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If I were asked what it was that made the deepest impression on me during my recent visit to some of the Australian colonies—their immense area, or their great and undeveloped re-
sources, or their “weird” scenery, or their political institutions, or their schools, universities, churches, and public buildings—I should reply at once: None of these things, but the hospitality of the people. And, as I am about to give my “Impressions” of Australia, I must begin with the impression which, now that I have been at home again for more than six months, remains the most vivid. There is no clear promise as yet that Bacon’s vision of an ideal republic, discovered in Australian latitudes, will be realized on Australian soil; for the English race in that new country, like the English race at home, care a great deal for material prosperity, and they cannot say as yet with the Governor of “the House of Strangers” that they maintain a trade with all nations, “not for gold, silver, or jewels; not for silks, not for spices nor any other commodity of matter, but only for

4 God’s first creature, which was light; to have light, I say, of the growth of all parts of the world.” But one of the virtues attributed to the people of the “New Atlantis” is nobly illustrated by the people of the Australian colonies. The adventurous navigators who visited the mysterious island say, “We found among its inhabitants such a freedom and desire to take strangers, as it were, into their bosoms, as was enough to make us forget all that was dear to us in our own country. ... We were come into a land of angels, which did appear to us daily and prevent us with comforts which we thought not of, much less expected.”

Even the inhabitants of the “New Atlantis” were not more generous in their treatment of strangers than are our Australian kinsmen. I dwell on my recollections of Australian hospitality—partly, perhaps, because it is very pleasant to myself to think of the charming homes in which I stayed and of the cordial friends I found on the
other side of the world; but partly, too, because the English race, under the new conditions of life in Australia—social, economic, and climatic—are rapidly developing new national habits and a new type of national character; and their hospitality, though a virtue which they carried with them from the old country, is showing in the vigour and luxuriance of its growth the quality of the new soil.

As I went out on the invitation of the Congregational Unions of South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales, I knew that I should receive kindness from my own people; but their kindness surpassed all expectation; it was unwearied, considerate, ingenious, and inexhaustible. In some houses my wife and daughter and I stayed for several weeks together, and we were treated with a generosity and affection which could not have been exceeded if we had been the nearest relatives of the family, or if for twenty years we had been rendering them the greatest services. As soon as we had crossed the threshold of our new home, we forgot that we were among strangers whom we had never seen before; it was as if my host and I had been the most intimate of college friends, and had written to each other by every mail since he left England; and as if my wife and her hostess had been at the same school when they were girls, and had maintained a vigorous correspondence ever since; had confided in each other about their “offers” and their engagements; had told each other their troubles when their children had the measles and the whooping-cough; and had shared, though there were twelve thousand miles of sea between them, all the sunshine and storms of life.

In houses where we stayed only a night or only a few hours, we found the same cordiality and ease
and frankness, and the same eager earnestness to be hospitable. Those who could do nothing more, met us at railway stations at which we stopped for five or ten minutes on our way to other cities, bringing flowers and fruit, and they succeeded in making us feel that in towns of which we had hardly known the names, there were friends who would have been glad to entertain us as long as we chose to stay with them.

But it was not merely from Congregationalists that I received kindness. Methodists of all descriptions, Episcopalians, Baptists, Presbyterians, were equally zealous in their endeavours to make my visit agreeable and interesting. I was credited by the newspapers with being a Radical—and a Radical of an advanced and exasperating type; but the most cautious and conservative of politicians were not less cordial than those who share my general political opinions.

II.

Something—perhaps very much—of the unsparing hospitality and overflowing kindness which it is so pleasant to recall was due to the depth and strength of the love of Australians for the old country. Their affection for England is a passion, and it makes them extraordinarily sensitive to the criticisms of the English press and of the least distinguished of English travellers on Australian achievements, Australian institutions, and Australian manners. It also makes them sensitive to the treatment which colonial affairs and the representatives of the colonies receive from English statesmen. They love us too well not to feel keenly when we judge them hardly or treat them with indifference.
They show a natural resentment when they discover that educated Englishmen, interested in politics, know so little of the condition and resources of their great country—are uncertain whether Ballarat is in Queensland, in New South Wales, or in Victoria; and address their letters to “Melbourne, South Australia.” Their affection for England leads them to endeavours, which have in them an element of pathos, to reproduce under those distant skies the sights and the joys and the customs of “home.” They dine on roast beef and plum-pudding on Christmas Day, though the thermometer marks 100° in the shade. They can surround their houses without much trouble with flowers and shrubs and trees having all the grace and splendour of sub-tropical and even tropical vegetation; but they spend hundreds of pounds in watering their grounds, because they are resolved, notwithstanding fierce heat and months of drought, to have something to remind them of the velvet softness and living green of our English lawns; and when they show you their gardens they take you away from orange groves and glorious palms and point with special pride to poor little roots of cowslips and primroses such as grow in English country lanes. And they tell you that, even when the drought is at its worst, the “English Garden” is never permitted to pine for water.

Every Englishman that visits Australia comes from “home.” It does not much matter from what part of England he comes. The nearest of the stars, whatever its real magnitude, is reduced by distance to a point of light; and, at the distance of twelve thousand miles, Birmingham and London, Newcastle and Penzance, the Suffolk village from which one man came, thirty years ago, and the Yorkshire town which another man has not seen for more than forty years, seem very near together.
All England is “home” to the colonists, and the home affections surround their English guest with an atmosphere of genial warmth. For the moment, he seems to them to be the representative of unforgotten playmates and schoolfellows, of early friends, of old neighbours, of dead kindred; his presence revives a thousand tender memories of long past years. And even to the men and women born in the colonies he is invested with an interest which could not belong to a stranger of another race; they think of him as having shared the life of their parents, and they receive him as though in a remote country and in a remote time he had been their father’s and their mother’s friend.

This, however, is only an incomplete account of the matter. For in their treatment of each other, as well as in their treatment of strangers, there is a frank cordiality and a demonstrative kindliness which distinguish them from ourselves. If a very eminent man is leaving Euston on a political mission to Lancashire, a crowd may gather to see him off, and another crowd will gather to receive him at Manchester or Liverpool, greatly to the inconvenience of quiet people who are travelling by the same train. But similar courtesies are shown in Australia to men who are not very eminent. With us the crowd meets for purposes of political demonstration; in Melbourne and Adelaide men go to the station for no other purpose than to show their goodwill and friendliness. This is their kindly way. It is one of the slight indications of character and temperament.

---

9 The Adelaide morning papers contain the names of the first-class passengers travelling by the express leaving Melbourne the previous afternoon and due at Adelaide about eleven o’clock in the morning; they are received by telegraph from the station nearest the boundary-line between the two colonies. This custom facilitates the meeting of friends. The Melbourne and Sydney papers contain similar announce-
The same spirit shows itself in their social intercourse. Mr. Froude, describing his experience in Melbourne, says: “Party followed party, and it was English life over again; nothing strange, nothing exotic, nothing new or original, save, perhaps, in greater animation of spirits. The leaves that grow on one branch of an oak are not more like the leaves that grow upon another than the Australian swarm is like the hive it sprang from.”

I differ from Mr. Froude. The oak has been transplanted. It is rooted in quite a different soil. It has more sunshine. It has almost forgotten the rough winds with which it wrestled in the old winters. The “leaves” of the transplanted tree are beginning to show the effect of the change.

But Mr. Froude saw only one section of Australian society, and the section which he saw was that which is kept most “English” by its nearness to the Governor and to Government House. He travelled about Victoria in great splendour: “Mr. Gillies was waiting for us at the station, with Chief Justice Way.” We were conducted to a superlative carriage, lined with blue satin, with softest sofas, cushions, armchairs, tables to be raised or let down at pleasure. A butler was in attendance in a separate compartment with provision-baskets, wine, fruit, iced water, and all other luxuries and conveniences.”

Metaphorically, Mr. Froude may be said to have travelled all over the colonies in a “superlative carriage, lined with blue satin,” with “a butler in attendance in a separate compart-
ment.” He saw Australian society under exceptional conditions—under conditions likely to lessen, if not to efface, the differences which distinguish it from society at home. It was my better fortune to have a more varied experience. I travelled now and then “in a superlative carriage, lined with blue satin,” so to speak, with “a butler in attendance in a separate compartment”; but I also travelled in an ordinary first-class carriage, sometimes in a second, sometimes in a plain third, and now and then in a carriage of the country, over what is pleasantly described as a “natural road.” Dismissing metaphor, I saw all sorts and conditions of men, and I saw them when they were free to be themselves. In the presence of an eminent man of letters from England, like Mr. Froude, people

positive genius for hospitality. Some of my brightest and pleasantest recollections of South Australia are connected with his beautiful house, “Montefiore.”

would assume English manners. Australians have a great reverence for literary distinction. The weight of his reputation oppressed them. He noticed that, perhaps, there was “greater animation of spirits” in Victoria than in England; but I venture to think that the “animation”—as he saw it—was a little subdued.

III.

There is probably a difference—a difference very easily accounted for—between people living up-country, on stations and farms, and people living in the towns and cities. I thought that the people from the country whom I saw seemed grave and serious, and that some of them bore the marks of a hard life. But among all descriptions of people living in towns—among merchants, professional men, tradesmen, and working men and working
women—I found a much more buoyant temperament than is common at home. They are more light-hearted, surer of themselves, more fearless, more open. This is generally true, even of those who were born in England, if they have been in the colonies for twenty or thirty years. The climate, with its brightness and warmth, has found its way into their blood, and begun to modify their character. It is still more true of the young people, the “Australian natives,” as they are proud of

13
calling themselves. They have a large and healthy capacity for enjoyment. They do not exhaust the interests of life before they are one-and-twenty. Among the young men and women whom I met I cannot remember any that had the weary, listless, withered look which is too common among young men and young women at home. I think that among all my young Australian friends it would be hard to find one to whom it has ever occurred to ask, “Is life worth living?” With a vigour which we northerners are apt to think can only be disciplined and maintained under our own ungenial skies, they already begin to unite some of the characteristics which belong to races nearer the sun. They are not too shy to say kindly and agreeable things to each other. I have heard more compliments exchanged during an Australian dinner, some of them very felicitously turned, than I hear at a dozen dinners in England—compliments not to women merely, but to men, gracious words showing the pleasant temper of the speakers, and likely to give pleasure to the persons to whom they were addressed.

In American—perhaps I ought to say New England—society there is also more of this kindly commerce than among ourselves; but between American and Australian courtesies there is a difference. When I was in New England ten
years ago, I could at times almost imagine that the people whom I met had stepped out of Miss Austen’s novels. Their ways had an old-world charm. They treated each other with a measured and stately politeness. Their manners had the reserve which is an element of their national character. It surprised many of my English friends to hear that I had found the Americans at home a reserved people; but when I made my discovery known to a friend who was editor of a New York paper, he said, after a few moments’ hesitation, that he thought I was right. The ordinary American is apt to be very inquisitive about other people’s affairs, but he tells you little about his own. He always has himself well in hand.¹

But the Australian is unreserved, and his manners are free and unrestrained. If you really care to know his story, he will tell it you. And to me it was one of the delights of Australian travel to hear from all sorts of men about their adventures in the old times when they had to travel through the bush between Melbourne and Ballarat; about

¹ I can only speak for New England and for the States which have been formed and largely influenced by emigration from New England. I did not get farther west than Chicago—and even in 1878 Chicago had ceased to be in “the west”—nor farther south than Richmond; and in Richmond I saw nothing of society.

their life at the Bendigo diggings when there was the first rush for the gold; about the rough ways of the miners, their courage, endurance, recklessness, and generosity; about the ships that lay in Melbourne harbour for weeks because all the crews had caught the gold fever and gone off to the diggings; about working all night long, night after night, loading wagons in Flinders Street to send off goods to Ballarat; about the troubles in
the early settlement of South Australia, and the
sagacity and energy with which they were met;
about the terror created by the bushrangers in the
old days in New South Wales. One man, who
has since held high political office, told me that
when he and his father reached Melbourne he
succeeded in landing his own and his father’s
luggage, as soon as the anchor was down, by jump-
ing down into the barge which was alongside to
unload the ship, and asking the “boss” for a job;
he earned a few shillings by landing his own
luggage, and then he earned a few more shillings
by landing the luggage of other people. Another,
who is now a rich man, and who has also held
high office, told me that in a few weeks at
Ballarat he got gold to the value of £250; sent
it home to a brother in England, a barrister,
who had the wit to send back the whole
amount in cheap jewellery—the last thing in the
world that most men would have thought of send-
ing for sale among miners living in shanties and
under canvas. But the jewellery was sold at a
profit which my friend never ventured to calculate;
with the money it yielded him he bought a piece
of land in Melbourne and built three cottages,
each of which for a time, when emigrants were
streaming into the colony by thousands and could
find no roof to shelter them, let for £500 a year.
He sold his land and cottages while the demand
for houses was still urgent, and now they are let-
ing for 12s. 6d. a week. Story after story was
told me without any trace of ostentation or
egotism, and simply because I was interested in
them.

There are other differences between the typical
New Englander and the typical Australian; and
they admit of explanation. The early settlers in
New England were men who took life seriously.
They were Calvinists at a time when Calvinism was credible, and they lived in the presence of the solemn and august grandeur of their creed. They had the courage to face the sternest and the gloomiest aspects of it. They had been disciplined by the most rigorous forms of Puritanism. The authority of the Eternal had for them a most awful reality. They had been driven into exile because they dared not disobey what they believed to be His will. The shores on which they settled and the early history of their settlements hardened their fibre and tasked all their severer virtues. The soil was not generous; the climate not more genial than that which they had left behind them. By hard work and thrift they succeeded in making a living; but for a long time they had no wealth. They were left to themselves. For several generations no strangers settled among them, bringing other beliefs, other traditions, other manners. A definite type of character had time to form itself. The New Englanders became a grave, self-restrained people. Their characteristic qualities are, I think, explained by their history. And New England has exerted a great influence on the middle and western States.

On the other hand, the people who have left these islands for Australia have been people of many varieties of religious faith—members of the Church of England, Methodists, Congregationalists. Baptists, Presbyterians from Scotland and the north of Ireland, Irish Roman Catholics; and over very few of them has religious faith had that awful supremacy which it held over the Pilgrim Fathers and the men and women who founded the colonies of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. They had not suffered the rough but invigorating discipline of persecution. As their religious be-
liefs varied, their theories of conduct also varied; and they did not carry with them a common ideal of the moral life to form the basis of the new society. Some of them went at the impulse of a patriotic desire to contribute to the extension of the empire, and to take their part in shaping the early history of a new nation of English blood; some, I know, went with the hope that they might assist to lay the foundations of the new community in faith and righteousness. But many went merely because they were restless at home, and wanted a freer and more adventurous life; many with the hope of making a great fortune by lucky finds at the gold-fields; and the immense majority because they thought that by industry they could do better for themselves, and for their wives and children, than in England. And even if the settlers had gone out with an ethical ideal as severe as that of the New England Puritans, the conditions of Australian life would probably have relaxed its severity. They found that the summers had a fiercer heat than they had ever known, and that the winters were hardly colder than English springs. For weeks and months together they lived under brilliant skies without a cloud. The soil in many districts almost fulfilled Jerrold’s humorous account of it: “Tickle it with a hoe, and it laughs with a harvest.” Farmers cropped their land with wheat twenty years in succession, apparently without impoverishing it; and the wheat was the finest in the world. The orchards yielded in abundance luscious fruit. Within a few years men numbered their sheep by thousands and tens of thousands, and the pasture was boundless. Then came the wild excitement of the gold discoveries, and the country was flooded with wealth.
Immense fortunes were made, not only by lucky speculators in mines, but by tradesmen who supplied the miners with the necessaries and luxuries of life. Petty dealers became great merchants, and their profits were enormous. Fortunes were made in less time than is required at home to establish a new business, and to make it pay a fair interest on the capital invested in it. Individuals had to live a rough life, and sometimes to suffer great hardships. And fortunes were lost easily as well as made easily. The community as a whole, in every one of the colonies, has passed through great vicissitudes. But there has been nothing like the prolonged struggle with difficulties which has left so deep and enduring an impression on the New England character. Notwithstanding occasional and even serious checks, the last fifty years of Australian history—the previous fifty need hardly be counted—have been years of magnificent prosperity.

Such a climate and such a history would, I say, have done something to relax the severest and most rigid ideal of life; and with the Australians the ideal of life was never rigid. Their history and their climate have combined to give them their high spirits, their warmth of temperament, their frank, cordial manners, their freedom from reserve.

They have also a great capacity for enjoyment, and though they work hard, they like to keep ample time for their pleasures. The young ladies—though from the scarcity of servants they do much more household work than young ladies in England—are just as zealous at lawn-tennis. They dance hour after hour, through the hot nights, with an inexhaustible vigour. The young gentlemen are equally ardent and energetic I was told that when a prosperous Melbourne gentleman builds a large house for himself, one of his first cares is to
make sure of having a handsome ball-room. At one of the houses at which I stayed the ball-room was large enough to seat three hundred people—I am no judge of how many couples could dance in it. It was used for all kinds of pleasant purposes. While I was there, eight or ten young men, friends of the sons of my host, came in on one or two evenings in the week, and fenced for a couple of hours, under a fencing-master; and my host himself, when he could get away from the "House," took his foil and fenced with them. Once a week a professor of music came to "conduct" a glee club, consisting of the members of the family and twenty or thirty ladies and gentlemen from the neighbourhood; when the practice was over, there were refreshments in the dining-room. In the season there are dances. Occasionally the room is crowded with friends invited to witness amateur theatricals, and sometimes advantage is taken of the popularity of entertainments of this kind to make a charge for tickets, and the proceeds of the sale are given to a charity. Whether there are many houses in which such pleasures as these are provided for the young people of the family and their friends, I do not know; but if a large ball-room is supposed to be of such importance in a large house, private entertainments on a considerable scale must be common. There are, I believe, five theatres in Sydney, five in Melbourne, and there is one, at least, in Adelaide.

Outdoor amusements are also popular with all classes of the community. On bright days—and the days are generally bright—the wonderful beauty of Sydney Harbour is heightened by the white sails of innumerable yachts, and a great regatta draws tens of thousands of spectators. In all the colonies a football match between two
famous teams is a public event of the first importance. Cricket is still popular, though it excites less interest than in former years. The young men are keen for all kinds of athletic exercises; and in a climate like that of Australia there are the strongest reasons—moral as well as physical—for maintaining a public sentiment in favour of athletic pursuits. Whether the amount of time that is given to them leaves sufficient opportunity for intellectual culture and for taking interest in public affairs, is a question on which a stranger has no right to form a judgment.

In Victoria the great event of the year is the race for the “Cup,” at Melbourne. I happened to be in the city just before it was run. All the drapers’ and milliners’ shops were gay with ladies’ dresses and bonnets and hats for the “Cup Day.” It was plainly a national festival. The course is said to be the finest in the world. The Governor is always present; he would no more dare to be absent from the “Cup” than from the opening of an Intercolonial Exhibition. Governors from other colonies often find that as Cup Day comes near, imperative business requires them to go to Melbourne. I was told that the public schools do not get a holiday on Cup Day, but that—so the rumour runs—the school-keepers are unaccountably and inexcusably negligent of their duties, and forget to open the doors. A hundred thousand people witness the great contest—one-tenth of the whole population of the colony. It is as if more than three millions of people met to see the Derby. The behaviour of the great crowd is, I am told, most admirable. There is no drunkenness—no rowdyism. So sacred is the occasion, that many of my friends were almost scandalized that I left Mel-
bourne for Sydney a day or two before the race was run; but as I do not go to races at home, I did not care to go to a race in Australia. And it would hardly have done for me to apologise for absence from a meeting of the Congregational Union of New South Wales on the ground that I was staying a few days longer in Melbourne to see the “Cup.”

Climate and prosperity have done much to form the characteristic qualities of the Australian people; but much is also due to the fact that the men and women who have gone out from these islands have had more than the average vigour of their countrymen and countrywomen. Australia is a very long way from England; it is separated from us, even now, by a six weeks’ voyage; and I met many men who were six months on the sea—some who were nine months—between London and Sydney or Melbourne. Before the gold discoveries, hardly any information about Austra-

lia had found its way to the great mass of the people at home; and as soon as the first excitement of those discoveries was over, the mass of the people heard no more of the country. It has required courage and a sanguine temperament to travel so far to a land so unknown. Some, no doubt, have gone with broken strength, hoping that the kindlier skies would give them a chance of a successful fight against disease, which in England would have been certain to end in death; and some, ruined in reputation and fortune, as well as in health, have been sent by their friends to the other side of the world to conceal the disgrace which they had brought on honourable names. But these have borne an inconsiderable and hardly recognizable proportion to the great mass of the settlers. Australia has enjoyed a kind of natural “protection” against the feeble, the less resolute,
and the less effective of our population. It has been settled by men and women with more than the average physical energy, and with a fearless and adventurous spirit. They were an excellent stock, both physically and morally; and their children inherit their admirable qualities.

A second generation has now grown up to manhood and womanhood; a third is growing. A few years ago a grandfather was an unknown personage; but grandfathers are now not uncommon.

There is no sign, as far as I can see, that the race is deteriorating. The “Australian natives” are taller, especially in New South Wales, than their parents; their spirits are higher; they have abounding physical vigour. It is sometimes said that the children born and reared in the “bush” are more vigorous than their fathers and mothers; but that the children born and reared in the cities are less vigorous. When I think of the bright, animated young women, and the robust, energetic young men, that I saw in Sydney and in Melbourne, I find it hard to believe that this can be true. If with the young squatters and farmers born in the bush there is a greater pressure of steam on the square inch than with the young barristers, journalists, and merchants born within walking distance from Pitt Street, Sydney, and Collins Street, Melbourne, the young squatters and farmers must be very formidable persons indeed. We Englishmen, at home, can be no match for them.

The time at my command was too limited to allow me to see anything of Queensland or Western Australia. Nor could I see anything of what it would be right to describe as the “bush.” What kind of a life people live in “stations” far remote from towns and cities—what influence their loneliness exerts on their character—I learnt only by report. I saw some very interesting men and
some very remarkable men, who are “squatters,” but I did not see them under the conditions of station life; and some of those whom I saw spent much of their time in towns. The type of national character and temperament which I have endeavoured to describe, is that which I found in the cities and smaller towns of South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales, in each of which colonies I was able to stay for several weeks. In New South Wales, for reasons which I shall venture to give on a later page, it is exhibited with the fewest specific variations.

IV.

But while this is the common type, the people of each colony seemed to me to have their distinctive qualities. Between the Victorian, the South Australian, and the New South Walesman—I do not wonder, by the way, that Sir Henry Parkes endeavoured to give New South Wales another name—there are very appreciable differences. I have speculated about the origin of these differences—probably unsuccessfully. But as I have never seen the subject discussed, I venture to give my theory; perhaps it may provoke some Australian writer whose knowledge of colonial history and the conditions of colonial life is larger than a mere visitor to

the colonies can possess, to treat the question more adequately.

The colony which presents to a visitor the most striking and the most strongly marked type of national character is the colony of Victoria. The explanation is, I think, to be found partly in its exceptional history, and partly in the proportions in which England, Scotland, and Ireland have con-
tributed towards its settlement. The colony may be said to have been created by the great rush for gold in 1851 and the following years. In 1850, the year before the rush began, the population was a little over 76,000; in 1854 it had risen to more than 312,000, of whom 205,000 were males; the net immigration from 1850 to 1860 was nearly 400,000; the immigrants remaining in the colony at the end of the ten years were five times as numerous as the whole population at the beginning of the period.

The men drawn to the diggings were for the most part men of exceptional physical vigour, of courage and daring; indifferent to hardships and careless of danger. They lived a rough, wild life. Only those who were capable of great physical exertion and of great physical endurance were able to stand it for long. Of the rest some broke down; some drifted into other employments; some ultimately settled in other colonies; others returned to England. But the majority of the strong men remained, and they were numerous enough to impress their own character on the colony. When they left the diggings for other employments they carried with them their boldness, their force, their confidence in themselves and their own resources, their vigorous individualism.

But, further, in these days we have learned to appreciate the immense importance of race; and while the immense majority of the settlers in Australia have been drawn from these islands, they have been drawn in different proportions from the three races which occupy the United Kingdom; and these proportions have varied in different colonies. To quote the percentages of the present population of each of the three colonies that were born in England, Scotland, and Ireland respectively, would not be very instructive. The
important question is, What have been the relative proportions of English, Scotch, and Irish immigrants to the whole number of settlers from the foundation of each colony? For the descendants of Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scotchmen retain many of the racial characteristics of their parents, and they severally make a definite and distinct contribution to the formation of the dominant national type; but in the population tables they are, of course, all classed together as “born in the colony.” I do not happen to know whether there are tables which show the nationalities of the settlers in each colony from its commencement till now; and if they exist, and were accessible, they would be defective for my immediate purpose in one very important particular. Emigrants from Cork and Kerry and Tipperary, and emigrants from Londonderry and Belfast, could not be discriminated from each other; they would all appear in one group, under the head of “Ireland.” It makes an immense difference, however, to the distinctive temperament and character of a colony whether the Irish people who have settled in it come from the north of Ireland or from the other parts of the island.

For the explanation of the distinctive qualities of the various colonies, so far as these qualities are the result of differences of race, it is safe, I think, to use the official returns which show the relative strength of two powerful religious denominations. It may be practically assumed that the Roman Catholics are of Irish birth or of Irish descent, that they or their fathers belonged to the west of Ireland, the centre, or the south, and that the Presbyterians or their fathers came either from the north of Ireland or from Scotland. This assumption might, no doubt, be fairly subjected to some qualifications. But it is roughly accurate.
Now, the tables setting out the religious denominations\(^1\) of the people in the several colonies, show that in Victoria the Roman Catholics are about 23 per cent of the population, and the Presbyterians 15 per cent; I have not thought it necessary to carry out the percentages into decimals. In other words, the Scotch and Irish elements form 38 per cent. This is rather a higher percentage than is found in New South Wales, where they reach 35 per cent; and a very much higher percentage than is found in South Australia, where they reach only 21 per cent. Victoria has more of Scotch and Irish blood in it than either of the adjacent colonies. But this is not all: the Presbyterians who represent the proportion of the population drawn from Scotland and the north of Ireland are 15 per cent of the whole population in Victoria, as against 9 per cent in New South Wales, and only 6 per cent in South Australia.

The characteristic qualities of the Scottish people—their industry, fortitude, tenacity, courage, thrift, and shrewdness—are the admiration, where they are not the terror, of mankind; and in all these qualities their kinsmen in the north of Ireland are their equals, and perhaps their superiors. From this vigorous and formidable race Victoria has drawn a larger proportion of her people than either New South Wales or South Australia.

There was another important factor which contributed to what Mr. Carlyle would have called “the daemonic energy” of Victoria. In early days

\(^1\) I have used for convenience the tables which are given for all the Australian Colonies in the Victorian Year-Book for 1885–6. The tables represent the number of persons of each denomination—giving males and females separately—as returned by the census of 1881. Tasmania does not appear. In that colony there was no religious census in that year.
there were for a time a considerable number of American firms in Melbourne, and the business men of that city learnt to carry on their business in the rapid enterprising American way.

New South Wales has had a very different history. Though now and then the colony has expanded very suddenly—between 1850 and 1860 the excess of immigrants over emigrants was 124,000,1 and between 1870 and 1880 the excess was 103,000—its growth has, on the whole, been gradual. And at each of the two periods which I have mentioned, the population of the colony, before the sudden increase by immigration, was considerable. There were 265,000 people in New South Wales in 1850—more than double the net
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immigration between 1850 and 1860; and there were close upon 500,000 in 1870—nearly five times the net immigration between 1870 and 1880. There has been no sudden influx of immigrants of a particular class, in numbers so large in proportion to the population already in the country as to impress their own qualities upon the whole community. The development of the typical Australian character has at no time been subjected to any violent disturbance. Among the people of New South Wales I thought that I found those qualities of life and temperament which distinguish all the colonies from the mother country; and I did not observe those secondary characteristics which belong to the special types exhibited in Victoria and South Australia,

South Australia, by the origin of its people, is more English than either Victoria or New South Wales. The Scotch and Irish, as I have already said, constitute only 21 per cent of the population
—hardly more than a fifth. The Catholic Irish are less than a sixth of the whole people, instead of being nearly a fourth, as in Victoria, or rather more than a fourth, as in New South Wales. The percentage derived from Scotland and the north of Ireland is absolutely less than in either of the other two colonies—only 6 per cent.; but its proportion to the Catholic Irish is a little higher (5 to 2) than

in New South Wales, though considerably lower than in Victoria.

The important fact, however, about South Australia is, that so large a proportion of its people belong to the English stock. And the colony was founded by men who, no doubt, wanted a good investment for their capital, but who also wanted to try a new scheme of colonization, which, however, had very soon to be modified and then abandoned. Part of the revenue from the land sales was to be appropriated to a fund for bringing out labour. The scheme had its attractions for men who were interested in economical experiments. The papers of the South Australian Colonization Society, of which, I think, Mr. George Fife Angas was chairman, were freely circulated among the Evangelical Noncomformist congregations in the north of London, and probably among similar congregations in other parts of England. I can remember seeing them in my father’s house when I was a child. The promises which were made were not, I think, of a kind to draw the daring and the ambitious. The people who went out went to grow wheat and wool, and to engage in the quiet industries which are developed in an agricultural and pastoral country. They did not expect to come back to England with a fortune in five years. The discovery of the Burra-Burra copper mines in 1845,
and then of the mines on the York Peninsula, drew quite another class of settlers, and drew them in large numbers; but copper has not the violent attractions of gold, and working a mine is a much less exciting occupation than digging for nuggets. Nor did the miners remain long in the colony; as soon as gold was discovered in Victoria, 15,000 of them crossed the border.

The history of South Australia has been less exhilarating than that of Victoria. It has had times of great prosperity; but it has suffered from prolonged depression. Its growth has been slow: the estimated population at the end of 1886 was under 320,000, as compared with a million in Victoria and a million in New South Wales.

Among the South Australians, therefore, you do not find many men of the impetuous and daring sort that rushed to the Bendigo and Ballarat diggings: nor do you find the children of such men. There is less audacity and stormy vigour among them than among the Victorians. Their strength is of the calmer and more patient kind. They can get excited on occasion; many of them must have lost their heads before losing their fortunes, during the land mania a few years ago; and when I was in Adelaide the city was working itself into a violent fever over the wonderful success of the silver mines at Broken Hill. But

judging from those whom I met, and from what I heard from men who knew the colony well, and whose opinion seemed trustworthy, I think that in South Australia there are very large numbers of thoughtful people, with gentle ways and quiet tastes. The proportion of women to the whole population is larger than in any of the other colonies of Australia.† The absence of a great
city like Melbourne or Sydney deprives the people of some excitement. Their climate, too, is much hotter than the climate of Victoria, and they seemed to me to show the influence of their more fervent sun. The South Australian has some of the more attractive qualities of the Italian temperament. The demonstrative warmth which I found in all the colonies was most demonstrative in South Australia; and the gracious and graceful things which were said in all of them were said most frequently there. I think, too, that the South Australian has a greater capacity than the people of the other colonies, not for pleasure in general.

1 The estimated number of females for every 100 males in the seven colonies (in 1885) is instructive. New South Wales, 78.91; Victoria, 87.25; South Australia, 91.34; Queensland, 70.76; Western Australia, 76.03; Tasmania, 88.22; New Zealand, 84.30. The births in South Australia (1884) are also more numerous in proportion to the whole population than in any of the other colonies.

36 but for pleasure of a kind that requires no violent exertion. Like the races of southern Europe, he can find dreamy enjoyment in sun and air, in shining waters and clear skies.

In Tasmania I spent only a few days, and these were spent in Hobart. Life in Hobart is very unlike the life which I saw in the three great cities on the other side of Bass’s Straits. The hospitality shown to us there was just as cordial, as unsparing, and as demonstrative as that which we received in the towns and cities of Australia. It was dark before we reached our anchorage, and we were just finishing dinner when we heard the rattle of the anchor chains which told us that our six weeks’ voyage had come to an end. Within a few minutes after dinner, a steam launch came puffing towards us through the darkness; when she touched the side of the vessel there were loud cries for “Spicer” and “Dale,” and presently thirty or
forty ladies and gentlemen were on board, grasping our hands, flooding us with the heartiest and kindliest welcomes, begging us to go on shore at once, and telling us that carriages were waiting to carry us off to the friendly homes where we were to be entertained. As our luggage was not ready

1 Our party consisted of Mr. and Mrs. Albert Spicer, my wife, one of my daughters, and myself.

for landing we thought it better to wait till the next morning; and then the launch came again, and our friends came again, and every one of them was eager to do something to make our brief stay as interesting and pleasant as possible.

But though the hospitality was the same as that which we received elsewhere, and though there was the same frankness, openness, and warmth of temperament, life in Hobart seemed to me, as I have said, very different from the life which I saw afterwards in Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide. There was a delightful sense of repose. Perhaps this came in part from the beauty and peacefulness of the scenery which surrounds the charming house, three miles out of the city, where we found a home. It reminded me of some of the loveliest parts of Cumberland and Westmoreland. Behind the house rose Mount Wellington to a height of 4,000 feet; and, as it was still early spring, its summit was crowned with snow; in front there was a range of hills of inferior elevation, covered with grass and dark foliage; and at their feet, looking like lakes, we could see here and there the shining reaches of the Derwent. The garden was brilliant with flowers, and the orchard was a sea of blossoms.

But it was not merely the beautiful scenery outside the house where we stayed, and the cultivation, the thoughtfulness, and the affectionate and
considerate hospitality which we found under its roof, that gave me the impression of peacefulness at Hobart. During the few days that I was there, I met a considerable number of persons belonging to the city, and no one seemed to be in a hurry; business was carried on leisurely and without excitement; there were no indications of struggle, no symptoms of fever. Everybody seemed fairly well-to-do; and it did not appear as if any one was very anxious to become richer. I was told that money is not being made rapidly in Tasmania, and that the young, eager, ambitious people cross over to Melbourne; that the people who remain are contented with moderate incomes; that a considerable proportion of them began life with money which had come to them from their fathers, and are not wholly dependent on their business or their profession; that the shopkeeper usually owns his shop and the merchant and professional man his house; and that shop-keepers, merchants, and professional men have generally some safe investments that yield a modest income.

It seemed to me that the life possible to the people at Hobart was an ideal kind of life—a life free from ambition, free from anxiety, free from the passion for money-making—a life with leisure for the enjoyment of the charities of home, for the love of Nature, and for all the higher intellectual and moral interests. I dare say that the hard reality is not exactly what it seemed to a passing stranger; that many a brain is weary, many a heart restless, and many a household vexed with petty cares; that sickness, misfortune, sin and folly find their way into many a home under those beautiful hills and near those shining waters; and yet, judging not merely from what I saw but from
what I heard, I think that Hobart has an ease and tranquillity which distinguish it from the cities of the Australian mainland. In the quiet resoluteness and strength of my hostess, the daughter of one of the most eminent and successful of the early colonists, I saw illustrations of the qualities of the men who founded Tasmania; and I should have seen more of the common characteristics of Australian life had I been able to remain in Launceston, through which I passed to take ship for Melbourne. But, as I have said, the more eager and fiery young life of Tasmania finds its way across Bass’s Straits, and is contributing to the energy and heat of the neighbouring colonies. Tasmania, unless something happens to keep its more adventurous youth at home, will, in a generation or two, develop a distinct type of national character and manners.

These are the impressions which I received during the three months and a half that I stayed in the Australasian colonies. The time was short, and it would betray a very inordinate measure of confidence in my powers of observation if I expressed any peremptory judgments; but I saw large numbers of people, and people of every kind; and I saw them in their homes. They are ourselves—but ourselves with a difference; and while they are developing a certain common type of character and temperament, each colony, if I am not greatly mistaken, has its distinctive qualities. There are doubtless timid and irresolute men in Victoria, but the typical Victorian is not timid and irresolute; there are doubtless “hard” men in South Australia, but the typical South Australian is not “hard”; there are doubtless cold, selfish, reserved men in New South Wales, but the typical and representative man of New South Wales is
not cold, selfish, and reserved. I have attempted, in speaking of each colony, to describe the type.

Whether the type—the general or the special type—will be permanent is an interesting speculation. As yet I do not think that the sunnier skies and the higher temperature have lessened the physical vigour of the English, Scotch, and Irish who have formed the majority of the settlers. The second generation often seemed to me more hardy and robust than the first. But will the stock retain for a hundred years the rude strength which

has been disciplined by the frosts and snows of these northern seas? Will not the fibre soften? Will not the muscles relax? Will “native Australians,” even fifty years hence, be as vigorous in business and as keen for cricket and rowing and football as they are now?

Other influences than climate may contribute powerfully to modify the Australian national character. One-third of Australia is in the tropics; will it be possible to develop the immense resources of the northern part of the country without coloured labour? And when the cotton plantations, the tea plantations, and the sugar plantations are being worked by hundreds of thousands of coloured labourers under the management of a few thousand whites, what new vices or new virtues will be formed in the ruling race? With coloured people doing all the hard work in the fields and in the mines of the north, it will hardly be possible to exclude them from the south. What is to happen? Within the next hundred years the coloured people of Australia—drawn from China, India, or the islands of the South Pacific—may outnumber the white population. The descendants of the settlers who have gone out from England, Scotland, and Ireland may become a proud aristocracy, and
may have their work done for them by inferior races.

These new economic and social conditions—if they arise—will gravely modify the national character. I can venture no prophecy of what Australians are likely to be a hundred years hence; at present they have in them the making of a powerful, high-spirited, and noble race.

CHAPTER II.

SPECULATIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE.

I.

It is estimated by Mr. Hayter, the Statist to the Victorian Government, that in 1891, when the next simultaneous census of the colonies will be taken, the population of the Australian continent will be at least 3,200,000, and that the population of Tasmania and New Zealand will be about 800,000. If this estimate is correct, and there is no reason to regard it as excessive, the Australasian group will contain within the next three years four millions of people.

Mr. Hayter, with that delight in the speculative treatment of figures, which characterises a statis-
tician who has a real genius for his subject, has also worked out a table showing what the population of the group would be at each of the ten next decennial periods, supposing that the same rate of increase is maintained between census and census, that occurred between 1871 and 1881. It appears that in 1981 the population of Australia, Tasmania,

1 Note A.

and New Zealand would, on this hypothesis, be just under ninety-four millions; and in 1991—a hundred years from the next simultaneous census—more than one hundred and thirty-three millions. He closes this discussion by the wise words: “It must be admitted that, at the present time, such speculations are more curious than practically useful.”

But the imagination of the Australian people delights to dwell on the probability—on the certainty—of the immense expansion of their numbers during the next hundred years. They are now celebrating the centenary of the founding of the earliest of the colonies; they confidently predict that the Australian continent alone, which now contains about three millions of inhabitants, will contain, when the second century comes round, a hundred millions. As the patriotism of young Englishmen feeds its fires on the past glories of our race, the patriotism of young Australians derives equal fervour from the vision of the future development of their country. With a population of a hundred millions, having in their veins the best and most vigorous blood of these islands, blending in themselves all the best qualities of the English, Scotch, and Irish people, inheriting the material, intellectual, and moral triumphs of European civilization, living in a country the resources
of which are boundless, and under skies such as poets in their dreams have seen bending over the isles of the blessed, Australia, a hundred years hence, will be one of the greatest, most powerful, and most splendid of nations. These are the prophecies and hopes on which the more ardent and generous of the young Australians delight to dwell. Their buoyant faith in the future of their people is an animating contrast to the weariness, the despondency, the hopelessness, the perplexity with which many of the most thoughtful and most cultivated of our young men at home discusgs the condition and prospects of our own country. And the exulting hopefulness is a great element of strength.

A hundred millions of people on the Australian continent within the next hundred years—this is what the Australians expect. And there seems to be more than room for them all. England, Scotland, and Wales have an area of 88,800 square miles, with a population estimated at rather more than 32,500,000. The area of the Australian continent is 2,944,000 square miles, or just about thirty-three times as large.

Some very considerable deductions, however, would have to be made from this immense area, if I were venturing on hazardous calculations as to the population which may ultimately live and prosper on Australian soil. For in the interior there are vast tracts of desolate country, rocky, covered with stones, covered with sand, which is driven in clouds by the wind; vast tracts where the soil is impregnated with salt, and fresh water is found only at points separated from each other by great intervals of dry, barren, cheerless wastes. In some parts there are great salt lakes. I met a gentle-
man who travelled recently from Adelaide far into the Northern Territory with camels and Afghan drivers: he was a delightful companion, and full of information which he was very willing to impart; but English reserve, which in his case had not yielded to the influence of the characteristic Australian temper, restrained him from saying much about his own adventures and hardships. From what he said, however, it was easy to infer that the journey had not been a pleasure excursion, and that he passed over great tracts of country which are terrible to both man and beast. How much of the whole area of the continent is of this dreary kind is not accurately known; but it has been estimated that, of the 900,000 square miles of South Australia (including the Northern Territory), 300,000—an area about three and a half times the area of Great Britain—are waste. In Western Australia, with its 975,000 square miles, it has been estimated that the area of waste and desert
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country is equally immense. If, as is generally believed, these great tracts of desolation are rich beneath the surface with mineral wealth, it may be assumed that, sooner or later, means will be found for making them habitable; but it is difficult to believe that they will ever be covered with a very large population. Men may work there, but when their work is done, they will fly to the more genial parts of the country.

A third of the whole continent—as I said in the previous chapter—lies within the tropics. If tropical Australia is ever to be thickly populated, it will not be by men belonging to the great race which has created Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide; for they cannot endure severe and continuous labour in a tropical climate, Europeans are working in the mines—it seems as if men could feel no
exhaustion as long as they can actually see gold—but the resources of the country can never be

1 Native wells have been discovered in the desert, which justify the opinion that there is water not far below the surface. There is a popular belief among sanguine Australians that an immense subterranean lake of fresh water extends under the whole continent, and that means will be invented for bringing this hidden treasure to the surface.

2 To prevent an erroneous inference, it may be necessary to say that considerable parts of the desert country of the Northern Territory and of Western Australia are included in tropical Australia.

developed by Europeans or their descendants. Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen may find the capital, and may direct the labour; but the labourers themselves, who must form the great majority of the population, will be coloured people.

“But even after allowing for uninhabitable wastes, and for those parts of the continent where the climate is too oppressive and enervating to allow of any great amount of European labour, there is room enough for an immense population of European origin.” No doubt It is certain, I imagine, that a hundred millions of people of European origin could live, and live happily, on that immense continent.

But speculations about the possible population of Australia, if not less “curious,” would be condemned by Mr. Hayter as still less “practical” than speculations about its probable population at the end of its second centenary. I return to the “impressions” which I received from what I saw and heard.

II.

A few weeks after I landed I spent an interesting day at a “station” in South Australia. In England we should call the property an estate;
the freehold belongs to the owner. It covers about 60,000 acres, lying between two ranges of low hills.

which are grassed to their summits. From a point near to the beautiful house where we lunched we could see it from end to end, and the view was a lovely one. The owner’s son, who had not long returned to the colony from Cambridge, was a pleasant host. He showed us the official plan of the property, and gave us interesting information about how it is worked. He hoped, in the course of a few weeks, to clip 50,000 sheep; but the station is not a mere sheep run. The father of our host is a famous breeder of cattle and horses, and near the house are long rows of stables and of cattle-sheds for the stud stock. I asked how many men were employed, and was told thirty, with additional hands at shearing time. Thirty men for sixty thousand acres! and this on an estate which requires an exceptional amount of labour on account of the cattle and horses which are bred upon it. I expressed my astonishment; but had our host been less courteous he would have shown his astonishment that I should be astonished. For I afterwards met one of the great squatters, who holds, in addition to other land, a cattle run in the Northern Territory. The run extends over 8,000 square miles,1 and is therefore larger than the

1 Other squatters in the Northern Territory occupy still larger runs. The following are selected from a long cata-

whole of Wales. Or, to put it differently, the run is equal to a strip of country seventy miles broad and extending from London to Birmingham. On this immense territory he told me that he employed three “whites” and six “blacks.” By “blacks” he explained that he meant Australian aborigines, who make excellent stockmen. I asked whether
the station was fully stocked, and he said that it was not, but that if it were, it would require twenty-five men instead of nine. Large districts of this run must be desert. Of course it was not fenced, but the cattle could always be found at the places where they went for water.

Of late years, the practice of shepherding sheep has been very generally abandoned, and this has diminished the number of men employed on the sheep runs. The run is divided into large paddocks, surrounded by wire fencing; and the bound-

ologue given in “South Australia in 1887,” published by the Commissioners for the Adelaide Exhibition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Square Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macartney, J. A.: Amheim Land</td>
<td>11,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray, David: Barrow’s Creek Run</td>
<td>12,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello, John: Roper River</td>
<td>16,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos, Amos, &amp; Broad: South of Gulf of Carpentaria</td>
<td>19,033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the occupiers of these large runs occupy other runs, which are also of enormous extent.
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dary rider rides round the paddock two or three times a week, to see that the fence is unbroken. The sheep are left very much to themselves. The size of the paddocks varies: some of them are not more than 3,000 or 4,000 acres; I have seen a notice of one which extends over nearly 200 square miles. In New South Wales, the great wool-producing colony, Mr. Coghlan reports that, in 1886, 36,682,801 sheep were in paddocks; that 1,504,904 were under the care of shepherds; and that 981,599 were both paddocked and shepherded.

The paddock system not only saves labour, it facilitates the management of the runs; and a higher percentage of lambs is obtained from the sheep in paddocks than from the sheep under shepherds. “In 1886 the general average of the lambs for the whole colony was 64 per cent, for the
paddocked sheep, and only 53¼ for the shepherded sheep."

The area of land under pastoral occupation in New South Wales in 1886 was 142,927,000 acres; the population engaged in pastoral pursuits and about animals was 30,810: this does not include the wives and daughters of those who are employed in these pursuits. The figures give one man to about 4,500 acres. The Victorian figures show a larger population in proportion to area. The land in pastoral occupation is 18,348,660 acres; the

number of persons engaged in pastoral pursuits and about animals is given as 13,906; but these figures include, as the similar figures for New South Wales do not, the wives and daughters of squatters assisting on the stations. Including the wives and daughters, there is one person employed in Victoria for every 1,300 acres of land used for pastoral purposes.

If the greater part of the Australian continent is to be covered with sheep runs, there is little prospect of a rapid increase of the population. And, on the whole, the pastoral industry is still growing. Comparing 1875 with 1885, the number of sheep in Victoria has sunk from 11,749,532 to 10,637,412; in South Australia the increase during the same period has been inconsiderable—from 6,179,395 in 1875 to 6,696,406 in 1884; it is not probable that there was any large increase in 1885.¹ In New South Wales, on the other hand, the increase during the ten years has been from 25,353,924 sheep to 37,820,906. Victoria has probably almost reached the limits of its pastoral resources. In South Australia the growth of the pastoral industry has been temporarily checked.²

¹ There have been no returns since 1884.
² I do not care to say much about the colonies which I did not visit. But Mr. Coghlan points out that Queensland
and the Northern Territory of South Australia are more

In New South Wales the production of wool will probably continue to increase for many years; for, though a very large proportion of the whole area of the colony is now occupied, the stock may be largely increased.

The demand for Australian wool is still enormous. On my way out several of my fellow-passengers were confident in their predictions, that the wool of New South Wales would be driven out of the English market by South America; and I found that the Argentine Republic was regarded by some of my Australian friends with nervous apprehension, although they are confident that the quality of their own product could not at present be approached by the South Americans. The quantity of wool now produced on the vast plains of the Argentine Republic is no doubt very large. In 1882, the last year for which I have been able to find returns, it amounted to 244,666,040 lb.; and there is every reason to believe that it is now very much larger. It is also true that the total pro-

...favourable to the breeding of cattle and horses than the breeding of sheep; and that, while the southern portion of Western Australia will probably be stocked with sheep, the northern portion will probably be found more suitable for cattle and horses. The Australian production of wool, as well as of cattle, will therefore be immensely increased as these colonies are developed; but neither sheep nor cattle can profitably employ a very large population.

...duction of the Australian colonies has slightly diminished during the last few years. The production in 1885 was less by about five million pounds than in 1884; and less by over nine million pounds than in 1883. The diminished production may perhaps be partly accounted for by the fall of prices in the London market. For several years before 1878 the average price of Australian wool
in London had not sunk, except in one year, below 1s. 3d. per pound; in 1878–9 it was 1s. 2½d.; in 1880, 1s. 2¾d.; in 1881, 1s. 2½d.; in 1882–3–4 it fell to 1s. 0½d., and in 1885 to 10½d. In 1886 there was a slight improvement; and when I was in Australia the wool-growers were hopeful. But, though the fall in prices is a very serious loss to the Australian squatter, a diminution of nine million pounds on a total of 400 millions need hardly create anxiety.

As far as the London market is concerned, it looks as if Australian wool had nothing to fear. South America sent us more wool in 1873–4–5 than in 1885–6–7; in the first three years she sent us in round numbers 48,000,000 lb., in the last only 43,000,000 lb.; while Australia sent us, in 1873–4–5, 651,000,000 lb., and in 1885–6–7 no less than 1,140,000,000 lb.¹

It is true, no doubt, that in each of the three

¹ Note B.

colonies the acreage under crops—including wheat, oats, barley, maize, other cereals, potatoes, hay, vines, green forage, and other tillage—has during recent years greatly increased. In New South Wales the acreage under crops of all kinds, which was only 451,139 in 1875, was 868,093 in 1885; Victoria, in the same ten years, had extended its cultivated area from 1,126,831 acres to 2,405,157; and South Australia from 1,444,586 acres in 1875 to 2,785,490 in 1884.¹ The return shows that the acreage under wheat in each of these colonies has been immensely enlarged. In New South Wales, though that colony does not yet grow enough wheat for its own population, the acreage under wheat had almost doubled; it had risen from 1 33,610 acres to 264,867 acres. In Victoria it had increased more than threefold—from 321,401 acres to 1,020,082; and Victoria has become the formid-
able—it would be more accurate, perhaps, to say the successful—rival of South Australia in supplying bread-stuffs to the Sydney market. In South Australia, however, notwithstanding the rivalry of Victoria, the acreage under wheat has been more than doubled; in 1875 it was 898,820 acres, and in 1884, 1,942,453 acres.

1 The figures, for the reason given in a previous note, cannot be given for 1885.

But in wheat the United States, British India, and British North America seem to defy Australian competition. In 1873–4–5 we received from Australia only 4,500,000 cwt. out of a total importation of 160,500,000; in 1885–6–7 we received only 7,000,000 out of a total importation of 225,500,000.1 Drought and the high price of labour put the Australian wheat growers at a great disadvantage. Australia will continue to raise sheep, an industry which employs very few hands compared with the acreage devoted to it; but there seems very little chance of any great expansion of wheat cultivation, except to meet the demands of her own increasing population.

III.

I was not, therefore, surprised to find in Victoria and South Australia a considerable amount of anxiety to create new forms of industry, or to develop forms of industry already existing, which would render these colonies less dependent on wheat and wool.

In July, 1887, the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly of South Australia united in appointing a Select Committee, to consider “the

1 The cwt. of wheat flour is reckoned in the returns as equivalent to 1¼ cwt of wheat in grain.
best measures to be immediately adopted with a view to encouraging amongst farmers and smaller occupiers of land the production of such products as are most specially adapted to the soil and climate of South Australia, and will yield the greatest profits and provide the most constant employment, as well as increase the railway traffic.”

The Committee published its evidence and presented its Report last November.

A similar inquiry has been made in Victoria by a Royal Commission appointed in September, 1885; the Commissioners are directed to inquire and report “respecting the vegetable products other than wheat for the growth of which the climate of Victoria is suitable, both with and without irrigation.” When I left Melbourne, in December, 1887, the final Report had not appeared, but the Commissioners had published the evidence in four handy volumes, containing, in all, between 800 and 900 pages. The evidence which had been taken both by the Committee and Commission is extremely interesting.

It is clear, I think, that within the next quarter of a century the Australians will send into our markets a great variety of new vegetable products. We already receive Australian apples, and I learnt in Hobart that the choicer sorts of Tasmanian apples fetch a high price in London. The pears are excellent. Peaches, apricots, plums, and other fruits might be grown in abundance for canning and preserving. An enthusiastic person, whom I know, is under the impression that no one has any conception of the ideal perfection of jam who has not tasted jam in Australia. But this wild judgment ought perhaps to be qualified by the statement that all the jam that created so much enthui-
siasm had been prepared in private families. The soil and the climate are admirably adapted to the growth of almonds, olives, lemons, and oranges. The guava and the lime flourish. Raisins and currants might be sent from Adelaide and Melbourne in tons. There are districts of the country which might be covered with fields of mustard. In any part of South Australia the poppy might be grown for the manufacture of opium. With irrigation, tea might be produced in large quantities in the southern parts of the colony, and in the Northern Territory there might be coffee plantations and groves of cinnamon. Some of the witnesses suggested that capers might be grown very easily. Australia is also a country for plants which might be used in the manufacture of perfumes—such as jasmine, roses, oranges, cassia, rosemary, geranium, and the wattle-flower; the difficulty, apparently, lies in the distillation of the perfumes. There have been some satisfactory

experiments in growing tobacco, but in the curing of it there has not as yet been much success. Some witnesses thought that Australia could produce, in any quantity, admirable fibres for the paper manufacturers. The bark of the wattle tree is already largely used for tanning, and is said to be extremely valuable. The Victorian witnesses attached great importance to the growth of timber in that colony; and the South Australian Committee reported that forest tree culture is estimated by the Conservator of Forests to yield £2 per acre per annum for the first ten years; £3 8s. per annum for the next five; from £10 to £12 per annum at the end of fifteen years; and that the timber remaining on the ground after thirty or forty years should be worth £300 per acre.

Many of these industries are already active; they require to be developed rather than created;
other industries of the same kind are gradually making way. In 1886, for example, 200 lb. of opium were produced in Victoria; 771 cwt. of mustard, 13,734 lb. of tobacco, and 616,112 lb. of hops. But for some reason both the acreage under hops and the weight of the yield had diminished during 1883–4, 1884–5, and 1885–6. In the first of these years, the acreage, which was only 428 in 1883–4, had risen to 1,758, and the weight from 307,328 lb. to 1,760,304 lb.; in 1885–6 the acreage had diminished to 896, and the yield to 616,112 lb.

I have not been able to put my hand on similar returns for South Australia.

Olive oil of most excellent quality is already manufactured in considerable quantities, chiefly for colonial consumption. One of the principal growers told me that it would not be possible to send it to England at the prices given for Italian oil, and he believed that the Italians could not make a profit if their oil were not adulterated. He maintained that the Australian oil is much better than the oil which we are receiving from Italy.

There is a considerable number of fruit farms scattered over the country. At one of them, near Angastan, I stayed a night, and spent a pleasant time with hospitable people. My host and hostess came from the West of England, and had been in the colony more than forty years; they and their family worked hard, but appeared to be living a tranquil and fairly prosperous life. They made some of their fruit into jam, and canned most of the rest. Some members of my party still retain a vivid remembrance of the perfect condition and delicious flavour of their canned peaches; they were very superior to the canned fruit which reaches the English market from America.

The present Premier of South Australia, who is a man of great natural ability, and a born leader
of men, is a successful fruit-grower and market gardener, and he finds in the fortunes of the fruit trade a conclusive argument for South Australian Protection—as long, at any rate, as Victoria maintains a Protective system. "When we have a good season," said the Premier, "the Victorians usually have a bad one; and the Victorians usually have a good season when ours is bad. What happens? If we have an unusually large crop, the fruit is very cheap on this side of the border, and our market in Victoria is spoiled by the tariff. When we have a poor crop, and want good prices, we can't get them, because our own market is flooded with fruit from Victoria." He was carrying a Protective Tariff through the House when I met him, and I did not care to spoil an interesting dinner-party by plunging into a discussion on Free Trade.

While travelling about the country lying within a hundred miles of Adelaide, we saw an immense number of orange trees, lemon trees, and citron trees, all of them loaded heavily with fruit. The oranges grow to great perfection. I had often heard that in orange countries men will eat a dozen oranges before breakfast, and I do not think that I had ever quite believed it. But one morning I found my way to some orange trees near a house in which we received most generous entertainment, near Gawler; and now, if a man told me he had eaten fifty oranges before breakfast I should not dream of doubting him. Oranges are also cultivated—to what extent I do not know—in Victoria. In New South Wales there were, in 1879, 4,287 acres under orange cultivation, producing 3,398,445 doz. oranges; the acreage in 1887 was 7,920, and the production 6,376,868 doz. The
average production per acre for nine years has been 798 doz.

New South Wales seems to be satisfied with growing oranges and grapes; for other fruits she depends on the sister colonies. Mr. Coghlan records, with a certain feeling of resentment, that in 1886, Tasmania, New Zealand, Victoria, and South Australia supplied the markets of New South Wales with green, dried, and bottled fruit to the value of nearly £250,000. All this she could have grown for herself. The quarter of a million does not include what was paid for tropical fruit imported from Fiji, New Caledonia, and Queensland, some of which might have been just as well produced in the northern parts of New South Wales.

But it is to the extension of the wine industry that the colonists are looking with most hopefulness. Readers of "Oceana" will remember the description of the vineyard of St. Hubert’s, where, according to Mr. Froude, “the only entirely

65 successful attempt to grow a fine Australian wine had been carried out, after many difficulties, by a Mr. Castella, a Swiss Catholic gentleman from Neufchatel.” Mr. Castella deserves great honour for his vigour, perseverance, and skill; and he has produced very good wines; but it is not quite certain that the wine manufacturers of New South Wales and of South Australia would admit that the Victorian is alone in his success. My judgment on such questions is of very little value, but Sir Samuel Davenport’s Chablis, and Mr. Hardy’s Reisling, which I often drank in Adelaide, seemed to me excellent; and in New South Wales there is a wine called Dalwood’s Red which I found both wholesome and pleasant.

In the quantity of wine which it produces, however, Victoria is very far in advance of its immedi-
ate neighbours, and, indeed, of all the colonies in
the Australasian group; and the industry is de-
veloping rapidly. According to the official returns,
the production in 1886 was just over a million
gallons; this was more than double the return for
1881, and was 240,000 gallons in excess of the
return for 1885. The area under vines was larger
than in any previous year, and exceeded the area
in 1885 by 733 acres. New South Wales in 1886
returned only 555,000 gallons. This falls below the
quantity produced in 1876, which was 831,000 gal-

lons; but the number of acres under vines, for wine-
making only, was only about 300 less in 1886 than
it was ten years earlier. The yield was 262 gallons
an acre in the earlier year, and only 192 gallons in
the later. The last South Australian return is for
1885, when the production was 473,000 gallons.
In a Handbook published in 1887, by the Com-
missioners for the Adelaide Exhibition, it is said
that about 600,000 gallons were at that time
annually produced in the colony; this seems to be
a rough estimate, without any very definite facts to
justify it. The same authority states that in 1866
the acreage under vines was 6,629, \(^{\text{^^}}\) against 4,850
in 1885; that the production in 1866 was 895,000
gallons; and that the number of wine-makers in
the colony had diminished. On the other hand, it
is maintained—and probably with perfect accuracy
—that the quality of the wine is much better.

It will not be easy to persuade the world that
Australia can rival the vineyards of France, Ger-
many, and Spain; and for many years to come it
seems probable that the Australian manufacturer
will be compelled to imitate as closely as he can
the wines which have become familiar to the taste
of Europe. He believes—and he is probably right
—that he has no chance of a market unless he uses
the old labels—"Port" and "Sherry," "Claret" and "Hock"; and the contents of his casks must correspond to the familiar names. He is lost if he ventures to be original. In these days a new wine has a harder battle to fight than a new theory of the universe; and the battle is very much more costly. And so the new man in the new country cannot do his best: like the rest of us, he is bound and fettered by the tyranny of "use and wont."

But the new man will have his turn. The Adelaide Select Committee is of opinion that, if the whole area of South Australia now devoted to the growth of wheat were one immense vineyard, the produce would not be equal to the deficiency in the wine production of France through the devastation of the phylloxera; and there is a general belief in Australia that a large amount of Australian wine is supplied to the English consumer under French labels, and that the happy Englishman finds the wines of Australia most admirable when they have undergone treatment in France, and are called Macon or Beaune. The Report of the Committee goes on to say that

"In England, France, and India we have markets capable of absorbing all the wine we can produce. For wines of the port, sherry, and Burgundy type our climate and soil are equal to the most favoured spots on earth. *The deep-rooted vine is far better adapted to withstand the irregularity of our rainfall than our present largest industry—wheat.* Wines of the quality we can produce can be grown only on a small portion of the globe. America, Russia, and India are con-

stantly increasing competitors in wheat production, while, if our wheatfields were turned into vineyards, our competitors might be turned into large consumers of our wines, currants, and raisins."

The sentence I have italicized is exceptionally important. The great terror of the Australian farmer, as well as of the squatter, is the drought;
if the grape-grower can defy it, this is an excellent reason for growing grapes instead of wheat.

With regard to the choicer wines, Mr. Hardy, a witness of high authority, said that in Australia, as in the older countries, the localities in which these could be produced were probably very limited in area; they require exceptional soil and exceptional situations; “but,” he added, “for ordinary wines we have, to our certain knowledge, thousands of acres within fifty miles of Adelaide, and much of it is already cleared and fenced, and it is very likely that many of our worn-out wheatfields will produce better wine than virgin land. The growth of the vines will not be so luxuriant, but the quality of the wine will be better.” Mr. John Howard Angas, a member of the Committee, confirmed Mr. Hardy’s judgment with regard to the possible uses of exhausted wheatfields. He had found at Angaston that worn-out wheat lands are very suitable for the growth of the vine, especially where there is a sandy soil on the surface and clay be-

neath. And the farmer who resolves to have a vineyard need not give up growing wheat. When he finds that part of his land, after being under wheat for five-and-twenty years, is beginning to show signs of poverty, he can put vines into it, and continue to grow wheat on those lands which are still unexhausted. According to Mr. Hardy, the labour necessary for a vineyard “is wanted at times when other cultivation is over, and farmers can therefore grow grapes at an advantage over those who depend wholly on vineyards and hired labour; and a few acres of vines will help to give constant employment all the year round—a thing we very much want in this country, to keep a settled population on the land.”

This last suggestion implies that the ordinary farmer who grows grapes should not attempt to
make his own wine; and it also implies that he must be within easy distance of a wine manufactory. At the date of the last returns (1885) there were in South Australia eleven wine manufacturers; and the number in Victoria is, I believe, very much larger. Many of the wine manufactories must be on the scale of our village public-houses, which supply home-brewed ales; a farmer has a small vineyard, and the wine which he makes is sold to his neighbours. The annual consumption of wine in New South Wales is nearly three-quarters

of a gallon per head of the population; in Victoria it is just over a gallon; in South Australia, nearly a gallon and a half. The “wine of the country,” however, is apt to be heady, and a stranger has to be careful in drinking it. But sometimes it is both palatable and wholesome. I remember staying for a night in a most homely and comfortable house, where my host was anxious that I should drink some of his own Port. I was rather nervous, but found it a very clean and honest wine, pleasant to drink and not dangerous. But there is an impression among those who are interested in the extension of the industry that the reputation of Australian wines has been injured by the small manufacturers. If a speculative exporter bought a few barrels of “pale ale” from a village brewer, and sent it to some foreign market which had not yet heard of the fame of Bass and Allsopp, the venture would not encourage the purchaser to order any more beer from England. And the wines of the smaller Australian manufacturers—so it is said—sometimes find their way to this country, and

* In the United Kingdom the annual consumption per head is considerably less than half a gallon—considerably less than one-third of the consumption in South Australia. Even Germany, with its vineyards, consumes less wine per head than South Australia; the consumption in Germany being just under a gallon and a third.
people who happen to drink them resolve to keep to the wines of Mayence and Bordeaux. Experts are therefore anxious that farmers should be content with growing the grapes, and should leave the production of wine to large establishments, properly equipped and managed by skilled and experienced hands.

IV.

There seems to be a general conviction that the Governments of the several colonies can do very much towards creating or developing these new industries. The production of wine in south Australia might, it is thought, be encouraged by the establishment of reciprocity treaties with Tasmania, New Zealand, Queensland, and other countries; this is the recommendation of the south Australian Committee.

The Committee also suggest that inducements should be offered to persons in the South of Europe, who are familiar with vine pruning and wine making, with olive pruning, with the processes for preserving olives in bottles and the making of olive oil, to settle in South Australia. They look especially to the district in the south of Spain lying between Tarragona and Barcelona. It is thought that immigrants might be drawn over in sufficient numbers if they were offered a grant of

20 acres after they had worked at their business for three years in the colony.

The directors of the beautiful Botanical Gardens, of which Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide are so justly proud, distribute cuttings of plants suitable to the Australian soil and climate to persons who engage to cultivate them; and the South
Australian Committee recommend that the Conservator of Forests and the Principal of the Agricultural College should be instructed to do this on a large scale for the encouragement of vineyards and olive gardens.

Since 1878 the Victorian Government has maintained an experimental farm of nearly 5,000 acres. A small portion of the ground has been planted with vines, olives, oranges, citrons, limes, figs, and other fruit trees. On plots of one-tenth of an acre, experiments have been made in rotation cropping, various systems of manuring, and other farming processes. Fodder of various kinds, supposed to be specially suited to the climate, has been grown with success. Experiments have been tried with thirty varieties of wheat, and twenty-four kinds of clover and grass. Chicory, turnips, mangold, beans, and medicinal plants have also been raised. There is a dairy which produces excellent butter throughout the hottest weather. According to the last report there were five acres of vineyard, which had yielded during the year 1,200 gallons of wine, and the olives had yielded 100 gallons of oil. Under an Act passed in 1884, 150,000 acres of Crown lands were reserved for the permanent endowment of State agricultural schools and colleges, and State experimental farms. More than 100,000 acres had been actually leased in 1887, and the annual rents amounted to £5,167. The first school, with accommodation for forty students, was opened in October 1885, and was filled from the day it was opened. The students receive instruction in chemistry, botany, entomology, geology, advanced English, arithmetic, mensuration, surveying, bookkeeping, practical work on the farm, the use of farm implements and machinery, and the management of livestock. No fee is charged for instruction, but the students pay £25 per year for board and lodging.
South Australia has had an Agricultural College for some years; and I believe that it has worked satisfactorily. It is maintained by an annual Parliamentary vote, and accommodates twenty-eight pupils. During the last seven or eight years an experimental farm, in connection with the college, and under the management of the principal, has given satisfactory results; a similar farm in another district, which had been established earlier, does not seem to have been successful. The principal of the college, in addition to his work with the students, supplies information to farmers by letter, and sends them samples of seeds for trial plots. It is part of his duty to receive visitors, and to explain to them the operations and experiments conducted on the farm. He also delivers lectures of a practical kind in different parts of the colony.

As yet New South Wales has neither an agricultural college nor a State experimental farm; the Technical College at Sydney, however, with its branch country schools, provides classes in agriculture, botany, veterinary science, and wool-sorting. But it is felt that these classes, however useful, cannot give to students all the training that they require; and it is probable that within a few years the Government will create both a farm and a college.

Visitors to the Colonial Exhibition of 1886 may remember the striking collection of beautiful woods in the Queensland Court—woods rich in colour and some of them finely grained. There may have been similar collections in the other courts, but it was the Queensland exhibit that attracted my special attention. At the Exhibition held last year in Adelaide there was also a very interesting collection of woods from several of the colonies, and I had the advantage of examining them under
the guidance of an expert. I learnt from him that

the hard timber of the indigenous forest trees has
great value for various industrial purposes; it is
also contended that the softer timbers, which are
now imported in very large quantities, grow rapidly
and to great perfection. Considerable encour-
gagement is already given by different Governments to
the growth of timber, and it is probable that this
industry will in time add largely to the wealth of
all the colonies.

But perhaps the most interesting experiment
which has yet been made by any of the Govern-
ments for the development of the resources of the
soil is the scheme for establishing what are de-
scribed as Irrigation Colonies in Victoria and in
South Australia. Rather more than two years
ago, Messrs. George and W. B. Chaffey applied to
the Victorian Government for the concession of a
large tract of almost worthless land on the river
Murray, which they proposed to change by irriga-
tion into an orchard and a garden, and broad fields
of golden wheat. For carrying out the scheme it
was necessary that certain definite rights to use
the water of the river should be granted to the
promoters. The Government came to the conclu-
sion that their powers under the existing laws did
not enable them to make the necessary conces-
sions; but the scheme was so attractive and so full
of promise, that a Bill, entitled “The Waterworks
Construction Encouragement Act,” was introduced

into Parliament, and became law before the end of
1886. The Act required that the concession asked
for by Messrs. Chaffey should be open for two
months to public competition. No tender, how-
ever, came in except from Messrs. Chaffey, and
they are now carrying out their scheme.
The contractors were able to appeal to the remarkable and rapid success which had been achieved by a similar undertaking of theirs in California. A cattle ranch, which had been regarded as useless for agricultural purposes, had been suddenly transformed, as if at the touch of a magician, into one of the richest fruit-bearing districts in the world—the desert rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

The Californian settlement, named Ontario, after the Canadian birthplace of its promoters, was founded in 1882. The Hon. Alfred Deakin, Chief Secretary of Victoria—a man of singularly clear and vigorous intellect—visited the settlement in 1885 as a member of a Victorian Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the water supply of the colony, and, in a memorandum published on his return, gave a brilliant account of its position and prospects. More recent visitors describe it in still more glowing terms. There is a double avenue, two hundred feet wide and seven miles in length, extending in a straight line from one end of the settlement to the other, and lined on each side with pepper trees, eucalyptus, magnolia, orange, and palm trees. Set back a few yards from the avenue are villas, surrounded with lawns, orchards, and flower-gardens. The population already numbers 2,500. There is an hotel, described as excellent; there are stores, schools, churches, and, of course, a newspaper. There is also an Agricultural College, which was endowed by the contractors with land, valued at the time it was given at £20,000. Part of the college estate was sold to raise funds for the building, and already the land which remains has become as valuable as the whole of the original endowment. The college contains a chapel, four large class rooms, and rooms for a museum, library, and other purposes. It has been
handed over to the University of South California. There are no “saloons,” the settlers having themselves determined to refuse licences. In 1885 Ontario, within three years of its foundation, exported 524 tons of raisins.

This is the kind of settlement which the Messrs. Chaffey propose to found in Victoria and in South Australia. The Victorian settlement, which is named Mildura, after the pastoral district which forms the chief portion of the grant, is in the north-west corner of the colony, and extends along the southern bank of the Murray, right and left of the point at which it is joined by the Darling, which flows into it from the north. It is much nearer to Adelaide, the chief city of the neighbouring colony, than to Melbourne.

The agreement with the Victorian Government is dated May 31, 1887; the contractors have already entered into possession of 50,000 acres, and the works are well advanced: ultimately their grant is to include 250,000 acres. The water-rights are conceded for a term of twenty-five years, with right of renewal from time to time for the same period. Messrs. Chaffey undertake to spend £10,000 during the first twelve months, £35,000 during the first five years, £140,000 during the second five years, £75,000 during the third five years, and £50,000 during the fourth five years—a total of £300,000 in twenty years—in irrigation works, agriculture, horticulture, etc., and the establishment of a fruit-preserving industry. An agricultural school or college is to be established, and one-fifteenth of the whole of the irrigated land is to be appropriated to the college endowment.

Any serious breach of the conditions on the part of Messrs. Chaffey Brothers involves the annulment of the agreement, on the payment by the Government of 80 per cent, on the value of the
irrigation works and substantial and permanent improvements then existing upon the land re-

sumed. But any land vested in trust for the agricultural college, or actually sold to settlers, is to be exempt from resumption.

The fee simple of the first two blocks of 50,000 acres is to be granted to the contractors when £5 an acre has been expended in permanent improvements on land not usually flooded in flood seasons by the Murray, and when £2 an acre has been expended on land usually flooded; but the land on which only £2 an acre is to be expended is not to exceed 10,000 acres. To obtain the fee simple of the remaining 200,000 acres, or any part of them, £1 an acre must be spent on improvements, and the contractors must pay £1 an acre to the Colonial Treasurer. They must also satisfy the Governor that they intend, in good faith, to carry out the whole of the agreement. It is further provided that the Messrs. Chaffey shall never retain in their own possession, or that of their agents, more than 5,000 acres of cultivated and irrigated land; it being the intention of the scheme, not to make Messrs. Chaffey Brothers large landholders, but to secure the settlement of a great number of settlers.

1 It is hardly necessary to say that the money to be spent on permanent improvements includes not only the cost of the irrigation works, but the cost of clearing the land, fencing, erecting houses, farm-buildings, etc.

There are limitations in the agreement on the amount of land that can be sold to individual purchasers. Eighty acres is the maximum that can be in the hands of one holder for fruit-growing, and 160 acres the maximum for general agricultural purposes.
Land suitable for the cultivation of fruit is sold by the company at £20 an acre; land for general agricultural purposes at £15 an acre. For payment in cash there is a discount of 2½ per cent. If the purchaser prefers it, he can spread the payment over ten years, but there is, of course, an additional charge for interest. He is also allowed to hold under the métayer system, and to pay as rent one-fourth of his crop. Town allotments of one quarter of an acre are sold at prices varying from £20 upwards, and villa or suburban allotments of two acres and a half at £100.

To the earlier settlers the land was sold already cleared; later settlers have to clear the land for themselves, Messrs. Chaffey undertaking to do the work at a reasonable cost.

The town is to be pierced by a great avenue, like the avenue of Ontario, 200 feet in width. There are reserves for churches, halls, and reading-rooms; for parks and gardens. The Bishop of Ballarat (Dr. Thornton) has already accepted the acre offered him as the site of a church. On his visit to the settlement he delivered a lecture on a Saturday evening in the engineers' shop, and had an audience of eighty-two, whom he describes as "splendid listeners"; the next morning he conducted service in the same building, and had a congregation of eighty-five. A business meeting, he says, was attended by forty persons; a committee was appointed, and steps were taken for the immediate erection of a school-church, the establishment of a Sunday-school, and the holding of periodical services.

No drinking-bars or saloons are to be allowed; whatever intoxicating liquor is drunk will have to be drunk in private. It is not quite clear whether the regulations will allow liquor to be sold.
The scheme is a fascinating one. Fruit-growing does not require such severe exertion as many other colonial employments. The settlers, as the promoters are careful to say, will not have to live a lonely life in the Bush. They are promised all the advantages of a well-ordered town—schools, an agricultural college, churches, reading-rooms, banks, hotels; brick-yards, where they may obtain bricks at the lowest cost to build their houses; saw-mills, where they may get their timber; stores, where they may purchase whatever necessaries and luxuries they do not raise for themselves.

The first Government Report on the progress of the enterprise is dated April 16, 1888, and was presented by the Chief Engineer of Water Supply. At that date there had been sold 458 town lots, 54 suburban lots, and 1,610 acres of agricultural and horticultural land. The population was 270.

Messrs. Chaffey and staff

Engineers, blacksmiths, machinists, carpenters, bricklayers, and other mechanics

Men clearing land, and other labourers employed by the firm on daily wages

Men engaged on contract work and their employees

Settlers, employed chiefly in fencing and clearing their lands and erecting dwellings

Women, chiefly married

Children of school age

Children under school age

The Report adds: “Of the forty-seven men set down as engaged on contract works, the majority are purchasers of land in the Mildura colony, and are thus employing themselves and their cattle, pending a favourable opportunity to take pos-
session of their allotments, and commence operations there.” The Engineer further reports that the Messrs. Chaffey have fully complied with the covenants of the agreement; that vouchers were produced for an expenditure of £11,086 16s. 8d. up to February 28; and that there could be no doubt that at the date of the Report the contractors had expended on improvements £18,000.¹

The South Australian settlement—Kenmark—lies west of Mildura, a few miles beyond the Victorian boundary. The agreement between Messrs. Chaffey and the South Australian Government is almost identical with that which they have made with the Government of Victoria.

The scheme, as I have said, is a fascinating one; and I am rather afraid that within a month I may receive a score or two of letters from persons whom I have never seen, asking me whether I advise them to apply at once for twenty acres suitable for the cultivation of fruit, or whether I think that they had better apply for forty acres; whether, in

¹ I heard a great deal of this interesting scheme when I was in the colony; but for the details given in the text I have relied on (i) an account of the scheme drawn up by Mr. J. E. M. Vincent for the official “Victorian Year Book, 1886–7”; (2) an illustrated book, called the “Australian Irrigation Colonies,” issued by Messrs. Chaffey Brothers. This book contains, among other interesting matters, the Bishop of Ballarat’s account of his visit to Mildura; descriptions of Ontario by various travellers; speeches on the scheme by eminent Australian politicians; (3) a copy of the indenture containing the agreement between the contractors, or, as they are technically called, the licensees, and the Victorian Government. I am indebted to the courtesy of Mr. Vincent, the London representative of Messrs. Chaffey, for (2) and (3). The London offices of the company are at Cornwall Buildings, Queen Victoria Street.

² The long run, a town lot at £20, or a suburban lot at £100, is likely to be the better investment; whether, in my judgment, Mildura or Kenmark has
the better prospects; what are the fares for first and for second-class passengers by the Orient Line and the P. and O.; and which line I recommend.

Since my return from Australia, though I have said little or nothing in public about the economic prospects of the colonies, I have received letters from unknown correspondents living in remote parts of England, implying an estimate of the value of my judgment more surprising than gratifying. To recommend a person of whom I know nothing to give up an income, however small, in this country and go out to Australia, to tell him which of the colonies he should select, when he should go, what kind of employment he should seek when he gets there, and how much money he ought to take with him, would be a cruel abuse of his confidence. Before I could give such advice to any man, I should have to learn whether, if he is a working-man, he is a good carpenter, bricklayer, mason, or blacksmith; or whether he knows much about horses, cattle, or sheep; or whether he understands farming or market-gardening. I should have to ask him his age, and whether his lungs and heart are sound; what diseases he has suffered from; whether he can stand a hot sun; and whether he likes hard work. I should have to find out whether he is temperate, whether he is resolute, ingenious, alert, capable of adapting himself to new conditions of life, and of doing good work without his usual tools. And if, on all these points, the results of my inquiries were satisfactory, I should suggest that it would be well for him to apply to the Emigrants’ Information Office, 31, Broadway, Westminster, for copies of the admirable official handbooks of the colonies—they are only one penny each—to study them carefully, to write to friends in the colonies for information, if he happens to have any friends there, and then to form
his own judgment as to whether he ought to go. If the applicant were a man with some capital, I should have to ask him many of the same questions, and should have to end with substantially the same counsel. There is a criminal levity, as it seems to me, in assuming the responsibility of recommending people to emigrate without adequate knowledge of their capacity and character, and without a very intimate acquaintance with the actual economic conditions of the colonies at the time when the advice is given.

This is a digression. But I wanted to escape the letters of inquiry which I feared might be provoked by my account of Mildura.

Mildura and Kenmark may perhaps become as

prosperous in a few years as Ontario; and their success may suggest to colonial authorities in England, Australia, Canada, and South Africa the expediency of promoting colonization—as distinguished from emigration—on a large scale. Why should not some of the Colonial Governments co-operate with the Government at home in endeavouring to found organized settlements, equipped from the beginning with stores, brick-yards, saw-mills, schools, and whatever else is necessary for the life of civilized men and women?

But, whatever may be the success of Messrs. Chaffey’s schemes, it is not, I think, very probable that the new agricultural industries suggested by the witnesses who appeared before the Victorian Commission and the South Australian Committee will develop elsewhere very rapidly. The men who are already on the land will not be easily induced to plant vineyards and orchards and olive gardens. For the Australian farmer is generally a stubborn Conservative on his farm, whatever he may be at the polling-booth. As long as he can make a fair living by growing wheat, he does not
care to grow anything else. Grapes, oranges, figs, peaches—these are mere “fads,” good enough to fill up the idle time of women, and very proper trifles for the amusement of rich men who are at a loss how to spend their money; but for a man

who can put his reapers or his reaping machine into a thousand or a couple of thousand acres of splendid wheat every year, to rely upon mere fancy crops, seems to him contrary to common-sense. According to the traditions of the old country, there is a certain dignity in growing wheat, which he would lose if he took to market-gardening and fruit-growing. And then, if he told the whole truth, he would say that the new crops would require a knowledge which he does not possess, and a care which he does not feel inclined to expend upon them.

But the Agricultural Colleges will send out a constantly increasing number of younger men, who will have caught the enterprising and innovating spirit of their professors, and who will be anxious to make use of their new knowledge. In the course of twenty or thirty years, these men, less controlled than their fathers by English customs and English ways of thinking, will have changed the whole character of Australian agriculture. They will grow wheat where wheat can be grown to profit. They will grow hops where hops can be grown to profit. They will cover immense areas of country with vineyards, olive gardens, and orchards; and Australian fruits—fresh and canned—Australian raisins, Australian currants, Australian olives, Australian oil, and Australian wines

will take their place in the English markets side by side with Australian wool. The paper-makers of Europe may find that Australia can supply
them with a better fibre than the Spanish Esparto. Queensland coffee may be drunk in Paris in preference to Mocha, and Russians may discover that the tea from the Northern Territory of South Australia is better than they can get from Pekin.

I find that I have been caught in the prophetic rapture which exalts the imagination of some of my young friends in Sydney and Melbourne. The last paragraph might have been prepared for a speech at a meeting of “Australian natives.” But let it stand. According to a poet who was popular forty years ago, “Prophecy is more true than history.” And whether these larger anticipations are fulfilled or not, this, at least, seems certain, that within a generation or two Australian cultivation will become so varied, that for Australia the dream of another poet, whose fame has lived for nearly two thousand years, will be fulfilled. For the time will come when it will be no longer necessary for ships to plough the ocean in order to bring to Melbourne, Sydney, Adelaide, and Brisbane the necessaries or the luxuries of life from remote lands:

“The soil shall bear
For all men’s use all products of all climes.”

It is very possible that there may be, within a few years, a great economic development in other directions. At the end of 1887, a passing traveller, knowing nothing about the colonies except what he learnt from the conversation he heard in railway carriages and at dinner tables, might have come to the conclusion that nearly the whole of the prosperity of Australia was derived from its gold and silver mines. Men were telling stories about Broken Hill which were wilder than the
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stories of romance. There was a young man, for example, on a station in South Australia, who, three or four years before I heard the tale, was receiving 20s. a week and his “tucker” as a boundary rider. He was playing euchre with a friend, who, after he had lost all his ready money, staked an original share, which he had just purchased for £100 or £120, in a new silver mine. The boundary rider won. A few months later, he and another friend went up to the mine to see how it was going on. As they were returning to Adelaide, they caught a dangerous fever, and they were nursed by a stranger. The friend died; the successful euchre player recovered. When he was better, he said to the stranger: “You have rendered me the greatest service one man can render to another, for you have saved my life. You ought to have a share of my luck. I will divide with you. Here’s a cheque for £15,000. My share in Broken Hill is worth £30,000.” I was telling this story at the table of a friend in London a few months after my return to England; there was only one guest besides myself, and he was a well-known stock-broker from Melbourne. When I had finished, he said: “Yes; I know the boundary rider very well, and have done business for him. The story is quite true. He held his share for a time, and sold out at an enormous price; but if he had held till now, he would have been worth £600,000.” People talked about Broken Hill as we in England used to talk about the Tichborne Trial. It was on everybody’s lips. They quoted the last price of shares as we quote yesterday’s returns during a General Election. Reports founded on private information from a sure hand, about the wonderful yield of a new “lode,” were as common, and were listened to with as much interest, as reports in a London club.
about divisions in the Cabinet when a Ministry is in trouble. Not only was everybody talking about Broken Hill; an extraordinary number of quiet people, who, in England, would never touch speculations of the sort, held shares in it. The excitement was sufficiently intense when I was in Adelaide. After I left—so a correspondent wrote to me—it became more intense still. One professional gentleman, who usually leaves the city for two or three weeks during the heat of Christmas, spent his holiday at the “corner” where the brokers meet, and claimed to have made £8,000. “You remember,” writes my friend, “sitting next to Mr.— at Mr.—’s luncheon. He had held a very good position, but had been very unfortunate; just before you met him at luncheon he had been obliged to call his creditors together. He has gone into Broken Hills, and is now worth £150,000.” I lunched with this fortunate unfortunate gentleman in September; the letter was written, I think, in February.

The seven forty-acre blocks which are included in Broken Hill proper, were purchased in 1883 by seven “station” hands, who each contributed £70, to buy a mineral lease of the land, and to start the mine and work it for tin. The capital was soon exhausted, and no tin was found. Some of the members of the little syndicate lost heart, and retired; and then it was determined to enlarge the company from seven to fourteen. In 1884 a fourteenth section could have been purchased for £120; a share was offered to a friend of mine at that price; some of the shares were sold for less. The whole value of the mine was therefore under £1,700. On Jan. 1, 1888, the shares were worth in the market £8,000,000. They rose still higher,
I believe, for a time; but have since declined. Whether they have recovered I do not know.

In New South Wales I heard more about the great gold mine at Mount Morgan, in Queensland—the most valuable mine in Australia—discovered by the brothers Morgan in 1882. A pathetic story was told me about a man who had worked the land unsuccessfully as a farm some years before, and who was said to have gone mad when he learnt that just beneath the soil which he had found so uncongenial there was boundless wealth.

Indeed, I heard mining stories everywhere, and half the people whom I met with seemed to hold mining shares. Nor is this universal interest in mining speculation at all surprising: for the discovery of copper in 1845 gave a sudden impulse to the growth of South Australia; and the discovery of gold in 1851 changed the economic condition of the whole of the Australian colonies and opened for them a new course of material prosperity.¹

For some years the production of gold in every

¹ The value of the total production of gold in all the Australian colonies from 1851 to 1886, estimating it at £3 15s. per ounce, was £303,841,151; estimating it at £4 per ounce, the value was £324,097,228.

93 one of the colonies had been diminishing,¹ but in 1884 the decline in Queensland was arrested, and, if the accounts which are given of the enormous wealth of Mount Morgan are true, there will be a continuous increase in the yield for many years to come. The recent expansion in the production of silver is still more surprising. The three colonies of Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand yielded 64,655 ounces in 1882, 116,012 ounces in 1883, 145,644 ounces in 1884, 839,749 ounces in 1885; and in 1886 New South Wales alone yielded 1,015,433 ounces.² The production must have greatly increased in 1887, owing to the develop-
ment of Broken Hill and the opening of other mines in the neighbourhood of Silverton. There is no reason to suppose that these mines are even approaching exhaustion.

Tin is found in New South Wales, Tasmania, and Queensland. In New South Wales alone the tin fields are said to extend over 5,440,000 acres;

1 The total production in South Australia has been so small that it is hardly necessary to qualify this general statement; but, as a matter of fact, the produce in that colony for the five years 1882–1886 was larger than for any previous five years; it reached its highest point—£26,315—in 1886.

2 The returns for New South Wales do not include the silver obtained in the form of silver-lead ore, the value of which, from 1876 to 1886, is estimated at over £600,000.

and as the countries in which this metal has been discovered in quantities which would bear the cost of working are very few, tin is likely to contribute largely to the prosperity of these colonies. The total value of the tin and tin ore produced in the three colonies in 1885 was £925,084. For 1886 I have no returns except from New South Wales; in that year the value of ingots and ore was £467,651, an advance of £50,000 on 1885. The heaviest production in the colony was in 1882 and 1883, when the total value reached £833,461 and £824,522. The diminished production in 1884–5, when it suddenly dropped to £521,587 and £415,626, was probably owing to the sudden fall of prices in the London market.

Copper is still produced in considerable quantities in New South Wales and in South Australia, but the low prices which ruled for some years led to the closing of many of the mines and to a very serious diminution of production. In 1872 copper realized £108 per ton; the average prices for 1884–5–6 were £54 7s. 6d., £44, £40 5s. Prices were rising rapidly in the autumn of 1887, and I believe that early in 1888 South Australian copper
fetched £70 per ton. Perhaps this may have tempted some of the mine-owners to re-open their works, but when I was in South Australia, in September 1887, they were too doubtful about the permanence of the rise to make the venture. There is, however, a great abundance of excellent copper both in New South Wales and in South Australia; and in the judgment of some persons, the introduction of modern smelting processes might do much towards enabling Australian copper to recover the place it held in the English market a few years ago.

But, for a great expansion of the mineral products of the country many are looking to the Northern Territory of South Australia. In a report on the geology and mineralogy of that great district, the Rev. J. E. Tenison-Woods expresses the following sanguine judgment:—

“I do not believe that the same quantity of mineral veins, of gold, silver, copper, and lead will be found in any equal area of Australia; in fact, I doubt if many provinces will be found in any country so singularly and exceptionally favoured as Arnhem’s Land is in respect to the mineral riches of the mines that have already been worked, in gold especially.”

When great fortunes are to be made by a few fortunate speculators in gold, silver, copper, or tin, the speculative fever spreads through whole communities, and men have no inclination to plant vineyards and peach orchards and olive gardens. It may be that the immense mineral wealth of Australia will for some years divert the energy of the colonists from less exciting industries.

VI.

Will the Australians become a great manufacturing people? Why should they not? They
have coal—and excellent coal—in immense quantities. The area over which coal is distributed in New South Wales has been approximately computed at 23,950 square miles. The industry was checked for many years by a monopoly. A company known as the Australian Agricultural Company, whose buildings may still be seen in the neighbourhood of Newcastle, obtained in 1826 a grant of 1,000,000 acres of land near the mouth of the river Hunter; and their charter conferred on them the sole right of working the coal seams in the great coal district of the colony. In 1847, when their charter expired, the total output was only 40,732 tons; in 1857 it had risen to 210,434 tons, in 1867 to 770,012 tons, in 1877 to 1,444,271 tons, and in 1886 to 2,830,175 tons. The average annual value of the output during 1883–4–5–6, was over a million and a quarter. In addition to supplying its own demand, New South Wales exports coal to all the other colonies of Australia, to Hong Kong, to China, to Manilla, to Fiji, to India, and to the United States. To the United States it sent, in 1886, 305,824 tons, valued at £176,991.1

1 There is also excellent coal in New Zealand.

The Australians, then, have coal for manufacturing purposes, and both in New South Wales and in South Australia they have iron. In South Australia, however, they have not yet got coal; the Government has offered a bonus of £4,000 for the discovery of a paying coal-field; at present, the iron ore, if worked, would have to be smelted with wood. And in New South Wales the actual production of iron is at present very inconsiderable. The annual yield to the end of 1885 has never exceeded 7,500 tons; in 1885 it was only 4,176 tons. Mr. Coghlan says that
“Iron is widely diffused all over the colony. ... The richness of the ore is marvellous. ... Hitherto the very richness of magnetic ores has been the chief drawback to their being worked, for the smelting of rich ores has been exceedingly difficult, and, until recently, little understood. Now, however, since the introduction of the Bessemer process, and the successful experiments in the treatment of similar ores in England, the difficulty of smelting has been entirely overcome.”

But even if these hopeful anticipations are not soon fulfilled, and if Australia has still to import her iron and steel, and much of her machinery, from older countries, is it not possible for her to engage with success in many forms of manufacturing industry? She has magnificent wool; she has hides; she has admirable bark for purposes of tanning; in the course of a few years she may have great cotton plantations in the northern parts of the country. Why should she not have large manufactories of woollen and cotton and leather goods?

And though she may not, for some time to come, be able to do without corrugated iron from England, and iron-wire from Germany—for the supply of the hundreds of thousands of miles of wire which are necessary every year for fencing has been largely lost to this country and secured by our German rivals—and though she may still be obliged to send to Sheffield and Birmingham and to the United States for knives and forks, for shovels, and other kinds of hardware, there are metals in which it would seem natural for Australian workmen to show their genius and skill. Can they make their gold into nothing but sovereigns, and their silver into nothing but florins and threepenny pieces? Could they not produce beautiful things for ornament and use from the precious metals with which their soil is enriched? And their copper—must all of it be made into half-
pence? Is not their climate, with its clear skies and genial warmth, friendly to artistic genius?

The rougher work of settlement has been already done. They have built great cities, which possess all the resources of the most advanced civilization. It may be that they are now ready to show that they have not only the robust vigour of which they have given proof in their past achievements, but a fresh unworn sense of beauty and the skill to give it expression.

To all this a cool critical reader may reply—But if Australia is to become the rival of European countries in manufactures, her people must be willing to live on European wages. The reply is not, perhaps, absolutely decisive; but there, no doubt, lies the difficulty. The Labour Question is the insoluble problem of all civilized communities. Australia has not solved it.
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I.

M. DE TOCQUEVILLE, in the course of his exhaustive discussion of the influence of democracy on the life and character of the people of the United States, expresses the judgment that “in America the passion for physical well-being is not always exclusive, but it is general; and if all do not feel it in the same manner, yet it is felt by all;” and he is of opinion that, as the result of the breaking up of the old aristocratic order, “something of an analogous character is more and more apparent in Europe.” Democratic nations—this is M. de Tocqueville’s contention—are likely to care too much for mere material prosperity.

The Australian colonies are democratic. Their loyalty to the throne is, no doubt, passionate and demonstrative, and they are proud of the extent and splendour of the Empire. The monuments of

order of which these monuments are the visible symbols. But still Australian society is democratic, and the Australians would not have it otherwise.

In the dear mother country it may have been well that the custom of primogeniture and the power of entail should have held great estates together through century after century. For an hereditary aristocracy is picturesque and gracious; and to people living in a country which a century ago knew nothing of the securities and refinements and traditions of a settled political order, there is something that touches the imagination in the thought of a family which has lived on the same hillside and cultivated the same fields since the days of Henry VII., or even since the Norman Conquest. But for themselves there is nothing in their colonial legislation which they regard with greater satisfaction than the scheme of Colonel Torrens for the transfer of land, under which a farm changes hands as easily as a ship.

105 It is the same with other ancient English Institutions. There are large numbers of Australians—some of them not Episcopalians—who think it seemly that at home religion should “lift her mitred front in Courts and Parliaments.” The bishop, the dean, and the country rector—all holding their places in the ancient organization of the State—seem to them necessary elements in English life; and to disestablish the English Church would impair the stateliness and beauty of the pleasant pageant of which they dream whenever they think of “home.” But do they care to set up an Established Church in Australia? No; there would be something incongruous in it. There can be no Warwick Castle on the banks of the Yarra; and all the gold of Mount Morgan could not purchase for Sydney the venerable traditions of Canterbury, or
for Melbourne the majestic towers of York. In Australia an institution like the English Church is impossible.

Australia, I repeat, is democratic; and though I do not know that the passion for material comfort and luxury is stronger in Melbourne than in London, in Sydney than in Liverpool, Manchester, or Birmingham, it is certain that the Australians have not altogether escaped the perils which, if M. de Tocqueville is right, menace all democratic communities—perils which must be exceptionally grave when democratic communities have achieved, and achieved very rapidly, exceptional material prosperity. But it is equally certain that there are among them large numbers of men who have been admirably loyal to the higher pursuits and aims of life; and—what is still more satisfactory—in every colony the community, as a whole, has given in its public acts and policy splendid proofs of its hearty belief in the truth that a nation's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which it possesseth.

II.

The population of Tasmania is less than 120,000, and it is scattered over a country nearly as large as Ireland; Hobart, its principal city, has less than 30,000 inhabitants. It was a pleasant surprise to me to discover that Tasmania has had a Royal Society of its own since 1844; that the “Fellows” hold a monthly meeting from April to November; and that their “Papers and Proceedings” for 1886 fill a handsome volume of about 250 pages. There are also “Royal Societies” in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia. They have their corresponding members in different parts of the
world, and they exchange “Transactions” with the learned societies of Europe and America.

And as I travelled from colony to colony I found, in unexpected quarters, an enthusiasm for some of the less frequented provinces of speculation and learning. For example, I spent a night with the minister of a Congregational church in a small mining town in South Australia; and I found on his shelves and on his table translations of the sacred classics of the East, dissertations in English, French, and German, on Buddhism, Confucianism, and the other great Asiatic faiths. He was an “Australian native,” had taken his Arts degree at the University of Melbourne, and had studied theology under my friend Professor Gosman; and now, though he had a wife and child, he was consumed with a burning desire to get to Europe and to study the science of Comparative Religion under the great European authorities. At a garden party in the neighbourhood of Melbourne I met another young Congregational minister who had received the same education, and who had just returned from Germany, where he had won distinction as an Orientalist. In another Australian city I was the fortunate guest of a successful stock and share broker. I discovered that my host, in addition to cultivating general literary interests, had made a specialty of Egyptian Archaeology. He had in his library the latest authorities on the subject, and he was minutely familiar with their contents. For many years he had found it a re-

lief, when he closed his office in the afternoon, to think nothing of colonial stocks and mining shares and bank shares till the next morning; and he was able to forget them all while endeavouring to disentangle the intricacies of the “dynasties” and
familiarizing himself with the monuments of Memphis, Abydos, Denderah, and Thebes. I heard that a young and able minister from England, whom I know very well, might have accepted an invitation to become the pastor of the Congregational church of which my host is a deacon, if he had not been alarmed at having in his congregation a man whose knowledge of a subject intimately connected with the Bible was so much larger and more exact than his own. I cannot answer for the truth of the story, but I suppose that young ministers going out to the colonies do not generally expect to have to preach in the presence of deacons “learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.”

The general cultivation of a community is indicated more or less accurately by the books it buys. In Adelaide I had a long conversation with a bookseller in King William Street about his stock, which was large—very large we should think it for a town of 60,000 people—and excellent in quality. He told me that to meet the demands of his customers he was obliged to keep the best and most recent books in all departments, and he said that of the very best books large numbers were sent up into the “Bush.”

III.

Among the most striking proofs that care for the intellect has not been destroyed by material prosperity, are the splendid gifts which the Universities have received from private liberality. There is a strong public opinion that to enrich seats of learning is one of the most honourable uses of wealth. The University of Adelaide was created by the munificence of a colonist who had made a large fortune from the copper mines of Yorke’s
Peninsula. The story of its foundation is interesting. My friend Dr. Jefferis—now of Sydney, then the minister of the Congregational Church at

Where men are not within reach of "circulating libraries," with their floods of ephemeral literature, they often read seriously. A connection of mine who has been in South Africa for many years, told me when he was last in England that he was reading through the new edition of the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and that up to the time that he left home he had kept pace with the publisher. It seemed to me an appalling enterprise. If he has not flagged he must feel, now that the last volume has appeared, very much as men feel towards the end of a long voyage: he is within sight of port. But what will he read next? He has exhausted the knowledge of his age.

North Adelaide—had a scheme for establishing a "Union College" for the education of young men for the Congregational and Presbyterian ministry. He and one or two friends called on a Mr. Hughes and asked for his assistance. He offered them at once £20,000, and, as in those days money in South Australia could be relied upon to yield at least 6 per cent, Mr. Hughes' contribution would have secured for the college a yearly income of £1,200. This was a larger income than the modest scheme was supposed to require; and its promoters—I believe on the suggestion of Dr. Jefferis—proposed that instead of founding a college for the education of young men for the ministry in connection with their own churches, Mr. Hughes should found a University for the colony. Their proposal was accepted, and a University was founded. Mr. Elder—now Sir Thomas Elder—contributed another £20,000. More recently Sir Thomas has contributed £10,000, and Mr. John Howard Angas £6,000 as a special endowment of the Medical School.

Towards the building of the splendid Hall of the University of Melbourne Sir Samuel Wilson gave £30,000, which, before the Hall was built,
had increased by the accumulation of interest to £37,000. The Hall—which is called the “Wilson Hall”—is a Gothic building, 140 feet long, 47 feet broad, and 84 feet in height from the floor to the apex of the roof. In the same University a Chair of Music has received an endowment of £20,000 from the Hon. Francis Ormond; £5,000, in addition, has been raised by public subscription.

The University of Sydney has been enriched by many benefactors. Lectureships, scholarships, and fellowships have been created by public subscription, in honour of men who have served the colony; and the Calendar contains a long list of scholarships, bursaries, and exhibitions established by private founders. The total amount derived by the University since 1853 from these sources is £271,624. Very recently the Senate received notice that the Hon. W. Macleay had by will devised to the University a valuable Museum of Natural History and a Zoological Library, together with £6,000 for the maintenance of a curatorship. In the year 1880, by the death of a Mr. John Henry Challis, the University became entitled, on the fulfilment of certain conditions, to a legacy which, when I was in Sydney, was valued at £200,000. The conditions are now fulfilled. This will raise the gifts received by the Sydney University from private sources to nearly £500,000.

The munificence of the Governments of the three colonies has been equally remarkable. In Adelaide the Government gave a fine site and a sum of nearly £18,000 for the University buildings, and conveyed to the University 50,000 acres of land, the rents of which are a permanent endowment. It also makes an annual grant equal to 5 per cent on whatever sums the University receives
from private donors; this is, of course, in addition to the interest accruing from the investment of these benefactions. In 1886 the University received from the Government, in subsidies, £2,945, and drew in rents from its lands £2,335—a total of £5,280.

In Melbourne the University has received, at different times, for its own buildings, for the medical school, and for a recreation ground, a site of about seventy acres; forty additional acres were given and reserved for colleges that might be affiliated to the University. Under an Act passed in 1853 it receives from the Treasury £9,000 per annum as what may be called a “fixed grant”; additional grants were made between 1884 and 1887, amounting to £23,500.

The University of Sydney received for its buildings and grounds, and for colleges which might be affiliated to it, a grant of 126 acres in 1855, and a second grant of rather more than 8 acres in 1866. The Act of Incorporation gave it an annual endowment of £5,000 from the public Treasury, and by a subsequent Act it received £45,000 towards the cost of its buildings; but the liberality of Parliament has grown with the expansion of the University, and instead of the original £5,000 provided for in the Act of 1855, it received in 1886 £17,500; this, however, included £1,000 for scientific apparatus, £1,000 to complete the schools of medicine and science, £1,000 for a temporary chemical laboratory, and £2,000 towards the expenses of evening lectures.

The majority of the professors in all the Universities are, I think, Oxford or Cambridge men; and, though large sums are expended on laboratories and scientific apparatus, “useful knowledge” is held in less honour than the old learning. The
traditional studies of the ancient Universities maintain their place against the modern sciences.

Provision has been made in some of the colonies, partly by private munificence, partly by grants from the Treasury, to enable a few young men to study in the Universities of Europe. The “Gilchrist” scholarships, each of which is worth £100 a year, are tenable for three years by persons who were born in the Australian colonies, or have resided therein for the five years immediately preceding the examination. The successful candidates are required to study either at the University of Edinburgh or at University College, London, and to graduate in one of the faculties of the London University. One of these scholarships is offered annually to students of the University of Adelaide. Another, of the same value and held on the same terms, is awarded annually by the Tasmanian Council of Education. Two “Tasmanian Scholarships,” each worth £200 a year, offered annually by the Tasmanian Government, are also awarded by the Council of Education. The Scholarships are tenable for four years at a British University.

A certain number of young men belonging to the wealthier families come over to Oxford and Cambridge at their own cost. A Cambridge tutor told me that the colonial men—and he included those who come from Canada and from the Cape as well as those who come from Australia—have one excellent quality: they know exactly what they mean to do, and they do it; if they come to the University to play, they play and play well; if they come to work, they work and work well. It was my impression before I left England that if I were an Australian, with that zeal for the honour and strength of my colony which I
should think it my duty to cherish, I should not be disposed to encourage the most brilliant young Australians to come to an English University. Thomas Jefferson—I think I found a sentence or two to that effect in one of his letters—believed that young Americans who were sent to Europe for their education lost something of the spirit and temper of American citizenship. Jefferson’s opinion seemed to me reasonable, and in conversation with some of my Australian friends I argued with something of that rash confidence with which most of us, perhaps, are apt to maintain a priori judgments which can be sheltered by a great name, that it was an unwise policy to send their ablest young men to English Universities; but they assured me—and the assurance came from all the men with whom I discussed the subject—that their sons, their nephews, their brothers, who had spent three or four years at Cambridge or Oxford, came back to Australia with their interest in Australian life as keen as ever, and with the fervour of their Australian patriotism undiminished. In Melbourne and Sydney, Australian munificence in support of the higher education has found other outlets. As I have said, the Act under which the Melbourne University was incorporated provided for the establishment of colleges to be affiliated to the University. Sites, each about ten acres, contiguous to the University grounds, were reserved for the Church of England, the Presbyterians, the Wesleyans, and the Roman Catholics. The Roman Catholics have not yet taken up their site; but the Church of England has erected Trinity College at a cost of about £30,000, and the Presbyterians have spent over £40,000 in the erection and equipment of Ormond
College. The Presbyterian College is named after the Hon. Francis Ormond, who, amongst other magnificent acts of generosity, has contributed towards the building over £30,000. It is estimated that the total cost of the building, when completed, will be £65,000; and with a view to this Mr. Ormond has promised to increase his contribution to a total of £35,000. The Wesleyans were erecting their college when I was in Melbourne, and I believe that it has been opened since my return to England.

These denominational colleges are wholly under the control of their trustees; but their students must matriculate in the University. Board and lodging are provided on very reasonable terms; and there are college lectures to assist the students in their University work. In Trinity the cost of rooms and commons is £50 per annum, and the cost of tuition £2 2s. per term. In Ormond the total cost varies from about £60 per annum to £80, according to the number of subjects in which a student receives tuition. In neither college is any religious test imposed.

Sydney has been still more generous to the religious denominations. In 1854 an Act was passed, declaring in its preamble the expediency of encouraging and assisting "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;" and it was enacted that, on the fulfilment of certain reasonable conditions, the founders of any such college should receive out of the general revenue of the colony grants towards the building fund. The grants must not exceed the sum actually expended on the building from time
to time out of subscribed funds; nor is the whole amount contributed by the Government to one college to exceed £20,000. Further, the Principal of each college is to receive £500 annually from the colonial Treasury, “as a salary,” or “in aid of salary.” The Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, and the Roman Catholic Church have availed themselves of the provisions of the Act, and have erected colleges on sites granted by the Crown. The Wesleyan reserve has not yet been taken up. A few of my younger Congregational friends in Australia think that the older Congregationalists, who, thirty years ago, but for their scruples about receiving endowments for denominational purposes from the State, might have secured a similar “reserve” both in Sydney and Melbourne, were very foolish not to seize the opportunity of doing so. The Congregationalists have had for some years colleges for the education of their ministers both in Sydney and Melbourne, but they have been on a small scale. In Melbourne there is now, I hope, a prospect of a Congregational college of a more satisfactory kind.

It is apparent, I think, from the facts which I have recited, that although the passion for material prosperity is strong among the Australian colonists, they are not insensible to the nobler claims of intellectual pursuits. It is an imperative necessity for a civilized democratic State to provide elementary education; but there is something admirable and surprising in the private and public munificence with which these young democratic communities, in the very earliest years of their existence, have endowed great seats of learning.
IV.

The skill and vigour which every colony has displayed in constructing and maintaining a system of effective elementary schools are also admirable, though less surprising. The difficulties which had to be solved if the means of education were to be brought within the reach of every child were serious; a complete solution was hardly possible; but the greatest credit is due to the several colonial Legislatures for the ingenuity, courage, and liberality with which they have endeavoured to solve them. There are immense districts where the population is so scattered that it is hardly possible to secure regular attendance at school, or even to build schools accessible to all the children. Roads are bad, or there are no roads at all, except such as have been made by great droves of cattle and of sheep on their way through the bush to the nearest market, or by wagons carrying wool to the nearest railway station or the nearest port. Sometimes an inspector has to inform the Minister of Education that heavy floods have prevented him from reaching a part of his district in which there were several schools to be inspected; sometimes the floods cut off the schools for days together from the children in their immediate neighbourhood.

The New South Wales regulations provide that a public school may be established in any locality where a regular attendance of twenty children between the ages of six and fourteen can be guaranteed. Free railway passes are granted to children living in country districts to enable them to reach the school nearest to their homes, and the
railway authorities are extremely accommodating. Several times the train by which I was travelling pulled up where there was no station, and I found that a number of children—sometimes four or five, sometimes a dozen—were waiting to be taken to school; the children were living remote from any town, and had met at a point on the line nearest to their homes; when school was over the return train dropped them at the same place.

A provisional school may be established in any locality where not fewer than twelve, but not more than nineteen children of school age can regularly attend the school, provided that there are no means of education within four miles by the nearest route, “practicable for children.” The curriculum in the provisional school is less ample than that in the ordinary public school, but it must include reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and history, with needlework for the girls, whenever practicable; and the instruction must be imparted in accordance with the prescribed standard of proficiency.

But there are districts where there are not even twelve children within reasonable distance of any site that can be chosen for a school; and therefore the regulations provide that, “wherever twenty children between the ages of six and fourteen are residing within an estimated radius of ten miles from a central point, and can be collected in groups of not less than ten children in each,” two half-time schools shall be established, and one teacher is to divide his time equally between them. Ordinarily he is to give the morning to one school, and the afternoon to the other; but he can make other arrangements with the sanction of the inspector. Teachers are to be paid “a sufficient
annual allowance for horse forage, irrespective of the salary attached to their schools;” “every half-time school is to be conducted in all respects as a public school;” and the rank and salary of the teachers are to correspond to the rank and salary of teachers of public schools having the same average attendance.

When the population is still more sparse, an itinerant teacher goes from house to house, and teaches either the children of one family, or the children of two or three families living within reach of each other. In the case of house-to-house teachers the regulations do not insist on regular training, but they must be “persons of good moral character, and must satisfy the inspector that they are capable of imparting the rudiments of an English education.” The subjects of instruction are limited to reading, writing, dictation, and arithmetic. Oral instruction is to be supplemented by a regular course of home lessons. The dis-

tribution of the teacher’s time between the different families he visits is determined by the Minister on the report of the inspector.

At the end of every month both the half-time teachers and the house-to-house teachers are required to furnish the inspector with a report on the month’s work. The schools of both kinds are alleged to be very successful, and the following extract from the report of an inspector, who has twenty-eight half-time schools in his district and five house schools, is interesting and instructive. He says:

“I have found, on the whole, that the half-time and house schools do the best work, particularly if supplemented by a thorough course of home lessons and exercises, as all are or ought to be. I have no difficulty, as a rule, in gauging the merit of a school once I see the work done at home. I attribute the excellence of the half-time and house schools to this, and to the regular breaks in the school work; for it ap-
pears to me the children always come up brighter and fresher after a day’s rest. It is a great strain, that of five hours’ mental application, to a very young child, and for five consecutive days. An occasional break for such, of one day in the school week, ought to be beneficial.”

It must, of course, be remembered that half-time in New South Wales is very different from half-time in Rochdale or Bolton. The child does not spend half his day in a mill, surrounded by the roar of machinery: when he is not at school he is playing in the open air, or engaged in doing light work on the farm or the station; and although it is the rule that every half-time school should be open every morning or every afternoon, the teachers are at liberty, with the sanction of the inspector, to arrange that each school shall be open on alternate days; and the extract which I have given suggests that they freely avail themselves of this liberty.

It is not my intention to describe in detail the organization of the elementary schools in each of the colonies that I visited—such a description would have no interest except for experts; but there are some points in connection with Australian educational systems on which I think that information may be interesting to persons to whom “standards,” “passes,” “merit grants,” “class subjects,” and “specifics” are unintelligible mysteries.

The systems differ from each other in some of their details, but in all the colonies that have representative institutions they agree in one very important particular: the actual administration—and not merely the supervision and control—of the whole system is in the hands of the Minister of
Education and his department. The Department buys the sites for the schools, builds the schools, and keeps them in repair; establishes, maintains, and manages training colleges; appoints and dismisses teachers. There are no local managers. This is the Tasmanian as well as the Australian system.

No aid, therefore, is given to what are known in England as “voluntary schools” and “denominational schools.” The English system of making grants from the Treasury in aid of private managers was abolished in Victoria in 1873; in South Australia in 1875; in New South Wales in 1882. The South Australian Act, however, provides that in districts where the population is so scattered that twenty children cannot be assembled for a “public school,” the State may “grant assistance ... to schools, not being denominational or sectarian, established by private persons.”

I have said that there are no “local managers,” but in each of the colonies there are certain local educational authorities, called, in New South Wales, “Public School Boards,” and in Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania, “Boards of Advice.” In Victoria these Boards are elected by the ratepayers in each school district; but the Governor can remove, at his pleasure, any of the elected members; in the other colonies they are appointed by the Governor. Their powers are very limited.

In Victoria their duties are thus defined:

“I. To direct, with the approval of the Minister, what use shall be made of school buildings after the children are
dismissed from school, or on days when no school is held therein; to suspend any school teacher for misconduct, and report the cause of such suspension to the Minister:

“II. To report on the condition of the schools as to the premises and their condition, whether new schools are required, and as to books, furniture, gymnastic appliances, or other requirements:

“III. To visit the schools from time to time, and to record the number of children present, and their opinion as to the general condition and management of the schools:

“IV. To use every endeavour to induce parents to send their children regularly to school, to compare the attendance of children at the school with the roll for the school district, and to report the names of parents who fail or refuse to educate their children or to send them to school:

“V. To recommend the payment by the Education Department of school fees, or the grant of a scholarship or exhibition in the case of any child displaying unusual ability.”—“An Act to amend the Law relating to Education, December 17, 1872.”

This account of the powers of the local Boards practically represents the extent of their authority
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In New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania, as well as in Victoria. When I was in Melbourne the Minister of Education, Mr. Pearson, had a Bill before the House containing clauses which would have slightly enlarged their powers. The Bill proposed to enact that no teacher who had “at any time been punished for misconduct” should be appointed to a school without the consent of the local Board. It also proposed to empower the Board to spend a limited amount on small repairs in the school buildings. If I remember aright, the Bill did not pass.

In New South Wales, where the schools are not free, the Public School Board of the district may, under certain regulations made by the department,
relieve parents or guardians from the payment of fees in any case where their inability to pay is satisfactorily shown; and if the course laid down by the regulations is, in any case, not convenient, the Board may grant a certificate of exemption for three months, but must report the case to the Minister. Fees are also paid in South Australia, and the Board of Advice has power to determine, in all cases, whether a child shall be admitted to school, either without payment or on paying a reduced fee.

It appeared to me that as the Boards had such limited responsibilities and such limited powers, it

would not be easy to induce men of intelligence and vigour to serve on them. In this, however, I was mistaken. I spent a morning in the school of a small town in South Australia, and the chairman of the Board of Advice and several of his colleagues were good enough to meet me. The chairman was obviously an able man, possessing, as I should judge, considerable administrative faculty. He and his friends submitted with exemplary patience to a prolonged examination. I found it impossible to provoke them to any expression of discontent with the restrictions on their powers. They argued that though they had no authority in the school, their moral support strengthened the teacher. If he became careless in his work, or if he was guilty of any grave moral fault, it would be their official duty to report him to the Department. If the moral fault was gross they could suspend him. They were able to do a great deal of most useful work in carrying out the compulsory law. They could recommend the Minister to exempt children from attendance, or to allow attendance at an evening school to count, in special cases, instead of attendance at the day school. They had to investigate complaints against teachers, and, if
the complaints were sustained, to report to the Minister. They had power to grant the occasional use of the school building for other than school purposes; applications for the regular use of the building—for a singing class, for example, one night in the week—they sent to the Minister with their own recommendation as to the answer he should give to them. They had a small amount to spend annually on repairs, and felt a pride in so spending it as to keep the school building in good condition. Both the chairman and his colleagues seemed fully satisfied that what they were able to do was worth doing, and my conversation with them modified very considerably my previous judgment—arrived at without knowledge—as to the usefulness of local educational authorities, invested with no educational authority.

A few weeks later I had the opportunity of discussing this subject with a gentleman holding a high educational office in another colony. He startled me by saying that, unless there were some kind of local educational authority in districts which are sparsely populated, a school might be closed for days together without the knowledge of the Department; but that in districts of that kind, and indeed in many of the smaller townships, it would be difficult to find persons who could be

---

1 The South Australian Regulations allow a Board of Advice to spend £10 within the year on a school building where the average attendance is under 100; £15 where it is 100 and under 200; £20 where it is 200 and above.

---

safely entrusted with the appointment or dismissal of teachers, or with any control over the educational work of the schools. With the best intentions, any Board that could be constituted in many parts of the country would make grave mistakes. When asked whether it would not increase popular
interest in education if towns with a population of 10,000, or even 5,000, were allowed to elect Boards with powers corresponding to the powers of School Boards in this country, he replied that, if such powers were conceded, there would be at once a fierce struggle between the Churches in order to secure a majority on the Boards and so to command the appointment of teachers; educational interests would suffer from the passion for sectarian ascendency.

My engagements in Australia did not end till the middle of December, 1887, and as the meetings of the Royal Commission on Education were to be resumed early in February, 1888, I was compelled to abandon my intention of visiting New Zealand, but the organization of the New Zealand educational system is so interesting that I venture to give an outline of it.

The colony is divided into twelve educational districts, each under a Board; and each educational district is subdivided into school districts. The ratepayers in each school district elect every January a school committee, consisting of seven resident householders. The election is by the culminating vote. The school committees of each educational district elect the education Board, consisting of nine members; one-third of the members retire every year.

The powers of the Board are very extensive. It is charged with the duty of establishing and maintaining public schools within the district, with creating school districts, and varying the districts from time to time, as circumstances may demand. It appoints and removes all teachers and other educational officers. It can establish scholarships, school libraries, normal schools, and district high schools. It has the administration of the funds by
which the educational system in the district is mainly supported. These funds consist of—

1. Grants from the public revenue. The Colonial Treasurer, under the Act of 1877, grants to each Board £3 15s. for each child in daily average attendance at the public schools in the district. According to the report for 1887 there was a supplementary capitation grant of 5s. per head, which raised the capitation allowance to £4 and this supplementary grant appears to have become a regular addition to the statutory £3 15s. The Boards receive a further capitation grant of 1s. 6d. —if so much is actually spent—for scholarships.

They also receive building grants.1 Four of the Boards receive about £8,000 for maintaining normal schools.

2. Rents and profits derived from property or endowments vested in the Board. But if the rents or other profits are received from public lands vested in school commissioners under “The Education Reserves Act, 1877,” the amount so received is deducted from the ordinary grant made by the Treasury.

3. Special endowments or grants for particular purposes.

4. Special fees for higher education. The ordinary elementary education is free.

“5. Any other moneys which the Board may receive from donations, subscriptions, or otherwise.

The powers of school committees are larger, even in theory, than the powers of the local educational authorities in New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia; and, in practice, it is probable that they are larger still.

The committee “with the express sanction previously obtained of the Board,” can establish schools; can erect, enlarge, and improve school buildings; and can provide school apparatus.
Special building grants from the Treasury are now made only for new buildings.

Sites, however, are acquired by the Board on the application of the committee. Subject to the general supervision and control of the Board and to inspection by an inspector, the committee discharges the miscellaneous duties which in England are entrusted to school managers—except that the teachers are appointed and dismissed, not by the local committee, but by the Board. The only teachers appointed by the committee are teachers of sewing, and their appointment must be approved by the Board.

The school fund administered by the committee consists of—

1. Moneys granted out of the Board fund.
2. Donations, subscriptions, and all other moneys granted to the committee for the purposes of the Education Act.

The Board determines what part of the cost of a site, and what part of the cost of building, improving, repairing, and equipping schools, shall be provided by the committee out of its own fund, and what part shall be provided out of the fund of the Board.

It will be observed that neither the Board nor the committee has rating powers, but that both Boards and committees receive subscriptions and donations from private sources.

The policy of New Zealand is precisely the opposite of the policy of the mother country: here, the State gives aid to schools under private managers; there, private contributors give aid to schools under representative managers. The aid received from this source by the Boards is, however, very small. In 1886, out of a total income
of £440,768, the income from donations, subscriptions, and interest on bequests was only £872. The aid received by the school committees from voluntary sources is very much larger, absolutely, as well as in proportion to their income. Their total income for 1886 is not given in the report for that year; the returns for the school committees in four education districts are wanting. But it is probable that the total income of the school committees was between £50,000 and £60,000. Of this amount, the income received from voluntary sources by the committees in eight districts was £2,500. Some of these contributions were for “general” purposes, others for “special” purposes. Most of the money appears to have been spent in beautifying the buildings and the grounds, and in providing physical recreation for the children. “About £400,” says the Minister in his report, “was contributed by committees to eke out the small salaries of teachers in scattered districts.”

I very much regret that, as I was unable to visit
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New Zealand, I could not learn from members of Boards and members of school committees how the system works. A gentleman who had lived in New Zealand for many years, and with whom I had long conversations on the subject, gave me the impression that, if a school committee consists of fairly able and zealous men, its control over the school or schools under its care is practically almost as complete as that of a body of managers in England. It cannot dismiss a teacher, but if a strong committee wants a teacher dismissed, the Board can hardly insist on retaining him. It cannot appoint a teacher, but if a strong committee has a very definite opinion about an appointment, the Board is likely to treat the opinion with
deference. On the other hand, the mistakes and vagaries of weak committees may be corrected and controlled by the superior authority. I was assured that, as a rule, Boards and committees work together very harmoniously; and this is the general effect of the official testimony of inspectors. But the terms of the Act which entrust the school committees with "the management of educational matters within the school district," under the general supervision and control of the Board, are vague; it is hard to believe that conflicts will not occur between the superior and the inferior authority, and in the reports of some of the inspectors there are indications that Boards and committees do not seem to be always of one mind as to the limitations of their respective powers.

The principle of the system is very simple: a committee having real though limited powers over the schools in its district, is elected by the rate-payers; a Board having much larger powers and entrusted with the supervision and control of the school committees, is elected by the committees. In the rural districts of England where the School Board area has a very limited population, such an organization would promise some advantages over our present system.

With regard to the payment of fees, the colonial systems vary. Elementary instruction is free in Victoria, Queensland, and New Zealand; fees are paid in New South Wales, South Australia, and Tasmania. Where the schools are free, the people with whom I met seemed satisfied that they should remain free; where fees are charged, I could not hear of any serious agitation for their abolition. In the absence of large masses of extremely poor parents, the question is not a "burning" one. There are no such serious administrative difficulties as those with which we at home have to deal, in
collecting the fees and in discriminating between parents who are able to pay and parents who are unable.

136 One of our “burning” educational questions at home—I mean the religious question—is, however, a “burning” question in the colonies. The Roman Catholic Church insists that its schools ought to receive aid from the State, and there are times when Catholic electors make this question a troublesome one for Parliamentary candidates; but if the information which I received from many sources is correct, there is a very strong and resolute opinion in every one of the colonies against conceding the claim. The public school system, for the present at least, seems secure.

In Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, and New Zealand the schools are secular; but religious instruction may, under certain conditions, be given by ministers of religion and others, to children whose parents are willing that they should receive it. In South Australia the teacher may, if he pleases, “read portions of the Holy Scriptures in the Authorized or the Douay version, to such scholars as may be sent by their parents, for not more than half an hour before 9.30 A.M.” But there must be “no sectarian or denominational teaching;” “the teachers must strictly confine themselves to Bible reading.” If the parents of not less than ten chil-

1 I have already noticed that the educational system in Western Australia corresponds to our own.

137 dren attending a school send a written request to the Minister of Education that the Bible may be read during the half-hour before school, the Minister “may require the teacher to comply with the request.” In New South Wales the Act of 1880 declares that the words “‘secular instruction’
shall be held to include general religious teaching as distinguished from dogmatical or polemical theology;” and the selections from Holy Scripture drawn up for the use of the Irish Board are used in all the schools. Definite doctrinal instruction may also be given by “a clergyman or other religious teacher,” under arrangements to be made by the local educational authority.

My impression is that in New South Wales the clergy do not avail themselves, to any considerable extent, of the opportunity afforded them to give definite religious instruction to the public schools; but I do not think that there are any official returns on this subject, and the information which I received from private sources varied.1 I did not visit Queensland or New Zealand, and I omitted to ask my friends in Victoria and Tasmania how the provision works in those colonies.

In Victoria there are very many persons who think that the “godless schools” are a peril to the
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at what happened when he was kind enough to spend a morning with me in the schools of Melbourne. At the first school the children were asked to show their loyalty in the presence of the visitor from England, by singing “God save the Queen.” I hardly noticed this infringement of the severe “secular” rule; for though occasionally my own congregation at Carr’s Lane sing “God save the Queen” on Sunday as part of a religious service, I know that it does not occur to many people that the National Anthem is a prayer to God to defend and to bless the throne.

But in one of the infants’ schools that we visited, where the mistress was anxious that we should hear how successful she had been in teaching the infants to sing, the children sang a song in which they asked who taught the bee to build its comb, and the bird to build its nest, and some other creatures to do equally wonderful things; and the song gave the triumphant reply, in verse after verse, that God taught them all. In the course of the morning I had had some conversation with Mr. Pearson about the charges which were made against him, and when we passed out of the school into the playground, we could not help laughing in each other’s faces. In the very presence of this terrible Minister, whose great object in life, according to some of his opponents, is to prevent the children of Victoria from ever hearing the name of God, a hundred and fifty children, in a State school, sung with cheerful voices about God’s power and wisdom in the creation of animal life. There may have been some unnecessary expurgation of the reading-books, though, as I have said, the charges against the Minister on this point are exaggerated and inaccurate; but it was plain that the songs the children sing have not suffered from expurgation. It is one thing to maintain
that it is no part of the duty of a State teacher to give religious instruction; it is quite another thing to exclude carefully and systematically from school books and school discipline all recognition of the Christian faith and of the authority of God.

Another of our “burning” questions is also a “burning” question in Victoria—the question of “payment by results.”

In all the Australian colonies—with the exception of Western Australia—the teachers in public elementary schools are, as I have said, employed by the State—not by local managers. They are civil servants of the Crown: they receive their salaries from the Minister of Education, and the Minister appoints and dismisses them.

The “Regulations” which fix the salaries of teachers differ in different colonies; but with differences of detail they are constructed on the same general principle—except that in Victoria, and to a slight extent in South Australia, there is a recognition of the principle of “payment by results.” It would be tedious and confusing to set out all the various schemes; the New South Wales scheme, which is very elaborate, illustrates the general principle which has been adopted in all the colonies.

Teachers are divided into three classes, accord-

1 In New Zealand, as already stated, the teachers are appointed, paid, and dismissed by the Board of the Education District.
skill. There are separate examinations, varying in subjects and varying in difficulty, for first, second, and third-class certificates; and each scheme of examination, except the third, which is the lowest, offers the candidates alternative groups of subjects.

A teacher may obtain promotion from a lower to a higher grade in the same class by satisfactory service; but to obtain promotion to a higher class he must submit to examination.

Schools are classified, primarily, according to attendance; the schools with the largest attendance—not less than 600 daily, in the three departments—are "first-class schools," if the standard of proficiency prescribed for that class of schools is fully reached. The lowest class—the tenth—consists of public schools in which the daily attendance does not exceed twenty. If a school does not reach the standard of proficiency prescribed for its class, the Minister removes it to a lower class.

Teachers are eligible for appointment as head-teachers of schools or departments on the ground of their classification, as shown by the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Schools</th>
<th>Teachers' Department</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>I. A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>I. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>II. A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>II. A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>II. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>II. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>III. A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>III. B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>III. C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A teacher may be removed from the school in which he is employed to another of a lower class, should he fail through any default on his part to maintain the requisite number of pupils in average attendance, or to satisfy the conditions of the standard of proficiency.

The salaries of head-masters vary from £400 for the head-master of a school of the first class, to £108 for the head-master of a school of the tenth class. The salaries of head-mistresses vary from £300 for the head-mistress in charge of a girls' or infants' department of a school of the first class, to £180 for a mistress in charge of a school of the fifth class. Mixed schools below the fourth class may be in charge of mistresses, and their salaries are the same as the salaries of male teachers, less £12 per annum. Houses are provided for married head-masters; mistresses of departments and unmarried masters of public schools receive allowances for rent.

The salaries of assistant teachers are determined—partly by their certificate, partly by the class of school in which they hold an appointment, partly by their position in the school:—e.g., a first assistant, holding a first-class certificate, in a school of the first class, receives, if a man £250 a year; if a woman, £168. A second assistant, holding a second-class certificate in a school of the first class, receives, if a man, £150, if a woman, £120. But a first assistant, holding a second-class certificate in a school of the second class, receives £180 if a man, and £144 if a woman.

Pupil-teachers receive salaries varying, according to class, from £66 per annum for males and
£48 for females, to £36 for males and £24 for females.

Teachers are promoted, except in special cases, according to classification and seniority.

In New South Wales the stimulus applied to a teacher to do his best arises from the possibility of his being removed for negligence or inefficiency to a school of a lower class than that for which his professional rank qualifies him—and this involves a lower salary. In South Australia and in Victoria his payment for the work he has already done depends, in part, on the “results” of inspection and examination.

In South Australia the schools are divided into six classes, according to the results of the annual examination by the inspector: the rules by which the results are determined are too complicated and technical for statement in these pages; but they are both ingenious and flexible, and they are free from the objections which lie against our own system of passes. Head-masters of schools placed in the first five classes receive a bonus varying from £24 in the first class to £16 in the fifth class. Head-mistresses receive a bonus varying from £16 if their schools are in the first class to £12 if they are in the fifth. Schools in the sixth class carry no bonus. Assistants employed in a school for six months before the examination receive the same bonus. I did not happen to have many opportunities of discussing the scheme with teachers in South Australia, but, as far as I could learn, there is no serious objection to it; and the extremely able Inspector-General, Mr. Hartley, appeared to be satisfied that it worked well. The bonus is not very large, but, combined with the distinction of securing a high class, it is effective.
In Victoria the teachers have (1) a fixed salary, determined by the Public Service Act; and (2) a variable grant, which may amount to half the fixed salary. This variable amount is subject to deductions as the result of the annual examinations. If a school perfectly satisfies the inspector, and wins full marks, head-teachers and assistants receive the full grant; if the school falls short of the full marks, the result payment to the teachers is in the same ratio to the full grant as the number of marks awarded to that which might have been obtained.

Against this system a very large number of the teachers, among them the ablest in the colony, are in violent revolt. All the evils attributed to our own system of payment by results are attributed to the Victorian system. It leads, so the teachers say, to constant and universal “cramming”; the inspector, not the child, has the first place in the teacher’s thoughts, and the best methods for the education and discipline of the child are abandoned for the best methods of training the child for examination; the life of the teacher is made unnecessarily anxious, and his income is precarious. The teachers in Victoria are in a less favourable position for fighting their battle than the teachers in England; for here the managers have an interest in the grants and are very generally on their side; there, the undivided pressure of the system rests on the teachers.

When I was in Melbourne in October 1887 the controversy had reached an acute stage. The Assistant Inspector-General of Victoria, Mr. Brodribb, had been sent into New South Wales to examine the public schools, and especially to report on the differences between the educational systems of the two colonies. His report, a document of great ability, had just appeared. He had
arrived at several important conclusions, the most important of which are summarized by the Minister of Public Instruction for Victoria, in his report for 1886–7, in the following words:—

“That the teaching there is freer and more intelligent than among ourselves. That this last result is mainly due to the absence of the result system, and to the greater strength of the inspectoral staff, allowing more time to be spent on oral examinations. At the same time Mr. Brodribb remarks that the Victorian teachers possess, on the whole, more skill in teaching, and that the organization of the New South Wales schools is inferior to our own, and the attendance less regular.”

Mr. Rose, another of the Victorian inspectors, visited some of the Sydney schools last year, and his account of them confirms Mr. Brodribb’s; he says: “What Matthew Arnold recently said of the German schools, as compared with those in England, fairly puts the impression left on my mind: ‘The children are taught less mechanically and more naturally than with us, and are more interested.’”

In his remarks on Mr. Brodribb’s report, Mr. Pearson says:

“The object of the result system has been to make the success of the State school teacher dependent, to some extent, like that of a private teacher or of a professional man, upon his own energy. If the children fail to pass an easy examination or attend irregularly, or do not get on as far as their years seem to warrant, the inspector reports accordingly, and the teacher is mulcted in proportion to his failure. In theory he may lose a third of his possible income. Practically, he hardly ever loses more than a sixth; and the teachers, on the average, get 84 out of 100 attainable. At one time the teacher was liable to suffer if children were kept away on the day of examination by bad weather or by the floods being out, and occasionally by neglected children joining his classes, and raising the average of age. During the last four years these grievances have been to a great extent removed, as the inspectors are instructed to make allowance for accidents of this kind.”
But the Minister recognized the gravity of Mr. Brodribb’s report, and told me that he intended to send two Victorian inspectors into New South Wales in the course of a few weeks to investigate


the subject as thoroughly as possible. He was good enough to promise me a copy of their report, and I hoped that I might receive it before this chapter was completed, but it has not yet reached me. The result of the inquiry did not appear in the Minister’s Report for 1888.

The Victorian system differs in some other respects, and differs, as I think, to its disadvantage, from the system of New South Wales. In both colonies the teachers are civil servants of the Crown; and in Victoria the hands of the Minister are tied so fast by rigid rules relating to the service that he has practically no freedom of choice in making appointments; he is obliged, under the “Public Service Act (773),” to offer a vacant position to the man who, according to the “rules” stands next for promotion; in New South Wales, on the other hand, more is left to the Minister’s discretion. The Victorian system has, no doubt, been suggested by the democratic dread of corrupt appointments; but rules of promotion which may be useful and expedient in the case of clerks in Government offices can hardly fail to be mischievous when they are made to govern the appointment of schoolmasters. It would be far better to accept the risk of favouritism in the promotion of teachers than to insist on a system which is likely to injure the schools.

There is another difference between the two systems. Mr. Brodribb’s report calls attention to
the fact that “more advanced subjects” are taught in the schools of New South Wales than in the schools of Victoria. The New South Wales regulations provide that if in any State school a class can be formed of not less than twenty pupils who have reached a certain standard of attainments, the school may be declared “a superior public school”; and, in addition to more advanced work in the ordinary subjects, boys are to be taught mathematics, Latin, science, and drawing; and girls, French, drawing, and sanitary science. At the discretion of the Minister, instruction may be given in other special subjects. The Minister has used his “discretion”; and in addition to the special subjects enumerated in the regulations, German and Greek are now taught in “superior public schools.” It is also provided that the subjects taught each year shall “coincide with the subjects prescribed annually for the junior or senior examinations of the Sydney University.” No special fee is to be charged: necessary text-books are to be supplied by the Minister; and where the regular staff is unable to teach any prescribed subject efficiently, the Minister may employ and pay a special teacher. But, as Mr. Pearson observes,—
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“The policy of the Victorian Department has been to draw a sharp line of demarcation between primary schools and high schools. It is conceived here [i.e., in Victoria] that the object of primary schools is to teach such elements of knowledge as every child may fairly be expected to acquire; that if primary schools are encouraged to compete with high schools, the result will be to extinguish high schools in many small towns, and to withdraw the attention of the State school teacher from his lower classes; and finally, that the higher education may best be stimulated by providing the cleverest and most industrious pupils in our State schools with the means of carrying on their education in schools of a higher class.
The policy of granting scholarships is carried out in Victoria with great generosity. Two hundred scholarships are annually awarded to State school pupils by competitive examination, the subjects of examination being those of the ordinary programme of instruction. The scholarships are of the value of £10, tenable for three years. In certain cases travelling expenses are allowed, and there are other modifications of the scheme, conceived in a spirit of great liberality, to meet the exceptional circumstances of particular scholars. The scholarships must be held at “approved schools”; some of these are schools founded by churches and managed by trustees; others are schools carried on by private persons for their own profit. There are no State high schools.

The educational policy of South Australia and of Tasmania in relation to higher education is the same as that of Victoria, except that South Australia provides for a high school for girls.¹ There is very much to be said in favour of the Victorian policy; but I am inclined to think that the practical advantages are on the side of the policy of New South Wales. There are many towns in the Australian colonies, as there are many towns in England and Wales, in which there can be no high school; and the most liberal scholarship arrangements for meeting the case of children living in such towns, whose parents are willing that they should remain at school for a year or two after they have gone through the ordinary elementary curriculum, cannot cover the whole ground. There are many children not clever enough to win scholarships, who might with advantage remain at school till they are fourteen or fifteen, and whose parents would be both willing and able to keep them there. Further, the more advanced teaching gives animation to the teaching of the whole school, and,
where it is given by the ordinary teachers, increases
the intellectual interest of their work. Readers of

1 When in South Australia, I was struck with the inade-
quacy of the provision for the higher education of girls as
compared with the provision for the higher education of
boys. It was this, I suppose, that suggested the creation of
a State high school for girls.

the final Report of the Royal Commission on
Education will observe that the majority of the
Commissioners are, on the whole, and with some
qualifications, on the side of the policy of Victoria,
and that the minority are on the side of the policy
of New South Wales.

But in addition to the superior public schools.
New South Wales has several State high schools
—in Sydney for boys and girls, in Maitland for
boys and girls, and in Bathurst for girls. The
Bathurst high school for boys was closed last year.
The total enrolment in 1887 was 710, and the
average attendance 498. The fees yielded £3,897
7s. 6d.; and the net cost to the State was £3,560,
or about £5 0s. 3d. per head. The expenditure
for that year was exceptionally high; it included
£890 for furniture.

In each of the Sydney high schools the ten
candidates who get the highest marks at the
annual entrance examination receive scholarships
entitling them to free education for one year; and,
subject to a favourable report on their conduct
and work, the scholarships are continued for the
two following years. In each of the other high
schools the three first of the successful candi-
dates receive similar scholarships under the same
conditions.

The colonial Treasury also grants an annual
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subsidy to the Sydney Grammar School, which is
under the management of a private trust. This
school had over 500 boys on the books in 1886; and for many years it has held a very high rank. It received from the State, in 1886, £2,800.

I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity of discussing questions of educational policy and administration with Mr. Pearson, the Minister of Victoria, Mr. Inglis, the Minister of New South Wales, and Mr. Hartley, the Inspector-General of South Australia; and in each of the colonies that I visited I had long conversations on educational subjects with persons of various descriptions—politicians, ministers of religion of different denominations, inspectors, teachers, members of Boards of Advice, and others; but my public engagements were too numerous to allow me to spend much time in the schools, and if I had been able to spend very much more I should not attach any very serious value to my own judgment on their efficiency. It takes an expert to judge a school accurately. But it was not possible to avoid receiving some general impressions, and I give them for what they are worth.

I saw hardly anything of high school work; but while listening to a Latin lesson in the girls' high school at Sydney, I could almost have imagined that I was in one of the American schools which I saw ten years ago. The work had the same merits: and, in my humble opinion, the same faults. The book was Cicero's "De Officiis," and it was very plainly beyond the attainments of most of the girls in the class. The lady, however, taught admirably—too admirably. The construction of sentence after sentence was made clear by the teacher; verbs were connected with their nominatives, adjectives with their substantives, adverbs with their verbs. In the evening the girls had to go over the lesson at home and prepare it for the next morning, but nothing had been left to exer-
cise their ingenuity or to strain their attention. The lady was quite conscious that girls who learnt Latin in this style lost a great part of the discipline that should be derived from learning a language; but her plea was exactly the same that I heard from an American teacher—"We are obliged to teach in this way, for the girls have so many things to learn."

In an ordinary elementary school what most strikes a visitor from England as soon as he enters the building, is the bright and prosperous appearance of the children. All of them look well fed; nearly all are well clothed. In some of the schools I found the children of successful tradesmen and of professional men sitting side by side with the children of mechanics; and this mixture of classes stimulates the teacher and, on the whole, benefits the children. The discipline seemed to me excellent; the manners of the children, to use a happy phrase which I saw in a recent report of one of our own inspectors, are "easy and free" without being "free and easy." The teachers in South Australia and New South Wales appeared perfectly happy, and I heard of no grievances—except, by the way, that some of the teachers in South Australia found it troublesome to work a new method of teaching arithmetic recently introduced by the Inspector-General. The method is, in my judgment, an excellent one. In a pamphlet by Mr. Sonnenschein, the attention of the Royal Commission was specially called to the scheme of instruction drawn up by Mr. Hartley for the South Australian schools, and the scheme was contrasted with our own standards for all subjects—to the disadvantage of our standards. In Victoria, the teachers complained in very strong terms of the mischief that had been done to education by the system of payment by results.
In each of the colonies I saw country schools as well as city schools, and in all of them, as far as I could judge, the work was generally excellent. It may have been an accident, but the best work of all that I happened to see was in a country school in the Blue Mountains. I was staying at the Car-

rington at Katoomba, and intended to visit the famous gorge called Govett’s Leap; but fog and rain made the excursion impossible, and I turned into the State School, which is a few hundred yards from the hotel. The average attendance is under eighty, and the school is therefore worked by a head-teacher and a pupil-teacher. The heavy rain reduced the attendance that morning to forty-nine. I heard the head-teacher—a master whose classification qualified him for a much larger school—give a lesson in arithmetic. It was as good a lesson as could well be given; it kept the intelligence of the class active and alert from first to last; and when I gave a few problems myself, I could see clearly that the class had not only been trained to work with mechanical accuracy, but to grasp and apply principles.

This chapter has extended beyond the limits which I had prescribed for it, and yet I have omitted some things that I wanted to say. But the story which I have told, though very imperfectly, is a decisive demonstration that the Australian people have not been completely mastered by the passion for gold. For the splendid public and private munificence which has created and which continues to sustain their Universities, colleges, and schools, they deserve higher honour than for the
courage and vigour which they have shown in their magnificent material achievements.
I was sitting at table a few weeks ago, opposite to a lady who had been listening with interest to my stories about Australia. “But,” she asked, “are there any gentle people there”—adding, after a moment’s pause—“I mean people who care for anything besides making money? “If all people that care for something besides money-making are gentle people, the facts which I have recited are an answer to the question.

CHAPTER IV. POLITICS.

The prevailing political spirit and temper of a community may, perhaps, be most safely inferred from its newspapers. At public meetings people are not quite their ordinary selves; for public meetings are seldom held except in times of popular excitement, or, if held, are seldom largely attended; and in times of excitement people show themselves at their best or at their worst. But the intellectual quality and the “tone” of the newspapers which secure and retain a great circulation in any community are a fair index of some of the most important elements of its political life. People may continue to support a newspaper which on
some important questions does not represent their political opinions, but they will soon discontinue it if it rises far above their intellectual and moral level, or sinks far below it.

Speaking generally, it seemed to me that the principal newspapers in all the three colonies in which I spent most of my time are distinguished by political seriousness and a sincere regard for public and private morality. Some of them are extremely able. To whatever extent they may be accepted as representing their readers, they justify a high estimate of the political intelligence and political morality of the Australian people.

The least satisfactory columns in the great newspapers are those which contain the English and other European cablegrams. Correspondents on this side of the world, in their eagerness to transmit interesting news at the earliest possible moment, sometimes make grave mistakes, and sometimes forget the difference between prophecy and history. The cost of transmission is very high, and the cablegrams are therefore necessarily brief—in many cases too brief to be accurate. But they are supplemented by the letters of correspondents in England and in the different continental capitals, and these are in some cases written with fulness of knowledge and with conspicuous ability.

II.

Australians take a keen interest in English politics and English politicians; this is only natural; it comes from that loyal affection for the old country which finds expression in many different forms; but, while they are interested in our domestic affairs.
what they really care for is our foreign policy. This they follow with a vigilance which never sleeps, and they discuss it with eagerness and excitement. The Secretary for the Colonies is, of course, an important personage in Sydney and Melbourne; but most of the people I met with regarded the Secretary for Foreign Affairs as a more important personage still. Cultivated men have a remarkable knowledge of European politics, and on lonely “stations” they meditate and speculate on the personal qualities and on the policy of the leading statesmen of Germany, Austria, Russia, Italy, and France, and on the military strength of these great European States. They read books on these subjects, and form an independent judgment on the opinions of newspaper correspondents in Vienna, Paris, Berlin, and St. Petersburg about the prospects of peace and war. As an old Liberal, I was troubled to find that large numbers of men who have strong sympathy with English Liberalism in its domestic policy regard its foreign policy with distrust and dissatisfaction. Not that they are any better satisfied with the actual conduct of foreign affairs by the Conservatives; but they think that if it were not for the Liberals the Conservatives would do very much better. Men of all descriptions complained bitterly of the action of the Home Government in relation to New Guinea, and

insisted that we had given to the Germans the best part of the island. In this judgment I think they are wrong; I have good reason for believing that the best part of New Guinea is ours. I also found that there was a general conviction that the settlement with France about the New Hebrides has no elements of permanence in it.
I suppose that most Australians really believe that no European Power should be allowed to take possession of any new territory within a thousand miles of the Australian coasts. More than once I suggested this as a “form of sound words,” which might find a place in their political creed; and, though my friends hesitated about accepting the formula, I came to the conclusion that it expressed with a fair amount of accuracy their real political faith—the faith by which they live. Forty or fifty years ago such a policy might have been possible. Though France was already in the South Pacific, I imagine that we might at that time have planted our flag in New Guinea, and on a score of smaller islands, without giving any offence to our neighbours in Europe. But in those days we were so indifferent to the value of our Australasian territories, that we almost missed the chance of occupying New Zealand; and now the policy of surrounding Australia with a wide belt of British possessions is too late.

With regard to colonial policy and the conduct of colonial business, the people whom I saw had not very much to say in praise of either Conservatives or Liberals; though they acknowledge that in recent years both parties had shown signs of improvement. It was a source of satisfaction that English statesmen were beginning to visit Australia, and to learn for themselves, at first-hand, the real value of the country, the real resources and achievements of the people, the present condition of Australian politics, and the present drift of Australian political feeling. But during the last twenty years there have been enormous changes; and leading politicians at home, who paid a flying visit to the colonies thirty years ago, have probably retained impressions which mislead their judgment.
I heard the question of Imperial Federation discussed in the course of very many conversations with men of very different descriptions. Some expressed a strong belief that in the course of time the visions of those who plead for the complete and effective political organization of the English nation, scattered over many remote lands, will be fulfilled. Many expressed the hope that it might be fulfilled. There was universal agreement in condemnation of the theory, still held by some English politicians, that separation sooner or later should be regarded as inevitable. There was also universal agreement in the opinion that, if we are to hold together, there must be some readjustment of the political relations between the colonies and the mother country. But no one had a scheme; and it was generally admitted that any serious attempt to construct a scheme would, at present, be mischievous. Like the British Constitution, it must “grow.”

Some contended that, in the first instance, there should be a complete confederation of the Australasian colonies among themselves. It is hardly necessary to state that an Act of the Imperial Parliament, passed in 1885, provided for the constitution of a “Federal Council of Australasia.” Among the matters on which the Council may legislate are—the relations of Australasia with the islands of the Pacific; the prevention of the influx of criminals; fisheries in Australian waters beyond territorial limits; the increase of facilities for the enforcement of the law—e.g., by providing for the service in South Australia of civil process issued by a court in Victoria, and for the enforcement of criminal process beyond the bounds of the colony in which it is issued. Further, on the reference of any two or more colonies, the Council
may legislate on such matters as general defences, quarantine, patents, bills of exchange, marriage

167 and divorce; in such cases the Acts of the Council are to extend only to the colonies by whose Legislatures the matters have been referred to it. Acts dealing with the relations between Australasia and the islands of the Pacific, with the prevention of the influx of criminals, and with fisheries beyond territorial limits are to be reserved for the signification of her Majesty's pleasure. Other Acts may be assented to by the Governor of the colony in which the Council is held, subject, as is usual in the case of the Acts of the Colonial Legislatures, to subsequent disallowance by her Majesty.

The Acts of the Council are to have force only in those colonies which consent to federate. Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, Western Australia, and Fiji were represented at the two meetings of the Council held in Hobart in January, 1886, and January, 1888. South Australia did not resolve to enter the Federation till December, 1888. New South Wales and New Zealand still remain outside. At the meeting in 1886 a Bill was passed authorizing the service of civil process out of the jurisdiction of the colony in which it is issued; and another providing for the enforcement throughout the federated colonies of judgments of the Supreme Court in any one of them. At the meeting in 1888 a Bill was passed regulating fisheries in Queensland waters, and an Address to the

168 Queen was adopted in reference to French convict settlements in the Pacific. Another meeting was held in January, 1889.

While, as I have said, some persons, whose judgment deserves great consideration, believe that the federation of the Australasian colonies is the
first step towards the federation of the Empire, there are men of equal authority on the other side. The most sagacious politicians with whom I met in New South Wales said: “We want some day to have a closer and more effective connection with the mother country than we have now; but it must be directly with the mother country—not through a central Australasian authority. If all the colonies send representatives to the Federal Council, the Council will very soon become the organ and channel of communication between the

1 The term Federation carries with it misleading associations when applied to a scheme under which the Imperial Parliament should delegate to local assemblies in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland, large legislative and administrative powers in local affairs. Under a federation scheme, existing and independent States create a central authority and determine its powers. But under such a scheme for Great Britain and Ireland, as I have described, the central authority would create the subordinate authorities and determine their powers. The term Imperial Federation is equally misleading. The “omnipotence” of the Imperial Parliament, however constituted, would be preserved; but fresh powers would be granted to the colonies.

whole of Australasia and England, and the relations between England and the individual colonies will become less intimate. Further, if all the Australasian colonies are drawn into one powerful political organization, the chances of a Declaration of Independence, whenever there is any serious disagreement with the mother country, will be indefinitely increased.”

It can hardly be questioned that there is great force in these considerations; and there would be still greater if any executive and administrative powers were granted to the Federal Council. But at present it is a Council—nothing more; its powers are limited to legislation—and to legislation on definite subjects; it has no permanent president—the president is elected at each meeting. The practical advantages which the action of
the Council may secure for the Federating colonies are immediate and certain; and the perils which are dreaded, if real, seem remote.

I found a general concurrence of opinion as to the value of the Colonial Conference held in London in April, 1887; and the cordial friendliness shown to the representatives of the colonies, both in London and by the great municipalities, had made a great impression throughout Australia. Mistakes were inevitable. Some men were treated with great consideration in England who are not very considerable in the colonies; and, even in the distribution of honours by the Crown, it was thought that some men were overlooked whose claims should have been recognized. But everything was well meant; and to the Australians the enthusiasm with which our colonial visitors were received was a pleasant surprise.

The most important result of the Conference was the arrangement, subject to the approval of the several colonial Legislatures, under which the several colonies are to contribute, in the proportion of their respective populations, towards the original cost and the maintenance of the Imperial men-of-war on the Australasian station. The Legislatures of all the colonies except Queensland confirmed the Agreement either before the close of 1887 or early in 1888. Out of this much may grow.

But nothing will grow out of it unless we frankly recognize the present strength of the colonies, and dismiss from our minds—dismiss wholly—the traditional conception of their relation to the mother country. The British colonies, or plantations—according to the legal definition of them—“are remote possessions of this realm, occupied for the purposes of trade or cultivation.” Mr. Seeley is
wholly in the right when he insists that to speak of the colonies as “possessions” of the realm, or

“possessions” of the Crown, is misleading and mischievous; and yet the popular conception of them is identical with the legal definition. They are regarded as “possessions” of the realm—not parts of the realm. And because in our hearts we regard the Australian colonies as “possessions,” we treat them in a way which irritates the colonists. They do not claim to be any better than Englishmen at home; but they claim to be no worse.

Some of the powers which are exercised by ourselves cannot, for the present at least, be theirs: they share the Imperial fortunes, but cannot control Imperial policy. The poorest agricultural labourer in Dorsetshire, and the roughest scavenger in the streets of London, may assist to determine whether the Empire shall declare war or make peace; but the richest squatter in New South Wales and the richest merchant in Melbourne—though war may menace them with the loss of all their wealth—are powerless; they can only look anxiously across twelve thousand miles of ocean to learn their fate from the decision of the home constituencies. It may be that no scheme for extending to those members of the English nation living beyond the seas all the responsibilities and powers of the English nation living in the mother country is possible; and that Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, and Brisbane must continue to be ex-

eluded from all direct control of the foreign policy of the realm. If so—and in any case as long as their exclusion from Imperial power remains—the English people at home and the Imperial Government should make an effort to remember that the exclusion implies no inferiority. The
Colonial Office, specially, should take care to avoid whatever might provoke the colonists to suspect that we attribute to them any inferiority. Or, to use language which I have used already, the colonies should be treated as parts of the realm—not as “possessions” of the realm; and the colonists as members—not as subjects—of the English nation.

III.

In past times the action of the authorities at home in the selection of Governors has occasioned great irritation; and the promptness with which the Legislatures of New South Wales and of South Australia sustained the protest of Queensland against the appointment of Sir H. Blake indicates that this is a subject on which the colonies are still extremely sensitive. A few years ago there was an agitation in support of the demand that Governors should be elected by popular vote, and elected from among men resident in the colonies. It was largely the result of the resentment occasioned by unwise appointments, and was strengthened by the tendency of a democratic people to suppose that they ought to be ruled by men of their own choice. This agitation, I was told, had wholly subsided. It is seen that the Governor is the representative of Imperial interests, and of Imperial authority; that he has to consider, not merely the isolated interests of the particular colony of which he is the temporary ruler, but the mutual relations between that colony and the rest of the Empire; his appointment, therefore, should be made by the Crown. It is also seen that the position which is held by a Colonial Governor requires that he should be free from entanglements with colonial parties and colonial politicians. And further, recent ap-
pointments have been, on the whole, satisfactory, and some of the Governors have won great popularity.

But there is still a considerable amount of sensitiveness and uneasiness. Bad appointments have been made in the past, and may be made again. My impression is that those with whom I discussed the subject were anxious, first of all, that the authorities at home should have a better understanding of the position and duties of the Governor of a colony with representative institutions; and, secondly, that they should endeavour to learn, through unofficial channels, whether a proposed

appointment is likely to be acceptable. No formal communication, even of a “confidential” kind, with colonial Ministers was suggested; but it was thought that there are informal methods of discovering whether in a particular colony a particular man is likely to be regarded with confidence.

The contention of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales, as set out in its recent Address to the Queen, that future Governors should be confined to persons who have served in some high office or in the Imperial Parliament, or, as Sir Henry Parkes put it, that the Governors should be limited to that class of public men who had indicated that they possessed qualifications fitting them to assist in the government of the Empire, cannot, I think, be sustained. For a mere visitor to the colonies to differ from a man of such robust sense and such large experience of colonial affairs as Sir Henry Parkes is presumptuous, and I am half disposed to think that Reuter’s summary of his speech did not give his real meaning. But if Sir Henry believes that only those men should be sent to govern the great colonies who are in the running for Cabinet appointments at home, the reply is obvious:—If a politician with Cabinet
office in sight were to accept a colonial Governorship, he would find, when he came home after his six years' absence, that he had lost his position in

the country, that his party had learnt to do without him, that some other man had stepped into his vacant place, and that he had sacrificed a political position which it had taken him ten or twenty years to win. His political career would be ruined.

To this an Australian may answer: “Yes, his political career might be ruined at home; but if he proves himself a successful Governor, he will be sent at the end of his term to govern some other great colony; and to represent the Crown as Governor of Victoria or New South Wales is surely enough to satisfy any man's ambition.” Hardly. To be Prime Minister of Victoria or of New South Wales is to hold a very great position, for in dealing with the political problems which arise from the new and unprecedented conditions of national life in the colonies there are opportunities for the exercise of political sagacity and political genius of the very highest kind. But the Governor does not govern. He has to look on while other men do the real work. Now and then, when there is a Ministerial crisis, for example, something—perhaps very much—may depend on his good temper, his good sense, his courage, and his knowledge of human nature. Now and then, if he has an intimate knowledge of the great Government offices at home, his suggestions may assist a Minister in

reorganizing a department. Now and then, his private and unofficial counsel may save a Minister from grave mistakes of policy on great questions; but such occasions as these are likely, I think, to be very rare, for it is not to be assumed that even
a very able politician who has spent his life in the House of Commons at home will be able to master, in the course of three or four years, the political questions with which Colonial Legislatures have to deal, and the conditions under which these questions have to be dealt with.

My point is this—an English politician who has in him the making of a great administrator, or a brilliant Chancellor of the Exchequer, would have no chance of using his powers as a Colonial Governor. If he completely accepted the limitations of his position and restrained himself from interference with colonial politics, he would soon find his position irksome; if he broke through these limitations there would be trouble. He would be miserable if he did nothing; and if he attempted to do anything he would do mischief. Imagine Mr. Gladstone, thirty or forty years younger, with his zeal at fever heat for the reform of the tariff and for a sound financial policy—send him out to Victoria, shut him up in Government House while Mr. Gillies is expounding and defending the doctrines of Protection in the Legislative Assembly—

177 how long would the Governor be able to hold himself in and to prevent himself from rushing on the Prime Minister in a volcanic torrent of argument, figures, and passionate rhetoric? Or imagine an administrator like Mr. Chamberlain reigning in Sydney, but with no department to administer. If in the course of his official duty he discovered that one of the Government departments was badly organized, his fingers would itch to pull it to pieces and put it together again; or, if he found that the head of an important department was ineffective, I have a strong impression, from what I know of Mr. Chamberlain, that the unfortunate man would very soon learn the Governor's opinion of him, and would become
very unhappy himself, and do his best to make the Governor unhappy too.

When I was in Hobart I had the honour of lunching with Sir Robert Hamilton, and of spending an hour or two with him afterwards in his library. The Government House at Hobart is the most charming of all the Government Houses in the colonies which I visited. It is surrounded with lawns and flowers, and through the windows there are the loveliest views—below, the silver Derwent flowing between picturesque banks, and above, hills covered with forest trees. He made no complaint. But, as I sat and looked at his vigorous form, in the very maturity of its strength; as I listened to him, and discovered in all that he said the indications of a most masculine intellect, a large and varied knowledge of affairs, and a delight in administrative work, I could not resist the conviction that as Governor of Tasmania he was a wasted force. Had he been in Parliament, I suppose that he would have been certain before this time to have risen to Cabinet rank. At Hobart he had nothing to do—nothing, at least, of the kind that he could do best.

The character and resources necessary for the Governor of a colony having representative institutions are not the same as those required for a successful member of Parliament or a successful Minister at home. Neither in his temperament nor in his intellectual habits should he have the qualities which make a good party politician; and yet he must be free from that tendency to take up “crotchets” which usually distinguishes the “independent” member. He should be a stranger to that combative spirit—that joy in battle—which compels men to strike their hardest at opinions which they regard as false and pernicious; and he should be capable of maintaining
without effort the most agreeable relations with men that hold such opinions—and yet, intellectual cynicism will be fatal to him. He should have personal dignity, reticence, firmness, but should be genial and buoyant, and should not take politics too seriously. He should have a genius for what might be called a strenuous idleness: should be willing and able to spend his time on a thousand small duties, none of which seem very important, none of which make any severe demands on him, but which leave him with little leisure and little strength for graver pursuits. He should have a hospitable mind, capable of giving entertainment to a very great variety of human interests. He should be a sagacious man—not necessarily a scholar, certainly not a recluse—but with a knowledge of the world, and a gentleman’s knowledge of books. He should be familiar with the habits and pleasures of people of many descriptions. He should be not only a man of integrity, but a man of honour. No scandals about him should be in the air; no debts should embarrass him. Last of all, if not first of all, he should have for a wife a woman with abounding good sense, generous sympathies, high character, and charming manners. For the Governor and his lady exert an influence on the Society of the colony which can hardly be measured, and they may contribute animation and vigour to every scheme for the moral and intellectual cultivation of the community. Lady Carrington at Sydney, Lady Loch at Melbourne,

and Lady Hamilton at Hobart, are perhaps quite as important personages as their husbands.
Each of the colonies that I visited has its responsible Ministers, and is completely equipped with high officials charged with the various departments of administration. Even Tasmania, with a population of about 140,000, has its Prime Minister, its Attorney-General, its Treasurer, and its Minister of Lands and Works and Mines; these form the Cabinet. It has also its Chief Justice, its puisne Judges, and its Solicitor-General; its Postmaster-General, its Collector of Customs, its Government Statistician, and other officers besides. In each of these colonies there is an Upper and a Lower House, or, to use the colonial terms, a Legislative Council, which is the Upper House, and a Legislative Assembly or House of Assembly, which is the Lower House.

In New South Wales the members of the Council are appointed for life by the Crown, which means that they are appointed on the nomination of the Prime Minister of the day. The number of members is not fixed; there must be twenty-one, but there may be as many more as the Governor thinks fit to appoint. This elasticity, while permitting very obvious abuses, has one obvious merit: if a majority of the Council—consisting, as it does, of life-members—brought the business of the colony to a stand by refusing persistently to pass Bills sent up to it by the Assembly and supported by a great strength of public feeling, the Governor could change the majority into a minority, by adding fresh members. This power, like the power of the Crown at home to create peers when the peers are unwilling to come to terms with the Commons, answers its purpose without being exerted. It is enough that the obstructives know of its existence.
In Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania the Council is elected. In Victoria there is a property qualification, both for members of the Council and for voters; members must own freehold property worth £100 a-year, or possess a capital of £1,000, voters must hold a freehold rated at not less than £10 a-year, or a leasehold rated at not less than £25. In South Australia there is no property qualification for membership of the Council, but the voters must own a freehold worth £50, or a leasehold worth £20 a-year; or must occupy a dwelling-house rented at £25 a-year. In Tasmania, as in South Australia, there is no property qualification for membership of the Council, but the voters must own a freehold worth £20 a-year, or a leasehold worth £80 a-year; or must be graduates in Arts of some university in the British dominions, or have passed an examination in Arts conducted by the Tasmanian Council of Education. The franchise is also given to members of the learned professions, and to retired military and naval officers.

The electoral area for the Council is in all the colonies much larger than that for the Assembly, and the Council has a much smaller number of members.

In Sydney the nomination of members of the Council by the Crown was regarded with satisfaction by the people with whom I happened to meet, and in their judgment it secured for the public service many excellent men who would be unwilling, perhaps unable, to go through the excitement of a contest. In Melbourne, on the other hand, the general opinion seemed to be altogether in favour of popular election. Some useful men, it was thought, might perhaps accept nomination who would not stand for a constituency, or who, if they stood, might have no chance of being elected;
but popular election increased the authority of the Council. "When we were nominated," said a member of the Council with whom I was discussing the two systems, "we could offer no effective resistance to unwise measures passed by the Lower House; we had no moral authority; we were told

that the Lower House represented the people, and that we were resisting the people’s will; but now we are able to say that, if the members of the Assembly represent the people, so do we, and that we have just as good a right to our opinion as they have to theirs."

In all the colonies the election to the Lower House is practically by universal suffrage. In Tasmania the electors must have their names on the Assessment Roll—corresponding to our Ratebook—as owners or occupiers of property within the electoral district, or they must have an income from some source, it may be from weekly wages, amounting to £60 per annum; in computing wages, “rations” and other allowances are included. But these restrictions do not, I imagine, disfranchise any considerable number of the adult male population.

Between the proceedings of the two Houses there is the same kind of difference as between the proceedings of our two Houses at home: the proceedings of the Council are generally decorous and even dull; the proceedings of the Assembly are now and then extremely animated—not to use a more forcible word—and the Speaker does not always find it easy to keep the wilder members of his team on the safe and well-beaten road of parliamentary propriety.
V.

The three most picturesque personalities that I met with among active politicians were Sir Henry Parkes, Mr. Playford, and Sir Alfred Stephen. Sir Henry Parkes, who is now Prime Minister of New South Wales for the fifth time, has been for more than forty years a conspicuous figure in Australian politics. His rugged strength, his vigorous understanding, his courage, his audacity, have appealed very powerfully to the popular imagination, and given him a unique political position. He has passed through many vicissitudes, and in the management of his private affairs has not been fortunate; but there is unmeasured confidence in his public integrity. Those who heard him speak when he was in England a few years ago, are not likely to have formed a true estimate of his power. He is not a speaker for show occasions; he is at his best when he has real business on hand and is smiting his enemies in the Assembly. Mr. Playford—“honest Tom”—the Prime Minister of South Australia, is a man of a different type, but he, too, has the qualities which command popular confidence. He is a strong man, but less rugged and less volcanic than Sir Henry. I was impressed and attracted by the felicitous union of modesty and manly dignity in his bearing, and by his transparent simplicity. He is a market-gardener, and seemed quite as much interested in his vegetables and his fruit as in politics; and when he was induced to talk of his early history and of his father, who was a private soldier, promoted to the office of regimental schoolmaster, he was charming. Sir Alfred Stephen,
unlike Sir Henry Parkes and Mr. Playford, has the cultivation of a scholar. He belongs to a family which has produced many brilliant men, and though he is now a very old man, he is brilliant still, as a Stephen should be. I ventured to ask him what was the very earliest thing that he remembered, and he said, “I remember being whipped in the year 1807.” He knew Hannah More; and, as he said, Hannah More saw Dr. Johnson, and Dr. Johnson saw Queen Anne, so that there are only two persons between him and the beginning of the eighteenth century. Sir Alfred was formerly Chief Justice of New South Wales; he is now a member of the Legislative Council; and when I was in Sydney he had a Divorce Bill in hand, which he subsequently passed, but which has been vetoed at home—and vetoed, I imagine, through the influence brought to bear upon the Home Government by the Episcopalian, Roman Catholic, and Presbyterian Churches. When I suggested that some of the provisions of his Bill appeared to make divorce extremely easy, he showed, with great animation, that the conditions of life in the colonies are so different from the conditions of life at home, that if colonial law were governed by English law, the greatest injustice would be inflicted on innocent people. The courtesy of the old man, and the vivacity and force with which he talked on this subject, and on every other that came in his way, made him a most delightful host; the little luncheon party to which he was good enough to invite me is one of the most vivid and agreeable of my Australian reminiscences.

Of the other politicians whom I met I can give no personal description. Some of them were lawyers, some squatters, some merchants, some manufacturers, some farmers; some of them had begun life as mechanics, a few as ministers of reli-
gion; some of the cleverest and ablest had been journalists. Some were members of English or Scotch universities, some had graduated at Melbourne or Sydney; some had had the kind of education that used to be given in England to the sons of fairly successful tradesmen, others had left elementary schools when they were ten or eleven years of age, and had fought their way to their honourable positions by sheer force of ability, industry, and courage. They differed from each other very greatly. Some of them gave me the

impression of being men of great soundness of judgment and great capacity for labour. Some were brilliant and keen. Some—or was it my fault? would they have shown their power had they seen anything in me to induce them to exert it?—some seemed very dull, as dull as any of the members of our own House of Commons. Some were men who, in addition to their political knowledge, had wide and varied intellectual interests; some had a considerable knowledge of politics, but seemed to know nothing else; in some I discovered few signs of serious knowledge of any kind, but, as I have suggested, perhaps this was to my discredit rather than theirs. In private I could see no difference between the members belonging to the two Houses, except that the members of Council were generally older than the members of Assembly, and were reputed to be richer.

The history of the colonies is the best proof of the ability and integrity of colonial politicians. For they have shown themselves equal to the tasks of government. They have maintained public order. As far as I know, the only serious disturbance of the public peace in any of the colonies occurred at Ballarat in the early stages of the gold fever, and before Victoria had respon-
sible government. Property and life are as secure in Australia as in Yorkshire or Kent. The decisions of the Courts at Sydney, Melbourne, and Adelaide, command as much confidence as the decisions of the Courts at Westminster. Since the Imperial troops were withdrawn, nearly twenty years ago, each colony has raised a military and naval force of its own, consisting partly of "Regulars" and partly of Volunteers; has fortified its harbours; has maintained—and, in addition to its annual contribution to the cost of the Imperial Australian squadron, will continue to maintain—ships of war and torpedo-boats for the protection of its own waters.

VI.

But, in addition to discharging the primary duties of government—the maintenance of order, the protection of life and property, the administration of justice, and providing for the public defence—they have undertaken duties which in older countries are discharged by municipal or other local authorities. In New South Wales there are large districts in which at present no local authorities have been created; roads, bridges, and other public works are constructed and maintained by the State. In Melbourne the water supply is in the hands of the Government; for Melbourne is really a group of independent cities, and until they are federated under one municipal board, with rating powers extending over the whole area, or with power to levy contributions from the separate municipalities included in it, the State is the most effective authority for constructing and adminis-
tering those public works in which the whole of "greater Melbourne" is interested.

As with ourselves, the Post Office and Telegraphs are in charge of a public department. The railways, with the exception of a short line in New South Wales, are also in the hands of the Governments of the several colonies. Nearly all of them were constructed by the Governments; in one or two cases they have been taken over from private companies. I know nothing of the internal organization of the Railway Department, but the express service between Sydney and Melbourne and between Melbourne and Adelaide is a very fine one; and the sleeping cars between Melbourne and Adelaide are by far the most comfortable that I have ever travelled in. The suburban service, both in Sydney and Melbourne, is also admirable. In New South Wales the extension of railway communication into sparsely populated districts has, during the last few years, greatly diminished the interest on capital expended in construction. In 1881 the railways paid considerably over 5 per cent, on capital, in 1886 a little under 3 per cent. The loss comes out of the public revenue. In Victoria, on the other hand, which has about the same population, occupying an area which is considerably less than a third as large, the railways are now paying more than 4 per cent, on capital, although the cost of construction per mile was considerably higher than in New South Wales.

In the preceding chapter I have shown that they have constructed and maintained admirable systems of elementary schools, and have contributed generously towards the founding and support of universities. They have shown their care for the intellectual life of the community in other ways. They have established in the great cities public
libraries, museums, and galleries of art. In South Australia nearly every small town has its institute, with its lecture-hall, news-room and library. In the morning and afternoon the reading-room and news-room are reserved for the use of the members, whose annual subscriptions provide the expense of maintenance; after five or six o’clock in the evening they are open to everybody. For many years the Government contributed half the cost of erecting the buildings, the other half being provided from local sources. I believe that recently the proportion contributed by the Government has been diminished.

The Governments of all the colonies have shown that they are following with keen interest the development of technical education in America and Europe. There are Agricultural Colleges and State Experimental Farms in Victoria and South Australia. Sydney has a great Technical College, with branch schools and classes in suburban and country districts. The number of individual students who entered the Sydney classes in 1887 was 1930; the number that entered the suburban and country schools was 765—a total of 2,695. Towards the cost of maintenance the Government contributed in that year nearly £17,000; the fees received from students amounted to a little over £2,000. The management of the college is in the hands of a board responsible to the Minister of Public Instruction. The classes appear to cover every subject that can be included under the title of Technical Education.

Victoria has a School of Mines at Ballarat and another at Sandhurst; it is supposed to be a great advantage to the students that they can go down into the mines, which are within half a mile of their lecture-rooms and laboratories, and examine for themselves the methods of working them and
the manner in which engineering difficulties have been met and mastered. In Melbourne there has been recently founded a Working Men’s College.
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The buildings were unfinished when I was in the city, but excellent work was going on, and there seemed to me to be a vigorous democratic spirit in the institution, which promised large success. The total number of individual students at the time I visited the college was just under 1,000. I obtained from the secretary the numbers attending the various classes: there were 66 working at carpentry, 17 at staircase building, 35 at carriage drafting, 28 at photography, 57 at book-keeping, 69 at shorthand. The origin and constitution of the college and the sources from which it derives support are interesting. Mr. Ormond, of whose magnificent generosity a visitor to Melbourne is continually reminded, contributed £5,000 towards the building; the rest was raised by public subscription, and the Government gave the site. The Council of 22 includes nominees (1) of the Government, (2) of the University, (3) of the Public Library, (4) of the Founder, (5) of the Trades Hall, which belongs to the trade societies, (6) of annual subscribers of over £1, and (7) of annual subscribers of less than £1. Towards maintenance the Government contributed in 1887 £1,000; fees yielded just under £450; and the carpenters and joiners’, the painters’, the brewers’, the coachmakers’, and one or two other trade societies contributed between £20 and £30—a
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sum hardly large enough for the societies which united in contributing it.

The extent to which the Governments grant subsidies to stimulate and support local effort, both municipal and voluntary, is one of the character-
istics of Australian policy which most strike a visitor. In South Australia local authorities receive from the Treasury a pound for every pound expended out of the rates for public works. In Victoria the subsidy is paid on the amount of the general revenue from rates, and subject to conditions which limit the total amount of the annual subsidy to one municipality to £2000, and which diminish the subsidy in the same proportion that the local rate exceeds 1s. in the pound; the urban municipalities receive £1 for every £1 raised by rates, and the rural municipalities £2 for every £1.

The urban municipal districts in Victoria must contain at least 300 resident householders, and, as a rule, must not exceed nine square miles in area. The rural districts are districts which do not fulfil these conditions; most of them extend over more than 100 square miles, some extend over 4000, one extends over 10,000. The local authorities in both descriptions of districts have substantially the same powers.

Subsidies are also granted to charitable institutions of all descriptions—to hospitals, orphan
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The population of New South Wales—the most populous of the Australian colonies—is considerably less than double the population of Liverpool; the population of South Australia, with its 900,000 square miles of territory, is considerably less than the population of Sheffield; the population of Tasmania is not as large as the population of Portsmouth. At a distance, inconsiderate Englishmen may imagine that the duties resting on colonial
Legislatures are very much like the duties discharged in this country by town councils; and that the office of a colonial Minister is as easy to fill as the chairmanship of a watch committee or an estates committee in connection with an English municipality. Before I visited Australia I had formed a much more adequate conception than this of the kind of work that has to be done by colonial statesmen, and of the kind of men required to do it; but I confess that it was not till I saw something of the actual organization of the Governments of the several colonies that I visited, talked to judges about the suits which had to be settled in their courts, to Ministers about the infinite variety of serious duties which had to be discharged in their offices, and to members of Legislative Councils and Houses of Assembly of the large and difficult questions which had to be determined by Parliament, that I began to appreciate the real powers and resources of the men engaged in Australian politics.

That in communities, which, when compared with our own, are so small, and in which there are so few men who in early life have had the leisure for those grave studies which we think—and, as I believe, rightly think—are generally necessary for the discipline of the statesman, there are so large a number of men who have shown capacity for legislation and government, is greatly to the honour of our race. The proof of their capacity lies in what they have achieved. They have made mistakes, but their mistakes are not more flagrant than the mistakes which have been made by the trained statesmen of the old countries of Europe. Had their mistakes been much more serious there would have been no occasion for surprise. In the old countries statesmen inherit traditions and precedents which save them from
many blunders; in the colonies the economic and social condition of the people is new and strange, and the traditions and precedents of the mother country are in some cases misleading and pernicious.

VII.

Whether in their land legislation Australian statesmen have done wisely or unwisely in allowing themselves to be largely controlled by English traditions is a question on which there must be wide differences of opinion. When the colonies received representative institutions the Crown had already established methods of treating the land which, in their spirit and aims, were intensely English, and although during the last thirty years there have been frequent and great changes in the terms on which the unoccupied lands can be purchased, or leased, or occupied from year to year, all the changes have been controlled by English ideas. In early years the territory seemed inexhaustible. Land was sold freely, and even given freely, for agricultural purposes; but farms of a few hundred acres, or a few thousand acres, made no impression upon the boundless bush. Large facilities were afforded to squatters to cover immense tracts of country with sheep and cattle. For a time there seemed to be room enough, more than room enough, for both farmer and squatter. But thirty years ago it became apparent that the squatters were rapidly taking possession of all the land within reach of the towns and of the coast. There were vast districts of bush in the interior of the country, but the accessible land was held by a few men, who were becoming enormously rich by feed-
ing their flocks and herds on land that might grow wheat. And even where unoccupied land was accessible, the conditions of sale did not make it easy for poor men to purchase. The problem to be solved was how to get men on to the land instead of sheep—how to grow wheat instead of wool—how to settle a hundred farmers on an area which, under the old law, might be held by one squatter. This, in substance, was the problem which was raised in all the colonies, though in South Australia it seems to have been complicated by other aims. In New South Wales Sir John Robertson attempted to deal with it in the Crown Lands Act of 1861. The Act allowed a man who wanted to settle on the land to travel over a run already in the occupation of a squatter, and select a block which he thought would suit him. There was a fixed price for the land, and he was at liberty to pay for it by instalments or to pay down as much as he could and to pay interest on the balance. What happened might have been foreseen. Free selectors “picked out the eyes” of the runs, to use the Australian phrase. They selected the most valuable parts of a run; some-

198 times they selected those parts which gave value to all the rest—for example, the parts where the sheep or the cattle found water. Then came a protracted fight between the free selectors and the squatters. The squatters bought out the selectors, or they anticipated them by purchasing, but not in their own names, those parts of their runs which it was necessary for them to keep. Sir John Robertson’s Act remained in force till the end of 1884. In that year an Act was passed which, while maintaining what is technically called the principle of “selection before survey,” gave a substantial measure of protection to the tenants of Crown lands, and at the same time secured a larger
When I was in Sydney the new Act had been in operation less than three years. There was a general opinion among the people whom I met that it had worked beneficially, but further amendments of the law were thought to be necessary, and the Government had introduced an Amending Bill into the Lower House.

There are men of wide experience who doubt whether any legislation will permanently increase to any considerable extent the number of small holdings. Economic laws—so they believe—work in the other direction: they say that where land can be sold freely small estates will be bought up by large proprietors; that the farmer who owns 640 or 1000 acres cannot, in the long run, live side by side with the great landowner who owns two or three hundred thousand. But, whether this is so or not, the Australians have to face the fact that the great public estate is rapidly passing into private hands. The prices at which land was originally sold by the State were absolutely insignificant compared with its present value; and the increased value has been derived—not merely from improvements made by the purchasers, nor chiefly from these improvements—but from the rapid development of the prosperity of the colonies.

Further, it has been the general custom to run the revenue received from the land sales into the ordinary revenue of the several colonies. In Victoria, since 1869, there has been a special appropriation of £200,000 of the revenue annually derived from this source to a trust account for the extension of railways and the re-purchase of debentures; since 1884 all money arising from the sale by auction of public lands has been appropriated to the trust. In the other colonies I heard of no attempt to protect the income arising from the sale of the public estate from being used for the
ordinary purposes of government. It would, however, be contended that, even in the absence of any such provision, the whole or a large part of the revenue derived from the sale of the land has

been spent on railways and other permanent public works which contribute to the development of the colony and the increase of the general wealth; that, as the revenue received from the land sales diminishes, the increase of the general wealth will yield a corresponding increase from taxation; and that, though the State has parted with the fee simple of the land, the land remains, and may always be taxed.

In South Australia, an Act passed in 1884 levies a tax on land of a halfpenny in the pound; the tax is to be levied on its “unimproved value;” but the same Act levies an income tax of threepence in the pound on income derived from “personal exertion,” and of sixpence in the pound on income consisting of “the produce of property.” The Trades Unions Congress, which met at Brisbane in March, 1888, struck a bolder stroke. It resolved, “That it is advisable, in order to increase wages, to give employment to all, to abolish poverty, to lessen crime, to elevate the moral taste and intelligence of the people, to purify Governments, and to carry civilization to a noble height, to abolish all taxation save that on land value.” This glowing resolution would have had much greater significance, and would have produced a much deeper impression, but for the fact that, as a rule, the trade-unionists are in favour of Protective duties—and Protective duties are nothing more than taxes on the consumers of dutiable articles. Mr. Henry George, from whom the unionists
learnt the formula of "the single tax," is an ardent Free Trader.

The fact remains that the public estate is passing rapidly into the hands of private persons, and that the development of the several colonies by means of the revenue derived from land sales has gone to the advantage of the men to whom the lands were sold. They paid very little for the land they bought; what they paid has been expended in improving its value.

I asked a leading politician in Victoria how it was that in a great city like Melbourne, with tens of thousands of working-men in it, there was not a vigorous agitation for keeping the public estate in the hands of the public, and securing to the whole community the profit arising from its constantly increasing value. He answered, with a laugh, that every thrifty working-man in Melbourne either owns already the freehold on which his house stands or hopes to own it soon. I am not sure

1 According to a report which lately appeared in the Melbourne Daily Telegraph (Dec. 5, 1888), the building societies had, in 1887, more than 20,000 members; the amount to the credit of depositors exceeded £4,000,000 and the advances exceeded £3,600,000.

That my friend meant this for a serious reply to my question, and I very much regretted that I missed the opportunity of learning from some of the active politicians among the working people what they really think of allowing all that remains of that great estate, which ought to have been sacredly guarded as the priceless inheritance of the whole community, to become the property for ever of private holders.

Here, in England, it may be impossible to recover the national estate for the nation; but why, in the great Australian colonies, the portion of it that is still unalienated should not be kept for the nation
is a question to which it would be difficult, I think, to give any conclusive answer. The land question in Australia waits for its final settlement, and to settle it on equitable and enduring foundations would be an achievement worthy of the very highest political genius.

VIII.

Nor is the labour question yet settled. It is true that the working-man in Australia has shorter hours, better wages, cheaper food, than the working-man in England. There is an admirable system of public schools for his children; in some of the colonies their education costs him nothing, and where school fees have to be paid the fees are small. He lives in a beautiful climate, and as yet knows nothing of the discomfort and the loss of health occasioned by the crowded condition of our own great manufacturing towns. But the relations between capital and labour are as unsatisfactory in the colonies as in England. They are separated by mutual jealousy and distrust. Sometimes there is open war—and war is costly to both belligerents. At the wages which the workmen demand the masters are sometimes unable to employ them; the workmen lose their wages and the masters lose their interest on capital. Whether co-operation would solve the whole difficulty is doubtful; it has not been attempted on a large scale, though there is a co-operative boot factory in Melbourne which is said to be fairly successful.

How are Australian wages to be kept from gradually sinking to the European level? This is the problem which the trades unions and the statesmen of Australia have to solve; and, as far as I could learn, they had made no approach to solving it. The problem is urgent. Australia is very much
nearer to Europe than it was twenty years ago. Communication is cheaper and more frequent. What is of still greater importance, it is nearer to the imagination of the great mass of the working people on this side of the world. The influence of the economic condition of European countries, and especially of England, will tell more powerfully on the economic condition of Australia every year. The real wages of carpenters, bricklayers, blacksmiths, coachmen, grooms, gardeners, cannot permanently remain very much higher in Sydney and Melbourne than in London and Liverpool. In the various manufacturing industries the depressing influence of the lower wages earned in European countries will act still more directly and still more effectively.

The distance of Australia from the European ports gives to the Australian manufacturers the advantage of what may be called a “natural Protection,” but the Protection is wholly insufficient to compensate him for the higher cost of labour. In some branches of manufacture Protective duties may maintain wages at the expense of the consumer; and I was accustomed to tell my Protectionist friends in Melbourne that perhaps Victoria was rich enough to afford a Protectionist policy; but how long the consumer may be able and willing to bear the strain is an open question. When I was in Victoria I heard that the agriculturists were beginning to say that Protection had done enough for the manufacturers and their workmen, and that the turn of the farmer had come; some of them were asking for a bounty on the export of wheat.

Protection is not a permanent solution of the labour problem. It is a mere temporary make-
shift. Even now—though I know that the question is a subject of lively controversy—I believe that New South Wales is better off without Protection than Victoria with it.

Some of my South Australian friends, particularly the Hon. A. Campbell of Adelaide, and the Hon. H. Tarlton of Glenelg, both of whom showed me great kindness, are keenly interested in a scheme on which I find it extremely difficult to form even a provisional judgment. If I understand their proposals, they ask for such amendments in the homestead provisions of the land law as shall make it easy for working-men to get the freehold of twenty-acre blocks of good land within reach of the towns; and they ask, further, for advances of capital from the Government to enable the holders to make a fair start in improving and cultivating their land. I believe that the promoters contend that the only solution of the labour question lies in giving the workman something to fall back upon when his trade is slack. The carpenter, the bricklayer, the blacksmith, is, therefore, to be also a farmer on a small scale or a market-gardener. When he cannot get work in the town he is to go out and work on his land. But intermittent farming—so one would think—would not

be successful farming, and intermittent market-gardening would seem still less likely to be successful. And is it certain that a carpenter would always be short of work just when his land required most attention? I suspect that the scheme assumes that he will divide his time pretty regularly between his land and the workshop, and the organization of industry with which we are familiar in this country would make this arrangement very inconvenient. Workmen living in small towns might have their “blocks” within reach, but how could “blocks” be found for workmen
living in great cities like Sydney and Melbourne? Further, the scheme would require every man to learn two trades. I regret that when I was with the able men who are leading the agitation we had so many other subjects to talk about that we never discussed these objections to their scheme; the objections are much too obvious to have escaped their notice.

But the labour question may be considered from the point of view of the community as a whole, as well as from the point of view of the labourer, and when so considered it presents problems to Australian statesmen and economists which, as far as I can see, are at present insoluble. It is surely one of the first duties and one of the chief interests of a nation to develop the resources of the country which it occupies. But there are many forms of industry which cannot be carried on profitably in Australia, because wages are so much higher in Australia than in Europe. This seems to mean that the country cannot be developed without a great reduction in the cost of labour. But if there were a great reduction in the cost of labour, the fair hope that the great mass of the people, through many generations, might live a happier, easier, larger, and more prosperous life than the great mass of the people in the older countries would be blighted.

IX.

As yet, the Chinese question is a part of the labour question; for although a great deal is said—and said no doubt with perfect sincerity—of the vices of the Chinese immigrants, and of the social injury that their presence in the great towns inflicts on the community, the real force of the popular agitation against them arises from the dread that
if many more of them are permitted to settle in the country they will reduce wages. I am not in a position to express any opinion on the justice or injustice of the popular opinion which attributes to the Chinese settlers the most disgusting vices; but I think that I am neither unjust nor uncharit-

able in saying that, as yet, the virtues of the Chinaman, rather than his vices, provoke the popular hostility against him. His physical vigour, his industry, his patience, his powers of endurance, his ingenuity, his suppleness, his versatility, make him a very formidable person. He can work hard and live on almost nothing. Give him a piece of bare rock, and in a year or two it will be covered with excellent vegetables. He is a clever mechanic. He makes a capital cook and a gentle and careful nurse; and I remember reading, when I was staying at St. Kilda, the report of a public meeting held in the neighbouring city of Prahran, at which one of the speakers, in the fervour of his generous indignation against the crimes of the Chinaman, declared that at last he was taking the bread out of the mouths of their sisters and daughters, for he had actually turned washerwoman. The Chinaman is, in fact, so tough, and so persistent, and so clever a person, that even English pride of race does not prevent the Australian from recognizing

1 In proportion to their numbers there are very few Chinamen arrested for crime in Victoria; the percentage is lower than that of the persons of any other nationality except Victorians—and as the Victorians include a large number of children, this is very remarkable. The proportion of Chinamen committed for trial is also lower than that of persons of any other nationality except Victorians.

in him a very powerful rival. If Australian ports were opened freely to Chinese immigrants, the operation of the law of the survival of the fittest might bring about the gradual disappearance of
the descendants of the English, Scotch, and Irish settlers; and some cynical prophets have predicted that at the end of the next century the three typical forms of Australian life will be the rabbit, the sparrow, and the Chinaman.

What is at present a labour question is likely, in the course of a generation or two, to become a political question of great importance and of great difficulty. I have had occasion to say more than once that, sooner or later, the Australians will be compelled to employ, in very large numbers, men belonging to coloured races, to develop the resources of the northern parts of the continent. Chinamen may, perhaps, be excluded by stringent legislation, and men belonging to less vigorous races may work the mines and the plantations of tropical Australia. What is to be their political position? In many large districts, before the middle of the next century, they will immensely outnumber the whites. Will they be allowed to exercise the political franchise and to become members of Legislative Councils and of Houses of Assembly? Will the high-tempered Australian people, with their splendid visions of the future

greatness and glory of their country, consent to share the control of its legislation and its policy with races of weaker fibre and inheriting neither the ethical nor the political traditions which have formed the manners and which inspire the laws of the Australian commonwealths? I doubt it On the other hand, what is to happen if a half, or a third, or even a fourth of the inhabitants of a group of democratic States are refused all political rights? The question is a far more difficult one than that which had to be solved by the United States in the case of the emancipated slaves of the South.
I tried to learn from several of my political friends in Australia what they thought about it. I asked them whether the proposal had ever been made to naturalize the Chinese without giving them the political franchise. But at present, as I have said, the Chinese question is simply a labour question, and the political difficulties which will emerge when either the Chinese or the people belonging to any other coloured race begin to bear any large proportion to the white population have not yet been considered. Politicians engaged in the actual administration of affairs are necessarily men of short views. They confess that they "know not what shall be on the morrow." It is only persons like myself—spectators, amateurs,

who cannot find a solution for the most urgent questions of to-day—that trouble themselves with questions which may not become urgent till another quarter of a century has gone by.

Twenty years ago, perhaps rather more, I heard M. Laboulaye, who was at that time Professor in the College de France, deliver an introductory lecture to a course on the History of the American Revolution. The Empire was in the sultry noon-tide of its glory. The memory of political freedom seemed to have perished. France, drugged with material prosperity, lay prostrate and dumb, with no courage, no heart, to offer any resistance to what appeared to be an irresistible tyranny. But, ds M. Laboulaye said to me a day or two afterwards, the traditions of the country surrounded the chairs of the university with a certain measure of protection; and when all other criticism was suppressed the Professors could dare to speak. In the course of the lecture M. Laboulaye asked—"How is it that England has had such great success in colonization while we have failed?" He answered his
own question in a picturesque passage, which I can only very imperfectly reproduce:—

“I will tell you,” he said. “When we send out men to found a colony, we send a préfet to govern them and soldiers to defend them; we make laws for them; we levy taxes on them; and at last they say, ‘We might as well have stayed in France.’ But with the English it is not so. A few adventurous families plant themselves on the shore of some country remote from European civilization, and they are left to themselves. They struggle, unaided, with the difficulties of their condition. They are attacked by the wild people who are near their settlements, and they have to defend their lives and their homes as best they can. They regulate their own affairs. They elect their own magistrates. They suffer. Perhaps they perish. If they survive, it is because they are men of a vigorous fibre, and they and their descendants become a strong and successful people. In our colonies, gentlemen, as well as at home, if France is to be great, we must have more of that element in our constitution, to name which I must borrow a word from the race in whose history it is most nobly illustrated—we must have more of self-government.”

The large lecture-room was crowded with an audience of four or five hundred people, and as soon as these words escaped the lecturer’s lips they broke out into the wildest applause.

M. Laboulaye was thinking of our American colonies rather than of our colonies in Australia. In Australia the colonists were not, at first, “left to themselves.” But Australia, as well as America, confirms his contention; for it was not till the Australian colonies had received representative institutions that they began to display their real energy, and to show the sure promise of their great destiny. They have now to deal with questions far more difficult than any which they have dealt with during the fifty years that they have had in their own hands the control of their own affairs—the land question, the labour question, the
question of the political and social relations between themselves and the coloured races that will soon be spreading in immense numbers over the northern parts of their country.

They have shown great resources in their past history, and we may trust that for these unsolved problems they will find at last a safe and equitable solution. But for them, too, as for the rest of the sons of men, the way to the ideal life must be hard and rugged; it may lie through darkness and storm; and the end may not be won except at the cost of pain, and tears, and blood.

CHAPTER V.

RELIGION AND MORALS.

I.

In the religious life and thought of Australia, and in its ecclesiastical organizations, I found less originality than I expected. The Churches—all the Churches as far as I could learn—have too faithfully reproduced in new circumstances the customs and institutions of the mother country. The Congregationalists in Sydney, Melbourne,
and Adelaide hold the same number of religious services on Sunday as the Congregationalists of London, Liverpool, and Manchester; and the same number of religious services in the week. Notwithstanding the differences of climate they hold their services at the same hours—at half-past ten or eleven o’clock on Sunday morning, just when, in summer, the day is becoming intolerably hot; and at half-past six or seven o’clock on Sunday evening, before it has become cool. Their services are of the same kind. They sing the same hymns to the same tunes. The clearer skies, the intenser light, the fiercer sun, the new constellations, the orange groves and the vineyards, the unfamiliar trees and flowers, the fertile virgin soil, the immense pastures which are being gradually covered with flocks and herds, the terrible droughts, the hot winds, the solitude of the settlers in the Bush, the hopefulness and the buoyancy of the people in the towns, their joy in their material prosperity, their affectionate memories of the old country—these new conditions of life, as far as I know, have not as yet touched the imagination and the heart of any devout poet—no trace of them has passed into the hymns of any of the Churches. Great hymn-writers like Watts and Charles Wesley are very rare; but it seemed to me rather remarkable that no hymns had been written—or, perhaps, I ought to say, that no hymns had come into general and ordinary use—that had caught the colour and inspiration of the new country and the new environment of Church life. The reason may be that the new environment has not produced any serious effect on the religious life itself. For Congregationalists in Australia are hardly to be distinguished, as far as their religious thought and interests are concerned, from Congregationalists in England. It is the same with the
other religious denominations. The Baptists were discussing, when I was there, Mr. Spurgeon’s secession from the Baptist Union, and were exercised with anxious thoughts about the “Down Grade.”

The Presbyterians in Melbourne had been excited by the departure of a conspicuous and popular Presbyterian minister from the Westminster standards. The Wesleyans were alarmed by symptoms of indifference to the class meeting. At Sydney the Episcopalians were divided by a sharp controversy about the reredos in the Cathedral.

At Adelaide seventy or eighty ministers—Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists of several descriptions, Congregationalists—did me the honour to invite me to meet them and deliver an address. I thought that it would be difficult to select an appropriate subject; and when I met them I said that they would oblige me if they would write down the questions on which they would like me to speak and hand them to the chairman. Ten or a dozen questions were handed me at once, which it took an hour to answer; they were questions which would probably have been proposed at a similar meeting in Nottingham or Leeds. At Melbourne I had a “question morning” with the Congregational ministers of Victoria, and the Adelaide experience was repeated. It was all too much like home.

I was very much interested, therefore, when I met in Adelaide a young Episcopal clergyman who has seen visions and dreamt dreams of bold ecclesiastical reforms. In England, with a history of
the other side of the world, Whitgift and Cartwright and Hooker, the Elizabethan Separatists, Archbishop Laud, the Westminster Assembly, the Episcopalian troubles during the Commonwealth, the Nonconformist troubles after the Restoration, seem a very long way off. And the young South Australian clergyman has asked himself some very searching questions about his own Church and about the other Churches planted in the colony. “Is it not possible to dismiss the past and to make a new beginning? Why should the evil memories of a land from which we are separated by twelve thousand miles of ocean, and the evil memories of a time from which we are separated by more than two hundred years, infect this new soil and this new age? Is it not possible under these new conditions to forget the old controversies by which Christian men are divided, and to remember only the Christ in whom they are one? Can we not lay in Australia the foundations of a broad ecclesiastical polity which shall gather into it all Christians?”

The more sluggish pulse and the less mercurial temperament, which are due in part, perhaps, to our colder and gloomier skies, prevent me from thinking that the hopes of my ardent friend are likely to be fulfilled. He seemed to me to fail to recognize how deeply rooted are certain principles of ecclesiastical polity—as distinguished from their forms—in men’s conceptions of the very substance of the Christian Gospel and in the central elements of the Christian life. But he was trying to look at the actual facts of the religious life of Australia, and to consider how, apart from inherited hostilities, jealousies, and misunderstandings, it can be more effectively organized; and this was a great merit.

As yet, however, the power of the past over the religious institutions and religious activities of Australia seems unbroken. Nor do I imagine that large
changes, involving the disappearance of existing forms of Church polity, are probable. Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, Episcopacy, under its two forms, Anglican and Roman, will remain for many generations—perhaps for many centuries to come. But if the Christian life of the colonies is to maintain its vigour, the Churches, whatever their polity, must, as I venture to think, break new ground and modify the details of their organizations. Here, in England, Christian Churches are, to a very great extent, philanthropic institutions; and institutions which are altogether philanthropic are largely supported and largely worked by men and women whose

compassion for misery derives its inspiration from Christ, and who devote themselves to its relief as part of the service which they owe to Him. And the unhappy economic and social condition of large masses of our population has led to the establishment of mission churches and mission schools, and created other forms of activity of a strictly religious kind. If nine-tenths of the poverty and the misery suddenly vanished, the strain on the liberality and on the personal service of the best and most earnest people in all Churches would cease, and a large number of those institutions, religious and philanthropic, in which the power of their religious life is both revealed and disciplined, would collapse. Suppose that hundreds of thousands of men, who are now very thankful if they can earn eighteen shillings a week, suddenly became able to earn five or seven shillings a day; suppose that men, who are now fairly prosperous on four or five shillings a day, could earn eight, ten, or twelve; suppose that in the villages young men willing to remain on the land could get from £30 to £50 a year in addition to “rations” and lodging; suppose that every poor girl of decent character, moder-
ately good temper, and not an absolute fool, could get employment as a domestic servant with wages rising from £18 a year to £10, besides her board and lodging, with a prospect of still higher wages if she proved clever and useful; suppose that tolerably good dressmakers could easily get employment in private families at four shillings a day, with dinner and, perhaps, “high tea;” suppose that, as the result of this prosperity the narrow unwholesome streets and the miserable courts in which hundreds of thousands of our people live were deserted, and their inhabitants transferred themselves to healthy houses filled with comfortable furniture—what would happen? Three-fourths or four-fifths of the very best work which is done by Christian Churches and by the members of Christian Churches would become unnecessary, or would take an altogether different form.

This imaginary condition of things actually exists in the Australian colonies. Of course, there is trouble in Sydney as well as in Birmingham, in up-country towns in Victoria as well as in Warwickshire villages. In Australia as well as in England there are widows and orphans who are left destitute, and who must be cared for; there are the deaf and dumb and the blind, and people suffering from incurable disease, to be pitied and helped; strong men are struck down by severe illness, and their wives and children suffer great hardships; industrious men cannot always find work—at least, they cannot always find work at the wages which the economical condition of the country leads them to demand. In Australia as well as in England there are well-meaning people, in good health, not idiots, with the same hands and arms and legs and feet as everybody else, but
who, for some inscrutable reason, are perfectly 
useless; whatever they attempt, they always 
blunder and always fail; they suffer from some 
fatal defect of sense or of persistent energy. 
Finally, there are the reckless and the vicious, 
who ruin themselves and every one that depends 
on them. The claims of these various classes of 
persons on the solicitude and generosity of the 
Australian Churches are considerable; but the 
area of wretchedness when compared with the 
resources for its relief is much more contracted in 
Australia than in England, and its demands on 
personal service are comparatively slight. I dare-
say that there is unrelieved misery in Sydney and 
in Melbourne; and here and there I met with 
people who had been overtasked in their endeavours 
to care for the unfortunate and the destitute. But 
the sick, the poor, the wretched in these cities are 
not numerous enough to employ all the Christian 
men and women who are living near them; and I 
did not learn that any new forms of service, 
suggested by new conditions of life, had been 
added to the traditional “good works” of the old 
country. For large numbers of excellent and able

people there seemed to be very little to do, except 
to attend Church committees occasionally. They 
had no work—nothing that could be called work. 
But, with the eagerness and energy of the Austra-
lians, it seems indispensable, if their religious life is 
to be vigorous, that the Churches should make sub-
stantial demands on their time and their strength.

II.

In one direction all Christian communities have 
shown conspicuous zeal, and a splendid generosity 
—I mean in the building of churches. According 
to the estimate given by Mr. Horace Mann, in his
“Report on the Religious Census of England and Wales,” religious accommodation should be provided for about 58 per cent of the population; this represents the percentage that can be present at one time at public worship. Estimated by this rule, the religious accommodation provided in South Australia is in excess of the requirements of the population; there are 199,617 sittings in permanent church buildings, and 27,425 additional sittings in temporary buildings; as the population is only 313,423, there is permanent provision for more than 63 per cent, and a total provision for more than 70 per cent. In Victoria there are sittings for 551,883 persons; the population is 1,003,043; accommodation is provided for 55 per cent. In New South Wales the population is 1,001,966, and the total accommodation—including that in temporary buildings, which probably amounts to 40,000 or 50,000 places—is only 381,762; the provision is for about 38 per cent of the population.

Although the accommodation in New South Wales is inadequate, the figures for all the three colonies are extremely remarkable. In England every new generation inherits from its predecessors, houses, roads, bridges, cultivated fields, sawmills, workshops, forges, schools, churches, and everything else that is necessary to the existence of a civilized community. But the men who settled in Victoria and in South Australia only fifty years ago settled in a wild, untamed country. They found nothing ready to their hands. Not a house was built; not a road was made; not a field had ever been ploughed or fenced. There were no horses, no cattle, no sheep. And what was true fifty years ago of the whole of Victoria and of South Australia, was also true, at the same time, of a large part of New South Wales. The
settlers had to begin from the very beginning. But while they were living in tents or wattled shanties, they put up a larger tent or a larger shanty for worship. As soon as they built

houses for themselves they built churches. Wherever a crowd of diggers or miners was drawn together by the discovery of gold, of silver, or of copper, provision of some kind or other was made within a few weeks, or at most within a few months, for public worship; and as soon as a settled population was gathered in the neighbourhood of the diggings or the mines permanent churches were erected. In some parts of the country, churches have been built from which hardly a dozen houses are visible; the congregations are drawn from people living on farms and “stations” four, five, and even ten miles away.

We are often told that the religious faith of the English nation is decaying; that the most vigorous elements of our population are lost to the Churches already; that the immense majority of the rest are retained by nothing stronger than the force of “use and wont;” that a large proportion of those who attend Christian worship are drifting fast into unbelief, and that, if they had a little more courage, they, too, would soon be in open revolt against the Christian tradition. These assertions are made with such confidence, and are reiterated so incessantly, that, I suppose, the most earnestly religious men of all Churches are, in some moods, disposed to think that there must be something in them. It is possible that those who are not

relieved of their anxieties by the decisive evidence that there has been of late years a revival of religious faith in many parts of England may find courage and hope in these remarkable proofs of
religious energy and liberality in Australia. For Australia, as I endeavoured to show in a previous chapter, has been settled by men and women who, in physical vigour, in general force of character, in fearlessness and self-reliance, were above the general average of the people of these islands. Their children and their children's children retain the robust qualities of their parents. But the churches which they have built are a proof that they have not forsaken the Christian faith.

In Victoria the average attendance at “the principal service” in 1886 was 351,061, or about 35 per cent, of the whole population and 60 per cent, of the possible attendance at that service. In New South Wales the average attendance at “the principal service” was 241,569, or about 24 per cent, of the whole population and rather more than 40 per cent, of the possible attendance. There are no returns for either colony showing the attendance at the other services; but, in estimating the number of persons who are present at some service on the Sunday, a very considerable addition must be made to these figures. No returns of attendance are given for South Australia.

In Victoria the average attendance of scholars at Sunday-schools is 141,781, and the average attendance of teachers 17,141; in New South Wales the average attendance of scholars is 103,611, and of teachers 10,759. The attendance of scholars in Victoria is 71 per cent, of the population between six and fifteen; the attendance of scholars in New South Wales is 56 per cent of the population between seven and fifteen. In South Australia the number in average attendance is not given, but there are 59,000 scholars on the rolls as compared with 44,000 on the rolls of the public schools, and there are 7000 teachers.
III.

The contention that the religious faith of Victoria is being destroyed by the secular schools receives no support from the statistics which show the church accommodation, the attendance at public worship, and the attendance at Sunday-schools in that colony; and a comparison between Victoria and New South Wales affords no argument against the secular system. Grants to denominational schools in Victoria ceased in 1873, and since then it has been no part of the duty of the State school teachers to give religious instruction. The secular schools have been at work a sufficient time to produce a very considerable effect on the population. In New South Wales grants were made to denominational schools till 1882, and a large proportion of the men and women above twenty-one must have been scholars in the schools of the Churches; since 1882 the grants have ceased, but “undenominational teaching” has been given by the State school teachers. And yet, though the population of the two colonies is about the same, the churches erected by the voluntary zeal and generosity of the people of Victoria provide for 70,000 more persons than the churches of New South Wales; the average attendance at the principal service in Victoria is more than 100,000 in excess of the average attendance in New South Wales; in the Sunday-schools there are 8000 more teachers and 40,000 more scholars. Or—to repeat

1 I am not familiar with the details of the successive educational systems which have been adopted in New South Wales. At first I believe that grants of land for school buildings and annual grants for school maintenance were made to the Churches; then two central boards were constituted, one to superintend the denominational schools, the other the public schools; then both descriptions of schools were brought under the control of one board. But, whatever
may have been the variations in the system, the schools were largely denominational till 1882.

the percentages given on a previous page—the church accommodation in Victoria is for 55 per cent, of the population, and in New South Wales for 38 per cent; the attendance at the principal service in Victoria is 35 per cent, of the population, and in New South Wales 24 per cent.; in Victoria the number of the Sunday scholars is equal to 71 per cent, of the children between six and fifteen, and in New South Wales it is equal to only 56 per cent of the children between seven and fifteen.

When I first learnt these facts, it was my impression that the contrast between the two colonies was to be wholly accounted for by the fact that New South Wales has an area of over 300,000 square miles, with a population of only a million, while Victoria, with the same population, has an area of less than 90,000 square miles. In a country which is very sparsely populated the people are not likely to build churches; and if churches are built, church attendance will be irregular. Some allowance must be made in favour of New South Wales on this ground. But, even in Victoria, people living on farms and stations are very widely scattered; and, while there are about 9000 more persons engaged in “pastoral pursuits and about animals” in New South Wales than in Victoria, there are about 20,000 more persons engaged in “agricultural pursuits and on the land” in Victoria than in New South Wales;1 and the proportion of the population living in cities, towns, and villages in each colony appears to be about the same. I also thought it possible that the percentage of the native-born population might be smaller in New South Wales than in Victoria, and that this might be alleged as a reason why the religious schools
had not been more successful in training the people to religious habits: but I discovered that the percentage of the native-born is slightly larger in New South Wales, though the advantage is about balanced by a larger percentage of Chinese, Germans, and other foreigners.

I am not so irrational and fanatical a partisan as to maintain that the larger religious accommodation, the larger attendance on religious worship, and the larger number of Sunday scholars in Victoria are to be attributed to the system of secular schools which that colony adopted in 1873; but in the presence of the facts which I have recited it is perfectly fair to say that those who are attacking the secular system on the ground that it is destroying the religious faith of the people of Victoria have no case. It is also fair to say that the experience of New South Wales offers no encourage-

1 These figures are taken from the “Victoria Year-Book for 1886–7,” p. 62.

ment to those persons, either in the colonies or in England, who confidently believe that religious teaching in day-schools will train a religious people.

About the causes of the comparative deficiency of church accommodation in New South Wales it is not easy for a visitor to speak with any confidence. Something, perhaps, may be due to the fact that a very considerable number of persons had left England and settled in that colony before the great period of church building in this country had set in; while the immense development of Victoria had only just begun when the disclosures of the inadequate religious accommodation in the large towns contained in the “Report on the Religious Census (England and Wales) of 1851” created something like a religious panic, and suddenly invested the duty of providing adequate
religious accommodation for the whole community with new and more urgent obligations. The passion for church building, which the Report had created at home, revealed its power in the young colony; large numbers of the settlers carried with them the sacred fire.

There is another fact to which it is not unnatural that I should attach importance in this inquiry. New South Wales, when a Crown colony, had an Established Church with its salaried clergy, and the people were trained to rely on the Govern-

ment for the provision and maintenance of the institutions of religious worship. At some time during the governorship of Sir Richard Bourke (1831–1837), State aid was granted to Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, and Wesleyan Methodists, as well as to the Church of England. This system of concurrent endowment continued till 1862, when an Act was passed which limited future annual payments to the clergy who were at that time actually receiving grants. In 1863 the Church of England received £17,967; the Roman Catholic Church, £8748; the Presbyterians, £2873; the Wesleyan Methodists, £2784—total, £32,372. In 1886 the total amount of the grants had sunk to £10,743.

Victoria never had an Established Church; and the system of concurrent endowment created by the original Constitution, which provided that £50,000 should be set apart every year from the public revenue for the erection of churches and the maintenance of ministers, was abolished in 1875.1

But something is to be attributed to the difference between the educational systems of the two colonies. This is not the place to argue the ques-

1 The grant was to be for “the advancement of the Christian religion,” and was to be distributed among the denominations according to their numbers at the preceding census.
tion; but I have a serious conviction that, on the whole, religious teaching given in ordinary day-schools lessens instead of increasing the influence of religious truth on the life of a community, and that secular schools make the work of the Churches easier. If I were an enemy of the Christian faith, and an unscrupulous enemy, I should endeavour to persuade every growing colony to establish and to endow Anglicanism, Presbyterianism, Methodism—any one of them would answer my purpose; and I should also recommend the adoption of an educational system which provided that grants should be given to denominational schools, and that teachers in State schools should be required to teach religion.

IV.

The relative strength of the religious denominations varies in the different colonies. According to the religious census, the Church of England has the largest number of adherents in each of the colonies that I visited: in New South Wales nearly a half of the population—456,000 out of a million; in Victoria a third—356,000 out of a million; in South Australia nearly a fourth—76,000 out of 312,000.¹ It would be a serious error, however, to suppose that these figures really represent the number of persons who are in any real sense adherents of the English Church. There are large numbers of devout and zealous Churchmen in Australia, but when an Australian declares in the census paper that he belongs to the Church of England, it may mean just as little as when a prisoner committed to an English gaol makes the

¹ The last religious census was taken in 1881; the figures
same declaration. To hold the Church of England at home responsible for all the criminals that describe themselves as Churchmen would be grossly unjust; to hold the Church of England in the colonies responsible for all the irreligious people that claim the same description would be equally unjust. The description denotes national origin rather than religious conviction or preference. As long as the national religious establishment continues to exist in England, most Englishmen that care nothing about religion will call themselves members of the Church of England. In New South Wales, though the Church of England has 455,898 “adherents” on the census papers, she

provided in the text are those for 1886, according to the estimates of the official statisticians of the several colonies; the increase of the population since 1881 is distributed among the different sects according to their relative numbers in that year. Returns of accommodation and attendance are collected annually by the several Governments; the returns in the text are for 1886.

provides church accommodation for only 106,935, and the average attendance at her principal service is only 60,796. In Victoria, with 356,420 adherents on the census papers, she provides accommodation for 103,185, and has an average attendance of nearly 58,862; her adherents are fewer by 100,000, but the persons present at her worship are fewer by only 2000. In Adelaide, with 76,000 adherents, the Church of England provides accommodation for 47,495. There are no returns of attendance.

To whatever extent the effective strength of a Church is to be measured by the number of persons attending its services, Roman Catholicism is the strongest of the denominations in both New South Wales and Victoria. In both colonies the Roman Catholic adherents are less numerous according to the census than the adherents of the Church of
England, but the Roman Catholic attendance in New South Wales is 72,505, as against the Church of England attendance of 60,796; and in Victoria the Roman Catholic attendance rises to 85,816, while the Church of England attendance sinks to 58,862. In Australia, as in Canada and in America, the Roman Catholics constitute a very distinct element in the community: the immense majority of them are Irish, and they are therefore bound together by ties of race as well as of religion.

They can command a large number of votes, and when they act together, as they generally do, their political power is formidable. It is natural that they should be regarded with strong antagonism by politicians outside their own ranks. “Before I came to this colony,” said a conspicuous public man with whom I was discussing Australian politics, “I was a very keen Liberal on all religious questions; I hated the Orange Lodges; but I declare that since I have been here I have been a great deal shaken.” The substance of the complaint against the Catholics is that they care very little for the general interests of the community, and use all their political power to promote the interests of their schools, their Church, and their fellow-religionists. This is what is said by their political opponents; I had not the advantage of hearing their reply.

In New South Wales the description, “Presbyterian,” when it appears in a census paper, can often mean little more than that a man or his parents came from Scotland or the North of Ireland; according to the census there are 96,790 Presbyterians, but the Presbyterian churches provide accommodation for only 48,523, and the attendance at “the principal service” is only 19,970. In Victoria, Presbyterianism has great strength: there are 151,712 Presbyterians according
to the census; there is accommodation for 143,834; and the attendance is 77,297.

In each of the three colonies Methodism, in all its various divisions, has shown magnificent vigour. In Victoria, where, according to the census, they stand in the fourth place when ranked by the number of their adherents, they stand first, and far above all the rival Churches, when ranked by church accommodation, and they stand third when ranked by attendance. In the census returns they number 124,060; they provide church accommodation for 160,850; and their attendance numbers 75,673. In South Australia their energy in providing church accommodation is equally remarkable: the census gives them 63,583 adherents, and they provide accommodation for 88,888. In New South Wales they have shown less enterprise, but, perhaps, more prudence. With 85,968 adherents they provide accommodation for 78,459, and they return an attendance of 44,873. It is very apparent that there is something in the organization, the

---

1 Some of the official returns include the Bible Christians under the general head of “Wesleyans and other Methodists,” and the inclusion is perfectly accurate. By origin, ecclesiastical polity, doctrine, and characteristic spirit, they are Methodists. For the sake of uniformity, therefore, I have included them in all the Methodist figures given in the text. They are very powerful in some parts of Australia.

---

... creed, and the characteristic spirit of Methodism that makes it a great religious force in a British colony.

The Congregationalists and the Baptist Churches have drawn to themselves only an inconsiderable number of the population. They are most numerous in Victoria, where the Baptists number 23,314, and the Congregationalists 22,727: the Baptists provide church accommodation for 13,850, and have an attendance of 8672; the Congre-
gionalists provide for 17,400, and have an attendance of 9000. In New South Wales the Congregationalists have 19,138 census adherents; their church buildings accommodate 16,385; their average attendance is 8865. The Baptists, in the same colony, number 9819 adherents, provide for 7796, and return an attendance of 4095. In South Australia, though their actual numbers are less than in Victoria, their strength, when compared with the whole population, is much greater. The Baptists have 14,000 adherents, and provide church accommodation for 13,812; the Congregationalists have 9000 adherents, and provide church accommodation for 11,365.

1 It may be necessary to repeat that the returns show the number of persons present at the “principal service” on Sunday; a much larger number of persons are present in the course of the day.

The Church with which a man connects himself in the colonies is, in most cases, if he has the choice, the Church with which he was connected at home. The Presbyterian in Scotland or the North of Ireland is a Presbyterian in Victoria: he may bear for a time with the Wesleyan minister and the Wesleyan hymn-book if there is only a Wesleyan church within reach; and, under stress of necessity, he may bear with the surplice, the Liturgy, and “Hymns Ancient and Modern;” but to see a Genevan gown again and to hear the Scotch Psalms would be almost as good as to tread once more the purple heather of the old country and to breathe the free air of the hills; and as soon as half a dozen Scotchmen settle within reach of each other they build a Presbyterian church. It is the same with the members of other religious denominations; and nothing could be more natural. But it leads to very serious evils. A population hardly large enough
to form one good congregation is divided between a Presbyterian Church, a Congregational Church, and a Wesleyan Methodist Church; and it sometimes happens that there are even two kinds of Methodists. In one district there may be more church accommodation than is likely to be needed for twenty years to come, while other parts of the colony, where the population is more sparse, are left with no church accommodation at all.

The statistics showing the religious accommodation and the attendance on religious worship in Victoria have a special interest on account of its recent history. Ten or twelve years ago—before the secular schools could have done anything to change the religious temper of its people—many devout and observant persons feared that the Christian faith was exposed in that colony to very grave peril. The famous treatise on “Supernatural Religion,” by an anonymous author, produced an immense impression. Five hundred copies were ordered in Melbourne in 1874. In 1875 a Melbourne firm, with the permission of the author, issued a special edition, unabridged, to meet the colonial demand. This edition had a considerable sale, and it was proposed to issue a second; whether this actually appeared, I have not been able to learn. That a serious assault on the genuineness and authenticity of the Christian records and the supernatural origin of the Christian Gospel, a laborious treatise in two octavo volumes of 400 or 500 pages each, should have sold so largely in so limited a population is a

1 Nor do I know whether the third volume, which was issued later, was reprinted at Melbourne.
striking proof of the extent to which the public mind was agitated by the controversy. Some of the Evangelical Churches were reached and shaken by the rising flood of unbelief. I asked a distinguished minister of one of these churches some questions about the drift of theological opinion in the colony, and he said: “Ten years ago we were all Rationalists.” This, of course, was the kind of exaggeration which a man allows himself when he wants to state a fact strongly and knows that he will not be taken too literally; but it indicated that those who are loyal to the Evangelical faith must have passed through a very anxious time. When I was in Victoria at the close of 1887—after the secular system had been in existence for fourteen years—the dark waters which for a time threatened to submerge the faith of its people had sunk. But even then I could see traces of past troubles. I noticed that whenever, in a speech or a sermon, I approached a question of apologetics, or adventured into the tropical region of dogmatic controversy, the attention of the audience became keener; sometimes there were indications of suppressed excitement.

My experience in South Australia and in New South Wales was very different. The people were not uninterested in speculative controversies, but they were most deeply moved by expositions and arguments which dealt with those supreme truths of the Christian revelation which have a place in all the Creeds, and by appeals to those central elements of the ethical and spiritual life which are common to the devout of all Churches, and which, through all vicissitudes of human speculation, remain unchanged. And in New South Wales I found such a deep and vigorous religious life—
such earnestness, generosity, and zeal, that, though a very large number of the people have been lost to the Churches, I cannot but believe that before very long they will be recovered, and that the necessary religious accommodation will be supplied.

V.

On my voyage out I heard many stories of the crimes which were committed a few years ago by the bushrangers. One of my fellow-passengers was a lawyer—a quiet, gentle, courteous man, with charming manners—who, during the first half of his professional life, had saved many of these desperate men from the gallows. At last the Government thought that it might be as well to employ him on the other side; and then he was just as successful in hanging them. Another fellow-passenger had been for many years a superintendent in the mounted police of New South Wales, and since retiring from the force had been governor of a gaol in Sydney. Their wild and tragic stories were inexhaustible. Large districts of country were sometimes terrorized for months together by organized gangs of daring, reckless men, who defied all the attempts of the Government to arrest them. As the country has become more settled these bolder crimes have become less frequent. And, for a large proportion of the crimes which are still committed, the colonies and colonial institutions can hardly be held responsible. In Victoria, of 32,011 persons arrested in 1886, only 9598 were native born; and only 1877 were born in any of the other Australian colonies—a total of 11,475, very little more than a third of the total arrests. It is humiliating to discover that 7410 of the persons arrested were born in England or Wales, 2855 in Scotland, and 8005 in Ireland.
Of the whole number of arrests 31,255 were for light offences, and were disposed of summarily by the magistrates—11,053 were discharged and 20,202 sentenced. Of the 756 persons committed for trial on graver charges, 259 were Victorians, 70 were natives of other Australasian colonies, 239 were born in England or Wales, 47 in Scotland, 65 in Ireland.

1 Note F.
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In New South Wales, as in Victoria, only about a third of the total number of persons arrested in 1886 were born in any of the Australasian colonies. The number arrested was 48,854 persons; of these, 13,748 were born in New South Wales, and 2550 in other Australasian colonies—a total of 16,248 persons of Australasian birth. Of the rest, 11,343 were born in England or Wales; 3777 in Scotland; and 13,439 in Ireland. The number committed for trial was 1594; Mr. Coghlan’s Year-Book does not give their nationalities.

South Australia seems to suffer still more severely from criminals not born in any of the colonies. Out of the total number of 222 prisoners in the Yatala Labour Prison in 1885, only 64 were born in any of the Australasian colonies; 82 were born in England or Wales, 11 in Scotland, 27 in Ireland. These figures show the nationalities of persons convicted; the nationalities of persons arrested is not given in the Statistical Register of the colony.

It was necessary to give these figures in detail. In the United Kingdom—taking the average of the ten years from 1876 to 1885—only 4.5 persons in every 10,000 were annually convicted of serious crimes: in the Australasian colonies the average annual convictions for the same ten years were 7.6

1 Note G. 2 Note H.
persons in 10,000. But the majority of Australasian criminals were born in these islands: some of them—perhaps many of them—may have gone out to the colonies when they were children; but many of them certainly went out when they had grown to manhood and womanhood; they were ruined in character before they landed; and England, Scotland, or Ireland has more responsibility for their crimes than Australia. And if an Englishman, who has spent a few months in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland, comes home and talks about the drunken rows that he has seen or heard of in the lower parts of Sydney, Melbourne, and Brisbane, his stories should not be regarded as proofs of the disorderliness of the Australian people; the chances are that the men who were guilty of the disorder were not born under the Southern Cross but under the Great Bear; and very possibly they had not been long in the colony. A sea voyage of six weeks will not change a bullying Englishman or a riotous Irishman into a sober and law-abiding citizen.

About the extent to which drunkenness is prevalent it is not easy to form a very confident judgment. For some time after I landed I had the

1 The proportion of the native-born in the United Kingdom is 996 persons out of every 1000.

impression that as beer is the national drink of England, whisky of Scotland, and wine of France, tea was the national drink of Australia. Tea made its appearance at the most unexpected times—at lunch and dinner as well as at breakfast. In the stories which people told me about their travels through the bush, the “billy” in which they boiled their water for tea had a conspicuous place. And the Government returns show that the con-
sumption of tea per head in the Australian colonies is much larger than in England. But the number of persons annually fined for drunkenness in the colonies is much higher than in England. In England the proportion for 1881–4 is said to have been 7.1 in every thousand; and it had sunk in 1885 to 6.7 in the thousand. In Victoria—which claims to be the soberest of the colonies, though the claim is contested by New South Wales—the average proportion of persons summarily convicted for this offence during the ten years to 1885–6 was 8.6 in the thousand. The arrests for drunkenness in 1885, according to Mr. Coghlan, were 27 in the thousand in New South Wales as against only 11.6 in the thousand in Victoria. But too much importance must not be attached to these figures. It is probable that the administration of the law differs in different colonies as it differs in different English municipalities. In one town a policeman will put a drunken man into a cab and send him home, and in another will take him straight to the lock-up. Where the temperance party are strong they may insist that the law shall be rigidly administered, and there will be a large number of arrests; where they are weak the administration of the law may be more lax, and the arrests will be comparatively few. Nor is the quantity of alcoholic liquor consumed per head a safe indication of the amount of drunkenness in a community; liquors of the same alcoholic strength differ greatly in their intoxicating power. And the Australian authorities do not seem to have succeeded in finding a satisfactory common equivalent for the different kinds of alcoholic drinks. Mr. Hayter calculates that while in the United Kingdom the average annual consumption per head is equivalent to 37.11 gallons of beer, the average annual consumption in New South Wales
is equivalent to 35.60 gallons per head, and in Victoria to only 32.88 gallons. Mr. Coghlan reverses the positions of the two rival colonies, and credits the people of Victoria with drinking on the average what is equivalent to 3.80 gallons of alcohol (proof), while the people of New South Wales drink only 3.23 gallons. The two statisticians differ even as to the average annual consumption per head of beer, wine, and spirits in the two colonies. From what I heard I came to the conclusion that in proportion to the population the number of total abstainers is larger in Australia than in England; that, if people drink at all, it is rather more difficult to drink moderately in the Australian climate than in ours; that the labourers living in towns are in the habit of drinking freely; that a large number of men living up country usually drink tea, but that when they come into the towns many of them drink very heavily.

Illegitimacy is less common than in England and Wales, and much less common than in Scotland, but more common than in Ireland. The annual average proportion of illegitimate births to the whole number of children born in England and Wales from 1871 to 1885 was 5 in every 100; in Scotland, 8.5; in Ireland, 2.4. In Victoria, the annual average from 1872 to 1885 was 4.14; in New South Wales, 4.27. The returns for the other colonies do not extend over quite so many years: Queensland reports an annual average of 3.67; Tasmania of 4.30; New Zealand of 2.38. There appears to be a considerable amount of prostitution in the great cities, but I doubt whether the returns are trustworthy.

In all the colonies which I visited I found a great uneasiness about what is called “Larrickinism.” The origin of the word explains its meaning. An
Irish policeman had brought three or four young men before a magistrate in Melbourne or Sydney, for rowdy conduct in the streets—the kind of conduct of which gangs of young roughs were guilty on Sunday nights a few years ago in Upper Street, Islington, to the annoyance, and even to the terror, of quiet people. The policeman could not make the magistrate understand the nature of the offence with which his prisoners were charged; but at last, in reply to the question, “But what were they doing?” he said, “Well, Sir, they were just a lar-r-r-king, Sir.” The word took the popular ear; it defined a kind of offence to which the law had not given an exact or intelligible name. The anxiety which some of my friends expressed about Larrickinism seemed to me excessive; but I can imagine that in such a climate boys of sixteen or seventeen who have the physical vigour of the young Australians, and who eat meat three times a day, may be a little wild, reckless, and insubordinate. Perhaps one of the most promising schemes for taming and civilizing them is the movement for establishing a Cadet Corps in connection with every public school, with the hope that the boys will remain in it till they are eighteen, when they may enter the Volunteers. Regular military discipline will form them to more orderly manners.¹

¹ Note I.

It is no part of my purpose to attempt any elaborate criticism of the comparative amount of crime and immorality in the different colonies; but the figures which I have quoted for New South Wales and Victoria are, at first sight, so perplexing, that it is hardly possible to pass them by without some brief observations.
The people of the two colonies have, in the main, the same origin; their economical condition is not very dissimilar; their numbers are about the same; there are no very wide religious differences between them; and yet the arrests for various kinds of offences are 50 per cent more numerous in New South Wales than in Victoria, and, what is more serious, the committals and convictions for grave offences have, for a series of years, been 100 per cent more numerous. To the higher percentage of arrests for drunkenness, as I have already indicated, I attach very little importance; and the difference in the percentage of illegitimate births, though in favour of Victoria, is too slight to have any serious meaning. But the difference in the amount of crime is very real and very startling.

The statistics which have been already quoted show that in both colonies the majority of the persons arrested are persons of English, Welsh, or Irish birth; and it is probable that in New South Wales, as in Victoria and South Australia, the majority of persons committed and convicted for serious offences are also of English, Welsh, or Irish birth. If Victoria had a larger native-born population than New South Wales, this would account—as far as it went—for the smaller amount of crime in that colony; but the census of 1881 showed that the percentage of the population born in the colony was rather higher in New South Wales than in Victoria.

It appeared, however, at the same census, that, although in 1881 the population of Victoria was slightly larger than that of New South Wales, Victoria had 18,000 fewer males of what has been called the “soldier’s age”—that is, between twenty and forty years of age. Relatively to the total population, Victoria had fewer males of that age.
than any other of the Australasian colonies. This is a fact of great importance in relation to the present inquiry. For the "soldier's age" might also be called the "criminal's age." Of the total number of persons arrested in Victoria in 1885 rather more than half were between twenty and forty. There were 2383 arrests of persons between fifteen and

1 Mr. Coghlan's "Wealth and Progress of New South Wales, 1886–7," does not give the birthplaces of convicted criminals; nor are they given in the "Handbook to the Statistical Register" for that colony.

254 twenty; between twenty and thirty, there were 9836; between thirty and forty, there were 6392; during the next two decennial periods the numbers dropped to 5754 and 4024; and beyond sixty to 2571. Men are drawn to New South Wales by the prosperity of the industries in that colony. When they can get no work in Melbourne or Adelaide they go to Sydney. But the workmen who are turned off as soon as trade becomes slack are those who have not been employed very long, and they are of a kind that their employers do not much care to keep. Such men—the nomads of industrial communities—not very sober, not very industrious, not very skilful, not very honest—are always more numerous in New South Wales than in Victoria, and they are likely to furnish a heavy contingent to the disorderly and criminal classes.

The prosperity of New South Wales contributes in another way to the increase of its disorder and crime. The tonnage of the vessels entered and cleared at Sydney, Newcastle, and the other ports of the colony in 1886 was 4,258,604, as against 3,735,387 in the ports of Victoria. The real difference between the two colonies in this respect is not shown by these figures. Several lines of steamers call at Melbourne whose terminal port is
Sydney. They and their crews are at Melbourne for only a few days at most; they discharge the greater part of their cargo at Sydney, and may remain there for two or three weeks. But their tonnage appears in the Melbourne as well as in the Sydney returns. New South Wales has always the larger number of seafaring men on shore, and seafaring men are apt, on very slight provocation, to disturb the public peace.

In both colonies a very large proportion of the less serious offences are committed by Roman Catholics. These, for the most part, were either born in Ireland or are of Irish origin, and the fervent climate of Australia has not diminished the natural excitability of their race. New South Wales has a much larger number of Roman Catholics than Victoria, and according to the returns they are much more disorderly. In Victoria the Roman Catholics form 23 per cent, of the whole population; in New South Wales 27 per cent. In Victoria 42.6 per cent, of the persons arrested in 1885 described themselves as Roman Catholics; in New South Wales 46 per cent. In Victoria, out of every thousand Roman Catholics in the colony, 58.6 were arrested; in New South Wales, 81 out of every thousand. And while in Victoria the number of persons born in Ireland that were charged with grave offences and committed for trial was inconsiderable—65 out of a total of 756 committals, or just over 8.5 per cent

—the number of Roman Catholics committed for trial—234, or 30.9 per cent of the total committals—was large in proportion to the Roman Catholic population. I do not happen to have within reach any returns showing the religious profession of
the persons committed for trial in New South Wales.

The excess of disorder and crime in New South Wales may be due in part to another cause. The nominal “adherents of the Church of England” number nearly half of the population—455,898 out of a million; but I have already had occasion to say that this description, in an immense number of cases, means nothing more than that they were born in England or are of English descent. A very large proportion of them are indifferent to the institutions of religious worship. In New South Wales, to a much greater extent than in Victoria, the Church of England has lost its hold—if it ever had a hold—on tens of thousands of persons who profess to belong to it. They are released from the moral restraints which are imposed by attendance on religious worship.

These considerations may explain the startling excess of crime in New South Wales. The religious earnestness of the people who are really associated with the Churches is as deep and as serious in New South Wales as in Victoria; the morals of the great body of the community are as high. But in New South Wales one great Church has been forsaken by a larger number of persons who are its nominal adherents; and in the general population there is a larger proportion of persons of unsettled and nomadic habits, and of persons belonging to a race with an excitable temperament which easily breaks out into violence.

VI.

There is nothing in the crime, or the drunkenness, or the occasional disorder of certain classes of the population in any of the Australasian colonies to occasion anxiety. The crime, the drunkenness, and
the disorder will diminish as the habits of a comparatively small number of the people become more settled, and as the proportion of the native born to the whole population increases. It would also greatly contribute to the general good order and to the richer development of the national life if children of Irish parentage, instead of being kept apart from the other children of the colonies, went to the same public schools. The vivacity of the Irish nature would be somewhat subdued by free and early association with children of English blood, and with English habits of obedience and of subordination to authority; and the English temperament would at the same time be touched with a new fire and catch a new grace.

There are, however, some aspects of life in the Australian colonies which I should imagine must occasion solicitude to those who desire to see the Australian people penetrated with Christian faith and illustrating a noble form of Christian morality. The Australian Churches are not confronted by some of the tasks which try the faith and the courage of the Churches at home; but they have tasks of their own which, perhaps, are not less difficult.

The economical conditions of Australia create almost irresistible temptations to reckless speculation—speculation which, if described by its right name, must be called gambling. Many of the transactions connected with a great “land boom” are as immoral as the transactions at the tables of Monte Carlo. The discovery of a new silver mine creates a feverish passion as fatal to the moral health of the community as the announcement of a new Italian lottery. There is, no doubt, speculation in England as reckless and as immoral as in Australia. Here, as well as there, innocent and well-meaning people share the guilt, and often without any suspicion of what they are doing.
Country clergymen and devout widows, who are shocked when they see three or four commercial travellers playing Nap in a railway carriage for coppers, are bribed by a promise of 10 or 15 per cent to risk half their capital in all kinds of insane adventures. Not for worlds would they put even a franc on the “rouge” or the “noir,” but they virtually hand their gold, with the hope of sharing the plunder, to the men who are sitting at the tables. Betting on horses, on pigeons, on dogs is the ruinous vice of other classes of our population. But here, among the great body of decent and respectable people, there is a strong sentiment against making money in any other way than by hard work, by careful economy, and by investments which can hardly be described as speculative. In Australia the immense fortunes which have been suddenly made by speculations of a perfectly legitimate character have created, as it seemed to me, a far more general eagerness to find a short cut to wealth. And “the short cut” will, in a very great many instances, be “the broad way” which, in more senses than one, “leadeth to destruction.” I doubt whether the clearest ethical teaching or the strongest appeals to prudential motives will always keep men right. The line which separates investment from speculation is not, perhaps, very difficult to determine; but the line which separates legitimate from illegitimate speculation cannot be laid down very firmly or very distinctly even by the casuist at his desk; and men who are in the hot pursuit of wealth are not likely to know when they have crossed it: like the line of the horizon, it retreats as they approach it. They always think that they may safely and honestly go a little farther.
When the fever is in the blood, ethical laws lose their rigidity and prudence is regarded as cowardice and pusillanimity. What is wanted is a religious faith of exceptional vigour—a religious faith which will lead men to take the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount seriously, and give them the courage to attempt to translate it into conduct.

Such a faith—a faith far more robust than that which may enable large numbers of excellent people in this country to live a very decorous Christian life—is necessary if the Australian people, with their material prosperity, their splendid physical vigour, and their buoyant spirits, are to retain a deep and effective consciousness of the transcendent greatness of the invisible and eternal order, and are to be governed by the will of the living God.

A religion of sentiment will have no authority over their masculine nature; the Australian mind is impatient of vagueness: to borrow a word from the French, since we have no English word that defines the quality, it is *positif*. If the Churches are to be strong they must hold and teach a creed which is clear and definite; they must recognize the rights of the intellect in religion. And among the Australians a religion will be powerless which surrenders the control of large provinces of the practical life to other and inferior forces. To retain its hold on them, I believe that religious faith must insist on a somewhat austere moral ideal, an ideal not technical and artificial, but exacting. I doubt whether they will in the long run think it worth while to call themselves Christians unless it becomes apparent to them that Christ makes large demands on service and sacrifice. I remember reading, many years ago, the diary of a devout man, whose conscience was greatly distressed because he had eaten two pieces
of dry toast on the morning of a fast-day instead of one; and he recorded the offence with expressions of contrition and humiliation. Religious ethics of that kind are alien from the temper and character of the Australian people. But they will listen if the Churches teach them how they can serve God—not themselves merely—as miners, farmers, squatters, boundary-riders, manufacturers, tradesmen, merchants, and politicians.

As “politicians”—the word reminds me that I found some of my friends uneasy on account of what they describe as the secular character of the Australian State. They would strongly resist any attempt to establish or endow a Church; but they have a vague craving for what they describe as a formal and public recognition by the State of the authority of God. But such a “formal and public” recognition would leave the State just as secular as it is now. The nations of Christendom publicly and formally acknowledge the authority of Christ; but the ceremonial homage does not carry with it any real submission to His will in legislation or policy. The English House of Commons opens every sitting with prayer, but before business begins the Chaplain and the Prayer-Book are respectfully bowed out: the “bowing out” is the most significant part of the ceremony.

What serious Christian men ought to desire is the practical recognition of the spirit and laws of Christian ethics in the actual business of the State: this is what makes a State Christian. I was told that fewer men enter political life from religious motives in Australia than in England. It is, of course, impossible for me to judge whether the statement is accurate. But it was made to me by a sagacious man, who knows a great deal about the public life both of Australia and of England, and whose judgment on a question of this kind
is not likely to be ungenerous. The comparison between the two countries, whether it can be sustained or not, suggests, as I venture to think.

the true line which should be taken by those of my friends who are unhappy because the Australian State is secular. States cease to be secular when the people and their rulers seriously believe that the State is a divine institution—as divine as the Church, though belonging to a wholly different order and instituted for wholly different ends. My Australian friends—if I may presume to say it—should endeavour with new energy and earnestness to induce Christian men to become politicians "from religious motives." And by that I do not mean that men should go into politics with the hope of being able now and then to do their Church a good turn, or to introduce religious teaching into State schools, or to secure, on public and formal occasions, a public and formal religious service. Political life remains secular while men think that such exceptional political acts as these are necessary to consecrate it. There is a divine ideal of the State of which a Christian statesman will dream, and which he will long to realize. There is a doing of God’s will on earth—in the natural order—as well as a doing of God’s will in heaven; and it is in the earthly region that politicians are to get the will of God done.

But I have drifted into exhortations which lie outside the true purpose of these chapters. When I was in Australia I felt that to offer advice to

the Australian people about either their ecclesiastical or their political business would be presumptuous. A mere visitor cannot have the knowledge which is necessary to make his advice of any value; and I therefore resolutely limited
all my speeches and sermons to the discussion of those eternal truths and laws which, like the stars, have no parallax, and which are the same for men of all lands. If in recording my “Impressions” I have occasionally violated my self-imposed rule, it has been rather with the hope of serving Englishmen at home than with the intention of preaching from a safe platform, twelve thousand miles away, to Englishmen in Australia.

I close, as I began, with expressing my grateful sense—to which, however, no words can give adequate expression—of the boundless kindness shown to me and mine by my Australian friends while we had the happiness of being their guests.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

The figures in the text are taken from the “Victorian Year Book for 1885–86,” by Henry Heylyn Hayter. I take this opportunity to express—if it is not impertinent—my admiration of the manner in which the statistics of Victoria, and the comparative statistics of the whole of the Australasian Colonies, are presented in this volume. Mr. Hayter does not merely present elaborate tables relating to (1) Population, (2) Finance, (3) Vital Statistics, (4) Interchange, (5) Production, (6) Law, Crime, etc., (7) Accumulation, (8) Defences, (9) Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Progress: he discusses his figures with the skill of a scientific statistician and with a clearness and directness of style that make his book as attractive as it is instructive. The statistics are very minute, and throw a most interesting light on a very large number of curious aspects of colonial life. Mr. Coghlan, the Statistician to the Government of New South Wales, has recently published a volume, entitled “The Wealth and Progress of New South Wales, 1886–87.” This, too, is admirably done. It contains an historical sketch, beginning with the early discoverers, and bringing down the story of
the colony to our own times. It also contains a most ex-
cellent account of the physical configuration of New South
Wales, its climate, geology, mines and minerals, vegetation,
and fauna; and discussions and tables similar to those con-
tained in Mr. Hayter’s “Year Book,” illustrating the present
statistics of the colony. It derives a special value from the
fact that under each heading there is an historical survey
of the subject to which it relates—a sketch, for example,
of the beginnings and the progress of pastoral enterprise.

Both these volumes are issued by the Governments of the
respective colonies. Each of the colonies I visited pub-
lishes an annual volume, exhibiting the whole of its statistics
for the preceding year, and comparative tables for the other
colonies; and the statistics—especially those of New South
Wales (“Statistical Register” and “Hand-book of New
South Wales Sutistics”)—are of great interest and value.
But the only official “Year Book,” containing an apprecia-
tion and discussion of the figures, which I happen to have
seen, is that prepared by Mr. Hayter for Victoria. The
closing paragraph, however, of the preface to Mr. Coghlan’s
volume creates the hope that he, too, intends to issue an
annual “Year Book.” Would it be possible for the Imperial
Government to let us have (1) a similar “Year Book” for
Great Britain and Ireland, and (2) another, constructed on
different lines, for the Empire?

NOTE B.

The following figures show the quantities of wool imported
in some of the intervening years. The figures are from Table
32 in “The Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom,
1873–1887”:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Imports</th>
<th>From South America</th>
<th>From Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>318,036,779 lb.</td>
<td>21,099,262 lb.</td>
<td>186,664,946 lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>399,449,435 lb.</td>
<td>11,259,754 lb.</td>
<td>276,172,193 lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>495,946,779 lb.</td>
<td>7,064,219 lb.</td>
<td>351,685,606 lb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>577,924,661 lb.</td>
<td>13,288,801 lb.</td>
<td>383,506,395 lb.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Australia sent us about 58 per cent, of our whole supply in 1873; in 1887 she sent us about 60 per cent.

**NOTE C.**

Elementary education is free in Victoria, but fees are paid by parents for children who receive instruction in “extra subjects.” The following Table, taken from the Minister's Report for 1886–7, shows the various extra subjects taught, and the number of scholars receiving instruction in them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of Scholars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book-keeping</td>
<td>1753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Geo</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no fees charged)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiology</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shorthand</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is added that, “to a certain degree, some of these subjects are now taught in the ordinary course of free instruction under the revised programme.” Drawing, for example, is now taught “throughout the school, so as to give at an early age a reasonable mastery of pen and pencil.”

**NOTE D.**

In Queensland the policy of securing private contributions for schools under State management is carried out much more boldly than in any other colony. Before a primary school can be established in a new neighbourhood, one-fifth of the estimated cost of erecting the school must be raised by donations or subscriptions and “paid to the Minister.” Till this condition is complied with, the neighbourhood must be content with a “provisional school.” Local subscriptions are also necessary for supplementing the State grant for many purposes. From a table contained in the Queensland Report for 1886, it appears that there were local contributions towards providing water-tanks, closets, playsheds, gymnasiums, fencing, teachers’ residences,
kitchens, etc. The cost of painting, repairs, and improvements was also partly met from this source. And it is to be noted that in Queensland the local committees are generally, if not universally, nominated by the Governor, and their powers are as limited as those of New South Wales and Victoria. The Governor may, however, determine that in particular districts the local authority shall be elective.

NOTE E.

Mr. E. Coombes, an Australian witness who appeared before the Royal Commission on Education, gave some evidence on the extent to which religious teaching is given in State schools by voluntary teachers. He was asked by Mr. Henry Richard (Question 24,732): “As a matter of fact, is it within your knowledge that the ministers of the different denominations do avail themselves of this right to go in and teach the children of their respective denominations?” and he answered: “In many cases they do, but not so much, I think, as they should do; this is, of course, simply a matter of opinion.”

A few days after this chapter appeared in the Contemporary Review, a courteous correspondent was good enough to send me a cutting from a Sydney newspaper, containing some very interesting details respecting the visits of ministers of religion and others to the State schools of Sydney and its suburbs for the purpose of giving religious instruction. It appears that in 1883, clergymen and teachers of the Church of England paid 2292 visits, without reckoning some 70 odd visits by the Rev. M. Archdale to the Superior Boys’ School, at Balmain, of which no exact record was kept; Presbyterian clergymen paid 193 visits, besides frequent visits of the Rev. H. Macready to the Crown Street Public School, of which no record was kept; Wesleyans paid 37 visits; Congregationalists, 53 visits; and one Hebrew paid 667 visits. The total number of visits by 59 religious teachers of all denominations was 3288. The time generally given by layreaders and catechists to a lesson was from 45 minutes to an
hour. Some of the clergymen gave an hour, others 30, 20, or 10 minutes; in a few instances the time is entered as “a few minutes.” From the first of January to the first of August 1884, 2,867 visits were paid. The Department appends a note to these returns to the effect that as they were obtained chiefly from entries made in the visitors’ book in each school, the whole of the visits may not be recorded.

**NOTE F.**

The significance of the criminal statistics quoted on page 245 will be best seen if I place the estimated number of persons born in various countries, and living in Victoria in 1886, side by side with the figures in the text:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Arrested</th>
<th>for trial.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>590,629</td>
<td>9598</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australasian Colonies</td>
<td>47,208</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>159,386</td>
<td>7410</td>
<td>239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>51,909</td>
<td>2855</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>92,913</td>
<td>8005</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Hayter calls attention to the fact, that although the number of Irish arrested was so enormous, a very large proportion of them must have been arrested for light offences. “Those arrested of this nationality exceeded the English and Welsh arrested by 595, and this although natives of England and Wales in the population outnumbered the Irish by about 67,500, or over 70 per cent.:” but the English and Welsh “committed for trial were more than twice as numerous in proportion to their numbers in the population; the proportion of Scotch arrested was also much above that of the English, but that of those committed for trial was below that of any others except Victorians, the Irish and the
Chinese.” Mr. Hayter also calls attention to the fact that the small proportion of Victorians arrested and committed is to be accounted for, in part, by the large number of children in the native-born population.

NOTE G.

The following table for New South Wales corresponds to that given in the previous note for Victoria, except that the number of persons belonging to the several nationalities is given from the census of 1881; since then the proportionate number of natives of New South Wales has increased. I have no official estimate for 1886. The gross population in that year was about one-third larger than 1881.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Arrested.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>465,559</td>
<td>13,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australasian Colonies</td>
<td>44,708</td>
<td>2,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>107,574</td>
<td>11,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>25,079</td>
<td>3,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>69,192</td>
<td>13,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following figures show some of the offences for which persons of the different nationalities were arrested:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>England</th>
<th>South Australasian</th>
<th>and Scotland</th>
<th>Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Against good order, including drunkenness</td>
<td>9,842</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>9,066</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>11,744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against property without violence</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against property with violence</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against persons</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE H.

In the following table the number of persons belonging to each nationality is given from the census of 1881; since 271 then, the proportionate number of natives of South Australia has increased:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Misdemeanour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australasian colonies</td>
<td>173,073</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England and Wales</td>
<td>59,151</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>10,637</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>18,246</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE I.

Volunteer Cadet Corps have been established both in New South Wales and in Victoria. I did not happen to have the opportunity of learning much about their success in New South Wales; but I believe that when I was in Sydney some important changes were being effected in their organization. In Melbourne I was the fortunate guest of Colonel Sargood, who was Minister of Defences in 1883–4, when the whole military system of Victoria was reorganized, and who has shown great energy and zeal and liberality in promoting the Cadet movement; from him and Captain Henry, who for fifteen or sixteen years was a State school teacher, and who now holds the position of Staff Officer of the Cadet Corps, I received a great deal of interesting information.

The total strength of the force when I was in Melbourne, in October 1888, was 3529, including 3408 cadets, commanding officer and staff officers, and 119 officers. Boys ordinarily join the corps between the ages of twelve and fourteen; but boys are enrolled who are under twelve if they are exceptionally tall. Companies may be formed in any school in detachments of not less than 20. The boys can remain in the Cadet Corps after leaving school till they are old enough to join the Militia.
There are twelve battalions, each of which consists of the companies connected with the State schools and colleges—

or, as we should call them, the Public Elementary Schools and the Grammar Schools—in the district. The officers, in nearly all cases, are masters in the schools; those in command of battalions receive a commission, with the rank of captain; the other officers hold commissions as lieutenants. Some of the scholars, youths of seventeen, in the grammar schools hold lieutenants’ commissions. About 250 of the seniors are armed with the Martini-Henry cadet rifle; about 2100 of the juniors with the Francotte rifle; the rest—when I made my inquiries—had to be contented with carbines or dummy rifles. Arms and ammunition, which are kept in the schools, are supplied by the Government. The only accident which had happened was a very slight one: a boy fired a blank cartridge at another boy and singed his leg. Each corps has two weekly drills of three-quarters of an hour each; but where the officers are enthusiastic a corps is sometimes drilled for two, three, and even six hours weekly. The battalions parade monthly, but school holidays and bad weather reduce the annual number of parades to eight. The battalions are inspected by the commanding officer and a staff officer every half-year. In addition to the time which is given to drill, the boys generally spend a part of their time on Saturdays and on other school holidays in rifle shooting, under the direction of their officers. A handsome shield has been presented by Colonel Sargood for competition at the rifle targets. Every year the cadets go into camp for four or five days. The tents were being pitched for an encampment at Elsternwick the day I left Melbourne; more than 1800 officers and cadets answered to the roll call.

The direct object of the corps is to increase the number of men in the colony capable of bearing arms, and so to provide for any sudden call requiring the raising of a large military force. Captain Henry told me that the Cadet Corps is a splendid training ground for military life; that young men who have been in a Cadet Corps do not fear to join the
Militia, on account of the recruit drill—they know their work; that in the country districts the Mounted Rifles in the future will be strongly recruited from the cadets, who will have little to learn to become efficient members. He pointed out that if every school had its corps, the system would turn out 2000 youths annually, fit to enter the ranks, familiar with arms, many of them good shots, and with the greater part of their drill already mastered.

I was interested in the relations of the Corps to the defence of the colony, but still more interested in its moral effects on the community. There is, I believe, a very general testimony on the part of the teachers that a cadet company greatly aids the ordinary discipline of the school; and I was assured that since the corps were established, there has been a marked improvement in the behaviour of the youth of the colony. If the Corps came to include the whole of the boys in Victoria, “Larrickinism,” to use the emphatic words of Captain Henry, “would receive its death-blow.”

The trouble is that the Government are not sufficiently generous. The parents of boys who outgrow their clothes within twelve months, hesitate to spend 27s. 6d. on their uniform; and the teachers who hold commissions are subjected to heavy expenses, which they think—and, as far as I can judge, rightly think—ought to be borne by the State. One suggestion has been made which seems reasonable: no grant should be paid for military drill to a State school that has not a cadet detachment.

If I had known anything of this movement before the Royal Commission on Education had ceased to receive evidence, I should have asked my colleagues to call one or two witnesses who were familiar with it. It has long been my conviction that unless there is a great expansion of our Volunteer Forces, and unless the defects which are alleged by military critics to exist in their organization are remedied, we shall be compelled sooner or later to resort to conscrip-
tion. Cadet Corps might add immensely to the popularity, and perhaps to the efficiency, of the Volunteer movement. But it is on the educational advantages which would arise from their establishment that I have a better right to speak. One of the most serious questions considered by the Commission was the harm which comes to boys during the three or four years after they leave the public elementary schools; and the Commission recommended the establishment of evening continuation schools. I believe that the creation of cadet companies in connection with these schools, with a week in camp every year, would add immensely to their attractiveness, and that the habits of discipline which the drill would encourage would be of great value. Nor should the physical improvement which the boys would receive from drill be overlooked.

There are already, in this country, a few Cadet Corps, consisting of boys over twelve, belonging to some of our great public schools, and attached to ordinary Volunteer regiments; but what is needed is the encouragement of the “Cadet Battalions,” which may be formed under independent command, and the present regulations for battalions should be modified. At present a boy cannot belong to a battalion till he is fourteen; it is difficult to understand why the age for a battalion should be higher than for a corps. The battalions are furnished with “unserviceable arms,” and these are not to be fired: these conditions almost destroy the charm and attraction of the force. The officers receive only “honorary appointments;” they ought to receive substantive commissions. And the encouragement given by the War Office is extremely grudging and inadequate.

At present, I believe that there are only two battalions in this country; one in Birmingham, with a strength of 300, and one in Manchester, with a strength of 600.
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