

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 27 AUGUST 1879**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Wednesday, 27 August, 1879.*

Personal Explanation.—Construction of Railways.—  
Victoria Bridge Lands Sale Bill.—Supply—Loan  
Estimates.—Supply—resumption of committee.

The SPEAKER took the chair at half-past  
3 o'clock.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The Hon. S. W. GRIFFITH said that before the House proceeded to business he wished to say a few words. After what had taken place yesterday in the House, he had thought it his duty to take the course which he had then indicated, and to give hon. members on his side of the House an opportunity of electing another leader, if they desired it. He did so, and the members of the party had met that afternoon—he, himself, not being present—and he had since received an assurance of their continued confidence, and of their desire that he should still occupy the position of leader of the Opposition. He had therefore only to say, now, that he continued to occupy that position.

HON. MEMBERS on both sides: Hear, hear.

CONSTRUCTION OF RAILWAYS.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Mr. Macrossan moved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider of the desirableness of introducing a Bill to make further provision for construction of Railways, as recommended by His Excellency the Governor's message of date the 25th August.

In doing so he said that the hon. member for Darling Downs (Mr. Miles) had yesterday called the motion "not formal." His only object, apparently, could be to obstruct the making of branch lines at a low cost along the main roads of the colony, but he hoped the hon. member would withdraw his opposition.

Question put and passed.

VICTORIA BRIDGE LANDS SALE BILL.

The House in Committee having resolved that it is desirable to introduce a Bill to provide for the Sale of the Victoria Bridge Lands, as recommended by His Excellency the Governor's message of the date 21st August,

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Mr. Perkins) presented the Bill, and it was read a first time, ordered to be printed, and the second reading fixed for Monday next.

SUPPLY—LOAN ESTIMATES.

The Chairman of Committees having presented the Report of the Committee of Supply (Loan Estimates),

The PREMIER (Mr. McIlwraith) moved that the report be adopted.

Question put and passed.

# SUPPLY — RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION (Mr. Palmer) moved the item £18,000—Erection and furnishing of new Schools and additions and repairs. He said that the amount put down was the same as last year; and, although the number of schools in the colony was gradually increasing, still, as they had a credit balance at the end of the last financial year in this account amounting to nearly £8,000, the sum put down would be ample. At the same time, no unnecessary economy would be carried out. The wants of the year would be fully covered by the amount proposed.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that during the present year an attempt had been made to alter the regulations affecting additions to schools in cases where they were over-crowded. The Act required that one-fifth of the estimated cost of new schools should be contributed by the parents, or someone outside, as a test of their *bona fides*; but it was never intended that an over-crowded school should be carried on without additions, to the detriment of the health of the children, and the rule adopted when he was connected with the department was that when an addition became necessary the cost should be borne by the State. That was provided by the regulations made immediately after he (Mr. Griffith) came into office as Minister for Education. When the additions required were in the nature of ornamental additions, or for extra convenience, or something that ought to have been done in the first instance, it was the practice to require subscriptions. Under the new regulation, the one-fifth subscription was required for all additions, and that, he thought, was a mistake. Contributions, he contended, ought not to be required for enlargements in cases of over-crowding, or in other circumstances of that nature.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said he read the Act differently from the hon. gentleman, and he believed it was the intention of the Legislature that all additions should be treated the same as new schools. There was a very substantial reason why that should be so, for otherwise it would leave the door open to every species of fraud. For instance, application might be made from a district for school accommodation for fifty children, and they might subscribe one-fifth of the necessary amount—when, perhaps, there were 300 or 400 children in the district; and immediately afterwards they would apply for additional accommodation, requiring a building three times the size. The inhabitants of Brisbane and other large towns had never, under the late Government, subscribed anything like their proper proportion for their schools, while in the country dis-

tricts the rule had been invariably enforced. At Toowoomba, under a minute of the late Executive, the old hospital, which he held to be entirely unfit for a school, was handed over to the department at a cost of £3,500, not a penny of which had been locally subscribed. Did the Committee think that was a proper way of working the Act? At Maryborough an immigration depôt had been built at a great expense, and which, he was informed by the inspectors, was utterly unfitted for school purposes; yet it had been turned over to the department as a school, while the school had been transformed into immigration barracks. Was that the way to work the Act? It was much fairer to work it as he had endeavoured to do, by making the same rule apply in every instance. Where repairs were necessary he had invariably had them done out of the vote for public instruction; but that was a very different matter from additions, one-fifth the cost of which the districts were in all cases bound to provide. He contended that his mode of working the Act was much more consistent with the Act itself, and much fairer to the inhabitants of the colony generally.

Mr. GRIFFITH said that his object while at the head of the department was to encourage the system of national education, and not to work the Act in a restrictive manner. That was the difference between the system he pursued and that now adopted by the Minister for Instruction. As to Brisbane, there had been no schools built there while he was in charge of the department, and the only additions made were at Kangaroo Point and South Brisbane; and they were made strictly in accordance with the regulations. No distinction whatever had been made in the matter of subscriptions between town and country. At Ipswich, he found the middle school held in a hired building, and it became necessary either to discontinue the school or to procure a building, and the latter course was taken after full discussion in the House. At Toowoomba, a building used for a nonvested school, which was handed over to the State, became no longer applicable for the purposes of a school. It was used as a church on Sundays and a school during the week, and the furniture belonged to nobody and was left without protection. The nearest public school was quite over-crowded, and, therefore, it became necessary to provide another school building to carry on the school which had been a non-vested school. After full consideration and personal inspection by himself, it was determined to make temporary provision in the old School of Arts until the hospital building could be handed over for school purposes, which, in his opinion, and from the reports supplied to him, was quite suit-

able to be converted into a school; and they would then be able to do with two schools instead of three, to the saving of the revenue. At Maryborough, the old school buildings were over-crowded and inconveniently situated. They were said to be suitable for immigration barracks. There were new barracks at Maryborough, which the inspectors reported would be very suitable for a school, and as both buildings belonged to the State it was thought desirable to make a transfer—to turn the school into barracks and the barracks into a school. At Rockhampton, the only work during his time of office was the enlargement of a school—it was, in fact, impossible to show that he had made any difference between town and country in the matter of local subscriptions.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said he was quite as desirous to encourage the system of national education as the hon. gentleman, and he defied him to point to a single act to show that he had in any way endeavoured to check it. The hon. gentleman had not succeeded in explaining away the charge he (Mr. Palmer) brought against him. At Maryborough, although it was settled by Executive minute that the exchange of buildings should take place, yet it had not been done up to the present moment; and although several applications had been made to him to settle the question definitely, yet, acting on the information of the inspector, that the immigration barracks were quite unfit for school purposes, he had decided to leave the matter in abeyance until he had an opportunity of seeing the building for himself, which would not be until the recess. With respect to Toowoomba, he would leave it to the common-sense of the Committee whether an old hospital could ever be made suitable for a school? Nearly the whole of the ground consisted of old cess-pits, not filled up but simply covered in, and the walls of the building, which were not plastered, were impregnated with the seeds of disease. Was that a fit place for a school for children? The hon. gentleman tried to lead the Committee to imagine that it was used as a school, while he must know that it was still used as an hospital. As long as he (Mr. Palmer) had charge of the department he would never send children to school in such a hot-bed of disease. With respect to Brisbane, there had been a new school erected at Kelvin Grove; and at Ipswich what local subscriptions were paid towards the £2,000 given for the store purchased from the estate of G. and J. Harris? How could the hon. gentleman possibly say that he had treated town and country alike? He intended to carry out the Act strictly, and if the inhabitants of Brisbane and the other towns did not choose to subscribe for the additional buildings necessary their children would have

to suffer for it. He was happy to say that the schools in the outside districts were increasing rapidly, and the hon. gentleman was in no way warranted in insinuating, in his usual style, that he (Mr. Palmer) was endeavouring to check the system of national education. The records of the office would show that the reverse was the case. He now laid on the table a list of buildings authorised during 1878-9, and the amounts subscribed, from which hon. members would see that the rule had been impartially carried out since he had been in office.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the hon. gentleman had shifted his ground, and had in no way controverted the statements he (Mr. Griffith) had made.

Mr. GROOM said the arrangement made by the late Government was the best that could have been made under the circumstances. If, as the Colonial Secretary seemed to think, diseases were likely to hover about hospital buildings, it became a serious question whether convalescent wards should not be removed from them. The hospital buildings at Toowoomba had never been of a very satisfactory character. The original building was destroyed by fire, and, as the committee had only £1,000 subscribed and £2,000 granted by the House at command, they had to build according to their means. Notwithstanding that, the hospital at times of fever had done good work, and if it were now entirely removed and the site devoted to a school, the money which had been spent upon it would have been well laid out.

Mr. KATES said that if people in the country were called upon to subscribe one-fifth of the cost of the erection of school buildings, townspeople should be compelled to do the same. In one case of a country school a delay of twelve months took place because the amount was £9 short.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said the action of the Colonial Secretary in declining to use an old hospital for a school was to be commended. Medical authorities generally considered that the germs of diseases lingered about the walls of such buildings, and for that reason the old infirmary at Sydney was about to be pulled down.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £1,180 be granted for supervision. This vote, he said, showed a considerable increase, as a great part of the amount was previously included in the estimate of the Minister for Works. Formerly the superintendence of the buildings was undertaken by the Works Department, and the School Department had nothing to do with it. Except in the outside districts the two departments were now quite apart. The new system was working capitally, and by it a considerable saving would in time be effected.

Mr. GRIFFITH said the system was similar to that adopted in Victoria, and, he thought, New South Wales; and he was glad to hear it was working satisfactorily. It had not been adopted here on initiating the Department because he thought the creation of such sub-departments was a great and a growing danger, and he did not believe in starting more. He agreed, however, that the previous system was highly unsatisfactory, as delays were caused and there was a difficulty in getting anything done.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £5,250 be granted for Provisional Schools. Provisional schools, he said, were being extended all over the colony, and doing a great deal of good in their way, because they reached where there were no State schools. Wherever there were twelve or fifteen children, and proper application was made, a school could be started.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked whether the Tivoli provisional school, at which fifty or sixty children attended, had been converted into a State school?

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said he was not prepared to answer the question at the spur of the moment. Several such schools had lately been converted into State schools, and if proper application had been made no doubt a State school had been established at Tivoli. In nine cases out of ten, when complaints were made it was found that the delay was caused by the inhabitants of the district not making proper application. Several times he had had to complain to the Minister for Lands of delays in getting out grants of lands for schools, and the hon. gentleman had invariably attended to them without delay.

The Hon. G. THORN said that three or four years ago there was an excellent school at Dingo, on the Central Railway line, and he believed it was still there or further along the line. He should like to know whether any provision had been made for establishing schools on the other extensions, Northern and Southern? On the Dalby extension he remembered seeing a camp of four or five hundred persons at Chinchilla, where no provision had been made for a school.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said wherever there was a sufficient number of children and the usual requirements were fulfilled a master was appointed and a provisional school established. Provisional schools had been established at Blackall and Rolleston in the outside districts.

Mr. THORN said he was speaking of places where a large population was temporarily located. Possibly parents on the railway lines, not understanding the education laws, did not make application. In

that case the department should see that application was made.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said the employes on the line knew the Education Act quite as well as the hon. member. There was a large school at Cometville, and one at Emerald was being established.

Mr. THORN said he was aware that the people on the Central line had schools, but he wished to know whether those on the Northern and Southern extensions had them?

Mr. MACFARLANE (Ipswich) said there were sixty or seventy children in the Tivoli school, and the people had secured a piece of land, but he understood that the amount of money raised by them was insufficient.

Mr. WALSH said he hoped the Minister for Instruction would treat all alike. He had applied for a school at Port Douglas, for which the people had subscribed, but had been unable to get it. A uniform rule should be adopted and strictly adhered to.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £2,179 be granted for Grammar Schools.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £9,004 be granted for Orphanages.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he should like to have some explanation with regard to the £500 for inspector. The sum paid last year was £150, as the inspector held another office. He presumed, therefore, that this was a new appointment?

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said that no new appointment had yet been made, and it would depend upon this vote whether one would be made. There was great necessity for it, as the orphanages had suffered very much from want of proper inspection. Dr. Challinor, though as effective an officer as could be had, was a good deal engaged in attending ships in quarantine, and a great deal of money that was promised was lost for want of some officer with time to look after it. The very sad case of a child let out from the Diamantina Orphanage being murdered in the Valley had taken place through want of proper inspection. Such children demanded special care from the State, and it could not be bestowed unless they had an officer whose whole duty was to look after them. Since there had been no necessity for Dr. Challinor's presence in the Bay he had devoted considerable time to visiting orphans who had been let out, and, where he could not visit, instructions had been given to the police magistrates. Dr. Challinor was thoroughly well fitted for the service, and was at present receiving a higher salary than was proposed to be given. His duty of medical officer for

visiting the Bay would cease, and he would devote all his time to the new office. In the cause of humanity the officer was badly wanted; and if the appointment were made the money would be well earned.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he understood that a great part of the inspector's duties would be to look after the children who had been let out?

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said his duties would be also to keep the accounts of the institution, check the allowance per head, see that children went out as soon as they arrived at the proper age, and if he saw anything wrong report it to the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked whether the Government would endeavour to pass the Orphanages Bill during the present session?

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said he intended to do so.

Mr. GRIFFITH said in that case there would be plenty of work.

Mr. GRIMES asked whether Dr. Challinor acted as medical adviser to the orphanages?

The MINISTER FOR INSTRUCTION said no, he did not. For years past £1 per week had been paid to Dr. Hobbs, in Brisbane, and Dr. Salmond, in Rockhampton. He could not find any authority for the payment, except a resolution of the Committee and long usage. It had been paid hitherto out of contingencies, but he had placed it on the Estimates so that the Committee might see exactly what had been paid.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he discovered last year for the first time that it was so, and the history must be that when the institutions were under the charge of Committees these officers were appointed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was under the impression, when he first made the discovery, that the Health Officers had no right to receive the remuneration; but, on referring to a series of years, he found it was no part of Dr. Hobbs' specified duty. No charge was made for medical attendance for St. Vincent's. Dr. Mullen attended, but was not paid by the State.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, £6,992 was granted for Treasury, Stamp Office, and Printing and Engraving.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that £20,500 should be granted for Miscellaneous Services.

Mr. DICKSON said the agreement with the Admiralty for the survey of the coast extended no further north than Bowen. Had the Government opened up any correspondence with the Imperial Government with a view to extending the survey beyond Bowen?

The COLONIAL TREASURER replied that no such correspondence had been opened up.

Mr. DICKSON asked whether the Government intended to renew the charter of the "Llewellyn," which expired in December, or employ another steam vessel to continue the survey?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the "Llewellyn" was chartered for the present year, and no arrangement had been made for the survey afterwards. The Government, however, intended to continue it by means of a steamer.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that £33,224 be granted for Customs Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would again refer to a subject which was unpleasant to him personally, but which was still one that the Committee should consider carefully—namely, the anomalous position occupied by the Collector of Customs. Last year the Committee decided by a test vote that gentlemen who were the paid officers of the State should not have seats in the other branch of the Legislature. That was distinctly decided, with reference to Dr. Hobbs, on the motion that his salary should be reduced by one shilling, and he had hoped that the resolution would have led that gentleman and the Collector of Customs either to resign their seats in the other Chamber or their positions under the Crown, but it seemed to have had no effect. It required no argument to point out the anomaly which existed in one man holding two such positions. The Committee were absolutely voting the salaries of men who were at once their masters and the servants of the State: they reviewed the Acts of the Assembly in the other branch of the Legislature. He had no intention of reducing the salary of the Collector of Customs; but, to test the question whether this state of things should last, he should move a nominal reduction of one shilling. No servant of the State, placed in such an anomalous position, could be an impartial judge; he must go with the Government of the day, and that the gentlemen to whom he referred did he had only to point to the divisions in the other Chamber year after year. The Collector of Customs was put there under peculiar circumstances, he believed; but he should no longer be allowed to remain there and hold his paid office under the State at the same time. Many other members of the Assembly had seen the anomaly, and the sooner it was got rid of the better. The Collector of Customs, whom he believed to be an able officer, should be given the option of deciding which position he would retain—his seat in the Upper House or his office as Collector of Customs. He also wished to say that the Customs Department was terribly over-officered, particularly in Brisbane. Only the other day he had it on undoubted authority that Customs officers

were playing leap-frog on one of the wharves, not having anything to do. Trade was bad, few ships came to port, and yet these men were kept on. If any department wanted careful looking after it was the Customs. The Collector of Customs was not to blame for this state of things, for the department had always been "stuffed" by all Ministries. He had good authority for saying that men were almost forced into it every week against the wish of the head of the department. There were a lot of useless loafers in it, and the sooner they were got rid of the better, and it would be a good way of reducing the expenditure. He hoped the Committee would go with him, and show by voting for his amendment that they were determined there should be no such anomaly as now existed. While again expressing his high opinion of the Collector of Customs, he felt it his duty to attempt to have the anomaly removed, and he would move that the salary of the Collector of Customs should be reduced by one shilling.

Mr. DICKSON said that, while agreeing with the general principle that it was highly undesirable that a gentleman holding office under the Government should also occupy a seat in another Chamber, he must express his opinion that the decision of the Committee had reference to the future, and was not intended to apply to the present occupants of the two positions. It would be a great misfortune to the colony that the present Collector of Customs, who was a most able officer and looked well after the general interests of the colony, should be placed in a position which might cause him to feel compelled to resign his office. While accepting the principle embodied by the amendment, he must protest against the gentlemen named being unexpectedly placed in such an unfair position as to be required either to resign their offices under Government or their seats in the other Chamber, after having occupied them for many years.

Mr. STEVENSON said the last speaker told them plainly that he agreed with the principle of the amendment, and yet he was not prepared to act up to it. It was not a sound reason that, because the two gentlemen alluded to had held the dual positions for years, the anomaly should be allowed to continue; and as to the objection that they should not be required unexpectedly to decide which office they would retain, the thing had been discussed year after year, and the sense of the Committee had been taken in a very decided manner once before;—they would therefore not be called upon unexpectedly. He agreed with the member for Mitchell, and held that to ensure the good government of any country it was desirable that members of both Houses should be independent. It

was impossible that these gentlemen holding offices of profit under the Crown could be independent, and the experience of the past had shown that they had gone with every Government that had been in power. He would also take the opportunity of saying that the Customs Department was over-officered and over-manned—not only in Brisbane, but in the North also. If the opinion of captains trading to the Northern ports were asked the statement would be borne out. The Customs officers had so little to do that they took notice of the smallest matters and threw luggage about in a way that was very annoying to the passengers.

Mr. WALSH said that, while he thoroughly endorsed the opinions expressed by the member for Mitchell, he thought it should not be forgotten that these gentlemen had occupied their positions since the formation of the colony, and had filled them with credit to themselves and advantage to the colony; and to call upon them to resign their seats would be a gross injustice. While the principle should be accepted that in future officers of the State should not have a seat in the other Chamber, it would be most unjust, in his opinion, to ask these gentlemen to resign. With reference to the statement that the Customs Department was over-manned, it was possible that reductions might appear necessary; but it must be remembered that shipping was always a fluctuating business, and he doubted very much whether the Collector could discharge men during an idle week. He had had a good deal to do with the department at Cooktown, and had much pleasure in bearing testimony to its efficiency and to the courtesy of the Sub-Collector.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he saw nothing in the arguments brought up by the hon. members for Enoggera and Cook to induce him to alter his opinion. If the Committee saw any injustice, let it be swept away. He did not care how long it had existed—even if it were from the time that Adam went into the Garden of Eden. He did not say that these gentlemen should be dismissed from their paid offices, but that the option should be given of deciding which position they would prefer to retain. It was a state of affairs which did not exist elsewhere; it was a relic of a Crown colony, and should not be allowed. The objection that he had raised was not a new cry, but had been placed before the House and the country for years, and it was a blot on their Legislature that such a state of things should exist. Here were two Vicars of Bray, who had voted with every Government, and would always do so. With reference to the statement of the member for Cook, that the shipping business was fluctuating, and that therefore the present Customs staff was necessary,

he would ask for what did they allow such a large sum as £6,500 in the contingencies? The way that the Customs Department was crammed with men was the laughing-stock of the whole colony; the men were tumbling over one another. He had the pleasure of paying Government for a bonded store, and it was quite amusing to see how the different Customs officers visited each other. This "cramming" of departments would exist so long as political influence could be brought to bear with reference to appointments in the Civil Service. He believed that as regarded the Customs the same rule held good as was followed by the great houses in England, who put the clever son at the Bar, the next best in the church, and the fool in the army. That, he believed, was the rule—that if a man was not fit for anything else, put him into the Customs Department—he was good enough for that. At the same time, he was quite prepared to admit that there were good men in that department—as good as in any department in the colony. He hoped the Committee would not be led away by the statement that, because the gentlemen referred to had so long occupied the dual position they did, therefore it should be perpetuated. He said the sooner they got rid of a possible precedent the better. It was all very well to say it would never be repeated; but the sooner the House decidedly prevented the repetition of such a grave infraction of our constitution the better.

Mr. MESTON agreed with the hon. member that paid servants of the State had no more right to hold seats in the Upper House than in the Lower House, from which they were excluded. He held that whatever disqualified for that Chamber should also disqualify for the other. He believed that the Customs Department was overcrowded, and that on entering office the Treasurer found that was one of the departments in which reductions could legitimately be made.

Mr. McLEAN called attention to the detention of invoices by the Customs authorities before they were returned to merchants, which caused great inconvenience. He hoped that the Treasurer would see that the matter was remedied.

Mr. DICKSON said, with reference to the position of the Collector of Customs, hon. members appeared to overlook the fact that the Collector of Customs was specially induced to go into another Chamber at the request of a previous Treasurer, with the view to explain proposed tariff alterations, and he had frequently been of assistance to succeeding Governments in that way. Although he thought it would be very undesirable that paid officers of the Government should hold seats in the other Chamber, still he thought it would be very

unfair and a grave injustice to interfere with that gentleman and compel him to leave that Chamber simply on the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell. With regard to the Customs being over-manned, it must be borne in mind that the Customs collections amounted to more than one-third of the entire revenue of the colony, and therefore the department must necessarily be kept in an efficient position ready for any emergency or strain that might arise by the sudden arrival of shipping or from any other cause. He thought, considering this, the amount demanded for the department was not unduly large. These estimates did not represent the total number of officers required for Customs work. There was a large staff of supernumeraries, which he believed the Government, owing to the depression in trade, had been reducing, and he should be glad to hear that such was the case, inasmuch as large expenditure was represented by the supernumerary staff—not by the gazetted staff.

Mr. THORN said he could tell the Treasurer that if he placed a few more officers at Thursday Island, and in that neighbourhood, he would get considerably more Customs revenue from there than he did at present.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for Northern Downs had travelled so long that he actually knew nothing of what had taken place at home, or he would know that the Government had a schooner cruising in those waters to look after those matters. With regard to the abstract motion of the hon. member for Mitchell, he agreed that it was not right that paid officers of the State should hold seats in the other House; but he could not say that it was contrary to law, because on referring to clause 20 of the Constitution Act, which related to the composition of the Legislative Council, it provided that not less than four-fifths of the number should consist of persons not holding any office of emolument under the Crown, except officers of Her Majesty's sea and land forces on full or half-pay, or retired officers on pensions. So that it did contemplate some members of the Legislative Council being paid officers of the Crown, and to a greater extent than at present—namely, one-fifth. He held that such a position was exceedingly undesirable, and hoped it would never occur again. The opinions he expressed last year he still held. He then said—

"If any member would bring forward a resolution asserting the impropriety of any subordinate salaried officers of the Government being appointed to seats in the Upper House in future, he should be happy to support it; but he did not feel inclined to meddle with gentlemen who had done no harm—who had not injured the Constitution in any way during the many years they had held seats in the other Chamber.



While he hoped the debate would lead these gentlemen to resign of their own accord—and he should be very glad if they did so—he was not prepared to vote for any resolution that would drive them to the alternative of either resigning their seats or their offices.”

He believed the Collector of Customs had been of material service in the other House, and he was quite satisfied that if he remained there he would do no harm.

Mr. LUMLEY-HILL said the position of the hon. members who had spoken against the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell appeared to be that they were very sorry that such an evil existed, but at the same time they hesitated to put an end to it. This appeared to be an acknowledged evil that had existed for years; and, although it had been objected to before, he did not see why new members, who were perfectly well qualified to form an opinion of their own and to exercise it, should be called upon to support what was acknowledged to be a standing evil in the Legislature. He believed it was a standing evil, and he, for one, should exercise his judgment and support the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell. These gentlemen were not called upon to resign their seats in the Upper House and their emoluments, but they could elect their choice; and the very moderate reduction proposed by the hon. member for Mitchell would, if carried, mark the sense of the Committee as to the dual position they occupied. With regard to the over-crowding of the Customs Department with officers, if such exigencies arose as the hon. member for Cook (Mr. Walsh) had alluded to, but which he did not see any immediate probability of in the present affairs of the colony, it would be very easy to find men to do the work. But it was no use to keep an outrageously large staff in the anticipation that they were going to have a very large trade. He did not see any reasonable prospect of it at present, and he thought the amount put down for contingencies was very ample for anything likely to occur in the course of this year or next. This matter with regard to the Collector of Customs had been before the House and the country for years, and had not been brought up on the spur of the moment; the Collector of Customs had had warning of it year after year; and he (Mr. Lumley-Hill) thought that now, when they had a House with an additional number of members many of whom were new and not pledged in any way, and who could form an unbiassed opinion, they should show what their opinion was on this subject. He was prepared to do so, and should support the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell.

Mr. MILES said, if the motion were pressed to a division, he should support it. He had nothing to say against the Collector of Customs, but he was placed in

a false position. The Colonial Secretary had stated that he was in favour of the disfranchisement of Civil Servants, and, if that were necessary, how much more necessary was it that paid servants of the Government should be kept out of the other Chamber? He thought it would be well if Mr. Thornton resigned his seat, because every time the Customs Estimate was discussed the case was brought up, and the Constitution Act was only permissive; it was not absolutely necessary that such officers should have seats in the other House.

Mr. STEVENSON said, although the Colonial Secretary argued on the other side, he furnished one good reason why they should vote for the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell—that was, when he said the Collector of Customs had been of material service to the leader of the other House. That was the very reason why he (Mr. Stevenson) should vote in the way he intended voting—because of this material service, which simply meant that that gentleman always voted straight—one year with this party and next year with another party.

Mr. AMHURST said he should vote for the motion of the hon. member for Mitchell, on the principle that gentlemen in the receipt of Government money ought not to have seats in the Upper House—in fact, he believed it would be a relief to those gentlemen themselves if they did not occupy such a position, because at present their actions were liable to be misconstrued, and it was a confirmation of the old adage, “No man can serve two masters.”

Mr. MOREHEAD said the Colonial Secretary had told the Committee that Mr. Thornton was of material service to the Government in the other Chamber.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Has been.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, if he had been, then let him go. If he was not of service now, why keep him there? He held it was a mistake ever to put him there. The same argument might apply if they had an incompetent Treasurer—which, thank goodness, they had not—that because he was incompetent the Under Secretary of the Treasury should be placed in the Upper House because he would be of material service; or, if they had an incompetent Postmaster-General, that the Under Secretary of the Post Office should be placed there. This material-service business was all rubbish. If a Minister was not able to conduct his own business he had no right to occupy the position. This material-service business dropped to the ground because the reason which led to Mr. Thornton being appointed to the other House had passed away years ago and no longer existed. It had been suggested to him that great trouble might ensue with regard to Mr. Thornton's position, supposing he

were to quarrel with the Treasurer. In that case, if the Treasurer suspended him from his office of Collector of Customs, he could not suspend him as a member of the other House, and circumstances might arise by which he would have to withdraw his suspension or suffer defeat in the other branch of the Legislature, because, although this gentleman had always consistently voted with the Government, under these circumstances it might be to his interest to vote the other way. He hoped the Committee would hold with him on this point. If they did not step in and put an end to this state of affairs they might be overwhelmed by having a lot of underlings from the different departments appointed to the Upper House. Why should the Collector of Customs have a seat in the Upper House any more than any other under secretary—for that was his position? If that precedent was to be established, or was not abolished as sharply and as shortly as possible, the end would be that they would have nothing more than a Crown colony. Representative institutions would practically cease to exist if these things were permitted.

Mr. KATES agreed with the hon. member for Mitchell that persons who were not qualified to sit in that House should not be allowed to hold seats in the Upper House. With reference to the Customs Department being over-manned, if the hon. member would point out where a reduction could be made he (Mr. Kates) would support it for the sake of retrenchment.

Mr. MESTON said if it was not a violation of the constitution, as stated by the Colonial Secretary, it still remained the duty of the Committee to express their opinion as to how undesirable it was that Civil Servants should hold seats in the Upper Chamber. The hon. member for Enoggera had stated that this officer was very valuable in the Upper House to assist in the revision of the tariff; but he (Mr. Meston) held that if there was any special assistance to be given in connection with the tariff it should be in that House where primary legislation on such matters took place, and not in the Upper House. He could not see why the Collector of Customs could not attend the House and give information in the same way as the Under Secretaries of other departments.

Mr. BEOR quite agreed that a wrong thing was done when the gentlemen referred to were put into the Upper House, on the principle that gentlemen in the Civil Service should not occupy seats in that Chamber, and it seemed that they were going to force those gentlemen to resign their seats in order to affirm that principle. But the affirmation of a principle might be bought too dearly. Nobody said that any harm had occurred through those

gentlemen occupying the position they did, and yet they were to be sacrificed in order to affirm a principle. The hon. member for Mackay said it would be a relief to those gentlemen to be forced to cease to be members of the Upper House.

Mr. AMHURST said he did not say if they were forced, but that it would be a relief to them if they did not hold the dual position they did.

Mr. BEOR said that, notwithstanding the explanation of the hon. member, he must repeat that he understood the hon. member to say that it would be a relief to the two hon. gentlemen in the Upper House to resign their seats, or to be placed in such a position as to be obliged to resign. It would not be right in this particular instance to call upon them to resign, as they had been members of the Upper House for a great many years, and it had not been shown that any injury had occurred to the State through their being in that position.

Mr. MOREHEAD pointed out that were it not that the gentlemen in question were Public Servants, it would not be right to criticise their conduct as members of the other Chamber. Thus, there could be no clearer proof of the propriety of the course he had adopted than the action taken by members of the Committee when they spoke in condemnation of the dual position occupied by Mr. Thornton and Dr. Hobbs. The whole question was, whether their servants were to be their masters.

Mr. WALSH said that if the hon. member would put his amendment in this form—that it was desirable that in future no member of the Civil Service should hold a seat in the Upper House, he would vote for it. As the motion stood at present he could not support it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he could not put it in that way, as he could only move a reduction of the salary. He wished to deal with the matter at once, so that the Committee could, by a sharp, short, and decisive motion, prevent such a state of things continuing. Of course, the Collector of Customs might be willing to accept £699 19s., but he (Mr. Morehead) was bringing forward the matter as a test vote for the Committee to decide whether it was a correct thing for Messrs. Thornton and Hobbs, whilst they were paid servants of the State, to occupy seats in the Upper House.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that an attempt was being made to inflict what would be felt by those hon. gentlemen in the Upper House to be a punishment on them for what was no fault of their own. The cases of members of that House and those of the Upper Chamber were not analogous, as when a man wished to obtain a seat in the Assembly he had to announce himself as a candidate for a constituency and to

get himself elected, whereas gentlemen in the other Chamber were nominated. The gentlemen in question having been nominated by the Government, it was not kind or fair to reflect upon them in any way, or to call upon them to resign a position which they had not sought themselves. The Constitution Act provided that it should be lawful for a certain proportion of gentlemen receiving emolument from the State to occupy seats in the Legislative Council, and so long as they did not forfeit their position by any act on their part the Committee should not demand their resignation. Some consideration should be shown to age and standing. He was himself a young man in the colony and a young member of the House, and he had a great veneration for the institutions which he found already existing here. These were men who had borne the heat and burden of the day, and who had assisted to make good laws when he (Mr. Rutledge) and other hon. members were very young, and therefore he thought they should not indulge in any comments on those gentlemen who were called to the Upper Chamber many years ago, and who had faithfully discharged the duties required of them. It had been said that they had invariably voted for the Government of the day, but he (Mr. Rutledge) should like something more than the mere assertion that they had done so: from what he knew of them he believed they had as much manliness and independence of character as any member of the Committee. He should always object to anything that tended to brand an innocent man, and in this instance the Collector of Customs would feel that by the reduction of his salary by one shilling a stigma was attached to him as a man who had thrust himself into a position which it was not considered he was entitled to occupy.

Mr. MESTON said the hon. member seemed to think that veneration for that which was old should be his guide in all things. On the same principle the hon. member would say his prayers at the Pyramids and be a believer in Zoroasterism or Brahminism. Age did not sanctify an error or hallow an abuse, and therefore the hon. member talked profound nonsense.

Mr. RUTLEDGE explained that what he said was, that when he as a young man found an institution which had been existing for a great many years he had a certain respect for it, and he found that the present state of facts had existed for a great many years.

Mr. MESTON said that if it was not desirable that Civil Servants should occupy seats in the Legislative Assembly, it was still more undesirable that they should be in the Upper House to revise the acts of the Lower.

Mr. HILL could not understand the argument of the hon. member for Enoggera (Mr. Rutledge) that, because he found an institution in existence which was proved to be an abuse, he felt bound to countenance it. When the Committee found that any system was an abuse, the first thing to do was to mark their sense of it. The hon. member for Enoggera said it was an insult to knock off a shilling from the salary of the Collector of Customs, but if that gentleman chose to take it as an insult he could do so. No man had a right to be placed in a position of master and servant at the same time.

Mr. MESTON said that he had as great respect for both the gentlemen referred to as any one could have. The whole question was whether Civil Servants should have the right to occupy seats in the Upper House, whilst they had not that right in the Lower House.

Mr. HAMILTON was sure no one would wish to insult the Collector of Customs, whose efficiency as a public officer was well recognised; at the same time, he (Mr. Hamilton) must admit the principle was correct that no officer holding a position of profit under the Crown should occupy a seat in either branch of the Legislature.

Mr. GROOM said that on a previous occasion he had voted for a motion of a similar character, and he should do the same now. In New South Wales and the other colonies no public officers in receipt of Government pay were allowed to have seats in Parliament, and it was quite necessary that the same rule should be observed here. At the time of the separation of this colony from New South Wales there was a difficulty experienced in selecting gentlemen for the Upper House, and the Government were obliged to appoint Mr. Thornton, who was Collector of Customs before Separation, to the other Chamber; but affairs had vastly altered since then, and it certainly was a great anomaly that a public officer, through being a member of the Upper House, could, if he so chose, actually assist in "stonewalling" a measure introduced by the head of his department in the Assembly. It was also possible that the Government might appoint every under secretary to a seat in the other Chamber. The Constitution Act might, as had been stated, authorise such an appointment; but it was never contemplated that Civil Servants should be appointed to revise the acts of those from whom their salaries were received. The permanent under secretaries at home were not allowed to have seats in the House of Commons. Mr. R. G. W. Herbert, who was formerly Colonial Secretary of Queensland, and who was at present a permanent Under Secretary in the Colonial Office at home, was debarred from having a seat. The principle propounded by the member

for Mitchell was a sound one, and he should vote for it, as he had done last year.

Mr. BEOR said that, on principle, he was going to vote for the motion, but he did not think that either gentleman should be called upon to resign his seat.

Mr. REA trusted that the reduction of one shilling from his salary would not be taken to heart by the honourable gentleman in the Upper House, because if it was, and he resigned his seat, the result would be that the Ministry of the day would fill his place by pitchforking some obsequious supporter into his place, as they had done when a certain member was kicked out by the Logan electorate, and another by the electors of Rockhampton. If it came to the question of having no nominations to the Upper House, he would willingly support the proposition of the hon. member for Mitchell.

Question—That the item be reduced by one shilling—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 16.

Messrs. Meston, Morehead, Miles, Hamilton, Stevenson, Hill, Baynes, Kates, H. W. Palmer, Lalor, Amburst, Beor, Low, Horwitz, Groom, and Norton.

NOES, 16.

Messrs. Palmer, Griffith, McIlwraith, Walsh, Dickson, McLean, Perkins, Rutledge, Grimes, Rea, Macrossan, Garrick, Mackay, Macfarlane (Ipswich), Kingsford, and Beattie.

The CHAIRMAN said that, the numbers being equal, he should give his vote with the ayes.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Question—That £33,223 19s. only be granted—put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved the item, £2,682—Border Customs Patrol.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved the item £3,400—Distillation.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said that, but for the fact of the Chief Inspector of Distilleries being under suspension, he should have considered it his duty to call attention to that gentleman's connection with an establishment called the Civil Service Co-operative Society, where liquor was sold by the bottle over the counter to almost anyone who chose to ask for it. It was not legal, but it was done. Not long ago a series of prosecutions was instituted against persons in the city for selling single bottles of liquor contrary to the law, and in a manner very unjust to the publicans who alone should have the right to sell single bottles, and among those who had been fined for so doing was the representative of this Co-operative store; surely of all men the Chief Inspector should have been the last to countenance this practice. He expressed the feeling of a great many people out of doors when

he said that this establishment, as at present conducted, was a very great mistake. He did not wish to reflect on individual members of the Civil Service, but it was not right that they should be allowed to combine together and bring themselves, by means of a trading establishment, into competition with tradesmen of the city who in these times had enough work to make both ends meet. It was only fair that, if members of the Service felt it their duty to sell each other goods, that they should be confined strictly within those limits, and should not be allowed to interfere with the business of the trading public. It was not right that they should take up time which belonged to the country, and which ought to be devoted to the discharge of their duties in keeping shop. He hoped the Treasurer would direct his attention to the establishment, and particularly to the practice of selling single bottles of grog.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the right of Civil Servants to co-operate to supply themselves with goods on the best possible terms was a subject he declined to discuss; and if they sold single bottles of spirits over the counter, that was an offence against the law for which they could be prosecuted.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said his objection was not to Civil Servants co-operating to supply goods to themselves, but to their entering into competition with tradesmen for the custom of the public.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked whether the Colonial Treasurer was aware that this co-operative society was fined the other day for sly-grog selling? To his own knowledge, that kind of thing had been going on there for a long time.

Mr. MCLEAN said it was the special duty of the Chief Inspector to see that the law was not infringed, and as a member of this society he must have been well aware the law was being daily infringed by it. This, he would remind the Colonial Treasurer, was not a solitary case, for it was well known that nearly every wholesale wine and spirit merchant in the colony was in the habit of retailing single bottles over the counter. This was not only defrauding the Customs, but was placing temptations in the way of persons, and especially of women, to drink when they would never think of entering a public-house for that purpose.

Mr. KING said he objected altogether to the position taken up by the hon member (Mr. Rutledge). Although not a member of the Civil Service Co-operative Society, he thought no one had a right to prevent the public from buying their goods where they could get them cheapest. If anybody—whether Civil Servants or anybody else—chose to start a store, he did not see why anybody

should be prohibited from buying their goods there. The Civil Servants were not behind the counter—they simply put their money in it; and, so long as they did not defraud the public of any of their time, he did not see what blame could be cast on them. He objected altogether to the proposition of the hon. member, that the purchasing public should be tied hand and foot to the storekeepers of Brisbane.

Mr. WALSH said there was an evident instance of a public officer winking at a breach of the law because he happened to be a shareholder in the society. As a matter of fact, there was not a storekeeper or spirit merchant from Cooktown to the Southern border who did not retail spirits in quantities of less than two gallons. It was a question whether the present law might not be altered with advantage by reducing the quantity to less than two gallons.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he believed with the hon. member (Mr. King) that the public should not be bound hand and foot to any tradesman; but he thought they had a right to protest against a body calling itself the Civil Service Co-operative Society intervening between the trader in the city and the consumer. They knew it was ruled by leading Civil Servants, amongst them being the officer whose salary was now under discussion, who was under suspension, and who, he hoped, would be dismissed from the Service. Another leading Civil Servant interested in this Society was the Inspector of Invoices. He would not, of course, assert that that officer would do anything unfair, but it might be that he might pass improper invoices for the society. With reference to the Chief Inspector, if he had attended to his business he would have known that this society had been acting illegally for years by selling bottles of grog over the counter;—and that was certainly acting adversely against the honest trader. The society might be made the medium of dishonest trading, which the Colonial Treasurer might be unable to check. He had felt it his duty to point out that the society were dishonest traders, although it was ruled over by some of the leading members of the Civil Service.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had some hesitation in speaking of the case of the Chief Inspector, at the present time under suspension. Possibly this might be one of the charges against the Chief Inspector, although not a prominent one, that would be investigated. He was aware that the proprietors of the Co-operative Store had been fined for illegally selling spirits; and as the Chief Inspector of Distilleries was one of the proprietors and a director, that fact would probably go a long way against him. He (Mr. McIlwraith) did not see how he could be dissociated from the store in the

infringement of the law, and the fact of his being the officer appointed to see that the law was carried out made his offence greater. His position was, in fact, indefensible, if the facts were as hinted at.

Mr. GRIMES said the hon. member (Mr. Rutledge), having a greater number of Civil Servants in his electorate than any other hon. member, had shown great moral courage in referring to the matter. It was notorious that any servant girl belonging to the family of a Civil Servant could get a bottle of wine or grog from the store at any time, and the facility with which such articles could be obtained was a great evil.

Mr. SWANWICK said he had watched the career of the Chief Inspector for a long time, and he was perfectly satisfied that if the £550 were voted it would be entirely thrown away. He was an officer who had long been known as the bully of his department. Hon. members who had read in the correspondence the pitiful account the Inspector endeavoured to give of himself and his actions would agree that a worse case had never been brought before a commission. Although forage allowance had been drawn for years, the Inspector had not kept a horse at any time for the last three or four years. To bring the matter to an issue, he begged to move that the item be reduced by £550.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he hoped the hon. member would not insist upon that amendment. The item should be allowed to remain, although it would be necessary to work a reform in the department.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the item had better be withdrawn until the result of the inquiry was known. The Collector of Customs was quite able to look after this branch, and it should have been in his department. The work could be done by one clerk, and the vote would be a piece of profligate extravagance. If the amount were voted while the case was *sub judice* the country might never be called upon to pay it.

Mr. AMHURST said the Premier had stated that the whole matter was under consideration. If the money was not wanted it would not be spent, and the Committee might leave that matter in the hands of the Government. He should support the vote.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he should not support the vote. If the whole matter was under consideration the item might be withdrawn until the report of the Commission was received. He declined to accept the dictum of the hon. member for Mackay to trust any Government.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the member for Cook had made a statement which he must correct. In justice to the wholesale spirit merchants and other traders of Brisbane, he could safely state that the great majority of them observed the law.

If the Co-operative Store broke the law it was no proof that others had done so.

Mr. WALSH said he had not meant to refer to wholesale spirit merchants, but to general storekeepers.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said it was quite time that the practice of retailing bottles of wine and spirits by stores was stopped, and justice done to the honest licensed victualler who paid a £30-license, and was under continual police surveillance. It was the duty of Mr. Bryant, or anyone else in that position, to enforce the law in favour of a class from whom a large revenue was collected, but he must have connived at many breaches of the law, because where there was so much smoke there must have been some fire. While a number of heads of departments in the Civil Service combined together to carry on a business and to break the law, it was a comparative venial offence on the part of others to do the same thing in self-defence. Every time he walked down Queen street he was continually being asked if he was not aware that these stores were breaking the law, and setting others an example to do the same; and whether the Government were going to do anything to stop the abuse.

Mr. KATES said that if, as had been stated, the work could be done by one clerk, he should support the amendment.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the proposition was unfair altogether. The case of the Chief Inspector was now under consideration before a commission. He did not care to express his own opinion while the matter was under consideration, but he was determined to bring about a reform in the whole department. Had not some of the charges been personal ones the matter would have been dealt with in a different way altogether. The committee might be assured that the Government would act very promptly upon the judgment of the commission. Considering that the Chief Inspector had a right as a Civil Servant to an inquiry, although technically debarred from insisting upon it, he (the Premier) conceded the right. In addition to that objection it was not a proper amendment, because some provision would be required to carry on the Chief Inspector's work.

Mr. AMHURST said that in his district, where half the excise of the colony was collected, great dissatisfaction was felt at the inconvenience that was caused. He believed the work connected with the department was greatly neglected, and the whole thing was in a muddle; but it was only fair, whilst an investigation was being held, that the Committee should not come to a decision.

Mr. BEOR thought it was unfortunate that the attack should have been made upon the Chief Inspector of Distilleries at this juncture. He supposed the officer

was just as useless this time last year, yet no motion that the salary should be struck off was made. The attack made it appear as if a man had only to be trod upon to cause the House to decide that he was no longer required.

Mr. RUTLEDGE denied that any attack had been made upon any particular officer in regard to any charge. An abuse had been complained of by a great number of traders, and he thought he could most properly draw attention to it. It was a disgrace that Civil Servants, among whom was a gentleman who was responsible for the proper supervision of distillation, should be implicated in not only breaking the law, but depriving publicans of what they were entitled to by virtue of the heavy license-fee they paid. He held in his hand a list of seven names, and hoped that what he had said would be a warning to them, as well as the gentleman to whom allusion had been made, that when they were paid by the State for the performance of certain services, their time should be devoted to the discharge of these services. Could these seven gentlemen, who formed a board of directors, have all the anxiety of managing a large business and attend to their duties to the State as well? He hoped Civil Servants would confine their trading operations to providing one another with goods, but so long as they came into competition with traders attention would be drawn to the matter.

Mr. BEOR did not blame the hon. member, who was right in bringing forward the abuse. What he objected to was the striking off of this officer whilst he was under suspension and an inquiry was being held.

Mr. MESTON said the question for the Committee was not whether Mr. Bryant was under suspension or not, but whether he had sufficient work to justify the State paying the salary down on the Estimates? He had reliable information that the work did not justify the salary, and that, if the item were omitted, and £200 added to the salary of the remaining inspectors, all the work that was to be done could be performed.

Mr. McLEAN said that, taking everything into consideration, £550 was too much salary for the office. He should be willing to reduce the vote by £150, and leave it to the Government to make whatever arrangements they deemed desirable.

Mr. MOREHEAD wished to know whether £590 covered everything? He believed the Chief Inspector got heavy travelling expenses when he went North, or anywhere out of Brisbane.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the Chief Inspector got £40 a year for forage, and, when he was travelling, £1 a day and all his fares paid.

Mr. AMHURST said it certainly was necessary that there should be one responsible head to travel the country to inspect distilleries.

Mr. McLEAN asked to what extent did the Chief Inspector travel? He had not travelled 23 miles out of Brisbane to visit the distillery on the Logan.

Mr. STEVENSON thought the Inspector would be likely to travel a great deal if he got the allowances named.

Mr. BEOR thought the travelling allowances too much. When the Inspector went to Mackay he was on board the steamer a great part of the time and his expenses were trifling.

The COLONIAL TREASURER hoped the hon. member would not persist in the amendment. A reform could be made and was very necessary; he was quite satisfied that a Chief Inspector could be got at less than £550 and the travelling expenses allowed, and if the Committee passed the vote he would not take it as an affirmation that the Chief Inspector should be employed. He would promise the Committee that he would work a reform, but he did not want them to prejudge a case which was now *sub judice*. His great complaint was that the Inspector did not travel enough; he should be travelling frequently, inspecting the principal distilleries. The whole principle of inspection in this colony was wrong, and consisted in the employment of an inspector to watch a spigot and count every drop of liquor distilled; there were far too many inspectors. He was trying to work out a better system, but had not had the time as yet. Whilst, however, the matter was *sub judice* it was not fair to take it entirely out of his hands. If the Committee knocked off the £550 he should consider the whole matter judged, the Inspector would be dismissed, and the proceedings stopped, and the Government must do the best they could. That was a conclusion the Government should not be forced into.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked why the vote was not postponed? The Committee should not be asked to vote a sum which might not be applied to the object for which it was granted.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he had not seen a vote of this kind postponed except where there was just reason to distrust the Government for any action they might possibly take. He could not consent to the postponement for that reason, and because it would embarrass the Government.

Mr. WALSH said after the assurance of the Premier he felt bound not to vote for the amendment.

Mr. SWANWICK said the weak point in the case was that the matter of this officer was still *sub judice*. However, he came to a determination, long before there was

any inquiry into Mr. Bryant's conduct, that he should oppose this vote, and he should do so.

Question—That the item be reduced by £550—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 7.

Messrs. Meston, Swanwick, Morehead, Kates, Stevenson, Hamilton, and Horwitz.

NOES, 21.

Messrs. Palmer, McIlwraith, Griffith, Rea, Dickson, McLean, Perkins, Macrossan, Walsh, Rutledge, Amhurst, Beattie, Cooper, King, Beor, Grimes, H. Palmer, Kingsford, Miles, Norton, and Low.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr. GRIFFITH said there used to be a rule in the Civil Service that no member of it should be a director of a private company, and it used to be very strictly enforced, because he knew Government officers to ask permission to become directors of public companies and it was always refused. He thought that rule should be carried out.

The PREMIER said he did not think the remarks of the hon. member applied to any officer connected with this vote. If the hon. member would point any such case, he (the Premier) would put a stop to it by insisting upon the officer resigning either his position in the Public Service or his directorship. He quite agreed that the two positions were quite incompatible.

Mr. GRIFFITH said he did not refer to the Chief Inspector of Distilleries, but the question applied to the Civil Service generally, and it might as well be raised here as on any other part of the Estimates.

Mr. SWANWICK said it was a rule laid down for teachers in the Civil Service that they should not engage in any occupation but teaching, and they should not make fish of one branch of the Public Service and flesh of another. If teachers were debarred from having any other pursuit except teaching, the rule should be applied all through the Service, no matter whether a man's position was high or low.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said there were six gentlemen besides the Inspector who were registered directors of this company; and, the attention of the Treasurer having been drawn to the matter, no doubt he would inquire into it.

Mr. MESTON complained of the inconsistency of hon. members in speaking on one side of a question and voting on the other.

Mr. RUTLEDGE said he had stated that he was prepared to support the amendment; but, after the statement of the Treasurer, he did not like to appear to have no confidence in him. He had every confidence that that hon. gentleman would do what was right in the matter, and therefore he voted as he did.

Mr. MESTON said he had every confidence in the Treasurer, and believed he would find a way of abolishing these items altogether by amalgamating them with the Customs. They were therefore only giving him a little assistance by moving the omission of the first item.

Mr. BEATTIE said he should have voted against the item; but, after the statement of the Treasurer, that if they struck off the £550 he would have to discharge a man who was upon his trial, he did not feel justified in doing so. It would place the Treasurer in a false position, and he would be no party to it.

Mr. McLEAN said when he was a young member of the House he received a lesson with reference to members promising to vote one way and voting the other. He did not promise to support the amendment, but said that if the item was proposed to be reduced by £150 he would support it, because he thought the present salary too high for the office. He had every confidence that the Treasurer would make a radical change in this department—and there was plenty of room for it.

Mr. MESTON said the argument of the hon. member amounted to this—that in politics a man was justified in doing a mean action, and did not forfeit his right to be considered as a man of honour. He had yet to learn that in politics a man was justified in doing anything that was considered mean or dishonourable in the ordinary transactions of life.

Mr. McLEAN said he had never promised to support the amendment, but simply stated that he received a lesson some years ago that he had profited by.

Mr. MESTON said if a member who gave him his word that he would do a certain thing in the House and did not do it, he (Mr. Meston) would not take his word outside the House.

Question—That £3,400 be granted for Distillation—put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the following sums were passed:—Marine Board, £950; Shipping Office, £650; Harbours, Lighthouses, and Pilots, £22,707; Lighthouses and Contingencies, £12,652; Powder Magazines, £481.

The PREMIER moved that the sum of £3,680 be granted for salaries and contingencies in connection with Harbours and Rivers.

Mr. MESTON asked who received the sum of £500 for travelling expenses?

The PREMIER said that the item was for the whole department. The engineers, when travelling, had their expenses paid.

Mr. RUTLEDGE drew attention to the great difference between the salary of £1,200 which was paid to the Engineer, and that of £450 which was put down for the Assistant Engineer. Those who had any knowledge of the duties performed by

the Assistant Engineer were aware that the services he rendered were scarcely inferior to those performed by the Chief Engineer. His professional standing had been recognised in the highest quarters, and it was only fair that as he had been in the Government service a great many years, and his professional abilities had been well proved, he should receive a salary more in proportion to that of the Engineer.

Mr. McLEAN asked how the £120 proposed as an increase to the draughtsmen was to be divided?

The PREMIER said that one increase was from £250 to £300, and another from £80 to £150. The first increase was to the salary of the chief draughtsman, and the second to a boy who had served his apprenticeship in the department and was therefore entitled to the increase. He could not give any more information in regard to the first increase in the absence of the Engineer for Harbours and Rivers. He was not going in for any increases, and therefore had no objection to reduce the sum to what it was before until he had more information on the subject from Mr. Nisbet.

Mr. McLEAN moved that the item of £300 for a draughtsman be reduced by £50.

The PREMIER said he had just had put into his hands a memorandum showing that the late Treasurer authorised an increase of salary to the draughtsman, so that what he (the Premier) had done was simply to carry out that arrangement.

Mr. MESTON said he could not see his way clear to support the amendment, as if the gentleman in question was a competent draughtsman he was worth £300 a-year.

Mr. RUTLEDGE hoped the hon. member for the Logan would not insist on his amendment, as £300 a-year was not too much to pay to a skilful draughtsman, especially when they were paying £1,200 a-year to the Engineer.

The PREMIER said he was almost sure that the salary had been paid. He did not look upon increases to professional men in the same light as those to ordinary Civil Servants, as they were paid for certain technical knowledge. He knew that a good draughtsman would receive as much outside of the Service, as good draughtsmen in that particular branch were very difficult to obtain.

Mr. McLEAN said he approved of the principle that the workman was worthy of his hire, but as the Committee had set their faces against all increases he did not see how an exception could be made in this case.

Mr. DICKSON said that Mr. Nisbet had represented to him that the officer in question was a very competent draughtsman, and that he had stated that if he did not receive an increase to his salary he



should be obliged to leave. Before he (Mr. Dickson) left office he recommended an increase to that gentleman's salary, being of opinion, from what he was told by Mr. Nisbet, that if he left the office it would be a great loss to the department. As there was a difficulty in getting mechanical draughtsmen, he hoped the item would be passed. He observed from papers supplied him that he had authorised the increase, and, though it had not yet been paid, the increase was made on the understanding that it should be put in this year's Estimates.

Mr. McLEAN, on the explanation afforded, withdrew his amendment.

Mr. GRIMES asked if there was anything special about the work of the Engineer-in-Chief for Harbours and Rivers that there should be such a wide difference between his salary and that of the Assistant Engineer, or that his salary should be £300 a-year more than that of the Chief Engineer for Railways? He moved the reduction of the item by £200.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that there was a great difference in the responsibilities of the two officers of this department, and it was as much as was indicated by the figures. The salary of the Chief Engineer for Railways was £1,450.

Mr. GRIMES, on this explanation, withdrew his motion.

Mr. GRIFFITH asked if the late Colonial Treasurer also authorised the increase of a clerk's salary from £80 to £150, and what were the circumstances under which the increase was made?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said that he had authorised the increase himself. The late Treasurer had suggested an increase to £120, but he (Mr. Mellwraith) considered £150 little enough.

Mr. GRIFFITH said it was the only department in which increases of salaries were put down, and that would be unsatisfactory to officers in other departments.

Mr. WALSH said this officer was either worth £150 or nothing.

Question put and passed.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Mr. Perkins) moved the item of £5,430—Department of the Secretary for Public Lands—and, in reply to the hon. member for Rosewood (Mr. Meston), said that Mr. Tully, the Under Secretary, was at present acting as Surveyor-General. Whether he was permanently to be appointed or not he was unable to say, as the matter was under consideration.

Mr. WALSH called attention to the fact that the chief clerk, Mr. Deshon, had been taken from another department and put over the heads of several officers of the Lands Department. He believed him to be a good officer, but the very fact of putting him over the heads of men in this department

would create dissatisfaction and demoralise the Service altogether.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the only information he could give was that he found the present chief clerk in the office when he became Minister for Lands. He was a very efficient officer, but he would not be doing justice to other officers of the department if he did not say there were two or three competent men in the department at the time this appointment was made either of whom could have taken the position, and it was very poor encouragement to them to see an officer from another department put over their heads. Though he had nothing to say against the chief clerk, he would add that, had he been in office at the time, he would not have made the appointment.

Mr. McLEAN said he was in charge of the Lands Office at the time the appointment took place, and was, of course, responsible; but his colleagues, who understood the different departments better than he did, at the time considered that in selecting Mr. Deshon they were appointing the officer best suited to the work. From what he understood of the work, there were not many gentlemen who had the business capacity for this very important position.

Mr. WALSH was glad to hear the explanation, but such action was enough to discourage any public servant. If the clerk at £400 a year were not able to do the duties of the chief clerk he ought to be dismissed the Service. He knew that clerk personally, but he was a man who had not sought for political influence, and who had suffered accordingly. A great injustice had been done. He denied the propriety of taking an officer from another department to place him here. It seemed that one step in promotion had been denied to every man in the office. He hoped Mr. Deshon would be placed in the position he occupied before he went to the Lands Office; and by so doing a great injustice would be avoided.

Mr. PERSSE agreed with the hon. member for Cook. He had nothing to say against Mr. Deshon—a better officer would not be found in his department—but they had lately had before them the Auditor-General's Report, in which he regretted extremely that he had lost this officer's services, and added that it was doing him an injustice by taking him away as he could not get another to fill his place. He could not understand what could have possessed the party in power to make the change; it was a farce. Supposing the Under Secretary were unable to be at the office, and the Minister for Lands wanted certain information from the chief clerk in his absence, that officer would not be in a position to furnish it. It was wrong to put him into the Lands Office, and until he was put back to the Auditor-General's

Office both the Minister for Lands and the Auditor-General would have a right to complain. Had the late Ministry only looked in the Lands Department itself they would have found men just as capable of fulfilling the duties of chief clerk as Mr. Deshon. If not, the Under Secretary was unfit to hold his position. That officer ought to train the men under him so that one or more of them would be able to take his place if he were to die or resign to-morrow. There were men in the office who could do the work as well as Mr. Deshon, but for political reasons they had been ignored, and the whole department was disheartened in consequence.

MR. MOREHEAD said the fault lay with the Under Secretary, who would not have anyone in his department who could be a possible successor to him. He was one of those spoken of by Pope, who could

"Bear, like the Turk, no brother near the throne."

It was a direct insult and slur on every officer in the Lands Department to have it said that a chief clerk could not be provided from among themselves. It was grossly unfair to men who had toiled for years and years, fitting themselves for promotion, to put over their heads a gentleman taken from another department. If an officer had to rely for promotion on political influence, the system of the Service would be destroyed; but in that Service promotion, like kissing, seemed to go by favour and not by merit. He agreed entirely with what the hon. member (Mr. Persse) had said on the subject; and, giving Mr. Deshon all credit for his intelligence and ability, how was it likely that an officer transferred from the Audit Office to the Lands Office could be of very great assistance to either the Minister or the Under Secretary. He had one more remark to make. The offices of Surveyor-General and Under Secretary for Lands should be separated. The Under Secretary appeared to be the master of the situation; men might come, and men might go, but he went on for ever. He seemed to have more control over the department than the Minister. Mr. Tully had a great deal too much power, and arrogated to himself a position to which he had no right. He was the most domineering subordinate in the Government Service. He had a good position and great ability, but he seemed to let his abilities run riot sometimes, evidently thinking himself the Minister, and the Minister only one of his subordinates. If it were not profane to do so, he might call Mr. Tully a trinity. That officer was Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands, Under Secretary for Lands, and Acting Surveyor-General. Any one of those offices was enough to occupy the time of any ordinary man. Mr. Tully was a thoroughly well-meaning man, but he could not properly carry out

the duties of the three offices, which he had succeeded in getting within his clutches. At one time they had a very good counter-foil to Mr. Tully in Mr. Gregory. They were told that 479,000 letters passed between the late Surveyor-General and the Under Secretary for Lands in twelve months, although their rooms were only a few feet apart. He (Mr. Morehead) was inclined to think that Mr. Tully still carried on that correspondence with himself—that the Under Secretary wrote to the Acting Surveyor-General, and the Acting Surveyor-General replied to the Under Secretary for Lands, and then, in cases of difficulty, the whole of the correspondence was referred to the Chief Commissioner of Crown Lands for his opinion. Mr. Tully was the incarnation of red tape; he was tied round and round with it, and seemed utterly unable to unwind himself from the web he wove for himself. He hoped the present Minister would take some steps to facilitate business in the Lands Office, although he must admit that there had already been a great improvement in that direction; but the Minister would have a tremendous difficulty to get over in that most impenetrable buffer the Under Secretary. The outside public could not get past the Under Secretary, who sat and showed his front teeth at them, and they turned back afraid, saying, "If this is the Under Secretary, what must the Minister be!" He thought hon. members had long been too reticent in expressing their opinions about Mr. Tully, and he hoped they would now speak out. He looked upon Mr. Tully, with all his abilities, as one of the most expensive luxuries the State indulged in, and considered that he was the cause of more waste of money and time than any other officer in the Public Service.

MR. GRIFFITH said it seemed strange that private members should be better informed as to the working of the Lands Department than Ministers who had been in charge of it for years. One hon. member had told the Committee that the officers there were disheartened, and that none of them cared whether they did a day's work or not. If that was the case it was quite time the office was swept out. He did not believe in the information that came to private members, nor did he think that the department was so disorganised as some hon. members who stood up as friends of injured victims would have the Committee believe. He was sorry that the hon. members for Maryborough and Moreton, who had been Ministers for Lands, were not present. The former was confined to his house through illness and could not be present, but the latter might arrive before the sitting was over. With regard to the statement that the appointment of Mr. Deshon had been made through political

influence, he (Mr. Griffith) did not know that gentleman had a political friend, and he was quite certain that the only consideration that had influenced the appointment was Mr. Deshon's fitness. Many men might be admirable in certain places, but it was not everyone who made a first-rate chief clerk, and the appointment of an efficient chief clerk was most important for the good conduct of the office and the convenience of the public. When the office of chief clerk in the Education Department was vacant it was a matter of serious consideration whether Mr. Deshon should not be appointed to that post; but he (Mr. Griffith) then understood that it was desired that he should be appointed to the vacancy expected in the Lands Department.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would have been another wrong.

MR. GRIFFITH said he did not think so. From the way some hon. members talked about promotion, one would think that the Government Departments were rival establishments. Because a man happened to be in a very small department, was he to remain there for ever? One department appeared on the Estimates as consisting of only three individuals, including an Under Secretary, and was promotion in that department to be limited to the three? Such a principle was not adopted in any Civil Service in the world. In Great Britain, when an under-secretaryship was vacant, it was not the rule to appoint the immediately subordinate officer: the under-secretaries were always chosen for their special fitness for that particular work, and that was the proper principle. When this vacancy arose the hon. member for Moreton, who was just leaving the office of Minister for Lands, recommended Mr. Deshon to the hon. member for Logan, his successor, simply because he believed him to be the fittest man to carry out the work of the department. The officer in that position should be able to take the place of the Under Secretary in his absence, and give all necessary information to the Minister. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for the Mitchell with reference to the several offices held by Mr. Tully, it should be remembered that formerly the dual system and the preposterous practice of writing letters from one branch of the department to another was adopted for many years. That was remedied by Mr. Stephens, who tried to get all the department under one head, which was a far better arrangement. It was bad enough to have several different departments acting as rivals of one another, but it was worse when they were all under the same roof. So far from any difficulty having arisen through the Under Secretary occupying those positions, it had been found a very great advantage to the colony. The same principle was observed in the Treasury

where the sub-departments of Customs, Excise, and Harbours were under the Under Secretary. The system appeared to be a very good one. There were quite enough heads of departments already—perhaps too many, and there could be no advantage in multiplying them.

MR. WALSH said the hon. gentleman had evaded the real question altogether, which was the right to take an officer from one department and place him over the head of everyone else in another department. He (Mr. Walsh) held with other hon. members that Mr. Tully had ruled the colony too long, and that a change would be beneficial to the State and to himself (Mr. Tully). In his report of the working of the Lands Department during 1878 Mr. Tully said—

"I have noticed that it is an important consideration with many selectors, in selecting land, to secure a piece they can dispose of readily, when they are in a position to do so after fulfilling the conditions. In a great many instances, the land, under such circumstances, falls into the hands of the adjoining pastoral tenant or large freeholder, as the case may be. When the principal motive for selecting land is to sell it again, I do not think that settlement will be the result; and it remains to be proved how far such a practice is prevalent in Queensland. I fear that it will be found more general than has been anticipated, and that in some districts where small holdings now abound, the land will revert to the condition of large paddocks used for purely grazing purposes. I draw attention to this matter because I believe it has been the aim of all the administrators of the Lands Department to foster the settlement of population on the land, and to maintain and perpetuate it there. So far as my experience enables me to form an opinion, settlement cannot be forced; its growth will be proportionate to the requirements of the community and its energies; and too great facilities for acquiring land only lead to one result—that of opening a way for mere speculators to buy and sell, as they would any other commodity."

In that paragraph Mr. Tully took upon himself to assume that small people took up land for purely speculative purposes, an assumption which he had no right to make. He appeared to be trying to prevent small settlers from taking up land and giving it to large squatters—at least, that was all he (Mr. Walsh) could take the paragraph to mean. The whole tenour of the report was objectionable, and showed that Mr. Tully had ruled the Lands Office, and that all Ministers had been mere clerks under him. He hoped an inquiry would be instituted, and those clerks that were inefficient dismissed, and those who were capable placed in their proper positions. He had no wish to do Mr. Tully any injustice, but, in the interest of the Public Service, he thought such proceedings should be fully inquired into.

Mr. REA said the hon. members who had spoken had answered each other. If the late Government had merely advanced a subordinate clerk under Mr. Tully, the accusation would have been brought against them that they wanted to perpetuate the dominancy of Mr. Tully. The late Government would have been to blame if they had not searched every office to find the fittest and ablest man to put in the Lands Department; because to that department, more than all others, the people looked for facilities for getting information promptly and of a correct nature. The chief clerk was required to have a ready and inexhaustible memory, and from his experience on one or two occasions lately he inferred that Mr. Deshon possessed that qualification. That was a specialty in the commissioner for lands at Rockhampton which had called forth his admiration. He protested against an able man being kept in a particular department because he happened to be placed in it in his youthful days, and he considered the late Government had taken the best possible method to get rid of dominancy in the Lands Department by seeking out the best possible man for that position. Whether Mr. Tully really deserved the condemnation of the member for Mitchell he did not know, but frequent changes of Ministers for Lands had taken place, and of a necessity the permanent head of the department must have an immense amount of information within his own knowledge that no one else could possess. If they really wanted to get rid of the dominancy of one particular head of the department, the better way would be to get some one to work in the same position as joint commissioner.

Mr. GROOM did not know anything about Mr. Deshon, but he had known Mr. Heeney for many years. He knew him as land agent at Toowoomba at a time when dummying was carried on wholesale, and while other land agents got embroiled in difficulties Mr. Heeney discharged his duties without one of his actions being called in question. He was next appointed land commissioner for one of the western districts, whence he was transferred to the Lands Department, Brisbane. He believed that since the present Minister for Lands accepted office Mr. Heeney had to be sent specially to the Downs to get information about certain lands. He was an excellent officer, and was well entitled to promotion. As to the Under Secretary for Lands, it was long said that it would pay the colony to give the Gregory family a pension, and he believed it would pay the colony admirably to pension off Mr. Tully. They had heard a great deal about officers in the Civil Service taking part in political matters, but if ever there was a political report it was that of the Under Secretary for Lands

dated 23rd May last. The part in which he charged selectors with taking up land for the purpose of selling it to squatters was most impertinent. He should like to know how many such cases Mr. Tully had discovered, for in his opinion they were like angels' visits—few and far between. According, also, to the report, there were 72,796 acres of dummied land taken up under the Act of 1868 for which deeds of grant had not been issued. Mr. Tully said it was only possible to conjecture what the result of an appeal to the Privy Council would be, and that the probabilities were it would be in favour of the selectors. Why should it be in favour of the selectors if the lands had been dummied? Then he went on to say that he had no sympathy with men who had not acquired land in a *bonâ fide* way; but his object in suggesting that the deeds of grant for some of the selections should be issued was to arrive at some finality, and to get rid of a troublesome class of cases which were continuously being brought under the notice of the department. No doubt it was to be regretted that 72,796 acres of land should have been dummied on the Downs, and that the claimants should be still knocking at the land office for their deeds; but he hoped they would never get them, if the land was dummied. It was not right of the permanent head of the department to write to the Minister in charge in the way Mr. Tully had done, for the Minister was perfectly competent to take charge of the cases and decide upon them himself. Mr. Tully might be able to give some information in relation to them; but the Minister, who was responsible to the House, was well able to form his opinion upon them. As far as the question of promotion was concerned, if there was one officer deserving of recognition above others it was Mr. Heeney, for his long services. He was in every way a most excellent officer, but he did not think he was a favourite of Mr. Tully; and perhaps that was the reason Mr. Heeney had been kept in the background. If anything occurred to-morrow about land no one would be able to give such valuable information as that gentleman could; and, if Mr. Deshon was to be removed to his original department, Mr. Heeney was the proper officer to be appointed in his place.

Mr. KING said he wished to make a few remarks on the question of promotions in the Civil Service. With reference to what the hon. member for North Brisbane had said, he would point out that although under secretaries could be and were appointed outside the department it should be different as regarded chief clerks. A man of good ability might fill the position of under secretary, but he might be greatly dependent upon the chief clerk for departmental information; therefore, that officer

should be a man who had worked up to his position in the office, who was aware of everything that had transpired for years in it, and knew not only the work of the office but where to lay his hand at a moment's notice upon any information that might be required. It was perfectly impossible for a stranger, however able a man he might be, to make as good a chief clerk as a man who had been brought up in the office. He ventured to say that of late years a mischievous practice had been introduced. They were told when the office of chief clerk in the Lands Office had to be filled that no man would make such a good clerk as Mr. Deshon, who was accordingly removed from the Audit Office. In the Mines Office it was the same. Mr. Cameron was brought from the Lands Office to fill the office of chief clerk in the Mines Department, and men in that department were deprived of the promotion they were entitled to look forward to. Again, a gentleman was taken from the Treasury to fill the office of chief clerk in the Education Office, and in the Railway Department a gentleman was appointed to the position of pay clerk who was entirely unconnected with the department. All such appointments tended to demoralise the Civil Service, because they taught men that promotions went not by reward for faithful performance of duties but as a matter of favour. In the matter of the Lands Office, he believed Mr. Heeney was the most capable officer for the position of chief clerk; but even if he were not, there were other clerks who had been ten and eleven years in the department. Should it be for a moment supposed that one of these men would not make a better chief clerk than a stranger, who for some years, at all events, could not possibly acquire the knowledge required? It was a most unfair thing that, because Mr. Deshon might be an abler man in a general way than the clerks in the Lands Office, he should therefore be put over their heads, although they were perfectly qualified to perform the duties of chief clerk. He did not think it would be said there was not a clerk in the Lands Office competent for the position of chief clerk; and if Mr. Heeney was competent, an injustice was done to him when Mr. Deshon was placed over his head.

Mr. STEVENSON said he considered that a great injustice had been done to the clerks in the Lands Office by the importation of a stranger to fill the position of chief clerk; and as to Mr. Tully, without wishing to say anything against him, he must express his opinion that in the past there had been too much red-tapeism in the office. Of late there had been a partial reform effected, but there was a good deal more yet to be reformed.

Mr. MESTON would take the opportunity of testifying to the excellent administration of the Lands Office by the present Minister for Lands. He believed no Minister had done more to dispense with red-tapeism than the hon. gentleman, and, if he continued to conduct the Land Office with the same system and judgment, the colony would have reason to feel proud of his administration.

Mr. HAMILTON said it was very well known that the appointment of Mr. Deshon, who, he believed, was a most efficient officer, had been subversive of discipline in the department, and caused a good deal of heart-burning. With regard to hon. members having friends in the Lands Department, he noticed that the hon. member for Fassifern (Mr. Persse), in advocating the claims of gentlemen who might have filled the office which had been given to Mr. Deshon, carefully refrained from mentioning the names of friends. It was well known that Mr. Heeney was a thoroughly efficient officer, but he was not the only officer who could have filled the appointment with credit. There was Mr. Persse, who had been in the office sixteen years as land agent, and collected rents to the extent of £12,000 a year, and many other officers, who could have efficiently filled the office, and whose appointment would have given much more satisfaction than the one that had been made.

Mr. PERSSE said, with reference to the remarks of the hon. member for North Brisbane, any information he (Mr. Persse) got from those inside the Land Office did not make the slightest difference to him in regard to the course he had adopted. He had simply taken the matter up on the ground that this appointment was opposed to promotion in the Civil Service. He did not believe that a man taken from the Lands Department could fill a position in the Crown Law Office, or that an officer taken from the Crown Law Office could fill an office in the Lands Department, as well as an officer brought up in the department. An officer who had been a certain number of years in a department must know more about it than any member of that House, and he held that inquiries ought to have been made in the Lands Department whether there was an officer fit to fill the vacancy, before an officer was taken from outside. It was a slur upon the Lands Department to take an officer from outside to fill the vacancy, especially when there were officers in that department who would have filled it quite as well, if not better, than Mr. Deshon, whose removal from the Audit Department was contrary to the wishes of the Auditor-General. The best thing they could do would be to send Mr. Deshon back to the Auditor-General, and so satisfy his grievance, and let the head of the Lands Department see if he could

not find an officer in his own department to fill the position of chief clerk. Four of the best officers in the Lands Department had left it because they saw that they had no chance of getting on. They were Mr. Phillips, who went to the Works Department; Mr. Briggs, who became a surveyor, and went out on an exploring expedition; Mr. Lynn, one of the best draughtsmen in the department, and another officer whose name he had forgotten. These men had left through the domineering manner of the Under Secretary; they could not stand his tyranny and his red-tapeism. There was too much power placed in Mr. Tully's hands, who had also too much to attend to, and the department required complete re-organization.

Mr. REA believed that the transference of officers from one department to another had a good effect, because it showed a man of capacity and ability that his advancement would not be limited to his own department, and he hoped that system would be continued.

Mr. GRIFFITH agreed that, other things being equal, they should give preference to officers in the same department when vacancies occurred. The hon. member for Fassifern (Mr. Persse) had said it would be absurd to appoint an officer in the Lands Department to a position in the Crown Law Department; but perhaps he was not aware that that very thing had been done, and with very satisfactory results. Mr. Lukin, when a clerk in the Lands Office, was appointed chief clerk in the Supreme Court, and did the work very well. There could be no general rule in those cases. With regard to the immense experience which officers must have because they happened to be in one department for some years, he would ask what would a clerk in the Occupation Branch know about the Survey or other branches, or about the general clerical work of the office? The fact that a man was employed in the building did not give him any special knowledge of the whole department. In dealing with these cases the objections to every course that might be adopted should be considered, and not merely the objections to the course actually adopted, as was usually the case. That was the course taken by his colleagues when in office in regard to this appointment. He thought that Ministers often did not get the credit they were fairly entitled to in those matters.

Mr. PERSSE contended that the argument of the hon. gentleman did not hold good, simply because Mr. Lukin had been appointed chief clerk of the Supreme Court. There were officers in the Lands Department who were quite as able as Mr. Deshon to fill the office in question. There was Mr. Heeney, who had been fourteen years in different branches of the department—

who had filled positions of trust, such as land commissioner, and who held as high rank as Mr. Tully before he got to be Under Secretary; and his claims should have been considered before Mr. Deshon was appointed. As he had previously stated, the promotion of one officer in the department would give promotion to the whole; and the Civil Service would never be what it ought to be until promotion was by merit and nothing else.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he quite concurred with every word which had been uttered by the hon. member for Fassifern. He did not care whether Mr. Heeney or anyone else should have been appointed to the position into which Mr. Deshon had been foisted, but he contended that that appointment was a gross injustice to all the officers in the Lands Department. If no immediate good results followed from the present debate, ultimate good would arise, as it would be seen that neither the Committee nor the country would permit such an improper use of the power which a Minister possessed.

Mr. DICKSON said it had been stated that Mr. Deshon had been taken from the Audit Office against the wish of the Auditor-General, but he was prepared to say that that gentleman, although he considered Mr. Deshon one of the best officers in his department, was glad of promotion being given to him, as he had been in the Service for a very long period. There was no other reason induced the Ministers of the day to make the appointment except the very high character Mr. Deshon bore in the Audit Department. Whilst in the Audit Office, Mr. Deshon had several years' travelling, and therefore he was glad to have an opportunity of succeeding to an office where he would not only have a higher rank, but where he would be relieved from the necessity of travelling. The appointment was not made against the wish of the Auditor-General.

Mr. MOREHEAD could understand Mr. Deshon's wish to be promoted to an office where he would have higher pay and easier times, but that was not the question or any reason why an injustice should be done to the officers in the Lands Department. The hon. member altogether ignored the claims of those who had worked for years to get one plum out of the pudding. There was no doubt that Mr. Deshon was a good officer, but that did not justify an appointment that might have had the effect of demoralising the whole Civil Service. The hon. member had not adduced one argument to show that there was no one in the Lands Office fit to occupy the position given to Mr. Deshon, and until that was proved he, on behalf of the Civil Service, contended that the appointment was a most improper one.

Mr. MILES pointed out, as an instance of the difficulty there was sometimes experienced in filling up an appointment, the position the Government were in the other day in regard to the vacant judgeship.

Mr. WALSH said that the argument that Mr. Deshon was the best man for the appointment was not a correct one, as Mr. Heeney had had very long experience in the department. Had that gentleman been appointed, as he ought to have been, it would have caused promotion throughout the office, and Mr. Persse, who was in the habit of receiving from £12,000 to £14,000 a-year, and was thus placed in a position of trust, would have succeeded Mr. Heeney. He was satisfied that the debate would have beneficial results, and he hoped that a searching inquiry would be made by the Minister for Lands, and that if it was found that Mr. Heeney was fit to occupy the position now filled by Mr. Deshon he would be appointed to it, and Mr. Deshon sent back to his old office.

Mr. REA wished to point out that hon. members opposite had forgotten that the hon. member for Fassifern had answered all the queries, in saying that four gentlemen had previously left the Lands Office in consequence of the domineering conduct of Mr. Tully.

Mr. PERSSE rose to explain that what he argued was that the Lands Office was not working satisfactorily.

Mr. REA would accept the explanation. The arguments of hon. members opposite were a complete denial of the principle of competitive examinations.

Mr. WALSH, in order to test the feeling of the Committee, moved the reduction of the chief clerk's salary by 1s.

Mr. HAMILTON would like to ascertain on whom the onus of this appointment lay. He had been under the impression that to Mr. Drew was to be attributed the appointment, and that he had used his political influence to that end.

Mr. GARRICK said the appointment was made while he was Minister for Lands. It would be remembered that the then chief clerk, Mr. Huntley, intended to retire, and it became necessary to appoint someone to his place. It was a matter of very grave consideration who the selection should fall on, for he considered that there was not a more important office in the Service, as it was one which required a man with greater business capacity than many others. He made inquiries first in the department and then outside, having been told that there was no officer in the department so fitted for the duties as could be obtained outside. Two names were mentioned, one the land commissioner at Maryborough, Mr. McDowal, who had previously been on the Downs, and the other Mr. Deshon. Mr. Drew had nothing whatever to do with the ap-

pointment, and Mr. Deshon being a very able clerk with a considerable amount of organising capacity, which happened to be required at the time, he was appointed. He (Mr. Garrick) recommended the appointment, believing it was for the public good. He acknowledged the right of what hon. members had said, that officers within the department should have the preference, and if he had come to the conclusion there had been anyone in the office who would have suited as well as Mr. Deshon, he would have appointed him. He regretted that the appointment came while he was there, but knew that it was impossible to satisfy everybody. He had thought only of the public good, and had endeavoured to appoint the best man.

Mr. HILL said the hon. member for North Brisbane had stated he did not know how it was, but private members seemed to know a great deal about under secretaries and the officers in different departments.

Mr. GRIFFITH had not spoken about under secretaries at all. What he had said was that private members seemed to know a great deal more about the relative merits of the officers in the departments than the Ministers in charge of them for some years.

Mr. HILL might inform the hon. gentleman that there were private members who were old residents of the colony and had had opportunities of visiting the public offices year after year. He had done it himself, and was able to form an opinion about the officers of the departments and the Ministers as well. When the hon. member (Mr. Garrick) was at the head of the Lands Office, he (Mr. Hill) never went to any office with less satisfaction. The hon. member was the mere tool and dummy of the Under Secretary. There was nothing could get Mr. Tully out of his red-tape, and there was no termination to any business possible.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that they were informed by the hon. member (Mr. Garrick) that the reason why Mr. Deshon was appointed was because the Minister for Lands did not think there was a competent man in the Lands Office at the time. He (Mr. Morehead) denied that statement. There were a dozen men in the department throughout the colony who could take the position; and if they were not able to do it they were not fit for the positions they now held. There were men in the office in Brisbane, without going further away, equally qualified with Mr. Deshon to fill the position. The hon. member had cast the greatest slur he possibly could on the department—he had, in fact, said that they were a mass of incompetence. As the hon. member seemed a puppet in the hands of Mr. Tully, it was probably the latter who really made the appointment, the hon. member being either too careless or lazy to

ascertain whether there was anybody in the office competent or not.

Mr. WALSH, acting on a suggestion from the Premier, withdrew the amendment.

Mr. GARRICK said it was wrong to throw the blame on Mr. Tully. If there was any blame at all it must rest upon himself and his colleagues. If the same appointment were to be made to-morrow, and he had the same power of making it, he would do precisely as he had done, in the assurance that it would be best for the colony.

After further discussion,

Question put and passed.

The CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

The House adjourned at twenty-seven minutes past 10 o'clock.