what they are doing in the Federal Parliament in connection with this matter, I picked up a Federal "Hansard," and I read some interesting utterances by Mr. Bruce, who, I think, is the Prime

Minister of the Commonwealth. Dealing with the Defence Equipment Bill, Mr. Bruce said—

"We are told that in all countries there is a revulsion of feeling against warfare, because of the experiences of the late war. I agree that there is. I believe that every nation that was engaged in that war is determined, by all means in its power, to prevent its participation in another such trouble. But some years have now elapsed since the war. People are growing up in all the countries that were combatants who played no part in and had no experience of the war. The number of such people will inevitably increase as the years go by. Those of us who participated in, and those who lived during the war will, as the years go by, become fewer in number. I regret that already the revulsion of feeling against war appears to be becoming weaker, and that there is a tendency to forget the lessons that the war taught."

Let the Prime Minister of Australia speak for the Opposition, and let hon. members opposite do away with any thought in favour of war; let them endeavour not to perpetuate war. Mr. Bruce says again—

"A very real and very grave danger to the peace of the world lies in the fact that leaders, to maintain their position, may appeal to the sentiments of a people and arouse their national ambitions."

The speeches of hon. members opposite to-day will tend to do nothing but arouse the ambitions of the people of Queensland and instil into their minds the fact that there is a necessity for us to keep up a war spirit in Queensland. (Opposition dissent.) The sooner we get away from that the better. The sooner we do what we can to eliminate all ideas of war and teach our boys and girls a higher conception of life, the better it will be for us. If we do that we shall be doing something which will brand us as a Parliament and a State that is doing its little bit to bring about an era of universal peace throughout the world.

Mr. TAYLOR (*Windsor*): I am sure hon. members have listened with considerable interest to the speeches that have been delivered to-day on this vote. Before I make a few remarks regarding what has been the dominant note throughout the speeches, I think we should congratulate ourselves, and the Department of Public Instruction should congratulate itself, on the very excellent work that is being done throughout the State in promoting primary and secondary education in every possible direction.

Like the hon. member for Ipswich, I too had the privilege of going into the domestic science car exhibit at the recent show, and it was an exhibit that must commend itself to everyone desiring to see the benefits of that class of education bestowed on those who have not the same privileges as their fortunate sisters in cities such as Brisbane, Rockhampton, and other large cities in Queensland. I agree with the idea of the hon. member for Ipswich as to extending that system, if possible, to places where there is no railway communication. Probably a motor conveyance could be fitted up—not as expensive as the railway carriage we have at the present time—which could be sent out

Mr. Taylor.]

to those places where the children have no benefits or privileges of any kind. That is an idea that might be taken notice of by the Minister. Wherever there is a railway there are certain advantages accruing to those who live within close proximity to that railway.

Our system of education is being well maintained, notwithstanding the criticisms that are sometimes directed at it. The educational system of Queensland I certainly think will hold its own with the educational system of any other State in the Commonwealth. While I say that, I consider that the success of the Department of Public Instruction depends not so much on the Minister controlling it as on the permanent heads of the department.

Mr. COLLINS: Belittling the politician again.

Mr. TAYLOR: I am not belittling the politician, but because of the time the officers in the department spend in studying educational matters, they should be better qualified than any ministerial head to carry out the functions of the department as we desire they should be carried out.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A little variety is very good sometimes.

Mr. TAYLOR: I think the hon. gentleman can provide the variety all right.

With regard to the question that has been raised during this discussion as to advisableness or otherwise of inserting in the school books lessons pertaining to war, we on this side have no desire whatever to see anything placed in the school books of Queensland which will inflame the minds of the children in favour of war. We say that unhesitatingly.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is my argument.

Mr. TAYLOR: We have no desire that anything of that kind shall appear in the school books of Queensland. That is the opinion of every member on this side of the Chamber. We do not want to see war placed on a pedestal. We do not want to see it deified in any shape or form. The fear that is in the minds of the people of Queensland is that there is likely to be another war. That fear may be right or it may be wrong.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I say it is wrong. It is a newspaper fear.

Mr. TAYLOR: If we are going to have reference to the horrors of war, it must not be forgotten that there have been and there are glorious associations connected with the actions of men in war time. No one can deny that war brings out the very best that is in man and also the very worst. I think we all agree with that. If you are going to depict the horrors of war in your school books and in your school papers and show the pernicious and devastating influence it has on humanity generally, then it is only right, where there are splendid achievements and splendid things done by men associated with war, that they also should be recorded. I claim that that is not a deification of war in any shape or form. It must not be forgotten that all great reforms have all come through great stress, great sorrow, and great sacrifice. The redemption of mankind was brought about how? By the crucifixion of Christ. That is the doctrine that is accepted in the Christian churches to-day.

[Mr. Taylor.

Yet that crucifixion had to take place before there was any chance of the redemption of mankind.

Mr. COLLINS: Do you think we have redeemed mankind since that time?

Mr. TAYLOR: I do not know that we have succeeded in redeeming mankind. I certainly think there have been honest attempts made to redeem mankind since that time. Many of them have failed, and probably many more efforts will fail in the future; but so long as men are sincere in their endeavours, I claim that good must result. Whether the Great War was necessary in order to bring it about or not I am not prepared to say; but we have to admit that probably what was impossible of accomplishment before 1914 has been accomplished since the cessation of the war—that is the formation of a league of the principal nations of the world.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Some of the nations do not want war because they would lose too many ships.

Mr. TAYLOR: Since the cessation of the war we know that the League of Nations has been brought about. It may not have accomplished as much as we would like to see, but we must not forget that since 1914 we have had representatives of the leading nations of the world sitting round the table of the League of Nations to discuss the situation in regard to future wars. The interests of the different nations have been of a very conflicting nature, and to bring order out of chaos has been a most difficult task. Surely we have reason to hope that some means will be found of preventing war in the future while we have such a league in operation and functioning as it is at the present time, and on which Australia is represented by the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth and leader of the Federal Labour party. We could not hope for that solution years ago.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Something can be done by organisation.

Mr. TAYLOR: The Minister's great aim at the present time is to teach the children the blessings of peace, and if that is done, the Minister will have accomplished a very great work. I certainly hope that he will do that.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That is the idea.

Mr. TAYLOR: A short time ago we had a Disarmament Conference held at Washington. It looked quite improbable a few years ago that the nations would meet together to discuss the disarmament problem. We know the result of that Disarmament Conference. A great many war vessels were scrapped, and the number of vessels to be built by the Powers who met in the Conference was limited. We know that a certain arrangement was made by Japan, England, and America with regard to vessels in waters adjacent to Australia. Those things want to be taught in our schools as much as possible.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: We want to inculcate a horror of war, which has been so devastating not only to Queensland but throughout the world.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: You are expressing my sentiments.

Mr. TAYLOR: Reference has been made to mothers whose first-born children took part

in the war. Every member of this Chamber knows that there are hundreds of thousands of mothers in the world to-day—many of them in Australia—who, although they have shed bitter tears over the loss of their loved ones, do not regret that their boys fell in what they believe was a noble cause. They are proud of their boys, whose memories will always be sweet to them. These matters would not be out of place in our school books at the present time.

Another matter mentioned by the hon. member for South Brisbane was what he called "secret treaties." For quite a long time secret treaties between nations will be absolutely imperative. It may happen that it will be advisable for nations whose territories adjoin or whose interests are identical to make a treaty which it is not in the best interests of either to be known by a third nation; and I take it that when such treaties have been made the nations concerned have been actuated by the very highest possible motives, both in making them and in keeping them secret as far as possible for the time being.

I do not want to labour the question. If the discussion brings us any nearer to peace, we shall all welcome it. At any rate, I hope it will. There is one point on which I did not touch when dealing with the League of Nations just now to which I shall refer in conclusion. We have in Queensland and throughout the Empire our courts, our judges, and juries. Cases are brought before them. The judges listen to them, the advocates for the contending parties argue them, and the judge gives his verdict or award. What would be the value of an award or a verdict of a judge if we had not our police force and St. Helena behind it? It would not be worth a snap of the fingers. The hon. member for Fitzroy quite rightly said, "Why not start by dismissing our police force?" Does not the hon. member for Bowen—to whom I give credit for sincerity of view—lock the doors and windows of his house when he goes out with his wife and family? Why? For the simple reason that he knows there are people in this world who have no respect for his property, and he takes those steps to defend it. And if any man tried to interfere with his wife or his family and he had a weapon by him, he would not fail to use it; he would not wait to reason with the man in any way. He would rightly think that the man was an offender, and was not fit to receive any consideration from him—he would get rid of him as soon as he could.

The Minister in charge of this department undoubtedly carries a very heavy responsibility, because the young people of Queensland are practically under his control and under the control of the officers of his department. The characters of our boys and girls are made during their school life, and any interference with the historical teaching—with the telling of what has actually taken place—should be very carefully considered before anything is done. We want them to grow up with a true knowledge of what has happened during past years. We do not want to see our Department of Public Instruction made political.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TAYLOR: If it were so, nothing would prevent another Minister from altering the whole system. We have not been

troubled with such a thing in recent years; everything has gone on fairly well. Let our children have a knowledge of the facts which have made the history of the Empire! Teach Australian history! I speak as an Australian-born, who is proud of being Australian, but I also speak as a man who is proud of being British, too. I speak in this way because I realise that it is important that nothing should be done to impair the greatness of our State or of our Commonwealth, or to prevent it from becoming the greatest as well as the freest and most democratic country in the world. (Hear, hear!)

Mr. WINSTANLEY (*Queenton*): This is a fairly large vote, and it is also one of the most important that can be discussed. The amount required for the education of the children in Queensland is increasing every year, and that goes to show that we are not afraid to spend money in that direction. Frankly, I believe it is one of the best possible investments that we can make. Although the discussion has been somewhat protracted, and a great deal of it has very little to do with the vote itself, yet I think it is time well spent. Judging from the results, we have good reason to be proud of our educational system, and perhaps more so when one knows something of other systems in other States and compares them with our own. Good as our system may be, I consider the last word has not been said on education even in Queensland, and for that reason it is a very good thing indeed to have men like Professor Adams, who was here last week, and whom I had the opportunity of listening to, and men from other countries of the world whose systems are not exactly on all fours with our own coming here and looking at our system and seeing what it is like, expressing their opinion, and making comparisons. Comparisons are said to be odious, but they may at times be helpful. If the criticism is helpful, then I do not think anybody will grumble at it. We should learn from each other. If there are good points in the educational systems of the other States of the Commonwealth, and there are good points in the educational systems of the other countries of the world, then we should not be slow in accepting them if they are going to help to improve our own system. The report by this department furnishes exceptionally interesting reading. The reports of the inspectors from time to time go to show that the system is making good progress.

Mr. KELSO: The inspectors have not been recognised yet.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: The hon. gentleman need not trouble about that. His fears are exaggerated. He is making a mountain out of a molehill. The difficulties that he can see and the things that he is afraid of are creatures of his own imagination rather than anything else. It seems a pity that only a handful of teachers located in the metropolitan area can get an opportunity of hearing those men who visit Queensland. It has been suggested that for educational purposes the State be divided into three sections—South, Central, and North. It might be a good thing to have training colleges established in those three divisions; but it does seem to be a very unfair thing to expect the teachers in the Central district and the North to spend the whole of their lives in those districts. The Central and the Northern districts are not so thickly populated as the South, and everyone must know that in

Mr. Winstanley. }

sparsely populated districts the advantages and opportunities, both for teaching and learning, amongst the teachers themselves, is not as good as in the larger centres of population. Anybody who has spent twenty to thirty years in North Queensland and comes to live in Brisbane cannot help being struck by the decided advantages in many directions, particularly in connection with people who want to learn and are anxious to know, and who want to hear the opinions of people from other States and other countries. While the inspectors in their reports point out the splendid work these men are doing in the outback districts, even under serious disadvantages, it is known that a majority of these men think that, when they have done a fair turn there—they are justified in this belief—they should get an opportunity of coming into the southern parts of the State and enjoying the privileges that many of the teachers enjoy here to-day. That is only a fair and reasonable expectation on their part.

[4.30 p.m.]

One or two of the reports of inspectors point out what, to my mind, is a very great essential, and what is to boys particularly one of the greatest problems connected with education. That is, that the children should not be educated in a kind of educational rut. They point out that, while boys are fairly efficient so far as memory and other work is concerned, immediately they are asked to make an application of their knowledge to the everyday affairs of life they are at a loss how to do so. If that goes on, boys, when leaving school, may be fairly well crammed and have acquired a lot of things which they have memorised, but, if they are unable to make an application of their learning to the everyday affairs of life, then their education will be far from being complete. Education does not consist in the mere accumulation of facts, events, and figures, but should enable boys and girls to think for themselves and to draw logical conclusions from the everyday events of life. If they are unable to do so, something has been lacking in their education and in the system they were educated under. That fact may not be widespread, but it is evident that it exists in some places. It is one of those things which to some extent depends upon the teachers.

There is another matter I would like to point out, and that is in connection with play-sheds in the Northern and North-Western parts of the State. I understood an hon. member to say that these had now been cut out. If that is so, the children in those portions will be placed at a serious disadvantage unless the school buildings, like the modern schools, are built on fairly high blocks so as to afford shelter and shade from the hot sun during the play hours. Only this morning I received a letter from the Department of Public Instruction advising that an application for a play-shed in connection with one of the schools in my electorate had been referred to the Department of Public Works. All that is wanted in this case is for the wall plates, rafters, and iron to be placed on blocks which are already in the ground. The school is situated in a centre where the population has decreased, and in consequence of the school attendance having decreased, a portion of the school building has been taken to a

more populous district, leaving the blocks and concrete floor there. Play-sheds are an essential convenience attached to schools in the northern part of the State.

One of the northern inspectors has something to say in connection with the music and singing of the children. I agree with the hon. member for Bundaberg, who said that a good deal could be implanted in the minds of children by songs, and that many of the songs would remain in their minds. One song-writer said that he did not care who educated the children so long as he wrote their songs. The inspector points out that in one little school in North Queensland the singing stands out conspicuously on its own. It is evident that the teacher has a love for music and that he has imparted his love for music to the pupils. Anyone who has heard those children would agree with the inspector that their singing is exceptionally fine—not only their singing in unison, but their part songs.

Quite a lot of discussion has taken place as to what is to be the attitude of the department with regard to what it places before the school children in the school books and papers. To my mind the point is not so much whether the methods of the past have been right or wrong. The question is: What are we going to do and be in the future? The speech of the hon. member for Windsor contrasted with some of the speeches of other hon. members opposite, and it contained a paradox. The hon. member pointed out that the redemption of mankind had been worked out by sacrifice. There is no doubt about that; but the attitude of a very large number of hon. members opposite is not on those lines. Their attitude is not to redeem their people or their country by sacrifice, but the reverse. Their motto is very well defined—

“Thrice is he armed who hath his
quarrel just,
But six times he who gets his blow
in first.”

They appeal on behalf of war, and claim that we should inculcate the spirit of war in our children and train them, as soon as they can be trained, to meet an enemy who may arise and whom they must fight. They will, perhaps, say that they have no love for war, but it is an absolute fact that in days not long past military jingoes drank to the toast, “A bloody war and quick promotion.” Every soldier knows that his only chance of promotion is to have his mates killed or wounded. Hon. members opposite say that they do not believe in war, but they possess the jingoistic spirit and support traditions of war. The question is whether we shall foster war or avoid war altogether. Hon. members opposite have credited the Minister with quite a lot that he did not say. The statement has been made that the fighting spirit is not in man or in his progenitors; but it would be a great error to suppose that the instinct of acquisitiveness in its old and barbarous form has lost its hold on even the most civilised nation. When an old brigand appeared and put himself at the head of his nation, he became at once a popular hero. By any rational standard of morality few greater scoundrels have ever lived than Frederick the Great and Napoleon I. But they are still names to conjure with. I for one object to the fact that names like Frederick the Great and Napoleon should

[Mr. Winstanley.

be conjured with in our schools, and that their deeds should be lauded as those of heroes.

Mr. KELSO: They are only mentioned as a warning.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: They are held up as examples for our boys to copy, and as being superior to the heroes of peace. I believe that "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war," and that we should object to what has been done in times gone by in exalting only the militaristic and jingoistic section. If we continue to do that, we are going to inculcate into our children the idea that they should become a militaristic nation, or otherwise the nation will go back. I do not believe that. If we are going to have these things referred to in the school books at all, the truth should be told about them. They should not be glossed over. The horrors of war as well as its glories—if there are any glories—should be told to the boys plainly and distinctly.

Mr. KELSO: Everybody agrees with that.

Mr. WINSTANLEY: Everybody does not agree with that, and the speeches made by members on that side of the Chamber have not been in that direction. The idea seems to prevail amongst hon. members opposite that, unless we are a military nation and unless we cultivate the military spirit, somebody is going to come along by and by and swallow us up. What made the German nation so anxious and so ready for war was the fact that for thirty years they had been teaching in their school books that the Germans were superior to all the races of the world; that they were the cream of creation; that they belong to the Nordic race and that their culture and intelligence were superior to those of any other nation and they had a perfect right to impose their culture on all the other races of the world. We can easily imagine, if that was taught to the boys and girls, that they readily believed it, and that they did not need much inspiring or encouragement when the time came to buckle on their swords and fight for what they believed was in the interests of their country and of their culture. Those responsible fully met with the reward they deserved. The point to my mind is whether in our schools we are going to teach our boys and girls that there is something better than war; whether we ought to arbitrate before we fight; whether we are going to foster the spirit of the League of Nations; and whether we are going to try to get nations to meet together like we get people to meet together in a spirit of sweet reasonableness, and discuss the difficulties which do exist, and which may very reasonably exist internationally—whether these things are going to be discussed before fighting takes place or not. Does anybody imagine for a moment that, if in August, 1914, the war could have been postponed for a week or a fortnight and the matter discussed, the war would ever have taken place? No one for a moment believes that it would, and the question is whether the boys and girls of Australia are going to be taught to support a league like the League of Nations with representatives from all nations present—all nations are not represented at present, but I hope they very soon will be—and whether the minds of the people are going to recognise arbitration as between nations as a preventative of war. If we do that, we can take it for granted that the time is not very far distant—though perhaps not in our time—when war will be no more.

Some hon. members have talked about abolishing the police. Does anyone imagine for a moment that the police of Brisbane—probably the whole force does not exceed a thousand—does anyone imagine that 1,000 police can keep 200,000 people in order if the people do not want to be kept in order? Is it not a fact that members of the community understand that the police have a right to keep those in order who do not keep themselves in order, and that they should stand behind a policeman when he arrests a man who has been interfering with somebody else—who has assaulted somebody or robbed somebody—or who has transgressed the law? Once nations can be got to the stage when they will recognise what is right and wrong internationally and then submit it to a tribunal for decision, the time will not be far distant when war will be no more. Hon. members opposite are pessimistic about it. They say that because wars have been they always will be. I do not believe in that for a moment. I believe the time is not far distant of which Tennyson wrote—

"Till the war drum throbb'd no longer,
and the battle-flags were fur'd,

In the Parliament of man, the Federation
of the world."

Nobody worked harder and nobody did more than the late W. T. Stead to bring about what he called "The United States of Europe." His wish was to get the whole of the European nations together to discuss their differences—differences of race, of possessions, and of languages—and to try to understand one another. Everybody knows that in a great many instances there have been no real differences between nations, but wars have been fought because of the whims or fancies of some particular individuals. As I said once before in this Chamber at the close of the war, if the League of Nations does not succeed—I hope it will—it will be followed by a league of peoples in every country of the world. When once they can get over the imaginary boundaries—of course it is not an easy matter—but when once they can get together and discuss their differences they will soon come to the conclusion that they have nothing to gain but a very great deal to lose by perpetuating the barbarous system under which we live at the present time. I think a great deal can be done to instil into the minds of the boys and girls of this great and privileged country the truth that there are better things than war, and that wars can be avoided just in so far as people are educated up to the point of seeing that these differences can be settled by other and better means than the arbitrament of the sword.

Mr. SWAYNE (*Mirani*): I would like to say a few words on behalf of the country children in Queensland. Unfortunately, wherever we will through the country districts we find groups of settlers with children of school age without educational advantages. As we have a new Minister in charge of the department, it is a fitting opportunity to draw his attention to this matter. I do not wish to labour the question. The Minister can easily ascertain for himself that such is the case. Even when his officials decide that a school is required, unfortunately the matter is hung up by another department. I think the hon. member for Burnett this morning laid his finger on a weak spot when he pointed out that the decision of the Department of Public Instruction as to what schools should

Mr. Swayne.]

take precedence in erection is overruled by the Department of Public Works. The officers of the Department of Public Instruction are as capable a body of men as we can find anywhere. When we lay before them the just requirements for our respective electorates we receive every courtesy; and every desire is shown to do what is right. Only the other day I had occasion to see the Under Secretary, and I was quite surprised at the detailed information he had at his fingers' ends regarding the working of the various schools which are under his charge, and what I say about him is applicable to every official in his department, but unfortunately the evil still remains. There are large numbers of children who are without educational facilities. We know that one of the great difficulties at the present time is to get settlement on the land. While there are many other factors which go towards creating a disinclination in that direction, one very important cause is the feeling on the part of parents that, if they go into the country, their children will not get the education they would get if they remained in the towns. I would like the Minister to assert himself, and see that, when Parliament votes money for the erection of schools the schools are built as the department thinks fit, and not as the Department of Public Works thinks fit. The Minister may think it is a joke, but it is not a joke to parents in country districts. I have a letter which appeared in the "Daily Standard" on 20th August last—

"WANTED A SCHOOL.

"R. O. Marshall (Monto, via Eidsvold) writes—

I am a settler on the Upper Burnett Settlement. My wife and three children came here on 16th January last. The three children are of full school age, the eldest having been in the sixth class before we came here. The Government gave us a definite assurance that schools would be established for our children. The ex-Minister for Public Instruction was here on 25th May, and he assured us we would get a school at our centre. We have here nineteen children of school age, besides several more who will be due for school at next birthday—all within 2½ miles of the proposed school site. We sent in our claim for our school on 26th May last, and we got a reply recently saying the department refused us a State school, but that if the parents built the schoolroom the department would supply furniture and a teacher for a provisional school. Now, we claim that as we have over the required number of children entitling us to a State school, and as there is no school nearer than 20 miles, we are not getting a fair deal. We have been seven months here in the bush, and are no nearer a school for our children."

That is only typical of the position of most of our centres, but the trouble has been that, instead of only having to wait seven months, we have had to wait seven years or longer.

I should not have risen and dealt with similar matters to those which have been discussed by members on this side of the Chamber had it not been for the constant attempt which is being made on the Government side to put a wrong complexion on the statements of the Opposition. Hon. members on this side have merely urged that it is not

wise in the interests of Queensland that our boys and girls should be brought up with the idea that we shall never have to fight for our country. In these questions it is not advisable to mince matters. Although it is true that some nations are desirous of bringing about world peace, yet we are not by any means assured of ultimate success, and until we are assured of ultimate success it would not be wise to limit ourselves to the idea that the time will never come when we shall have to fight for the country we own. That is the sum total of the statements which have come from this side of the Chamber—that it is not wise that all reference to the responsibility of nationhood and the defence of one's country should be obliterated from the training of our young people. It is common sense to think that since Australia is one of the richest countries in the world, it must be viewed with envy by other nations, and that the time may come when we shall have to defend it from a foreign foe; and all we say is that our children should be told that, if that time should come, it will be necessary for them to take their part in carrying out that duty. That is really all that has been said by hon. members on this side; yet we have been credited with wishing to imbue the young Queenslanders with a warlike desire to rush to war and a desire to fight. Nothing of the kind has come from hon. members on this side. All we have urged is that in our school literature it shall be set forth from time to time what has been done by the various nations in the defence of their rights, and that our children should be told that it may be necessary to fight for the country they own. Whilst we are on this question, I should like to say that I understand that it has been reported that English history has been banned, or that it is the intention of the Minister to do so. I should like to say that there are many passages in it which ought to be retained, such as those dealing with the growth of parliamentary government. The House of Commons is described as the "Mother of Parliaments," and the growth of constitutional government along the lines of parliamentary government, and other similar features are dealt with. The action of England as the first nation to take action in securing freedom of the slaves is touched upon, and it is pointed out that England has always been the sanctuary of those who were accused of political misdemeanours in other countries. I would like to ask the Minister whether it is his intention to exclude from the school books all these things. I would also like to ask him whether he intends to exclude all reference to the Spanish Armada and the great fight put up then by England for freedom.

At 4.50 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN resumed the chair.

Mr. SWAYNE: Things like that should be taught so as to stimulate the young Australian, and, if unfortunately the time does come when he must fight for his country, then he will only do what his ancestors did before him.

I was rather surprised to hear the hon. member for Warrego refer to the last war as a foreign war, and say that he hoped the last man and the last shilling had been contributed by Australia for such a cause. I wonder if he realises what defeat in that war would have meant. Anyone who remembers what took place and the causes

[Mr. Swayne.

that led up to it, the policy of those who were fighting, and their avowed intentions, must realise that our boys, when fighting in the trenches in Europe or Gallipoli, were fighting Australia's battles just as much as if they had been fighting on Australian shores. It was far better for Australia that the Turks, the Austrians, and the Prussians should be fought on the other side of the world instead of our sitting idly waiting until all the Allies had been defeated, and we, being the last because we were the furthest away, were then forced to put up a defence in Australia against a competent force from a victorious army. We avoided the domination of militarism by joining forces with our Allies overseas, and we so diverted from Australia the terrible misfortunes that have befallen France and other Allied countries on the other side of the world.

The hon. member for South Brisbane stated that the war had been brought about by Russia. The trouble was caused by the military system that was brought into being some 200 years ago, which has since brought about what became the Prussian Empire, for, after all, the German Empire was ruled by Prussia. I have here a book entitled "The Foundations of Germany," by J. Ellis Barker, describing the growth of the power of Germany. It says—

"Prussia has been a military State since its beginning. The country has grown great by successful wars and by conquests. Frederick William the First not only created a powerful army but militarised the administration and the civil institutions as well. He made the entire civil life of the country subservient to his military requirements and ambitions."

Further on the book says—

"Circumstances have made Prussia a military State. The country has grown great by its military strength. Frederick clearly recognised that the existence and the future of Prussia depended upon the army."

Ever since the early years of the eighteenth century, the Prussian army was strengthened and brought to greater efficiency with the view that some day they were going to dominate the world. We all know what a terrific struggle there was to maintain the rights of constitutional government during the last war, and, in spite of the hon. member for Warrego, who, although as a member of this House he took the oath of allegiance to the British Crown, termed it a foreign war, it was far better that we should take our part in the war on the other side of the world rather than that the enemy should come to our shores. We know what the position in Germany was under the Prussian domination before the war. We know how the military class bullied and domineered over every other class in the community. We know that a civilian had to submit to all sorts of insults to himself and his womenfolk at the hands of the man in uniform. If he resented in any way he was adjudged guilty of treason to the uniform, and no penalty was too severe for him. [5 p.m.]

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask the hon. gentleman to connect his remarks with the vote.

GOVERNMENT MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FARRELL: It is high time we had some talk about education and less talk about Germany.

An OPPOSITION MEMBER: What do you know about education?

Mr. SWAYNE: We should teach our younger people that the time may come when they will be called upon to fight against such a system as that. That is where the connection between my remarks and the vote comes in. If all references to such subjects are excluded from the school papers, the children will be allowed to grow up with the idea that the time will never come when they may have to put forward their best efforts against such a rule as that. That was the issue in the great war—whether militarism should prevail against constitutional government. The issue was not one nationality against another—of Great Britain against Germany, or Germany against another nation—but a war between two systems. The issue at stake was whether arbitrary militaristic systems should prevail over our parliamentary system. It was up to every community, whether great or small, to take its part in that great struggle. That is what our children ought to be taught, and not that the war merely meant one set of countries fighting another set. We talk of peace, but what do we find happening? I read only in yesterday's newspapers a cablegram which was headed—

"Six Hundred Executed."

"The Soviet Way."

"The Reds Capture Tiflis."

"Russian Red Troops Enter the Capital of Georgia"—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

Mr. SWAYNE: This subject has cropped up during the afternoon, and the debate has centred around whether references to such episodes are to be kept out of our school literature. It is well that our young people should know something of the horrors of war, so that they will be prepared to defend themselves if ever the time arises. Without reading the paragraph which I commenced, I should say that, when the Red Soviet army entered Tiflis, they summarily executed 600 residents and imprisoned hundreds of others. That is the sort of thing we should tell our young people they will have to resist.

The hon. member for South Brisbane said that wars were brought about against the will of the people, and other hon. members on his side suggested that wars were instigated by capital. I would like to ask if this Soviet war was instigated by capitalists.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Order! I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the vote. The question he is referring to has nothing whatever to do with this debate. If the hon. member initiates an argument, another member will reply to him, and that may possibly cause another hon. member to reply to that hon. member.

Mr. SWAYNE: This is all connected with the question of what should or should not be contained in the school books. I am simply quoting this one instance as showing what happens. Furthermore, hon. members opposite have urged that children should be brought up to abhor war. I have referred to the Georgian war, waged by men holding similar principles to hon. members opposite—men who embrace the principles of Karl Marx. I think the doctrines laid down by

Mr. Swayne.]

hon. members opposite cannot be applied to the war in Georgia, where all these atrocities have been committed by the Red Soviet army.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! If the hon. member does not obey my call to order, I will ask him to resume his seat. I have already called him to order twice on this subject.

Mr. SWAYNE: I wish to deal with another matter which was raised by the leader of the Opposition—that of the competition of schools by exhibits at shows. The attitude of the Government indicates that they desire there should be no healthy competition between schools and school children—no emulation of any kind. If the Secretary for Public Instruction is going to carry out that principle, it will kill all spirit of competition and emulation between ourselves, and that will simply mean stagnation. Without legitimate emulation and competition there can be no progress—I think hon. members opposite will acknowledge that. First there will be stagnation, and then there will be retrogression.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS: What would you do in our case?

Mr. SWAYNE: I think it indicates that hon. members opposite are afraid. It is really the action of weaklings afraid of healthy competition. It is carrying the matter to that distinct conclusion when the Minister will not allow children to compete amongst themselves. The same stand is adopted by hon. members opposite in connection with industrial and factory life. It is a pernicious doctrine, and must have an evil effect on the community. These school exhibits afford a splendid opportunity for the school child to show his work.

Mr. FARRELL: That shows you do not know anything about it.

Mr. SWAYNE: It gives those concerned an opportunity of comparing the work of different schools. I say all credit to those who are able to show that through hard work and ability they can hold their own with others. It is a mistake to cut out these competitions at the various shows.

Mr. COLLINS (*Bowen*): We have to realise the age we live in. One of the objections of the Opposition has been that Marxian ideas should not be included in our school books or school papers. I differ from them on that point. We are not responsible for the wars that have taken place in the past, but we are going to be held responsible for the wars that take place in the future. When I say "we" I mean the people on this planet at the present time. I would suggest to the Secretary for Public Instruction that he give consideration to the question of placing in the school papers lessons telling the children of the inventions that have taken place and the discoveries that have been made by science; that gases have been discovered that can be dropped from aeroplanes in the shape of bombs and that will kill thousands and hundreds of thousands of people—that will destroy cities, we are told, and also destroy nations. Think of it! We are living in an age when the inventive faculty of man has succeeded in inventing machines to navigate the air and to travel beneath the ocean. Then hon. members opposite say we are not in a position to abolish war! I say we are in that position. The hon. member for Queenton referred to the League of Nations. It is not a League

of Nations. It is only a league of half the nations. It cannot be considered a League of Nations until the two great nations of Russia and Germany are included. I was very glad to hear the hon. member for Queenton state that, if the League of Nations failed in dealing with this problem, we shall have to fall back on a league of the peoples of the earth which is more important, it may be, than a League of Nations.

During the debate many questions have been raised as to what should go into the school books, and what should be kept out of the school books. Reference has been made to Russia, and I want to define my attitude in regard to Russia. Ever since the Russian Revolution took place I have said that the Russian people should govern themselves as they think fit without the interference of any outside nation.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: One of the first things that the Soviet Government did was to establish an educational system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. COLLINS: I take it that I am in order in comparing the educational systems of other countries with our own educational system. During the rule of the Czars there was very little education in Russia, and the reason we have had to suffer all over the world—I say all over the world advisedly—is owing to the fact that the masses of the people were not educated. Everyone knows that. According to the statistics supplied from time to time illiteracy is very common in the great United States of America to-day, and the position of the masses in that country is deplorable. That in one of the leading nations of the world! Unless we are going to teach the young to do away with this terrible thing called war, what hope is there for the future of mankind? If we keep on killing each other there is no hope at all. Whatever justification there might have been for war in the past, when the masses of the people were in a state of illiteracy, when a few people governed the world and dictated what should be done and what should not be done, there is no justification at present. We are living in a new era, and it is true that we require new men. I am one of those who are not afraid to do pioneering work. This debate has been very gratifying to me because I remember that during the last session of Parliament only one or two hon. members spoke on this question, while to-day hon. members on both sides have discussed this question of education. We have had a very interesting speech from the hon. member for Windsor—one of the most interesting delivered on that side—which showed that he is not the jingo that some of the hon. members opposite are in regard to war. I give him credit for it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member has exhausted the time allowed him under the Standing Orders.

Mr. W. COOPER (*Rosewood*): I have listened with interest to the speeches made on both sides of the Chamber this afternoon in connection with the question of giving to the children of Queensland the education which is best for their future welfare. I have to congratulate the Department of Public Instruction upon the advancement which has been made in the work of education, as shown by the increased expenditure, and also to

[*Mr. Swayne.*

congratulate the teachers who impart the knowledge which most of the children acquire during their school days.

I regret the statements which have been made to-day in this Chamber regarding the literature in the school papers supplied by the department. Some hon. members have condemned the stories which have appeared in the school books and papers for the purpose of imparting knowledge to the children and inspiring them to go on in the right direction. I feel that we are in a period when it is necessary for us to do the very best we can to instruct the children of Queensland as to the road they should follow in the future. Some hon. members opposite, as well as some on this side, have practically condemned the matter which is contained in the school reading books. What we have to consider is whether it will be to the advantage of the children of Queensland to read the history of Great Britain as it is given in the stories and articles in the school papers, or whether it will be more advantageous to them to have a thorough revision of the literature in the school books.

So far as war is concerned, on which subject the debate to-day has centred, I am of opinion that it does not matter what we teach our children, as, when they grow older, they will form their own opinions as to whether war is necessary or not. I believe that all the scholars who attend the primary and secondary schools and the University will form their own opinion, when they get to the requisite age, as to what the welfare of the State demands. It does not matter whether we attempt to teach the children that war is not necessary, as the moment that one person says to another "You are a liar," war commences. (Laughter.) I am quite satisfied that, regardless of what we may place in our school literature, if one nation should attack another—and particularly if a nation should attack Australia—we would all say war was necessary for our self-preservation.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. COOPER: We are told that in the past Great Britain has done this. Well, while I believe that all the wars which Great Britain has waged were not in the interests of humanity, I believe that they were all in the interests of the British Empire. We must certainly admit that some of them were unjustifiable from the point of view of the other nation, but until the whole of the peoples of the world agree that war is unnecessary and are prepared to say "We will settle our differences by arbitration," we must teach our young people the necessity of patriotism to their nation and the State to which they belong. In Queensland, when the South African war broke out, we had men of all classes, all shades of political opinion, all denominations, volunteering to fight for the British Empire. Why? Because they believed that, unless they took up arms against an aggressive nation, they were going to lose something. The children of Queensland will not benefit to any extent by anything we may do to prevent them from becoming patriotic. After all, no nation can survive without patriotism.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There is no suggestion of a lack of patriotism.

Mr. W. COOPER: I know that. If the Minister will permit me to go on, I shall outline the attitude which he has taken up.

I am just as patriotic as any hon. member in the Chamber, and I realise the position we occupy. Australia is in an isolated position. We have to depend upon Great Britain or the British Empire as a whole for our defence. I would like to ask any hon. member whether, in the event of Japan attacking Australia to-morrow, we would not have every Australian, whatever his origin—whether his parents were German, Italian, English, Irish, or Scotch—taking up arms to fight the invader. I say without fear of contradiction that we would. We have quite near to us the black and yellow races—the greatest menace the white races have to face to-day, to-morrow, or in the near future. There are 350,000,000 Hindus up against the white races, or up against British control. There are 400,000,000 Chinamen whom unscrupulous nations are instructing in the best methods of warfare. We have to consider the necessity for the survival of the white races—there is not the slightest doubt about that—and, if we met a Japanese, a Hindu, or a Chinaman on the street and said, "Look here, Mr. Jap, or Mr. Hindu, or Mr. Chinaman, we do not believe in war. Let us play a game of football on the oval down here in Brisbane," wouldn't he laugh?

At 5.25 p.m.,

The CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

The resumption of the Committee was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

The House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.