

than 640 acres," which had been inserted by the Council with a view to afford facilities for letting portions of land of a smaller area than 640 acres. Under the existing law there was no mode by which an area of less than 640 acres could be let.

Council's amendment not insisted on.

Clause 23. Except under the nineteenth twenty-first and twenty-second sections of the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1861 no person who after the passing of this Act has made a conditional purchase shall be capable of making another within five years of the date of such purchase.

Mr. FOSTER thought there were strong objections to the Assembly's amendment including the 19th clause of the Crown Lands Alienation Act of 1861. He considered there were already too many facilities to take up land under mineral selection.

Mr. OGILVIE was of opinion that the omission of the words "unless with the written permission of the Minister to be first had and tendered to the land agent along with the application," which were at the end of the clause, as it was passed by the Council, would lead to great injustice. Suppose a man made a selection on a reserve in ignorance of the fact that this land had been reserved, it would be hard not to allow him to select again for five years. The difficulty might be met without making the Minister responsible. He would therefore move,—

That the following words be added to the clause, "unless such purchase shall have been disposed of from causes over which he has had no control."

Mr. DARLEY thought no harm could arise from the retention of the words which had been struck out by the Assembly. If a selector who had been on his land for three years became insolvent he would not, as the clause stood, be able to select again for three years. Such cases would not occur often, and it might be left to the discretion of the Minister to say whether or not the man should be allowed to select again before the expiry of the three years.

Mr. FOSTER pointed out that the case mentioned by the honorable member, Mr. Ogilvie, did not apply to the provisions of the clause. If a man took up reserved land in mistake it could not be said that he was a conditional purchaser.

[Mr. Ogilvie.

Mr. DE SALIS approved of the amendments of the Assembly. It was only reasonable to provide that a man should not be allowed to make a second selection until five years after he had made his first selection.

Amendment withdrawn.

Assembly's amendment agreed with.

Remainder of Assembly's amendments agreed with.

Bill reported.

The House adjourned at 2 minutes after 11 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 4 May, 1880.

New Member—Kennedy's and Hicks's Land Purchases at Bulli—Supreme Court Judges—Archibald Thompson's Trust Estate Bill—Affiliated Colleges—Savings Bank of New South Wales—Medical Bill—Petition of Mrs. Mary Jones.

Mr. SPEAKER took the chair at half-past 4 o'clock p.m.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had issued a writ for the election of a member to serve in the Assembly for the electoral district of Northumberland in place of Thomas Hungerford, Esq., resigned; and that the writ had been returned, with a certificate of the election of Ninian Melville, jun., Esq., indorsed thereon.

Mr. MELVILLE subscribed the oath and signed the roll.

KENNEDY'S AND HICKS'S LAND PURCHASES AT BULLI.

Motion (by Mr. FARNELL) made, and agreed to,—

That there be laid upon the table of this House copies of all documents, papers, plans, correspondence, and certificates of title issued to James Kennedy for 160 acres of land, and James Hicks, relative to certain land situated at Bulli, in the district of Illawarra.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES.

Motion (by Mr. BUCHANAN) made, and agreed to,—

That an address be presented to the Governor praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to be laid upon the table of this House,—

(1.) Copies of all correspondence between the Attorney General, the Minister of Justice, or any other Minister, and the Chief Justice, or any other Judge of the Supreme Court, as to leave of absence since the 1st of January, 1879, to present date, with copies of any medical certificates accompanying the same.

(2.) Copies of all correspondence between the Attorney General, or the Minister of Justice, or any other Minister, and the Chief Justice, or any other Judge of the Supreme Court, as to the appointment of a fifth Judge, or any other additional Judge of the Supreme Court, since the 1st of January, 1879, to the present date.

ARCHIBALD THOMPSON'S TRUST ESTATE BILL.

Bill returned from Legislative Council without amendment.

AFFILIATED COLLEGES.

Mr. BUCHANAN rose to move,—

(1.) That, in the opinion of this House, all State aid to what are known as the affiliated colleges should be withdrawn, at a date to be fixed by law, and that the Government should introduce a Bill as soon as practicable to carry out this resolution.

(2.) That the above resolution be communicated by address to His Excellency the Governor. He said: It would seem to be absolutely irrational on my part to say a single word in support of the proposition when I reflect that after a long agitation the Parliament deprived a variety of sects of State aid to the teaching of religion. That was a deliberate act of the Parliament, which met with the approval of the whole country, and which was supported almost by the entire Press of the colony. As that great fact forms part of the late history of the country, I shall be surprised if my proposal meets with any opposition. Aid to religion was countenanced by the State in the shape of payments to various sects from the State funds—a most pernicious principle; one which is false in every way. Nothing could be more so; nothing could be more injurious to religion itself; nothing could be more detrimental to the character of the people who instituted it, because it so far indicated a levity in reference to the sacred matter of religion that they did not care what was taught. Truth and falsehood were alike to them, and they supported the principle for some purpose or some cause known to themselves alone. We had, therefore, the monstrous spectacle of a number of religious sects—many of which held opinions diametrically opposite to each other—being endowed

with the moneys of the State. I can scarcely imagine anything more humiliating, anything more disparaging to our character as a people, than that such a thing should have existed. But it did exist, and was a deformity on our political system. It aroused the indignation of the people, and they returned to Parliament a sufficient number of members to abolish it. To show the inconsistency of our parliamentary action, and the absurdities in which honorable members will land themselves, I will point out that while, on the one hand, they held that it was wrong for the State to support religion when taught in the church, on the other hand they actually supported the teaching of religion in the school, as we had denominational schools established in which religion was taught with the aid of the State. A greater inconsistency, or a more monstrous defect, than that cannot well be imagined. After Parliament emphatically and solemnly declared that religion should not be taught with the aid of the State, one would have thought that the principle would have been entirely expunged from our system—and that the persons who supported the abolition of Government aid to religion would not have supported the teaching of religion in denominational schools. The inconsistency I have spoken of stamps indelible disgrace on the Parliament which committed it. Several honorable members, myself among the number, have been continually ringing in the ears of different Governments the gross abomination of the principle of the State supporting the teaching of religion in denominational schools, and the present Government, under a scare, under a terror, not from conviction, not from any sense of rectitude or from any appreciation of the outrageous wrong which was being done, consented to do away with denominational schools at the end of three years. Now, this is a sad, a lamentable history to give of any Parliament; still, it is a true history. I question if it had not been for the scare, the terror I speak of, whether, notwithstanding that we had abolished State aid to religion, Parliament would not have continued to countenance that principle in an equally obnoxious and hateful form. But to the insolence, the oppression, the exorbitance of the claims of Archbishop Vaughan, to

his outrageous attitude of insolent intolerance, are we alone indebted for the reformation which has been brought about. That reformation is one which ought to have been brought about from strong enlightened conviction—State assistance to denominational schools ought to have been abolished long ago. Just let the outside public notice how members of the House act in this matter. I know that there are some here who are ready to throw principle to the winds, within whom principle was never for a moment in a healthy state. I know that there are some who would like to see the question staved off till some more convenient season, and I shall not be in the least surprised if the previous question be moved or if some other means be employed by a tool of the Government to dispose of it. If the Government do not face the question can they stand in any other light than that of abject cowardice? The Government which has abolished State aid to religion in so far as it is involved in subsidies to denominational schools, and which is afraid to do what I now ask them to do, stands in a most humiliating light before the people of the country. What is the nonsense which I propose to abolish? Why, that several sects have religious dogmas taught at the expense of the State in these affiliated colleges. Was there ever a more hateful way for the State to aid religion than that? Why do the Government allow me to bring the matter before the House? Do they not see the defects, or do they not recognise the monstrous inconsistencies I have pointed out? If we say that it is wrong that the teaching of religion in denominational schools should be subsidised, and the Government have said so emphatically, how dare the Government sit in idleness when half-a-dozen sects are being aided not for education but for the teaching of religious dogmas?

Notice taken that there was not a quorum present; quorum formed.

Mr. BUCHANAN: I do not care if the Government do resort to the plan of counting out the House. Such a proceeding will be of very little use, as, if it be adopted, I shall put the motion on the paper as an amendment on the motion for going into Committee of Supply. Do the vain small-minded members of the House think that they are going to evade

[*Mr. Buchanan.*

a great truth by counting out the House? That is a paltry, insignificant, irrational way of doing things. If honorable members think the motion is wrong, let them have the courage to say so; if they think it is right, let it be dealt with; but do not let any men, who perhaps have not the capacity of thought, run away and so shirk discussion on a question which ought to have been dealt with long ago. We have half-a-dozen sects teaching their different nostrums or their doctrines, or whatever you like to call them. It is the greatest parody to call it teaching religion—it is nothing but the teaching of theological dogmas at the expense of the State. It is painful enough and nuisance enough to have the follies of these different sects taught when that is done at their own expense, but when it is done at the expense of the State it amounts to an egregious wrong. There is not a shadow of justification for the principle. If it be right to aid the colleges established, it is equally right to assist Pagans, Infidels, Buddhists, and Mormons, in order that they may teach their beliefs. One sect has no more right to State aid than another. The evils of the system ought to be so palpable as not to necessitate a word from me—they ought to evoke a simultaneous confession of the righteousness of my proposals; there ought not to be a dissentient voice; but I know honorable members too well to place any such confidence in them. I know how little honorable members are guided by principle, and it is intolerable that there should be thrust on me the task of hammering truths into them, of making those truths so self-evident that, for very shame's sake, for the sake of preserving that little shred of consistency which hangs about them in rags, honorable members are compelled to vote. In that way I am now doing my best to make it impossible for any honorable member to escape from voting on the question; however, as honorable members do not seem anxious to listen to argument, I shall content myself by moving the motion.

Motion made, and question proposed.

Mr. SUTTON: At the conclusion of his address, the honorable and learned member for Mudgee said that for shame's sake honorable members would vote for the motion. I do not think any honorable member will be influenced in his vote by

reason of any shame which may be supposed to be attached to it. The honorable member also said there was no justification for the continuation of the aid given to these affiliated colleges. I think there is every justification for it, inasmuch as Parliament calmly and deliberately determined that it should be given.

Mr. BUCHANAN: There is no justification in principle for it.

Mr. SUTTON: The statute under which the affiliated colleges are endowed was passed as far back as 1854, and it provides that upon any sect subscribing £10,000 or any larger sum for the erection of a college, the Government shall subscribe an equal amount up to £20,000. The objection which is now taken is that the sum of £500 a year is paid by the State to each of the principals of the colleges. The endowments to the colleges are restricted to that amount, and for principals' salaries only. The clause which deals with this endowment says—

There shall be paid out of the said general revenue annually to such incorporated college in perpetuity a sum of five hundred pounds for the use of and as a salary to the principal of the said college or in aid of such salary.

Three colleges have been established under the provisions of the Act. Before they consent to the motion now proposed, I would ask honorable members whether it would be fair to at once deprive the principals of the colleges of the salaries allowed them by the Act? The Act says that they shall be paid £500 per annum, in perpetuity, and even if it be considered desirable to abolish the system, it would be well to allow some time to elapse before doing so. As the honorable member is aware, the Government have on several occasions stated that it is not their intention to propose any new measures this session. The question involved in the honorable member's motion is of great importance; and, considering the large amount of work we have got through during the session, and the measures which remain to be disposed of, I think the Government will be only asking the honorable member to do what is reasonable in desiring him to withdraw his motion.

Mr. BEYERS: It is evident to me that the motion submitted by the honorable member for Mudgee does not meet with

the general approval of the House. I think the honorable member is quite justified in bringing forward such a motion, and if a division be called for I shall vote with him rather than that he shall be alone.

Mr. FARNELL: I have always approved of the principles embodied in the motion, but I do not think the present an opportune time to bring it forward. I do not concur in all the arguments of the honorable and learned member for Mudgee. He says that we have had quite enough teaching of truth and falsehood with the aid of the State, but he does not explain what is truth and what is falsehood. The honorable member's argument, as I understand it, is that State aid should be given in one direction.

Mr. BUCHANAN: There ought to be no State aid.

Mr. FARNELL: The honorable member believes that certain things are true, and he wants his beliefs supported.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The truth will support them.

Mr. FARNELL: Truth will always assert itself; it requires no extraneous aid. The religious sects ought to rely on the truth of their doctrines, and not seek aid from the State. I should support the motion if I thought it politic to pass it at present, but it does not seem to me that it would be politic to do so. I admit that, to be consistent, we ought to withdraw aid from these colleges, and I think the time is not very far distant when that will be done.

Dr. RENWICK: I am as consistent a supporter as the honorable and learned member for Mudgee of the principle that no aid should be given to religion by the State; but I think the motion has been brought forward at an inopportune time. In my opinion, the honorable member did not put the history of the case in exactly the proper light. When the University was founded the founders discovered that great difficulties would arise in consequence of the diversity of religious opinions amongst the students, and, in order to obviate such difficulties, they followed the course adopted by the founders of the University of London and removed all religious disabilities from students by not asking for any religious tests. At the same time they thought it proper to

provide for the religious wants of the students, and three colleges were established by religious bodies. These colleges accepted the aid offered them by the Government. The Act under which they are founded specially states that the engagements were entered into, not with the principals of the colleges, but with the institutions themselves. The 4th clause of the Act says—

There shall be paid out of the said General Revenue annually to such incorporated college in perpetuity a sum of five hundred pounds for the use of and as a salary to the principal of such college or in aid of such salary.

With the churches the case was different, as the aid was given direct to the ministers. I take it that, if the Act be repealed, compensation to the amount of £500 per annum will have to be given to the principals of the colleges. The question is one of vast importance, and when dealt with ought to be brought forward by the Government. If the honorable member presses the motion to a division, I shall support him, but I hope he will adopt the suggestion of the Minister of Justice and withdraw it.

Mr. GARRETT: I shall vote against the motion although at a more opportune time. I am prepared to assist in carrying out the opinions embodied in it. I hold that this aid should not be allowed to continue much longer; but I think any measure we may adopt to effect the purpose we have in view ought to be considered in connection with the question of University reform. The State has contributed large sums of money towards the foundation of these colleges, and is contributing every year to the remuneration of the gentlemen who conduct them. But when the State entered into this engagement it was with a view to promote public education; and it is therefore quite within the power of the House to deal with these institutions as it may deal with other public institutions. They are not private or ecclesiastical establishments. They are quite as public as the University itself, and if it be competent for us to deal with the University by Act of Parliament, it is equally competent for us to deal similarly with these institutions. I do not agree that there are any personal rights or corporate rights as distinguished from public rights, involved in the question. If honorable

[*Dr. Renwick.*

members read the preamble of the Act which provides for the establishment and endowment of these colleges, they will find that one of the reasons assigned would not be recognised now and has not been recognised by Parliament for the last sixteen years. The preamble says—

Whereas it is expedient to encourage and assist the establishment of colleges within the University of Sydney in which colleges systematic religious instruction and domestic supervision with efficient assistance in preparing for the University lectures and examinations shall be provided for students of the University etc.

Would any member of Parliament in the present day venture to propose a measure providing for the domestic supervision of any one attending the University? Would it not be considered diametrically opposed to the principle laid down by Parliament itself over and over again to provide for the systematic religious instruction of any child in any school of the country? This being one of the purposes contemplated when these institutions were established, Parliament cannot reasonably continue its support of them in view of the decisions at which it has arrived in reference to our national system of education. To allow this Act to remain upon our Statute Book would be to fly directly in the face of the Public Instruction Bill which we recently passed, and to proceed in a direction quite the opposite of that in which we were tending when we withdrew all State aid from public worship. Some years after this Act was passed it was amended in a direction which anticipated the ultimate repeal of the measure. The 9th clause provides—

And whereas it has been resolved by the Senate of the University of Sydney that honors and degrees shall not be given to any student who shall not produce testimonials of competent religious attainments and it is expedient to give legal permanency to such resolution Be it therefore enacted that no honor or degree shall be conferred by the University on any student who shall not produce from the principal of his college or (if not belonging to a college) from some religious teacher or other responsible person accredited by the University a certificate that he is of competent religious attainments.

But, four years afterwards, this religious test was abolished; and the abolition of that test showed that public opinion, even in the course of those four years, had made a great stride towards freeing the State altogether of any obligation to provide religious instruction for those who

might be educated at the University. The next step, I presume, will be the total repeal of the Act. But I would remind honorable members that there is a large amount of public property involved in the settlement of this question. The State has given £60,000 to three religious denominations, which large amount of money has been invested on public property. The whole purpose was a public one, and the House has a perfect right to deal with it; but this is not a fitting season. We are approaching the end of a lengthy session, in which, as the Minister of Justice said, a great deal of work has been done, and there still remains a great deal to do—the passing of the Electoral Bill, for instance. The introduction of a question of this important character at the close of such a session is scarcely just to the question itself, for the withdrawal of the salaries of the principals will not accomplish the purpose the honorable member for Mudgee has in view.

Mr. BUCHANAN: That is all I want.

Mr. GARRETT: Are you going to sever the link which binds these denominations to the Government and allow them to do as they like with the valuable institutions which have been established with the £60,000 contributed by the State? The entire question should be provided for in some comprehensive way when we are legislating in the direction of university reform. That question will, no doubt, shortly engross the attention of Parliament. We have connected the public schools with the grammar schools, and the grammar schools are connected with the University; but the University itself needs reforming so that it may be brought more in accord with the circumstances of the country and the desire of the public in regard to the matter of education from the lowest to the highest degree.

Mr. FARNELL: There is the land attached to the colleges.

Mr. GARRETT: I maintain that there is a public interest in these institutions, and we shall, doubtless, be able to deal with them without injuring any rights. I hope the honorable member for Mudgee will take the advice tendered him, and withdraw the motion. If he does not I shall vote against it. In so doing I shall not consider myself in any way compro-

mised in the matter; because I simply refuse to be dragged into dealing with this question at a time so disadvantageous as the present, and when there is such small likelihood of a satisfactory settlement being arrived at. The honorable mover said something about the Public Instruction Act having been passed under the influence of fear. For my part, I must deny that I was actuated by any influence, save a firm and well founded conviction of the necessity for the legislation which became law; and I believe other honorable members, who voted as I did, were similarly influenced.

Mr. COHEN: Where was the honorable member for Mudgee?

Mr. GARRETT: Everybody knows that that honorable member was generally absent from the Committee when that Bill was under consideration. The slightest temptation would withdraw the honorable member from his public duties in this House. My vote was given in support of principles I have always professed. I do not think, moreover, when any action is taken in this matter, that it should be placed in the hands of the honorable member for Mudgee, not only because his attendance here is so uncertain, but because he changes his opinions so suddenly.

Mr. CHARLES: I agree with the honorable member for St. Leonards that this is an important question, and I intend to vote against the motion, not because I think the question should be dealt with in another way, but because I believe that to carry the motion would be tantamount to an act of repudiation. It cannot be denied that the persons immediately concerned in these colleges collected a large amount of money on the faith of an Act of Parliament. Another reason why State aid should not be withdrawn, is that the colleges are performing in a most efficient manner the description of work which is expected of the superior schools established under the Public Instruction Act. The colleges are not devoted exclusively to religious training, and the work they perform is well worth the endowment of £500 a year. I know of several young men educated at one of these institutions who are now following the legal profession. As the honorable member for East Sydney (Dr. Renwick) has suggested,

if these institutions are interfered with as the honorable member for Mudgee proposes, there will be a good case for compensation. Not a session passes but some act of repudiation of this kind is proposed.

Mr. CAMERON : I completely differ from the honorable member who last addressed the House. I deny that the severance of the connection between the Government and these affiliated colleges would amount to anything like an act of repudiation. Although we have determined that no State aid shall be given to religion, we very inconsistently continue to contribute to sectarian establishments ; and to that extent I agree with the affirmation of the principle embodied in the motion of the honorable member for Mudgee. But that honorable member has an unfortunate way of asking the House to give its assent to certain principles at most inconvenient times. I recollect the honorable member being five years ago placed in a position similar to that which he occupies this evening, and then, against the advice of friends who agreed with him upon an educational policy, he brought down a motion, the sole effect of which was to demonstrate to the country how small was the number of those who were of the same opinion as himself. Such indiscreet conduct impedes the natural course of reform, and inflicts more injury upon many efforts than would be inflicted by their worst enemies. I have always voted in support of principles which countenance a complete severance of the State from theology. I have always thought that every creed should be self-supporting, and I only vote against the motion because it has been brought forward at such an inopportune time. The hands of the Government are as full as they can possibly be, and a discussion of the question at the present time is very likely to interfere with its proper settlement hereafter.

Mr. GREENWOOD : As far as I understand the arguments of the Minister who replied to the mover of this motion, he appears to consider that it is not within the competence of the House, and that a sufficient reason for granting subsidies to the colleges in perpetuity is that they are provided for by statute. I think the Act commits Parliament to a great deal more than the support of the three

[*Mr. Charles.*

affiliated colleges which at present receive the endowment. There is nothing in the Act limiting the number of colleges which are to receive State aid ; and any religious denomination which may establish a college, and affiliate it with the University, will have as good a claim upon the Government as the religious denominations who now receive an annual subsidy. If we limit the distribution of £500 each per annum to the three colleges who have already received it, we inflict a great injustice upon the country. Are the three colleges to have a monopoly ? Or, if any denomination complying with the same conditions as these colleges is entitled to the same privilege ; then there is nothing extravagant in the suggestion of the honorable member for Mudgee—that a Joss house, or any institution of that kind, may become an affiliated college, and receive £500 per annum. There is nothing in the Act of 1856 to prevent it, nor is there anything which, in justice, ought to prevent it ; and this shows the absurdity of religious endowment in any degree. If the Minister did not mean that, he must have meant that we should not touch any Act upon the Statute Book. But the honorable member is met upon the threshold with the argument that the House has passed an Act interfering with an Act of 1866, and in that interference has abolished a religious endowment fifty times as great as that covered by the Act dealing with affiliated colleges. The Minister's argument, therefore, proves too much or too little. The honorable member for Mudgee does not propose that we shall instantly discontinue State aid to the three affiliated colleges ; all that he asks is an expression of opinion from the House. He leaves the Government to decide when it will be practicable to bring in a measure to give effect to the resolution. I do not think the measure should be introduced this Session. I think, when we have disposed of the business we have in hand and have received certain measures back from the Council, we shall have done as much as the most sanguine man could have hoped.

Mr. O'CONNOR : More than was expected.

Mr. GREENWOOD : But no more than the country expected and had a perfect right to expect. We have been reaping the harvest of seed sown for many

years. It is almost invariably the case that years of labour must precede success. Success may come suddenly, but it was not due, in the case alluded to by the honorable member for Mudgee, to any little accidental circumstance. It has been argued that mistakes are made in regard to public feeling which afford an excuse for time-servers and waverers to take sides; but too much has been made of that argument. We passed the Public Instruction Act as a just and right measure to every section of the people, and not from fear of, or favour to, any one. Parliament would have passed such a measure in 1866 had there been a majority in its favour. I call in question altogether the right of any one Parliament to grant an endowment in perpetuity, when that endowment has to be provided for by annual taxes. It is enough for one generation to provide for their own wants, without tying down all posterity to their particular notions in regard to the administration of certain funds. If one generation could provide the means of meeting such an obligation in perpetuity, there would not be so much objection to this course; but it cannot. In this case the money granted to the affiliated colleges will have to be provided, if not from the sale of land, from the pockets of the people. We impose a burden on the pockets of the people in perpetuity, when we have no means of knowing how the money will be used. To come from the higher ground of justice and expediency, and to look at the question of utility, if we grant money to the colleges, it is to encourage a liberal education under the guidance of religious training. I do not think the State is on that ground receiving due benefit for its expenditure. Consider what these colleges are doing? I notice that in the last year, for which we have had a report, there were six students attending St. Paul's College. In order, therefore, that these students may be educated in the guidance of certain religious principles, the State pays £83 per student per annum. There were ten students at St. John's costing the State £50 each per annum. There were nineteen students at St. Andrew's, but I understand that they were not all studying theology specially. Now, it is extraordinary that two great bodies like the Church of England and the Church of

Rome, which are supposed to represent more than two-thirds of our population, can only obtain sixteen students at these colleges. Does not that fact expose the absurdity of aiding religious institutions in this way? The object for which these endowments were granted having failed to be accomplished, the State, as representing the whole people, and as trustee to the endowments, has the power to revise the trust and say in what way in the interests of the whole community it shall be administered in the future. I think we should settle the matter finally; but I do not agree with the honorable member for Camden (Mr. Garrett) that it would be better to take that course in connection with the reform of higher education generally. The University is in a position different from that of the affiliated colleges. The affiliated colleges are the remaining blot upon our system of education, and I can conceive of no reason why we should not settle this matter without dealing with the University. The University is a national institution, while the affiliated colleges are religious institutions, in virtue of which character they receive State aid. No course appears open to me but to vote for the motion, and I think the Government might have done so without any inconsistency, unless they think these endowments should be continued in perpetuity. I would rather give a reasonable sum in the shape of compensation, and have done with the colleges for ever, than continue these annual subsidies of £500 with the chance of having to endow other religious denominations who may presently claim under the same Act. The motion does not pledge the Government to do anything this session; it merely expresses an opinion that the grants of £500 per annum should cease. Whether provision should or should not afterwards be made in view of the understanding that State aid was to be given in perpetuity is another thing. If this motion were carried, the Government could afterwards determine what particular measure they would introduce to deal with the question.

MR. DILLON: No one in the House more strongly desires the advancement of secular education in the country than I do. I believe that at the last general election the honorable member for East

Sydney (Mr. Greenwood) and myself were the only candidates who distinctly expressed our determination to support the principles of the League.

Mr. CAMERON : No, certainly not.

Mr. DILLON : Though other candidates to a certain extent advocated the principles of the League, they did not pledge themselves to interfere with the existing system of denominational teaching but were rather inclined to let it die a natural death.

Mr. CAMERON : I never concealed my determination to do all I could in that direction.

Mr. DILLON : What I have stated is the impression made upon my mind at the time.

Mr. WISDOM : I was a member of the League from the beginning.

Mr. CAMERON : So was I.

Mr. DILLON : Although I intend to oppose the motion, I think I shall not be accused of having any sympathy with denominationalism. I have been publicly and privately censured for holding the views which I have consistently expressed and which, until my mind is changed by some reason which I have not yet heard, I shall continue to hold. I cannot see that any member who opposes this motion, whilst holding secular views in reference to education, is violating his principles in so doing. I attach no importance to the argument based upon the existence of a statute giving certain rights and privileges to these colleges. Any law can be altered by the Parliament which made it—though it should give money in perpetuity to some corporation. The argument of the honorable member for Mudgee is simply this, that the affiliated colleges are denominational institutions in the proper sense of the word; that they are not “part and parcel” of the University of Sydney, and were established primarily for denominational purposes. What is the primary object of these colleges? Simply to provide a place of residence for students attending the University.

Mr. CAMERON : A sort of board and lodging house?

Mr. DILLON : Exactly. They are intended for the accommodation of students attending the University. We all know that a large proportion of the students attending the University are from the

[*Mr. Dillon.*

country and they must have a place of residence. In the University itself no provision has been made for their accommodation; consequently it is extremely desirable that a suitable place should be established under the supervision of the University authorities. If such an institution were not provided the students would be obliged to live in the city.

Mr. BUCHANAN : Why not?

Mr. DILLON : All I have to say is that it is much better in the interests of the students that they should live in these colleges, and it must be much more satisfactory to parents that their sons should reside there, under proper supervision, than that they should be lodged in the town, where they would be under no control whatever, and with no one to prevent them from going wrong. Such arrangements are made as to bring those of each denomination together for the purpose of discipline, and it is in the interests of discipline that the system should be supported. The religious teaching which is carried out at the colleges is simply ancillary to the main object for which the colleges are established. If the honorable member for Mudgee wants to get to the root of the matter; if he wants to do away with what he regards as a system of indirect State aid to religion, his proper way will be to advocate the sale of the premises, and have all the money which has been contributed towards the institution returned to the subscribers. But he does not propose any such sweeping measure. To take away the £500 a year paid to the principal of each college is to do very little.

Mr. BUCHANAN : The motion proposes more than that.

Mr. DILLON : The fee-simple has been given by the State. One pound was given from the public Treasury towards the cost of erecting the buildings for every pound subscribed. The only effect of the motion can be to abolish the grant of £500 a year to each of the principals of the colleges. By the Act to which they owe their establishment, the colleges form part of the University. How can it be said, then, that because the principals happen to teach dogmas under an arrangement which is really a matter of convenience, they are doing something which brings them into the category of denominational teachers? They do not exist for denomi-

national purposes ; they exist as a matter of discipline, and they are carrying out an object entirely different from that to which the honorable member's objection applies.

Mr. MACINTOSH : I desire to correct a mistake which the honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. Greenwood), who is usually very accurate, has fallen into. He said that any religious coterie who raised £4,000 could set up a college. If he refers to the Act he will find that they must raise £10,000.

Mr. GREENWOOD : I agree with the honorable member. It is £10,000.

Mr. MACINTOSH : The honorable member who moved the resolution ought to have gone further in order to show the necessity of abolishing this grant of £500 per annum. When the Constitution of the country was accepted, the people of the country accepted this particular burden with it. There is no precedent whatever of any law of this character being repealed. It is a great inducement to erect colleges, and it would be very improper, in my opinion, to attempt to withdraw this aid. The money which the State pays is doing a great deal of good ; and no doubt it will long continue to do so.

Mr. O'CONNOR : I am very glad to find that there is a strong feeling in the House—and I am sure that a division will show it—against the resolution of the honorable member for Mudgee.

Mr. BUCHANAN : The division will not show it.

Mr. O'CONNOR : I think that those honorable members who voted for the Education Bill can quite consistently vote against this resolution, because I recollect that one of the chief arguments used in support of that Bill was that a religious spirit was still to be maintained in the education imparted in the schools. I venture to say that if the honorable and learned member had pondered over his motion he would have come to the conclusion that it ought not to have been brought in at all, for it strikes directly at the University itself. Fathers and mothers living in the interior, who are anxious to give their sons a good secular education—and to give them what is still more valuable, a knowledge of the principles of Christianity—will not send them to the

University if they are to be put into a public-house to board and lodge. Is it reasonable ; is it in accordance with common sense to suppose that parents who are anxious for the welfare of their sons will send them to the University if they are to reside at any common lodging-house where they may have to herd together with people from all parts of the world, and probably with persons of exceedingly doubtful character ? The honorable and learned member for Mudgee has received an academical education. Was it at a public-house that he put up ?

Mr. BUCHANAN : I wish I had had the chance.

Mr. O'CONNOR : Is not the honorable member for Mudgee, who is so anxious to conserve the morals of our youth, aware of the danger of young men living in public-houses and common boarding-houses becoming addicted to the practice of drinking intoxicating liquors and of falling into other degrading vices ? One of the best speeches that I ever read from the honorable member was a disquisition on the horrors of intemperance ; and certainly the idea of lodging young students in a public-house ought to be sufficient to make any grand-master of a temperance organisation shriek with horror. The honorable gentleman, I know, is consistent. He may be impetuous—that is perhaps his principal fault—perhaps he is impetuous and impolitic ; but I am sure that if he gives the subject a little further consideration he will see that the motion ought to be withdrawn. I hope the day will never dawn when the people of this colony will resolve upon depriving the affiliated colleges of the endowments which they are receiving. I say that it is quite consistent in any man whilst upholding the principle that the State should not endow any religious body to support this annual grant. The children who attend our primary schools have the advantages of home, where they experience the softening influence of a mother's tender care, and enjoy the advantage of a father's sage advice ; but if we place our youth in public-houses and common lodging-houses, what results can we anticipate ? I suppose it will not be denied that many of those attending the University are the sons of comparatively poor men. Some who have carried off the highest honors

have sprung from the humblest ranks of life. And shall they be taken away from the surroundings which, in those colleges, are calculated so to elevate and improve their minds? Place a youth in the College of St. Andrew's, where he has the benefit of superior training and the example of upright and scholastic men, and he will repay you hereafter as a good citizen and a Christian for all the care which has been expended upon him. The same may be said of the colleges of the Church of England and the Church of Rome. I know that every man, in proportion as he lives up to the doctrines of the faith to which he is born, will become a good citizen. It is beside the question to talk about Joss-houses. We shall never see the day when there will be a sufficient number of Chinese in the colony to make the erection of such a building possible. I hope we shall take care that they do not come here. I hope that soon the law of this country will protect us from a Chinese invasion; and if the honorable and learned member will devote his time and talents to the advocacy of such legislation as will preserve the country from the influx of this inferior race—the effect of which would be either to establish serfdom in the land or to degrade the people—he would confer a much greater benefit upon the community than by agitating for the abolition of the grant to the affiliated colleges. I ask the honorable member to withdraw his resolution, because I am sure the common sense and good feeling of the House will shrink from taking a step which will strike a blow at those admirable institutions which are rendering such good service to the State.

Mr. BUCHANAN, in reply: I feel somewhat surprised that the Premier should not have said anything in reference to this matter. The speech of the Minister of Justice has been so admirably dealt with by the honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. Greenwood) that I have no occasion to reply to it. The Minister seems to think that an Act of Parliament could not be repealed by Parliament, and he brought forward and flaunted this Act in my face. We are here for the purpose of repealing Acts of Parliament passed in by-gone times, and it is one of our main duties. I am very much disappointed with the reply made on behalf of the

[Mr. O'Connor.

Government to my motion. They seem to think they have done so much good, that they have brought so many good measures forward, that I may fairly apply to them the language of Macbeth, slightly altered:

They have in goodness
Stepp'd in so far, that should they wade no more,
Returning were as tedious as go on.

I do not demand that any action should be taken on the motion during the present session. The matter might be dealt with next session or even later than that. All that has been said as to the Government dealing with the subject during the present session is beside the question. I am glad that I brought the matter forward if only on account of the speech of the honorable member for East Sydney (Mr. Greenwood) who has set an excellent example to other members of Parliament. His speech was able and sound as well as thoroughly independent. That is a eulogy which the speeches of very few in the Assembly deserve. It is said that this is not a convenient time for dealing with the subject; I say that all times are convenient for putting your heel upon a black snake, and no time is more convenient than another. The honorable member for West Sydney is mistaken in supposing that the division will show that the general feeling is against the motion. The grants to these colleges are doomed, and the honorable member is not so shortsighted as not to see it. Not one member of the House has been able to utter a single sentence in justification of the subsidy to those institutions. The speech of the honorable member for Tenterfield (Mr. Dillon) was simply a rigmarole showing a complete, perhaps a wilful, misunderstanding of the whole subject. What were these colleges established for? They were established for the purpose of imbuing those who attended them with the dogmas of religious sects. And how many students do they contain? The Catholic College ten; and the Church of England College six. Is it for these that we are to maintain those colleges by solemn Act of Parliament? Whether there are six or 600, however, the principle is the same. Parliament can never consistently grant subsidies for religious purposes of any description. I have no wish to do any injury to the University, although I say the M.A.'s of that institution are very inferior.

I may very appropriately quote some lines which seem applicable to them—

A set o' dull, conceited hashers,
Confuse their brains in college classes !
They gang in stirks, and come out asses,
Plain truth to speak ;
An' syne they think to climb Parnassus
By dint o' Greek !

Gie me ae spark o' Nature's fire,
That's a' the learning I desire ;
Then tho' I drudge thro' dub an' mire
At plough or cart,
My muse, though hamely in attire,
May touch the heart.

What's a' your jargon o' your schools,
Your Latin names for horns an' stools ;
If honest nature made you fools,
What sairs your grammars ?
Ye'd better taen up spades and shoofs,
Or knappin-hammers,

As I have said before, the experience we have had of M.A.'s of the University is simply disgraceful. Their incapacity and their ignorance of general literature is so gross and so outrageous as to call for comment. I hope that honorable members will vote for the motion.

Mr. SUTTOR : As the honorable members seem to imply that I said Parliament had no power to repeal the Act, perhaps I may explain that what I said was that the colleges had an endowment under an Act of Parliament. I mentioned it as a subject deserving of consideration, but I said that I believed the present time was inopportune to interfere with the matter.

Question put, and division called for, with the following result :—

Ayes	...	...	...	7
Noes	...	...	...	29
				—
Majority	...	...	...	22

AYES.

Mr. Greenwood,	Mr. Bennett.
Dr. Renwick,	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr. Moses,	Mr. Buchanan,
Mr. Melville,	Mr. Hurley (<i>Hartley</i>).

NOES.

Sir Henry Parkes,	Dr. Bowker,
Mr. Watson,	Mr. Garrett,
Mr. Lackey,	Mr. Terry,
Mr. Wisdom,	Mr. Merriman,
Mr. Suttor,	Mr. Dillon,
Mr. Baker,	Mr. Jacob,
Mr. Farnell,	Mr. Barton,
Mr. Cohen,	Mr. Burns,
Mr. Beyers,	Mr. Teece,
Mr. Fawcett,	Mr. O'Connor,
Mr. Day,	Mr. Cameron,
Mr. McCulloch,	Mr. J. Davies.
Mr. W. C. Browne,	<i>Tellers,</i>
Mr. Thompson,	Mr. Charles,
Mr. S. C. Brown,	Mr. Macintosh.

Question consequently resolved in the negative.

Mr. BUCHANAN claimed the vote of the honorable member for the Western Gold Fields, as he seconded the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER : If the honorable member gave his voice in favour of the motion, he is bound to vote for it, but the mere fact of his having seconded the motion does not make it incumbent on him to vote for it.

SAVINGS BANK OF NEW SOUTH WALES.

Mr. HURLEY (*Hartley*) rose to move,—

That, in the opinion of this House, no person holding a seat at the board of any bank, or acting in the capacity of auditor, should be hereafter appointed or allowed to hold a seat as director or trustee in the people's bank, namely, the Government Savings Bank.

He said that he did not intend to take up the time of the House, as he had been told that some time ago when a debate took place on a question raised by the honorable member for Parramatta (Mr. Long) as to the advisability of the Government continuing to keep such large sums of money in the Savings Banks, the Treasurer said it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to amalgamate the Savings Bank and the Post Office Savings Bank, and to effect other important changes. He was not aware, when he gave notice of the motion, that that promise had been made, but no harm could be done by passing the motion. There was great necessity for making a change, seeing that such a large amount of money was deposited in the Savings Banks. In a previous session he proposed a resolution to the effect that a national bank should be established, and if the Government took control of the moneys deposited in the Savings Banks out of the hands of trustees, they would be taking a step in that direction, the tendency towards which he was pleased to notice. There were 27,584 depositors in the Sydney Savings Bank, and their deposits amounted to £1,125,555 16s. 5d., or an increase over the previous year of £74,039 2s. 8d. The deposits in fifteen country Savings Banks brought the total up to £1,410,904 19s. 9d., and out of this sum advances had been made to twelve banks, which amounted to £775,955. It seemed to him objectionable that such a large sum of

money should be loaned to the banks for the benefit of their shareholders. The depositors ought to reap the benefit, and this they would do if we had a national bank. He objected to the Savings Banks being under the direction of trustees, many of whom were directors of other banks in the colony. A return, which had been presented to the House, showed that amongst the trustees of the Savings Banks of New South Wales were the following gentlemen:—Mr. Christopher Rolleston, of the Bank of Australasia; the Honorable G. Thornton, of the City Bank; Mr. Thomas Walker, of the Bank of New South Wales; Mr. John Alger, of the City Bank; and Mr. Edward Lord, of the Australian Joint Stock Bank. He did not wish to cast any reflection on these gentlemen, or to impute dishonorable motives, but he thought it highly undesirable that gentlemen connected with the banks should know the details of the accounts of the Savings Banks. They actually had to lend money to themselves, and surely no one would argue that it was right, under the circumstances, that they should hold the dual positions. When the Government took control of the Savings Banks there would be a greater sense of security in the public mind. There was no danger of a crisis or of any of our banks failing at present, but the time might come when some of the banks would not be in a position to repay the advances made to them, and then the poor people of the country—who were the chief depositors in the Savings Banks—would suffer.

Motion made, and question proposed.

Mr. WATSON said that the Bill for the amalgamation of the Government Savings Bank and the Savings Bank of New South Wales which he promised to introduce some time ago had been prepared, and if time would permit it would be brought forward this session. The Bill would amalgamate the two banks and place them under the control and guarantee of the Government; the present trustees would be removed and three commissioners would be appointed in their stead. To carry out the object he had in view it would be necessary for the honorable member to amend his motion. The Government Savings Bank was that attached to the Post Office, and the bank which the motion was intended to refer to was the

[Mr. Hurley (Hartley).

Savings Bank of New South Wales. He fully concurred in the opinion that it was not desirable that gentlemen who were directors of other banks should be trustees of the Savings Bank. Since he had been in office he had refrained from appointing any new trustees in view of the change contemplated by the Government.

Motion amended, and agreed to.

Resolved,—That, in the opinion of this House, no person holding a seat at the board of any bank, or acting in the capacity of auditor of any bank, should be hereafter appointed or allowed to hold a seat as a trustee in the Savings Bank of New South Wales.

MEDICAL BILL.

Dr. BOWKER rose to move,—

That the Order of the Day for the second reading of the Medical Bill, which lapsed by reason of the House being counted out on Friday, 9th April, be restored to the Paper, and stand an Order of the Day for Friday week.

He said that, as a general rule, he did not wish to go into any matter against the wish of the House, but he was not satisfied that it was the desire of honorable members that the Bill should be counted out as had been done. He should not have pressed the question any further unless he felt assured that what he proposed was in accordance with the wishes of the people, and that it would be for their advantage; neither should he press it unless he felt that it was of supreme importance. He had no other motive in introducing the Bill than that of having the honor of doing good service to the people. He repudiated altogether the assertion that the Bill he proposed was intended specially to benefit the medical profession. It was intended to benefit the people, and for that reason he felt it to be his duty to persevere in the matter and to adopt every legitimate means to effect his purpose. The bitterest opponents of the Bill admitted that it was necessary to protect the public by providing for the punishment of men who practised under assumed titles.

Mr. CAMERON: Hear, hear.

Dr. BOWKER: How can the honorable member consistently oppose the Bill then, seeing that that is its chief object?

Mr. CAMERON: But there are other things in it.

Dr. BOWKER: Certainly there are, but should the House deem them undesirable they could be altered in Committee.

It had been said that the Bill would interfere with the rights and practice of chemists and druggists. It was not intended that it should affect chemists and druggists; and if it did not contain provisions which would prevent interference with them he would see that that was provided for. It had also been said that the Bill would interfere with homœopaths. The homœopathic practitioner had as much right to his status as any other practitioner, and the Bill would not injure him.

Question put, and resolved in the affirmative.

PETITION OF MRS. MARY JONES.

Motion (by Mr. FARNELL) made, and agreed to,—

That a select committee be appointed with power to send for persons and papers to inquire into and report upon the petition of Mrs. Mary Jones, respecting certain property at Darling Harbour, presented on 21st April, 1880.

That such committee consist of Mr. Barbour, Mr. Burns, Mr. Day, Mr. Garrett, Mr. Hoskins, Mr. Hurley (*Hartley*), Mr. Jacob, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Thompson, and the mover.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes before 7 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 5 May, 1880.

Forfeited Purchases Declaratory Bill—Lands Acts further Amendment Bill—Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Bill—Mining Act Amendment Bill (Second Reading)—Lands for Public Purposes Acquisition Bill.

The PRESIDENT took the chair at 31 minutes past 4 o'clock p.m.

FORFEITED PURCHASES DECLARATORY BILL.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON moved that the Bill be recommitted in order that an amendment might be made in the 1st clause. As the 1st clause stood, it made a declaration necessary when land reverted to the Crown; but the Act of 1861 provided that land under certain circumstances should revert to the Crown. Hence the provision contained in the 1st clause was unnecessary.

Question put, and resolved in the affirmative.

In Committee,—

Sir ALFRED STEPHEN moved,—
That the word “declared,” clause 1, be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause otherwise verbally amended.

Bill reported with amendments; report adopted.

LANDS ACTS FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

Report from Committee of the Whole on Assembly's message adopted.

Bill returned to the Assembly.

METROPOLITAN WATER AND SEWERAGE BILL.

SECOND READING.

Sir JOHN ROBERTSON, on rising to move the second reading of this Bill said, that although the measure was one which comprised a large number of clauses, its general purport might be very briefly explained. The Bill proposed to establish a board composed partly of elective and partly of nominee members, the title of which should be “The Board of Water Supply and Sewerage.” It was proposed that the Government should appoint three members, who would be the official members of the board, that the City Council should appoint two, who should be called the city members, and that the mayor and aldermen of several boroughs should also elect two members, to be called suburban members. They would retire from office by rotation. The President was to be appointed by the Government, and would have a fixed salary, whilst the other members would be paid by fees. The elected members might be members of Parliament, and could in such case take fees, but the nominated members could not. It would be in the recollection of honorable members that the City Corporation Act provided that when the Government took over the city water supply works they should also take up the debentures of the Corporation and make themselves responsible for the expenditure incurred in respect of the undertaking. The Bill provided that whenever the works for the supply of the suburban municipalities were completed, the local Councils might take charge of them, and the board would be reimbursed by payments spread over a stipulated period. The third part of the Bill provided for the