

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**THURSDAY, 20 NOVEMBER 1884**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

*Thursday, 20 November, 1884.*

Railway from Dalby to St. George.—Annexation of New Guinea.—Formal Motion.—Lithographs of Railways.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Parliamentary Buildings Committee.—Adjournment.

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

RAILWAY FROM DALBY TO  
ST. GEORGE.

Mr. JESSOP said he wished to move a motion, without notice, with reference to a petition received by the Minister for Works that day.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member can only make a motion without notice with the consent of the House. Does the House consent to the hon. member making the motion without notice?

The PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith): What is the motion?

The SPEAKER: The hon. member had better read his motion.

Mr. JESSOP: I wish to move that a copy of the petition received by the hon. Minister for Works from certain residents of Dalby and St. George and the district, relative to the construction of a railway between Dalby and St. George, be laid on the table of the House.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles): I will lay the petition on the table without any motion. There is no necessity for a motion.

## ANNEXATION OF NEW GUINEA.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—Before you proceed to discover the formal business, I rise to inform the House that a message has been received from Lord Derby by His Excellency the Governor, to the effect that, after full consideration of the replies from the Australasian Governments respecting the proposed increased contribution towards the expenses of Her Majesty's jurisdiction in New Guinea, and respecting the appointment of a council of advice, Her Majesty's Government propose to leave these questions for the consideration of the Australasian Governments with the special commissioner on his arrival.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Does this communication come direct from Lord Derby to the Premier?

The PREMIER: No; I think I said it came through the Governor.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Through our Governor direct?

The PREMIER: No; the communication has been received in the same manner as other communications lately, through the Governor of New South Wales.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I think it is time, now that the annexation of New Guinea, so called, has taken place, that we had a debate upon the matter in this House; and on Tuesday or Wednesday next, if it will suit the Government—and it will not take long—I will draw the attention of the House to the position of affairs so far as we in Queensland are concerned.

#### FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to:—

By the HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH—

That there be laid upon the table of the House all correspondence connected with, and evidence taken in the case of shooting blacks at Tambo, referred to by the Honorable the Minister for Lands in his speech of the 19th instant.

#### LITHOGRAPHS OF RAILWAYS.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker.—Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Premier if he can inform the House when the lithographs of the plans of the proposed railways will be distributed amongst hon. members?

The PREMIER: Instructions were given this morning for their preparation, and they will probably be ready in about a week. I had hoped they would be ready sooner.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Could they not be ready by Tuesday next if the Premier would kindly hurry them as much as possible?

The PREMIER: They will be ready if possible.

#### SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson), that the Speaker leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply—

Mr. PALMER said: Do I understand the Colonial Secretary to say that there will be a debate upon the New Guinea question next week? I had intended to refer to a telegram that appeared in this morning's *Courier* relative to the negotiations that were proceeding between the French and German Governments and Lord Derby; but if there is to be a discussion next week I will wait.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition intimated that he intended to call attention to the matter on Tuesday or Wednesday next. If the hon. member for Burke referred to the subject now I could give him no additional information whatever, as I know only what he knows.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that £21,983 be voted for services connected with the Insane, said that the first item of £400 was six months' salary for an inspector. When the Estimates were prepared it was proposed to appoint an inspector at £800 a year, but it was, after further consideration, considered unnecessary to make the appointment during the present financial year. Therefore he proposed to appoint the present Superintendent of the Asylum at

Goodna to act as Inspector of the Insane, at any rate for the present. That was the arrangement carried out in New South Wales when a similar law was passed, until it became necessary to appoint a separate officer. The next item of £175 was for six months' salary to the Curator in Insanity, being at the rate of £350 a year. It was considered that the duties of Curator of Intestate Estates and Curator in Insanity could be performed by the same officer. The duties were entirely analogous, being the protection of estates of persons which were left unprotected. With the assistance of a clerk the whole of the work could very well be done by one officer. The clerk was to receive £200 a year. With respect to the vote for Goodna, there were scarcely any changes, and what there were were very small ones, and he need not point them out.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he presumed that that £775 represented the sum that was required to put the new Insanity Act into operation. There was a foot-note (a) which showed that the Curator in Insanity was also Curator of Intestate Estates. Were they, he would ask, going to revert to the old system? Perhaps the hon. gentleman would say who was the Curator of Intestate Estates?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the present Curator was Mr. Darvall, who was also Inspector of Distilleries.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that gentleman was then to hold the offices of Curator of Intestate Estates, Curator in Insanity, and Inspector of Distilleries.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that it was a new vote, and it was thought desirable to give hon. members every information. It was the intention of the Government to appoint one officer at a salary of £700 a year to perform the united offices of Curator of Intestate Estates and Curator in Insanity. It would have appeared strange if they had put down a Curator in Insanity at a salary of £350 a year.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked why the salary of the Superintendent at Sandy Galop had been reduced?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Superintendent at Sandy Galop had been promoted to a better appointment at Goodna, and one of the warders at Sandy Galop had been promoted, but did not receive the full salary of his predecessor.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if it was anticipated that as much as £1,000 would be required to bring the new Act into operation?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he hoped not. It was difficult to frame the first estimate, but after the first six months they would be able to see pretty well what the expenditure was likely to be, and they would be guided by that to a great extent next year.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £2,110 be granted for Reception Houses. At Brisbane, two warders, who had been a long time in the service, each received a rise of £10, and the matron got a rise of £20. At Maryborough, a nurse had been appointed at £39; and at Rockhampton, the matron got an increase of £20, and an extra nurse had been appointed at £39. There was also an increase in the incidentals.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £26,625 be granted for the Colonial Stores. The only changes were, first, that a clerk got an increase of £20 a year, and the messenger's salary was raised from £7 a month to £100 a year. There was also an increase of

£2,000 for contingencies, which was caused by the increased number of police and inmates of asylums.

Mr. MACFARLANE said there was an item in contingencies which he would draw attention to—the clothes and stores for asylums and gaols. It was very well known that there was in the colony an industry called the Queensland Woollen Manufacturing Company. As one interested in the success of that company, he had waited on three different Colonial Secretaries with a view of seeing if it was not possible for the Government to give part of their orders to the colonial company. The first Colonial Secretary who was waited on was the Hon. J. Douglas. He (Mr. Macfarlane) and those with him were received with great urbanity and good feeling, and Mr. Douglas promised to do the best he could for the company, but nothing had been done. He then waited on the present leader of the Opposition, Sir Thomas McIlwraith, and was also received well by him. He promised to do all he could to further the interests of the company, and recommended the Colonial Storekeeper to make purchases from the company; but that promise came to nothing, or next to nothing. He had then waited on the present Colonial Secretary, and was also very well received by him, and he promised to bring the matter forward; but up to the present so little had been done that he had come to the conclusion that the Colonial Storekeeper was master of the situation, as far as not patronising the company was concerned. He (Mr. Macfarlane) maintained that the goods manufactured by the Ipswich company were better than those bought by the Government at the present time. The goods were made of pure wool; he had tested them himself, and they were better than the English goods for which a higher price was paid. It depended entirely upon the good-will of the Colonial Storekeeper whether he made purchases with the company, and his experience of the quality of goods could not be very great if he preferred shoddy-made articles rather than goods made of pure wool. He (Mr. Macfarlane) knew that the colonial-made article was better and purer than the English goods; and why there was a prejudice against it he did not know. The Colonial Storekeeper had said that if the company could provide what was known as indigo-blue cloth he would give orders for some, and the company had gone to the expense of purchasing machinery to the value of £1,000 to meet the demand, yet, when the cloth was turned out and supplied to the Colonial Stores, it was returned on the plea that it was not dyed with an indigo bottom. It was apparent that there was a hitch somewhere, because the General Superintendent of the Store Department was against the company. As a purchaser for the Government, that gentleman ought to have the necessary knowledge to know whether a piece of cloth was indigo blue dyed or whether it was only part wool, and whether the material was of a good quality. The gentleman did not appear to have that experience or knowledge, and therefore he chose a shoddy article, and left unpurchased goods which it would be most advantageous to the Government to use. There were asylums, gaols—institutions at St. Helena and Dunwich—besides the Police Force and the volunteers; in fact there must be actually enough goods bought by the Government to keep a mill twice the size of the one at Ipswich going. He could see that all that information was new to the Colonial Secretary, and he hoped that, having called attention to the matter, a change would be made.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not remember the hon. member calling upon him on the subject. It must have been a good while ago.

Mr. MACFARLANE: About six months ago.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he desired to encourage the establishment of successful industries in the colony; and it would be a good thing if, instead of one, there were a dozen such mills as that at Ipswich.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he did not think the case was as the hon. member for Ipswich had put it. His sympathies were entirely towards the establishment of those industries, and whatever could be done in a legitimate way to help them ought to be done. If any business arrangement could possibly be made by which the cloths used in the Government departments could be made here, he thought it ought to be done. That had been his object; he did everything he possibly could for the Ipswich Company; but the fact was, the fault was on the part of the company. He was persuaded that, from the price of wool here and the price at which labour could be got in Ipswich and at other places, far better cloths ought to be made in the colony than could be bought at home. But, as he had said, the fault lay with the company itself. When he said that, he was speaking to some extent against himself, because he was a shareholder in the company, though not a large one. He remembered the hon. member bringing the matter before him, and an order was given for a certain amount of police clothing; but when he saw the colour of it he could see at once that the Government were not getting a good bargain, and his decision was against the company. That, therefore, was the fault of the company. If they would produce an article that he was sure they were capable of producing, he had no doubt the Government would buy it. He was quite satisfied that both the last and the present Government had every disposition to assist the company if they could produce a good article, and that they would give a preference to the locally produced article, even considering the price. The proper thing for the company to do was to look to the real wants of the Government, and endeavour to meet them. He had always found the colonial tweeds last a great deal longer than the tweeds made in Scotland—there was no comparison in the wear of the two articles—but there was a great deal of difference in the art or design, and in the way they were finished; and it was well known that the tailors were always opposed to showing a customer colonial goods. He believed the Government were willing to help the company, and that the fault, so far, ought not to be put on the shoulders of the Government Storekeeper at all.

Mr. HORWITZ said that neither the last nor previous Governments had encouraged the company as they ought to have done; but he hoped the present Government would buy all the cloths that the company could make. He considered that colonial-made goods ought to be bought before imported goods.

Mr. SCOTT said he thought it was hardly fair for the hon. member for Ipswich to attach all the blame to the Colonial Storekeeper. He had accused that officer of being ignorant, prejudiced, and unfit for his position; that was not at all fair. The only illustration he brought forward was with regard to some blue cloth, which he himself acknowledged was not up to the mark, and not what was wanted. To accuse the Storekeeper of not doing his duty, because he refused to take that cloth, and to say that, therefore, he was ignorant and incompetent, was not fair, and was not the way to push the trade of the company. The Storekeeper was a good man; he had done his duty to the colony for many years, and he ought not to be treated in that way.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the hon. member had mistaken what he said. He did not say that the Storekeeper was not fit for his place. He believed that his knowledge—

Mr. SCOTT: You said "want of knowledge."

Mr. MACFARLANE said he knew the man, and he was not an ignorant man. He was a man whom he (Mr. Macfarlane) highly respected. What he said was that his knowledge of manufactured goods was deficient, because he preferred the imported shoddy goods to local goods made from pure wool. He admitted speaking of the cloth used by the police—that was indigo bottom dyed blue—and he said that that particular article, as made at Ipswich, was not equal to the English goods. But at present the company did not expect to make such a good article, so far as blue was concerned; but they could make other goods, such as were worn at Woagaroo and Dunwich, better than those that were imported; and he thought they ought to be encouraged, therefore, to produce that class of goods.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know whether the company had ever tendered for supplying cloth to the Government—he did not remember their doing so—but if they would state the kind of goods they could produce and the price, he should be glad to give every encouragement to the establishment of the industry on a sure basis.

Mr. SMYTH said he wished to draw attention to the item of £120 for the salary of one of the clerks. The clerk put down for that salary was a person who at one time was in the employ of the Government as an engine-fitter, or in some such capacity, on the railway works; and he was also a volunteer. By some mischance he had both hands blown away in the discharge of his duties. At the present time he was engaged in the Government Stores, and he (Mr. Smyth) had had an opportunity of inspecting his handwriting, which was very creditable indeed. He could also keep accounts well. At the time he lost his hands he was getting about £3 10s. a week, and that was twelve years ago. Nearly all the others who had been working in the department at the same time with him had progressed in the service, or had succeeded well on their own account; and it was hard that a man who had been maimed in the execution of his duty, and who was deserving of all the more consideration, as he had served the country as a volunteer, should now be getting less than £2 10s. a week. It was not sufficient for a man with a family, who had to keep up a respectable appearance. If he did his duties faithfully and well, he should have a salary equal to that of the second storekeeper, whose place he frequently filled.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the circumstances of the case had not been fully brought under his notice. The clerk in question had been represented as a deserving officer, and recommended for an increase, and the usual increase allowed on a salary of £100 was put on the Estimates—£20. Had he had all the circumstances before him, he should have recommended a larger increase, as he should probably do at the next opportunity.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he thought that if a man was disabled in the Government service he should have a pension to match with his salary, so that there would be a certainty for him to fall back on if he became unable to earn his salary. He thought this officer should be put down for a salary of not less than £150.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that he had known that person very well before he lost his hands. He wrote very well indeed now—better, he believed, than before the accident. He did not think that because a man had to write with

wooden hands he should receive a smaller salary than others, provided he did his work as well as they did. He should like to see the salary increased to £150.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that there be granted a sum of £9,765 for salaries and contingencies for Gaols. The changes in the estimate were not numerous. A junior clerk had been found necessary for the Inspector of Prisons; and at Roma an additional turnkey had had to be appointed in consequence of the increased number of inmates. An increase was proposed to the salary of the principal turnkey at Townsville, to put him on the same footing as the principal turnkey in Brisbane; as the number of prisoners was very large, and the work quite as great, if not greater, than in the Brisbane Gaol, while the cost of living at Townsville was higher. An additional turnkey had been appointed for the same reason.

Mr. PALMER said he remembered that last year the hon. member for Rockhampton (Mr. Ferguson) had made an astonishing statement about the gaol in that town, which had then been finished five or six years, but had never been used, while the old gaol was being propped up to keep it in position. Had anything further been done yet?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the gaol was at last inhabited—during the last few months.

Mr. BLACK said he noticed that the Inspector of Prisons was also Sheriff. He found by the Blue Book that the Sheriff of Queensland had a salary of £700. He would like to know whether that was in addition to the £100 he received as Inspector of Prisons.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, of course.

Mr. BLACK said that £800 seemed an excessive salary for the work done by the Sheriff. He noticed throughout the whole of the Estimates for the present year a tendency to increase salaries. He did not know whether that was an increase, but he thought that where the Government considered it necessary, under certain circumstances, to increase some salaries, they should also take into consideration the necessity for decreasing others, where the work done was more than sufficiently compensated. He thought £800 a year was an unreasonable remuneration for the work of the Sheriff, and that officer might very well be Inspector of Prisons without any additional compensation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Sheriff had always been on the same footing as the under secretaries, and had received the same pay; and when an officer was appointed to the position he accepted it on that understanding. The present Sheriff had held the office for fifteen years or more, and it would certainly be a very singular principle to introduce into the Estimates, to reduce the salaries of officers of that standing, who had been receiving the same salaries for many years, unless there was a general reduction.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that if it was a very bad principle to reduce the salaries of old officers, why did the Government do so in the case of the Registrar-General, whose salary was reduced by £30, without any reason being given by the Premier at all? There was exactly the same reason for reducing the salary referred to as for reducing that of the Registrar-General. But he did not believe in reducing the salaries of old officers unless for some special reason, and that was why he took such strong objections to the reduction of the salary of the Registrar-General.

Mr. BLACK said he was always willing to accept a reasonable explanation. But that the Premier's explanation was a good one he did not consider was borne out by the action of the Government. He looked at the Estimates, and found there many cases where there had been a reduction of salaries. He did not know whether it was because the gentlemen in those cases were not so high in the favour of the Government that their salaries had been reduced. But, as a matter of fact, they would find reductions all through the Estimates.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Where?

Mr. BLACK said it was hardly necessary to refer to one; but Rockhampton was a case in point of reduction. The Police Magistrate of Thursday Island had received £800; he now got £725.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Where does that come in?

Mr. BLACK: There was the Clerk of Petty Sessions at Toowoomba: he received £526, and now only got £360.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Oh, nonsense!

Mr. BLACK: It was in the Estimates. Again, the Clerk of Petty Sessions at Townsville got £400; he formerly received £608.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Nonsense!

Mr. BLACK: Then the Colonial Secretary did not schedule what the officers were really getting? He (Mr. Black) only spoke from what he saw in the Estimates. He held that the principle of reduction had been carried out in other Government offices in innumerable cases.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not give any reason for the reductions referred to, for the simple reason that they had not been made. It was explained about five times on Tuesday evening, in answer to questions from the hon. member himself; and the hon. member had expressed himself satisfied.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £9,840 be voted for the Penal Establishment at St. Helena. The chief warder had been put down for an increase of from £200 to £220, but since the Estimates had been prepared a change had been made, and that officer had been transferred to Goodna. The present chief warder had been appointed at the old salary of £200, so that he did not propose now to make the increase. Three additional warders had been appointed at lower rates.

Mr. ARCHER: Who is chief warder now?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Hamilton; he used to be at Goodna.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH asked how it was that they wanted so many warders down at St. Helena? The last time he was there, there was a want of prisoners. Had they increased so much since the present Government had been in power?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that when he was there, about three weeks after the hon. gentleman went out of office, the gaol was so full that there was scarcely room to put all the prisoners in.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: What! At St. Helena? Oh, nonsense!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; but he found that the new building was occupied immediately afterwards. Certainly he did not know how it could have been empty when the honourable gentleman was there.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he had been speaking of the accommodation for the

prisoners at St. Helena when he left office; and there was then accommodation for a third more prisoners than were in the establishment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was not the case a few weeks afterwards.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £2,210 be voted for the Reformatories at Lytton and Toowoomba. That was an addition of £210 compared with last year, and arose from putting down as salaries paid to the superintendent and matron, £60 and £40, which had been previously paid from contingencies; and the schoolmaster, whose salary of £110 had been hitherto paid by the Department of Public Instruction.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £6,580 be granted for the Benevolent Asylum, Dunwich. The two officers there were down for an increase of £25 each, and there was a considerable increase in the item for provisions, medical comforts, and incidentals. He was sorry an increase should be required, but it could not be helped, unfortunately. The present buildings were full to overflowing, and it would be necessary to ask for a vote for the erection of additional buildings.

Mr. MIDGLEY said he objected to the outlandish place to which pauper invalids were sent. The subject had, he believed, been discussed in years gone by; but, now that the erection of additional buildings was contemplated, the Government might take into consideration the expediency of shifting the place from the island where it was now situated. The men and women sent to Dunwich were people who had been simply unfortunate, who had grown old and infirm, and against whose characters there was nothing to be said; and yet they were treated considerably worse in some respects than the inhabitants of St. Helena. It was his disposition to visit Dunwich occasionally to see how the poor people there were treated, to talk with them and cheer them up; but as a matter of fact, during all the time he had been in Queensland he had only been there once, and that was to see a young man—a German—who had been a short time in his service, but who fell sick and was sent to Dunwich, where he ultimately died. Had that young fellow been sent to a place that was more get-at-able he should have felt it his duty to see him every week, and do little things for his especial comfort. That was only one instance out of many of a similar kind. The people at St. Helena were much nearer civilisation than the poor old unfortunates at Dunwich. One reason why the asylum should be removed was that greater facilities should be given to the people of the colony to visit the establishment, and see to the comfort of the inmates in their declining days; and another was that greater facilities should be given for clerical visitation. More frequent religious services would be acceptable to many of the inmates, who were now entirely dependent, in that respect, upon casual visitors. Again, if the asylum were on the mainland, the friends of the inmates might occasionally give them a few shillings which they might desire to spend in an evening's entertainment. At present they had no comforts or enjoyments, except the food and shelter provided for them by the country. People, when old and feeble, ought to look forward to the possibility of something better. Many of the inmates at Dunwich had been pioneers in the colony, and had worked there for years, and they must feel the isolation of the place. He protested against the continuation of the institution in the outlandish spot where it was now located.

Mr. SMYTH said he had visited the institution a short time ago, and what he saw led him to the conclusion that there was great room for improvement. The buildings were scattered, and in wet weather the poor, helpless people had to tramp through the rain to the place where they got their meals. The Government should erect better buildings in closer contiguity. He had read the report of the Select Committee issued by the Upper House, and some of the evidence was worth taking notice of. The meat used there was of the very poorest description—the sheep being like lanterns, running from 22 lbs. to 25 lbs. each. There seemed no occasion to keep sheep there to starve, when there was so much splendid mutton in Brisbane, with a steamer to carry it down once a week. Then, again, the bread was by no means what it should be. In short, the poor inmates were not taken care of as they ought to be. In looking through the list of names, he found there was only one inmate from Gympie—a man named Kermode, sixty-four years of age. Kermode's family were now living at Gympie, pretty well-to-do—earning good miners' wages—while the father was existing on the charity of the people of Queensland. Such a thing seemed disgraceful; it was a case into which the Colonial Secretary might well cause an inquiry to be made. Those people ought certainly to be made to pay for the support of their parent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought that Dunwich was a very suitable place indeed for a benevolent asylum. If near a centre of population, it would simply become a kind of hotel where people could go in or out as they felt inclined. That was not the case at Dunwich, to any great extent. Shortly after he assumed charge of the Colonial Secretary's Office he came to the conclusion that there was a great deal that was wrong in their system of dealing with those people. There was no law at all regulating them, or any power to make regulations or enforce any discipline, or any power to make relatives contribute to the support of the inmates if they were in a position to do so. All those things were wanting, and could only be done by legislation. Although he was aware of the importance of dealing with the matter, he neither had the time to frame a scheme nor sufficient information upon the subject to approach it properly. In the Insanity Bill they had provided for making relatives contribute towards the support of the inmates as far as possible, and the same rule ought to be applied to the relatives of the inmates of Dunwich. He hoped before long to be able to introduce a measure dealing with the matter in a practical manner.

Mr. FERGUSON said there was a large increase to contingencies in the vote. He was one of the members who visited the institution not very long ago, and he met there a man whom he knew very well in Rockhampton, and who was engaged for a long time in the Railway Department there. He there met with an accident, and lost one of his legs in consequence; but otherwise he was a strong healthy man, and fit to perform many duties still. He had made several applications to be given some employment in the Railway Department as a gatekeeper, or one of the many other things he was still capable of doing; but he could get none, and was at last obliged to apply for admission to Dunwich. If the Government would employ him in some way, it would be a gain to the institution. Men meeting with such accidents in the service of the Government should have the first consideration.

Mr. ARCHER said he agreed with what had fallen from several hon. members who had ad-

ressed the Committee, that a better place could not be selected than Dunwich. What would be the change if the asylum were brought nearer town? It would be a workhouse; and instead of living in a place where there were, at all events, green grass and trees about them, the inmates would have an English workhouse, and be caged in by stone walls. They could not have such an institution near a big town; and the arguments that had been brought forward for making a change were the very worst that could have been made use of by those who were concerned in those who lived at Dunwich. It was a melancholy place to go to; he had been there often. It was always melancholy to see a number of human beings collected together, who were suffering either physically or mentally. But what would be their position if they were brought nearer Brisbane? They would be put into a stone barrack and surrounded by stone walls, and not be allowed to leave without permission, not even for the purpose of attending—as the hon. member for Fassifern had suggested—evening entertainments. If they were brought to town they would be deprived of the little comfort they found at Dunwich—green grass and green trees. As to the other question which had been raised by the hon. member for Fassifern, that the inmates were not visited by ministers of religion, that was entirely the fault of the ministers. He could assure the hon. gentleman that if all those people down there were Roman Catholics they would be visited every week by the priests, who were always anxious to do their duty. There was no minister in Brisbane who looked upon it as a matter of necessity to visit Dunwich. It was too far away, and too much bother. It was simply the effect of the slackness on the part of the ministers of religion, who would not put themselves out of the way, and the poor inmates must suffer because there was no Protestant minister who cared so much about the well-being of those people that he was willing to put himself to a little discomfort to do what the hon. member for Fassifern would like to see done. Whatever they did they should not bring those people nearer town.

Mr. ALAND said he quite agreed with the remarks which had been made in reference to the position of that institution. He was sure that if it were brought nearer to town it would be open to many abuses; but he would say a few words in defence of the Protestant ministers, since the hon. member for Blackall had been so kind as to eulogise the Roman Catholic clergy. There was one Protestant minister in Brisbane, the Rev. Mr. Stewart, who occasionally visited Dunwich for the purpose of affording religious ministrations to the poor people there. No one had a higher opinion of the efforts put forth by the Roman Catholic clergy for the good of their people than he (Mr. Aland) had. They were self-denying in their efforts to afford ministerial comforts to those placed in their charge. He was aware that Dunwich was not occupied solely by Protestants—in fact, he knew there were a good many Roman Catholics on the island. Seeing that was the case, perhaps the hon. member for Blackall would say whether the Roman Catholic clergy were attentive to their duties, and visited those belonging to them at Dunwich.

Mr. ARCHER said he really could not tell the hon. gentleman, as he had not inquired. But he could tell him where he got his opinion of them as missionaries. He happened to be in the Sandwich Islands when the smallpox was about. The Protestant clergy were men with wives and families, and he never saw one of them visit a sick family. But he never saw one of the Roman Catholic priests or missionaries

who did not perform his duty, even to taking off his shirt and giving it to a sufferer. That was what gave him so high an opinion of the Roman Catholic missionaries. He thought they set a good example to ministers of other denominations.

Mr. MIDGLEY said the hon. member for Blackall had alluded to British workhouses as being bare stone buildings caged in all round; but he (Mr. Midgley) might say that he had seen English workhouses which were palaces—both as regarded the buildings and the surroundings—when compared with the Benevolent Institution of Dunwich. There was a time when the British workhouses were out of town, but they had been gradually built round and become like prisons; but that was not the kind of workhouses that were being built in Great Britain now. He remembered looking over one especially, which in every respect, in the gardens and in the agricultural surroundings and the buildings, was simply a palace in comparison with the institution in Queensland. He regretted very much that he seemed to be alone in the opinion that the place was not suitable, but he was in no way convinced that he was wrong. He felt perfectly confident that when a measure for a redistribution of seats was brought in, and if the inhabitants of Dunwich were allowed the privilege of returning a representative to Parliament, it would be a blue lookout for the present Government. Now, what objection was there to an institution of that kind being nearer the people than it was? He did not want it in Brisbane, or within a few miles of it, but it was not the custom to take a workhouse and plant it in the Isle of Man or Isle of Wight, though they were very salubrious and very healthy places. Those institutions were placed within reach of towns, and people who wished to go there and see the people and minister to their comforts had the privilege of doing so. No bad results accrued from that, and the visitors' day, he knew, was a red-letter day for the inmates. The same objection might hold good of other institutions. They might object to the hospital being so near to town, yet no evil resulted from that. The people there could be visited by their friends; and why men and women should be inaccessible only when they were old and feeble he failed to see. He had also alluded to allowing the people the privilege of coming up to concerts sometimes. He knew that occasionally people went down to Dunwich and gave a service of song which greatly delighted the inmates. He did not want them to go to concerts at the cost of the State, but they sometimes had a few shillings given to them, and could spend them in the way he had mentioned if they more accessible. With regard to being visited by ministers, he was not going to screen from their share of blame the Protestant ministers. He believed more might be done, but one reason why so little was done was because the place was so far away, and the inhabitants of the place were divided into so many denominations that what was everybody's business was nobody's business; whereas with regard to Roman Catholics they were as one, and could be got at by one of the ministers who belonged to their church. He repeated again that for the advantage of the people it would be better if the institution were nearer instead of being absolutely isolated as it was at present.

The Hon. B. B. MORETON said he had had an opportunity of going down to Dunwich when the committee of the Upper House had taken evidence, and one thing that struck him was the way in which males and females were allowed to mix together. He had not read the report, but he considered it necessary that some alteration should be made.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he noticed that the Superintendent and warder had each had their salaries raised. Had that been on account of the favourable report given by the committee? He noticed that the chairman of the committee was also the representative of the Government in the Upper House at present. Was it on his recommendation?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman must know that the report had been brought up since the Estimates were framed. The salaries had been raised on account of length of service. Mr. Hamilton, the Superintendent, had been at Dunwich seventeen years. With respect to the separation of male and female inmates, the present arrangement was in the highest degree unsatisfactory, and if hon. gentlemen would look at page 65 of the Estimates they would see that it was proposed to ask for £2,500 to build a ward for the female patients. The present arrangement was not as it should be.

Mr. PALMER said he noticed by some of the evidence that was given before the committee that there appeared to be a very loose way of admitting patients to the institution. It was a place for the aged and infirm, but by the evidence it would be seen that a great many persons were allowed to go there who either had means themselves or whose friends had means. Mr. Gray, the Under Colonial Secretary, had acknowledged that, although he had no official knowledge of such a state of things, yet he knew personally that inmates were admitted who were well able to support themselves and whose friends could support them. He thought, if it was possible to make the patients at Goodna pay for their keep, the same principle should be applied to the inmates of Dunwich. He would also suggest that, taking into consideration the fact that there were between 500 and 600 inmates of the institution, a resident medical man should be appointed to look after them.

Mr. MELLOR said that, in reference to one remark made by the hon. member, he understood that those who were entitled to remittances did not receive the money personally, but that it went to the Government. He had been to the island, and, as far as he was able to ascertain, the people there were very contented.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that, in reference to the salary of the Superintendent, he found that the gaoler in Brisbane received £375, besides £78 for house accommodation, making over £400; that was for looking after criminals. The Superintendent of the Benevolent Asylum, however, was only paid £300; so that it paid far better to go in for the rough department than for benevolence. He did not know who the Superintendent of the Asylum was, but, from the remarks of the Colonial Secretary, he had been a long time in the department, and only got £300, while persons in inferior positions were paid £400. But it was the same thing all through the Estimates; so that it was not new.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £1,810 be granted as salaries and contingencies for the schooner "Mavis." The "Mavis" had taken the place of the "Pearl," which was employed at Thursday Island, and had been found unsuitable for the trade; she had, in fact, got old and was sold. The "Mavis" was a great improvement on the "Pearl," which, he might say, was sold for her full value. The vote for the purchase of the "Mavis" would be put on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. ARCHER asked from whom the captain took his orders. Did he apply to the Government, or did he take his directions from the Police Magistrate at Thursday Island?



The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he took his orders direct from the Police Magistrate at Thursday Island.

Mr. BEATTIE said he was glad to hear that the "Mavis" answered admirably for the duties she had to perform. He thought it would be much better for the colony, particularly as the large trade through Torres Straits was increasing, to have a steamer. The expenses would not be a great deal more. There were two or three steamers coming out, and he did not know what they were intended for, though he believed that one was for the pilot service in Moreton Bay, and the other to take the place of the "Kate." A Government steamer at Thursday Island would be a great advantage, and might be able to render valuable assistance, more particularly as they were getting into closer communication with New Guinea.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it might be necessary before long to have a steamer at Thursday Island. At present they scarcely knew what arrangements were to be made in connection with New Guinea; they would know better after a while.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £2,676 be granted for salaries and contingencies for the steamer "Kate."

Mr. ARCHER asked when it was likely that the new steamer to take the place of the "Kate" would arrive.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had just read a letter from the Agent-General giving the latest information. The steamer was expected to be ready for delivery in about a month from the date of the letter, so that she would be delivered about a week ago. All the necessary arrangements had been made for bringing her out, and she would, therefore, probably arrive in two or three months at the latest.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the "Kate" was becoming a political institution now; so many Cabinet councils being held on board. The last Government used to try that; they used to try to hold Cabinet meetings in that way, and the result was that there was a fair amount of shooting, a good deal of claret, and sometimes there was whisky. It was very rarely that they did any business of any description. They visited Dunwich and St. Helena; but no knotty subject of politics was ever discussed. They did not try the plan often; and they only did so when they had some important public duty to perform. But the present Government was a sort of half-marine Government—they were almost always on board the "Kate," especially when there was any complication, and whenever they had got into a difficulty. The Minister for Lands, he had no doubt, when in the throes of the Land Bill, found relief—not from sea-sickness, but from what he found on board. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) would like to know how the thing worked; who paid the piper for it all; and were the contingencies to be increased very much on that account? There was another thing, too. He saw that several steamers for Queensland had been launched at home. He did not order any when he was there the last time; yet he found that there were no less than five reported to be building for the colony at the present time. What were they all for? The Committee were entitled to know something about how the new political institution worked aboard the "Kate." It did not seem to have produced a proper result, because on the next page they came to the Defence Force, and the Marine Department was neglected altogether. At all events, let the Colonial Secretary tell them how the system

worked, and whether it was intended to extend it? The new steamer coming out would have room not only for the Cabinet Council, but for the whole of them—Opposition and all.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Cabinet Councils the Government held on the "Kate" were real Cabinet Councils, and not jollifications, such as the hon. member said he used to hold. Whenever they had been on the "Kate" they had done hard work, for the reason that they could work without fear of interruption, which was a very difficult matter in Brisbane. They got an opportunity of working together for seven or eight hours without interruption. The plan, he thought, was a good one, though it was not by any means new, as he remembered it used to be adopted by a previous Government of which he was a member. The hon. member wanted to know about all the steamers that had been ordered. The hon. member must have a very bad memory; did he not know that he had ordered them all?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: No.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member did not actually let the contracts, but his colleague the Colonial Treasurer had made all the arrangements; and when the present Government came into office they found all the money there and all the preliminary arrangements finished, so that they had nothing to do but accept the contracts.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he knew exactly the number of steamers he ordered. There were two he did not order, and knew nothing about.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the final arrangements about those two steamers were made by him when in Sydney at the Conference, twelve months ago, after he had been in office about a fortnight. Everything had before then been completed, except a small question as to which of two alternative tenders should be accepted.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that there be granted a sum of £28,509 for salaries and contingencies in connection with the Defence Force. He said the general scheme had been explained last week in considering the Bill upon which the Estimates were framed. It was divided differently from the manner in which it had been divided before, in order to give the Committee an idea of the way in which the force was proposed to be organised. Of course it was only the land force, as they had not yet sufficient information upon which to frame Estimates for a marine force, and any expense on that score likely to be incurred during the present financial year would be necessarily very limited. The force was divided into the permanent staff, the permanent force and school of instruction, and the other branch of the service. In the estimate for the permanent staff, the inspecting officer was proposed to be omitted, and the salary of the commandant was proposed to be increased by an amount not quite equal to the salary of the inspecting officer. With respect to that increase, he ought to give the Committee some information. When the proposed salary of £700 was notified in England, it was pointed out at once to Colonel Scratchley, in whose hands the selection was left, that it was insufficient. Colonel Scratchley then undertook that if a good officer were selected he would recommend the Government to increase the salary. He had kept his promise, and he (the Colonial Secretary) felt bound to ask the Committee to concur in the recommendation made. In the next item there was simply a change in name; an officer was called brigade-major instead of artillery staff-

officer. Then there was the infantry staff-officer, who was the instructor of the infantry force. He was an officer in the Indian army, who had obtained leave of absence from the Indian Government at the request of the Queensland Government, to give his services in instructing the force—Captain Des Vœux. The sergeant-instructor in gunnery and the sergeant-instructor in submarine mining and engineering had both been engaged in England for a fixed term. Then came the item of clerk and storekeeper, with respect to which it had been said that there was an indication on the Estimates of some animosity on the part of the Brigade Office. He had already explained how it was that that officer had not received the full salary of £200, and he need not repeat it; but comments had since been made upon the reduction of the amount of £160, at present paid, to £150. The fact was that the salary recommended by the Brigade Office was £160, but he (the Colonial Secretary) thought it would be better, instead of having a military officer in the post—an old soldier—to get a civilian clerk to perform the work; and he thought £150 would be a fair salary. He was responsible for the change, and no one else had any share in the responsibility. He intended to provide for that officer in another manner. There were two additional drill sergeants; the other items were unchanged. Coming to the scheme for the permanent force, there were to be—1 quartermaster-sergeant, 1 master tailor, 4 sergeants, 4 corporals, 4 bombardiers, 2 trumpeters, 60 gunners and drivers. The chief instructor would be the instructor to the whole force; he was the major commanding the battery, with a salary of £550. It was not proposed to have any other commissioned officer attached to the battery; but it was proposed to have, from time to time, a captain and 4 lieutenants of the volunteer branch of the force, with pay at 14s. and 10s. a day, respectively, while under instruction. That system had been found to work very well elsewhere, in Canada particularly. The clothing was put down at £5 per man, and the annual cost of the whole was estimated as £9,207; assuming that as many as 60 gunners and drivers were employed. An increase of £50 was put down for the salary of the head instructor of the band, and £100 for the purchase of instruments. There was an allowance proposed for the medical staff while in camp at the annual review; and £50 was proposed for a veterinary surgeon. It would probably be a saving to have a veterinary surgeon attached to the force, to look after the horses employed on the batteries. There were proposed to be two batteries of field artillery, and there was a joint estimate for the two—90 privates at 6s. a day, 4 trumpeters at 6s., 8 bombardiers at 7s., 8 corporals at 7s. 6d., 8 sergeants at 8s., 2 battery quartermaster-sergeants at 8s. 6d., 2 battery sergeant-majors at 8s. 6d., 4 lieutenants at 10s., 2 captains at 14s., and 1 major at 16s. That, of course, was only while they were called out—a period varying from eight days to sixteen days during the year. Now the Estimates were framed intentionally to show the maximum amount of expenditure that would be incurred under the new scheme. In all previous years the actual expenditure had been considerably less than the vote; but it had been of course difficult to know, in framing the Estimates, what the actual expenditure would be. It had never happened yet in any year that the force had kept up to the full extent. Last year the amount voted in the Estimates was £23,421; and the amount actually unexpended was £9,850. In framing the Estimates they had to put down the maximum, so that the Committee might know exactly how much the force would cost at its full strength. They proposed now two

batteries of field artillery, three batteries of garrison artillery, one company of engineers, and four companies of infantry of the First Regiment. In addition to those, there was provision for the defence of the colony of ten companies of infantry, at a cost of £3,160. The full number of each company would be 61—50 privates and the rest officers and non-commissioned officers. There was also a company of mounted infantry, consisting of 51 men altogether. Under the head of "Contingencies" there was not very much to which to call attention, unless he was specially requested. A sum had been put down for torpedo stores, and purchase of a launch. There was a launch purchased by the late Government for the purposes of the Volunteer Force, but it was found to be perfectly useless for laying torpedoes, as it was not safe to go below Breakfast Creek in it in rough water. There was an item of £1,000 in the contingencies for additional companies, but that might not be required for the present year. It was proposed that the greater portion of the pay of the force should be deferred, so as to give a substantial inducement to the officers and men to remain in the force for the full period of three years. Hon. members would see that provision was made in the Estimates for the largest number of men that could be employed. Of course some money had already been expended on the old basis; but they had not attempted to put down two sets of Estimates—one for six months on the old system, and another for the rest of the year on the new. Of the £28,500, not less than £20,000 would be expended down to the end of the financial year. It was far better to frame the Estimates so that they could see what the system would cost in full working order, than to put down a problematical sum on the Estimates which might have to be considerably increased.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he scarcely understood a part of the hon. member's speech. Was it usual to lay on the table an estimate for an amount of money for the service of the year, unless it was expected that that money would be spent? The hon. member, in fact, said that he did not believe that the force would come into such a position that it would require the amount of money voted during the present year, or for a good many years either.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it would not cost more than that for many years.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he should be very sorry if it did cost anything like that for many years. He believed it was the most extravagant and unjustifiable vote on the whole Estimates. In 1882 they tried an experiment. They took the highest military opinion that they could get at the time, and they came to the conclusion—the House acting on the highest military opinion then available—that they could get an efficient force. The only thing required was money. Well, that money was proposed; the House was munificent and actually granted the amount; and regulations were, on the recommendation of the same military authorities, made under the Act then in force. But the force as reorganised turned out a complete failure, and they were left, in the opinion of all authorities, in a worse position than they had been in before. The Volunteer Force, or Defence Force, was just now as bad as it possibly could be. They had got a new authority on the matter—Colonel French—and he said that it was a failure; although he (Sir T. McIlwraith) did not put the opinion of that gentleman higher than the opinion of Colonel Scratchley. Acting on his (Colonel French's) opinion they had got a new scheme, and he had not the slightest hesitation in saying that, were it not for the responsibility that would have been

thrown on the Government if the force were disbanded at the present time—had he not taken into consideration that position—he could, had he exerted himself, have secured the support of hon. members and have thrown the Bill out. It was very questionable whether the Bill passed with the deliberate sanction of the House. There were few members who did not doubt its efficiency, and none of them would lay much money that it would turn out a good scheme after all. But they had passed a Bill which a military authority now said would enable them to establish a good and efficient defence force at a cost of £34,000 a year. £34,000 a year was far too great an amount to pay for that one arm of their defence; it was more than they could afford, and more than they needed. It must not be forgotten that they had to provide for their first line of defence, for which there was not a single penny on the Estimates. At least another £34,000 would be required for the first line. The Colonial Secretary shook his head, and said “No,” and when he did so it showed that he had far less appreciation of the value of that service than he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had. He believed that it was the most important, and that they were making a mistake in attaching too much importance to the military side of the question. Now that the Defence Bill had passed the House and would no doubt soon become law, they were committed to a reorganisation of the force; but even the Colonial Secretary himself admitted at the time that it was only an experiment. Well, if that experiment was to be tried, let it be tried with as little expense to the country as possible. He believed the amount which was thought in 1882 a magnificent sum to spend upon the Volunteer Force—£20,000—would be quite sufficient. The scheme of the Defence Bill would cost £34,000, which he considered extravagant—far too much to spend on what the Premier acknowledged to be an experiment. He intended to move as an amendment that, instead of £28,509, only £20,000 be granted for the Defence Force; and probably not the whole of that would be required during the present year. If the amendment were carried, it would involve sending back the scheme to the military authorities for rearrangement, on the understanding that not more than £20,000 would be spent upon it. He moved that the sum asked for be reduced by £8,509.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the inconvenience of the amendment would be that it would be difficult to know which items were to be reduced. If the hon. gentleman was desirous to press his amendment, it would be better to take the first two items—permanent staff, and permanent force and school of instruction—separately. Those were in the nature of salaries. The reduction could then be moved on the remainder of the force. Provision was made on the Estimates for 1,182 volunteers, or within 18 of the number provided for on last year's Estimates. He was certain the hon. member did not desire to disband any of the force, especially as he had recognised two years ago that payment was necessary. He should be sorry if Parliament were to put the Government in the position that they must either disband the men or reduce their pay to such a rate that they knew they would not remain in the force. If they were going to have volunteers at all, there must be a staff, and he would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his amendment, so that he might move the first item, that £3,510 be granted for the permanent staff.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that would not be the most convenient way. If the Committee decided to spend no more than £20,000 on the volunteers, it would be for the

Government to submit later on a scheme showing how they proposed to distribute that amount. That was how it was done in Victoria, and it was much the best way. The approval of the House to the modified scheme would be given afterwards.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the objection to that was that it would give the Government absolute power to arrange everything themselves. So long as they kept within the £20,000 they might expend it in any way they liked. They might give magnificent salaries to some persons, and very little to the volunteers; indeed, they might dispense with volunteers altogether. It was not desirable to leave the matter entirely to the discretion of the Government, at any rate as far as salaries were concerned.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman was simply wasting time talking in that way. The Government submitted a scheme to cost £34,000 a year, and they were asked to withdraw it and submit another to cost £20,000 a year. As to salaries, surely the hon. member did not suppose the Committee would submit to his increasing the Commandant's salary from £900 to £2,000, for instance. If there was any objection to any of the salaries it should be stated now.

Mr. FOXTON said that one great complaint that was made by hon. members who were opposed to any money being at present voted for the Defence Force, was that no improvement in the force had taken place since the appointment of Colonel French, as Commandant, less than twelve months ago. The new Commandant was blamed for not having improved the status and efficiency of the force in that time. But how could Colonel French do anything of the kind except by bringing in a scheme which he believed would effect that purpose? And the vote at present proposed was to give effect to that scheme. The proposal of the hon. member for Mulgrave was to reduce the vote by something like £10,000, and the point naturally arose that if hon. members were prepared to criticise Colonel French's scheme, and said it was too large an amount for them to vote, surely it was but fair that in reducing it they should indicate to Colonel French what portion of the scheme they objected to—whether the gunners should receive 4s. instead of 6s., whether the staff was to be abolished, whether the permanent force or the drill instructors were objected to, or whether it was the number of batteries or companies which should be reduced. Colonel French said, through the Estimates and through the Colonial Secretary, that that was what he considered necessary to make a proper and permanent force, and the complaint of hon. members was that the present force was not efficient. He said that was what he proposed in lieu of the present inefficient force. If a reduction were to be made, surely the proper way to make that reduction was to indicate where the expense was deemed excessive. The effect of their vote had been pointed out by the Colonial Secretary. The voting of £28,000 did not necessitate the expenditure of that sum, and from figures that had been given he was satisfied that something like £10,000 or £12,000 must have lapsed during the last three or four years.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: A great deal more than that.

Mr. FOXTON said that the Defence Force had not cost them anything like what had been stated by the leader of the Opposition the other night—£23,000. That was the fullest expenditure that could possibly take place, supposing the force to be up to its full strength, and every man

attended every drill and parade. But that was an absolute impossibility. In the first place, the force would not be up to anything like its full strength for some time, and experience had shown that men did not attend the maximum number of drills and parades. They attended only sufficient, as a rule, to qualify as efficient, although some attended oftener than others. If the Government were prepared to risk something in the matter they could accept the amendment of the hon. member with perfect safety and without altering the items on the Estimates one bit. The estimate was one which could not be possibly be spent.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said the Government appeared to be asking for money which they did not intend to spend. The Colonial Secretary said it was convenient for Colonel French to let them know what it would cost when it was in full going order. It was right for Colonel French to give as much information as possible. What were the Estimates for if not for the purpose of showing what money was required, and how it was to be spent? The gist of the speech of the hon. gentleman was that the Government could not spend all the money. When he took the sense of the Committee on the proposed reduction from £34,000 to £20,000 it was to affirm the principle that the Volunteer Force, when in full swing, should not exceed that amount. The Colonial Secretary had said that if they started now, and spent according to the schedule before them, they would not spend all the money. If they carried the amendment he had moved, the expenditure would be absolutely limited to that, which was the principle he wished to affirm. It was of no use asking for money that was not wanted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY asked what would be the consequence of the motion made by the hon. member, if carried? If the amount were reduced to £20,000 the Government would be perfectly well able to organise the force on the proposed basis, and would not spend more than £20,000 during the current year. But they would be deceiving the country, and throwing dust into the eyes of the country, because, although the force could be administrated on that basis for the rest of this year, what would be the effect of their being confined to £20,000 next year? When the Government proposed a new scheme it was their duty to bring down to the Committee in detail the scheme that they proposed. He said the proposed scheme would cost so much per annum, and he did not want to deceive the Committee by saying that £20,000 would be sufficient this year when they would want £30,000 next year. The proposition amounted to wiping out the Volunteer Force altogether. The permanent staff and defence force together would amount to £12,717. There must be a permanent staff, and it could not be much smaller than that. The permanent force would cost £9,207 per annum, and they could not get a force to be of any use for much less than that. Then the contingencies, however economical they might be, would more than make up the difference between that and £20,000. During the present year they had only half-a-year's expenditure on the permanent force and a smaller number of volunteers. To think that it would be kept up for £20,000 was out of the question. The hon. gentleman himself agreed last week that a permanent force was necessary, and that a school of instruction was necessary, and it was necessary that they should have their guns manned if they were to be of any use whatever. The hon. gentleman proposed to allow £10,000 for the rest of the force for the whole year. It could not be organised on that basis. If they spent £12,300 on the staff and permanent force they

would only have £7,500 for ammunition, camps of instruction, and the rest of the items under the head of "Contingencies," for which they had to ask £12,000. What would be left for the men? Absolutely nothing.

Mr. BEATTIE said he could hardly follow the Colonial Secretary, because he had told them that for the last three or four years there had been a large unexpended balance from the moneys voted by the House for carrying out the volunteer system. The officers required for the newly organised force would cost £3,000 a year, and the permanent force was a new item amounting to something over £9,000. He was not going to oppose the vote, for he should be sorry to do anything which would in any way injure the Volunteer Force. He knew that the money voted during former sessions was for keeping up a larger force of volunteers than existed at the present time, as was shown in the Estimates before them? Why then was that money not expended? That was one of the reasons which had tended to disorganise the system. He noticed by the estimate that each volunteer company was entitled to £390 year. There was provision made for 10 captains, 20 lieutenants, 13 colour sergeants, and 50 sergeants. That made provision for ten companies unless each company was to have two captains. How was it that that money had been allowed to lapse, and was that not one of the reasons why the volunteers had been complaining of the mismanagement of the department? They all knew that Colonel French was an admirable officer, but he had been here twelve months, and there was not the slightest improvement. The volunteers never ceased to talk of the matter among themselves, and no wonder. He had mentioned the other night, that when two companies were called out for drill on one occasion, thirty men of one company and ten from another turned up, and five of those were officers. That did not speak well for the two companies, which were looked upon as the prime companies. He would like to know the reason why the late Act had not been carried out so as to encourage the volunteers? It was no advantage to them to have the money lapsing every year, especially when every day complaints were heard of the disorganisation, and every day letters were written to the papers by the volunteers. An hon. member remarked, *sotto voce*, that they did not sign their names. No; it was only the officers who were privileged to grumble, and God help the unfortunate sergeant or private if he opened his mouth. That would be a breach of discipline, but the officer could do what he pleased. Sometimes letters of complaint were sent through the superior officers, but they seldom got to the head of the department. If the Colonial Secretary was going to insist upon putting the various items seriatim, he would draw attention to one or two matters. For the permanent force there was an item for forage, and first cost of twenty horses—£600. Were those twenty horses simply for the permanent force?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. BEATTIE said then there was an item in contingencies—"horsing guns, forage, lodging, and travelling allowances, repairs and contingencies, £2,500." Did it cost all that to keep twenty horses?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There will be more than twenty horses.

Mr. BEATTIE said he wanted to know if twenty horses were the number required by the permanent force and volunteers as well. He believed it was their duty to encourage as much as possible the Volunteer Force, but at the same

time to study economy. He had alluded the other night to the subject of a naval brigade, and was surprised that no attention had been paid to that branch of the force. However, they had the promise of the Colonial Secretary that he was going to make provision for such a force, and he (Mr. Beattie) would suggest that, if the material was on hand in the shape of guns to supply the various ports along the coast, the system might be combined with the land force. In looking over the Estimates for the New South Wales force, he found that every 100 men cost, including clothing and everything else, something like £2,000. And he had calculated that they ought to be able to get a force of between 600 and 800 men for about £12,000, who would really prove of some use in time of war and, as had been said by an hon. member, that would, at all events, make provision for the first line of defence. He was not going to do anything which would tend to injure the present Volunteer Force, but he hoped that it would be organised and looked after in a better manner than it had been in the past. The majority of the men in the force deserved the greatest respect for the attention they had paid to their duties. They had been very badly handled, and he thought they deserved every encouragement; but he doubted very much whether the new Act was going to be an improvement. It was an experiment, and they would see by-and-by whether it would be successful or not. For his own part he sincerely hoped it would be successful. Referring again to the sums voted by Parliament for the Volunteer Force during the last year or two that had lapsed, he believed, of course, that the number of men who had left the force would increase the amount of money in the hands of the Government. Turning to the first item in the vote—the inspecting officer having, of course, been struck out—he would say that he believed the Commandant was the right man in the right place; but he would draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that his salary was increased from £700, the amount agreed upon, to £900. But that did not show the total amount received by him; and it was on that point that he (Mr. Beattie) would like the Colonial Secretary to give some information. He understood that there was £100 set down for forage allowance, and £100 for quarters. That made the salary of the Commandant £1,100 a year. Of course, there was also 30s. a day travelling expenses, and that was very proper. It was for the Committee to consider whether the colony could afford to pay such a salary. A Minister of the Crown only got £1,000 a year, and he was sure the duties of the Commandant were not so heavy, nor was his position so responsible, as the Colonial Secretary's. He had nothing to say against the gentleman who held the position, because he believed he was an eminent professional man; but he thought £1,100 a year was too much.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was an allowance for forage and quarters, in accordance with the bargain made in England, as he had explained when he moved the estimate. A proposition had been made by an hon. gentleman opposite that the whole annual cost of the Defence Force in future should not exceed £20,000. That would simply mean abolishing the volunteers. The amount put down in the Estimates to pay the volunteers for the sixteen days' drill was just about £7,000. The estimate for the officers and the permanent force was £8,628; add to that the amount for contingencies, £12,810, and they got £21,438. Taking that from the total, £28,509, they got £7,000; which was just the amount of the daily allowance to the Volunteer Force, and the

amount the hon. member was proposing to strike off in future. The permanent force could not cost less than £9,000, unless they reduced its strength, and if they reduced it by one-half the saving would not be more than £2,000. Of course, thirty privates and a corresponding number of officers would not be enough to man the forts in Brisbane and the other parts of the colony. The permanent staff had been costing up to the present time about as much as was now proposed—£3,500. That gave £12,500 for the permanent staff and permanent force, and if they only allowed £20,000, it would leave £7,500, which the hon. gentleman proposed to be devoted to all the rest of the force. If they would look at the items under the head of "Contingencies" they would see they had to provide for uniforms, cadets, ammunition, and stores, ammunition for sale to members. Then there was £1,500 for camps of instruction; it would not cost less than that—last year the cost was within £100 of that sum—maintenance of rifle ranges, and so on. The items for ammunition and such things would more than absorb the £7,500, and there would be absolutely nothing left to give to the men. The proposition of the hon. member simply amounted to the abolition of the force, or the non-payment of the men. That might be the best system; but the contrary system had always been adopted. When hon. members talked about the expense of the system, they did not take into consideration the expense of the old land-order system—how much that cost the country. He understood that they had long ago agreed that it was desirable to give a certain amount of remuneration to the men when they were called out. £20,000 a year would be insufficient to carry on the force; if they adopted the hon. member's suggestion they would have either to abandon the permanent force altogether or have a purely volunteer body of men. He did not think it was fair to strangle the new system as soon as it was instituted; and if they did not vote sufficient funds it could not have a fair trial. They all desired that the defence force should be efficient. They could not predict with certainty that the scheme proposed would result in an efficient force, but they had good reason to believe it would, and all they asked was that it should have a fair trial. It could not be given a trial—assuming that there were to be volunteer corps in different parts of the colony—without a vote to the extent that they asked for. The total amount would not be expended unless the force was called out for the full period, and they all attended and got their full pay, which was not probable; but the Government felt they would be misleading the House if they put down on the Estimates for a new scheme any less amount than would put it in full working order. He believed that that amount would not be required to be increased for many years to come. They might get on that basis a satisfactory force if the House, which passed the Bill last week, were determined to give the scheme a fair trial. The estimate was the corollary to that Bill, and was what it would cost to give the scheme a fair trial; but if £20,000 was all that was to be spent in the future, then he said they might at once abandon either the permanent force, or reduce it to a purely volunteer force.

The HON. SIR T. McILLWRAITH said that the hon. gentleman had not put the position fairly before the Committee. In trying to force the conclusion that they ought to come to, he said that the proposition which he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had put before them would have the effect of making the permanent force remain in the position that they were in; that the contingencies should remain in the same position; and that there should be nothing left to the men—thus

reducing the present system to a purely volunteer force. That was not his proposition at all.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would be the result of the proposition.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Exactly; that would be the result of the proposition from the basis formed by the hon. gentleman, but not of his proposition. He moved an amendment to reduce the amount by 50 per cent. simply because the hon. member proposed the whole items in one sum; and it was the only way he could possibly move a reduction. He had shown afterwards, when he proposed to withdraw the amendment, that the object of it was to have an expression of opinion from the Committee, as to how much the defence force was likely to cost the colony. And having got that, he would leave it to the Government to come forward afterwards, with an amended scheme regulated by the amount the Committee were willing to grant. The hon. member said that he himself (Sir T. McIlwraith) had admitted that £9,207 for the permanent force and the school of instruction was necessary; that he had admitted that the amount of £12,810 was likewise necessary for contingencies; that he had admitted also that the cost of the permanent staff of £3,510 was also necessary: that those three amounts being assumed to be necessary, and claiming that he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had admitted that they were necessary—there was nothing at all left to pay the men. But he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had never for a moment admitted that those things were necessary, nor did he propose to support a permanent force or contingencies on such a scale as was put down there. The hon. member was quite right so far, in saying that he desired to fix the amount which the Committee wished to expend on the defence force. That was a right thing for them to do. But what reason had the hon. member given for the immense advance asked for in the Estimates compared with what had been expended before? They had a military commission sitting here which gave them the best advice that possibly could be got in the colony. That commission put forward a proposition, the cost of carrying out which would have amounted to £12,000. That was not agreed to by the House, because it proposed to pay only one class of volunteers, and to leave another class unpaid; to pay the men about Brisbane, and to leave unpaid all the country corps. The House said that was unfair, and resolved, therefore, to pay all alike. That came to £19,000, which was the estimate for 1882. That plan had been tried and found a failure. They were now going on a new system altogether. What they wanted to know was, whether the system they adopted of paying the men was the cause of the failure; or if it had anything to do with the failure; or whether the failure was caused by the amount of money voted not being enough? There was not a single tittle of evidence brought before the Committee to show that the failure was owing to not enough money being voted. The military commission considered the amount voted—£19,000—ample; that they could get a capital force for that amount of money. The new Commandant when reporting on the Defence Force had certainly never attributed the failure of the force to the fact that enough money had not been voted; at any rate he had not made any reference to it. But the reference that he had made had inclined him (Sir T. McIlwraith) to think that he rather looked with disfavour on the payment, or so great a payment as had been made to the force. He, at all events, spoke in terms of ridicule in one part of his report of the

amount of money paid to the men for their services at the camp of instruction. The member for Carnarvon, again, in speaking the other night on the matter, certainly did not go so far as to say that payment of the members on the big scale proposed in 1882 had been the cause of the failure; but he certainly led hon. members, if they chose to draw the inference, to believe that it had had a great deal to do with the failure. What reason had they, except simply that they had got a new commandant, to increase the sum from £23,000 to £34,000 at the present time? There was absolutely none, except that they ought to give the new Commandant a chance of carrying out his scheme. But if that scheme were a failure, what would be the result? The result would be that they would have lost their money, and would have what was a great deal worse than being saddled with an expenditure that it would be difficult for the colony to get rid of—an inefficient force. Those two consequences were sure to follow. They had initiated a new system. Hon. members did not understand it, and nobody but military men could. They had tried to understand it. He had taken a great part of it in good faith, as being the ideas of men who had had great experience in those matters. It was an important thing for the colony. Let them try those new ideas, but limit the amount to £19,000, which was considered a munificent sum in 1882. The pretence for the alteration was that it was organisation that was wanted; not an additional amount of money. What he said was, take a small force and try those regulations in the Bill with a small amount of money. £20,000 was, he considered, ample for a land defence force. They had not had one word from the Government as to the expense of the other defence force—the sea force, which was the real defence force of the colony. The great bulk of the £23,000 was to be swallowed up in Brisbane. It was not even for the defence of Moreton Bay, but only for the river and town. What they had got to provide for was the defence of the colony. Therefore his contention was that they should limit the money spent on the land force till they saw it thoroughly organised. Afterwards, if successful, they might increase the number of men and the amount of the subsidy. What else would the men have to do than to stand sentry at Government House, the Parliamentary Buildings, and the Treasury? Not half the number of men, in fact, were wanted. Contingencies might be reduced in exactly the same way. He had never given the hon. member to understand that he would support the contingencies as they stood, nor that he would support the permanent force as it was provided for there. The point on which he had always expressed a strong opinion was that they could not get men to give their services in a defence force unless they were paid. With regard to that he did not intend to propose any alteration. But they had gone a great deal too far in the cost of the permanent staff and of the permanent force. The object of his amendment was to secure an expression of opinion on the part of the Committee, as to whether the scheme should be so reorganised as to cost not more than £20,000 a year—leaving it to the Colonial Secretary to bring down afterwards a schedule showing the force on the reduced scale. It would be a waste of time for the Committee to try to rearrange the details of the scheme. The hon. member said that, if the amendment were carried, it would leave the Government free to carry out the scheme as they pleased, without consulting the Committee. But he had specially guarded against that, by stating that his amendment should be an instruction to the Government that they were not to spend more than £20,000 on the force when

reorganised, and that they were to bring up fresh Estimates in accordance with the change. How could he possibly have intended to leave that to the Government, when the Premier had said shortly before that even if the whole amount were passed there was no chance of more than £10,000 being spent during the present year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, in considering what they could reduce, they must first see where they could not reduce. There were some items which could not be reduced without seriously impairing the efficiency of the force, and those would have to be left out of consideration. Take the permanent staff. The only additional officers appointed were two drill-sergeants, and there was only an increase of £150 on the hon. member's own estimate. That item, therefore, was not capable of being reduced. Then came the permanent force. If the Committee decided to spend upon it £3,000 or £6,000, instead of £9,000, that force would have to be reorganised accordingly. He would leave out for the moment the allowance to volunteers, which was only £7,000 altogether—actually a smaller sum than was proposed last year by the hon. gentleman himself; and the only remaining item was that of contingencies. But clothing must be provided, and ammunition, and forage, and a camp of instruction. If the Committee authorised that for those purposes £6,000 should be expended instead of £12,000, the Government would have to make the £6,000 go as far as they could. But that was exactly where the question came in of starving the force. He believed the hon. gentleman would see the force of his arguments. If the total sum was to be reduced, let the Committee say on which items the reduction should be made, and with that view it would be far more convenient to take the first two items separately.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I never objected to that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member objected to it before; but however that might be, it would be a more convenient way, and would not lead to any waste of time. The question was a very important one, and it was very desirable that the Government should know exactly what were the intentions of the Committee with respect to the force. The Government would then carry out the wishes of Parliament, and make the defence of the colony as efficient as it could be with the money at their command. It would be convenient, and would not take longer if the hon. gentleman withdrew his amendment, and he (the Colonial Secretary) would withdraw his motion, and move the items separately.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he would do anything that the hon. gentleman considered would be conducive to good; but he deprecated the Committee doing work that should be carried out by the Government. It would be much better for them to have expressed an opinion as to how much they considered the force should cost; but if the hon. gentleman was desirous of going through the items one by one he had no objection; nor had he had any objection all through; still, he believed it would be best to get at the real opinion of the Committee, for the reason that they would have to fall back upon making amendments upon miserable subjects, such as reducing the number of men, or reducing the amount of pay. He would withdraw his amendment, and allow the hon. gentleman to propose the items as he chose. The Colonial Secretary was labouring under a mistake if he fancied that he had omitted to consider the position of the permanent force. He had not omitted to consider it, or any of the items. He had proposed a reduction of about 50 per cent. on

the whole cost, so as to get the opinion of the Committee that the force proposed by the Government was just about one-half more than what was necessary at present.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, with the permission of the Committee, he would withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn accordingly.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £3,510 be voted for the Permanent Staff. There were no new officers, except two drill instructors.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that, if the amendment had gone to a division, he should certainly have supported it, as he believed that £20,000 was sufficient for any defences that were required in Queensland. However, as it had been decided to take the items seriatim, the best thing they could do was to minimise them as much as possible. He observed that the salary of the Commandant was to be increased by £200. Last year that gentleman received £900. That was £700 regular salary, £100 for forage, and £100 as rent allowance. The salary would therefore be increased to £1,100, besides 30s. per diem when travelling, so that he had only to travel at the rate of sixty-six days in a year to give him another £100. He also received a free pass on the railways, which would make the total about £1,200 per annum, which he looked upon as an extravagant amount to pay any gentleman for commanding the forces in Queensland. They were not there to spend lavishly the taxes paid by the people. He had no doubt that the Bill would come into effect; but, believing that that amount was too large, he proposed that it be reduced £200.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would repeat what he had said before as to the circumstances under which that increase was proposed. The amount authorised by the Government was £700, and Colonel Scratchley, in conjunction with the Agent-General, engaged an officer to undertake the duties at that rate, with of course the allowances for forage and residence. Representations were made by Colonel Scratchley and to Colonel Scratchley that the amount was not such as ought to be offered to secure the services of a really efficient officer, considering what the other colonies were offering. Colonel Scratchley, who was then their military adviser, and who had since been succeeded by General Steward, made that recommendation, and the Government felt bound to act upon it. Colonel French was, therefore, led to expect that he would be recommended an increase on his arrival in the colony, but there was no bargain made binding the Government. He (Mr. Griffith) had also pointed out that the Inspecting Officer, whose salary was £235 a year, no longer acted in that capacity, and that Colonel French acted as Inspecting Officer as well as Commandant.

Mr. GRIMES said there was one question he would ask the Colonial Secretary. Did Colonel French understand that he was to have quarters and forage?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was part of the arrangement.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said there seemed to have been no agreement existing between Colonel French and the Government, but only an understanding with Colonel Scratchley that he should receive £200 over the original sum.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I stated the matter exactly as I understood it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said it was hard for members of the Committee to have

to decide upon matters that ought to be left entirely to the Government. At the same time he must say that they had been fooling away money for years upon the volunteers. Year after year they had been voting large sums of money, and there had been no single man in charge of the volunteers as minister or organising officer who had given the people value for their money. It was simply playing with the people's money. Colonel French might be a first-rate military organiser, but all he knew of him was his name, and that he was Commandant. Even if he were a good military organiser, £700 a year was too much. The whole matter should be left in the hands of the Government, as the Committee were scarcely able to give an opinion. Military matters were quite beyond the knowledge of most members of the Committee, even although there might be some volunteers among them. He would not support the reduction, simply because he thought the Government should be held responsible; but at the same time he believed they ought to get more value for the money than they had been getting; and £34,000, which was the real expense of the force, was far too much money to be thrown away without having any force which would be able to defend the colony when it was attacked.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he should like the hon. gentleman to state whether they were bound to follow the recommendation of Colonel Scratchley and stand by it. If Colonel Scratchley was authorised to hold out any hopes, or was given the power to make an arrangement binding the colony in the matter of that salary, then they were bound in honour to carry out the agreement. But if that was not so, it was not a proper thing to commence the reorganisation of the Defence Force by giving an amount to the Commandant that they decided was too much two years ago. They raised the salary then from £500 to £700; and hon. gentlemen must not forget that when Colonel Scratchley was authorised to engage a man, the engagement was understood to be only temporary.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Three years.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: He was empowered to engage an officer for a certain number of years, and at the end of that time he was to go back. He believed there could be nothing worse for the colony than to have a permanent commandant. The proper thing was to have that officer constantly relieved by a man of new ideas on the army. Bearing that in mind he could not understand why the arrangement should have been made. He did not remember the circumstances, but if Colonel Scratchley was authorised to hold out any hope of increase of salary, then they were in honour bound to vote it; but if it was simply a matter of opinion of the Committee, whether they thought the Commandant was not sufficiently paid, he would vote for the £700 being retained. The hon. gentleman mentioned the name of General Steward as military adviser to the Government. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) did not know of the existence of a military adviser. Who was he?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: General Harding Steward.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What is he; who appointed him; and what salary does he get?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said General Steward was nominated by the late Agent-General, Mr. Archer; and he (the Colonial Secretary) saw no reason to dissent from the selection. It was necessary to have somebody to act for the Government when they were

constantly buying military stores. It was necessary, too, that the Agent-General should have advice on such matters. General Steward was paid by commission. He (the Colonial Secretary) was not aware until that day how he was paid. General Steward acted in a similar way for several other Governments, and was engaged on the same terms under which he acted for South Australia. The hon. member for Mulgrave asked very properly whether the Government were bound by the arrangement made by Colonel Scratchley. The Government were under no binding obligation to increase the salary, but he thought they were under an honourable obligation to increase it. They were not bound to any fixed amount of increase.

Mr. BEATTIE said if such was the case he certainly could not support the reduction, but the Government had placed themselves in a very false position by allowing their late military adviser, Colonel Scratchley, to bind them down in any way. He thought it was a pity that such a thing had been allowed, but, having been done, they were bound to increase the salary from £700 to £1,100. Under the circumstances, he should be very sorry to oppose the reduction of the item; but he hoped the Government would be more careful for the future, and not allow anyone to lead them into an expenditure which he was sure they themselves did not approve of.

Mr. FOXTON said the hon. member was scarcely right in saying that the increase was from £700 to £1,100; it was an increase of from £700 to £900 or £900 to £1,100, according as the allowances were included or not. He went further than the hon. member for Mulgrave, who, if he understood him, put the case this way: that he considered the Committee would be bound to vote the money if the Government had authorised Colonel Scratchley to enter into an agreement. Now, he (Mr. Foxton) thought the question was not whether Colonel Scratchley was authorised, but whether he held out the increased salary at all as an inducement to Colonel French to come to the colony. That was the gist of the question. He evidently did so, and whether he had authority or not he was the accredited agent of the Government, and the Committee were therefore bound to vote the money. The hon. members for Fortitude Valley and Townsville said that £700 a year was quite sufficient pay for a commandant, but he had not the slightest doubt that Colonel Scratchley, in making the selection and holding out the inducement, was doing the best he could for the colony at the time. There was no reason to suppose that he volunteered to give that £200 additional salary for any other reason than that it was necessary. He had not done it out of friendship for Colonel French, and it was simply because he could not get a suitable man for less money that he had pledged the colony to the extent he had done. He (Mr. Foxton) might inform hon. members that £900 was not such a very large salary for a commandant, and was not as high a salary as was paid in Victoria. The emoluments of the Victorian commandant amounted to something like twelve or fifteen hundred pounds a year, all things included. When hon. members put travelling expenses in the shape of remuneration, the Committee had come to a sorry pass. Hon. members should bear in mind that Colonel French, while here, lost his chance of being employed in active service, which was a matter of great consideration to the members of the profession. Then again, if he had gone to India he would have received a higher salary than he was getting here. The salary did not seem to him (Mr. Foxton) to be at all out of the way, seeing the salaries that were paid to officers of experience elsewhere.



The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. member was now looking at the matter as a military man. He had been trying to explain that, no matter whether instructions were given to Colonel Scratchley or not, the colony was bound by what he did. That was not the legal aspect of the matter.

Mr. FOXTON: I explained it from an honourable point of view.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: From a military point of view; the hon. member having dropped the legal point of view. Of course, if the Government considered that they were in honour bound to give the increase, then it must be given. But he wished to raise another point. The £3,510 did not represent the amount that the permanent staff cost, because by looking at the schedule it would be seen that there were also allowances. He thought that from the consideration the Premier had given to the permanent staff he should be able to suggest how the cost could be reduced. They were not military men on that Committee; but he felt that £3,510 was too much to expend on a staff for working a volunteer force, which was to cost £20,000. He felt very sorry to see that, because three years ago the military authorities "got over" that House to pass an inordinate expenditure, and having got that, they now came forward, and by simply altering the rules and regulations into the Bill that had been passed by that House, asked that the amount should be doubled. He thought that some suggestions ought to come from the Government as to the reduction of the amount. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) could not say what amount ought to be left out; but he said, generally, that £3,510 was a large amount for working the Volunteer Force.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not see how the amount could be reduced. The Commandant and Brigade-Major were of course necessary; and the Infantry Staff-officer had been engaged specially in India to come here. The sergeant-instructor in gunnery, and the sergeant-instructor in submarine mining and engineering, were engaged in England under the late Government, and at fixed agreements for three years. The armourer-sergeant was a necessary appointment, because he had charge of the arms; and the clerk and storekeeper was absolutely necessary for the work in the office. Then, as to the drill-sergeants, it would be poor economy to strike them out. On careful consideration, therefore, he did not see how the item could be reduced.

Mr. FOOTE said he could see that it was the intention of the Committee to pass the item. The economical portion of the Committee considered that, for the money that had been passed for the Volunteer Force from time to time, the colony had not seen 20s. in value. Still the same thing was to be repeated. Hon. members on the other side thought the whole item ought to be reduced to £20,000, yet the first item was an increase of £200. But the present Opposition were in power when the arrangement with the Commandant was made, and therefore they ought to know what it was. The leader of the Opposition said he did not remember what took place. It was not to be supposed that he could remember every particular of the business, but he ought to know enough to say what kind of understanding there was. However, he could see that the vote would go through. Hon. members on the other side would probably agree to the heavier items, and then the smaller amounts would be cut down. That would be "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel." If that £900 was passed, he should certainly go in for all the rest. If they were to cut down at all, they

ought to begin at the top; but he hoped the Committee would not waste time over it. He should support the amendment if it went to a division.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member for Bundanba seemed to have made up his mind that the whole amount was going to pass; but he (Mr. Black) was not quite certain about that. It depended very much upon hon. members on the other side. He knew that hon. members on the Opposition side were extremely discontented at the expense of the Volunteer Force. If the cost of management, which they were now considering, was not going to be cut down, he had no intention of trying to diminish the pay of the volunteers. When the Defence Bill was before the Committee it seemed to him that they were nearly all dissatisfied with the volunteer system, and now was the time for hon. members to show that they were sincere in the views they expressed then. He did not consider the financial state of the colony justified them in launching forth into additional expense, as they were doing year after year. It was impossible to say what the expense would swell to. They were asked to vote at the rate of £34,000 a year for the volunteers alone; while the naval defence, which was of infinitely greater importance than the land defence, was not provided for at all. That, in his opinion, would cost £15,000 more. He was quite prepared to let the first item go to the vote to test the feelings of the Committee, and if there appeared to be a likelihood of sufficient support being obtained for the views held by hon. members on his side of the Committee, there would be a reasonable prospect of reducing the inordinate expenditure on the Defence Force. He knew that there was a great deal of ill-feeling amongst the volunteers, and that they did not look upon the new scheme as likely to lead to any better results than the old one.

Mr. SALKELD said he was glad to hear the hon. member for Mackay say that if the larger amounts were passed he did not intend to vote for any reduction in the smaller items. He was sorry to hear the statement of the Premier, that they were in some way bound in honour to pay the amount put down for the Commandant; and he thought that in a matter of that kind they should have a fuller explanation. He thought in cases where there was no urgency the Government should not promise any large amount without its being passed by the House, and he did not think that was an urgent case. If they paid such a high salary to one man, it almost necessarily entailed increased expenditure in other directions, to avoid too great a disparity between the salaries of the various officers. He thought an expenditure of £20,000 would be ample for the present. Of course, circumstances might arise when all the money they spent in the year would not be sufficient, but it was of no use taking account of such extreme possibilities as that. He did not wish the Government to do anything that looked like repudiation; but if they had given no promise in that matter, he thought they might consent to a reduction in the item.

Mr. KELLETT said that after the explanation given by the Colonial Secretary he thought that every member of the Committee who had any idea of justice or right was in honour bound to vote for the salary put on the Estimates for the Commandant. He was satisfied that Colonel Scratchley had made a promise of a higher salary than £700, and he thought that he was perfectly authorised to do so. He understood that the engagement was only for three years, and few men would care to accept the position of commandant for three

years without a fair remuneration. They were in honour bound to carry out the promise made by Colonel Scratchley.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said the hon. member for Bundamba was perfectly wrong in saying that the matter was arranged by the last Government. Colonel Scratchley was instructed to engage an officer at £700 a year, and was confined to that amount. He had no power to hold out any promise of a further amount. So far as he was concerned, there was no honour connected with it. Colonel Scratchley, in holding out a promise of that sort, was justified in doing this: He might, from his position, have said, "I will recommend to the Government to give an active officer of your ability an additional sum"; but, so far as the Government were concerned, they were not in honour bound to give Colonel French a single farthing more.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was surprised at the views of the hon. member for Stanley, who said that, because Colonel Scratchley had promised, the Ministry were in honour bound to give that advance. Were the Committee willing to delegate their power to Colonel Scratchley as to what salaries were to be voted by that Committee? He, for one, never should delegate the power to vote away one farthing of the country's money to any man, or to any Ministry either. It was their right to vote the salaries of every officer and every Civil servant, and they ought not to vote away that power.

Mr. FOXTON said he still held to the view that they were bound in honour to pay that sum to Colonel French. He would point out to hon. members who appeared to regard the pecuniary view of the matter as most important—though that was by no means the most important—that there was an actual gain to the colony at the present time by granting that money; because they formerly paid an inspecting officer, who occupied much the same rank as the present Commandant, £235 a year—and he could say from his own experience that that inspecting-officer did very little. He did not know how often that officer visited the colony, but it was not very often. As a volunteer he only saw him once. They were thus actually saving £35 a year to the colony by the arrangement which had been made.

Mr. ANNEAR said it was well known that the hon. member for Carnarvon was entirely in love with the Defence Bill as passed by the House. Now, he was not in love with the measure at all; and he thanked the hon. leader of the Opposition for the very liberal proposition he had made in suggesting a vote of £20,000 for the Volunteer Service of the colony. Not one word had been said about the past services of the volunteers. He maintained that the past services of the volunteers would, two years hence, prove to be ten times more important than the proposed system as carried out by Colonel French. They had, it was true, a staff and brigade office in Brisbane, but what did they do? What was the state of the Volunteer Force of the colony at the present time? Colonel French had been here twelve months, and the force was in a deplorable state. He knew that the ink was already dry on many notices of resignation which would be sent in from officers and men should the force be handed over to the tender mercies of Colonel French. They were paying a large sum of money, and what for? Let them look at the battery in the Gardens, and at the disgraceful state of the guns at Lytton. The proposed salary was an enormous salary indeed to give to Colonel French—a gentleman whose practical abilities they knew nothing about. Men of position said they were taking him on chance, and that his engagement was a

speculative thing altogether. They had no reliable information that that gentleman was all that had been talked about him. He knew that not only in Brisbane, but in many towns of the colony, the present officers in the Brigade Office were not liked by the men. They had no sympathy with the men, and the men had no sympathy with them. The men showed their dislike to some of those gentlemen by omitting to invite them to a recent banquet. It was too much to spend £28,000 on chance. The plan would end in utter failure, and before twelve months were over they might have to send for Colonel Drury to take command, and for Mr. Blaxland and all the gentlemen who had been a credit to the force and the colony. They had had a volunteer force pure and simple, and the officers had found their own uniforms and had paid their own expenses, accepting no emoluments whatever from the State; and if such were the case in the past they could do the same thing again. Colonel French should be told he was not in Ireland, but in a free country, and that his proposed system should be done away with altogether. If not, it would be a failure and an utter disaster. He looked upon the present officers as very good drawing-room officers, first-rate companions of the ladies, and all that sort of thing, but not the sort of men wanted for the colony.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH asked if he was to understand that those members of the Volunteer Force who were not invited were not liked by the men. If that were the case he should like to know who were there. He should also like to know what were the feelings of the men connected with the force. It was astonishing how very little information could be got about the matter. There was not much sense or reason in the letters in the newspapers. He could not fathom them, or see exactly where the grounds of dissatisfaction were. He wished some one would tell the Committee what the grievances of the men and officers were.

Mr. ANNEAR said he gained his information from the columns of the *Courier*. There were present at the banquet to which he referred, a gentleman, a good soldier, and a credit to the force—Major Mein, Colonel Blaxland, and he thought Captain Foxton. But he could not help noticing that the names of Colonel French and Major Moore did not appear as being present.

Mr. FOXTON said that he and Colonel French were not present at the banquet, simply because it took place on the night of the collision at Darra, and they were waiting at the railway station till 10 o'clock with the intention of going but were unable.

Mr. ANNEAR said he referred to what took place last week.

Mr. FOXTON said it was only fair, then, that the hon. member should properly inform himself as to the facts before making statements to the Committee. That was a banquet, or sort of jollification amongst the infantry officers and men, and with which the artillery had nothing whatever to do. Consequently, no artillery or engineer officers were present. If that was all the hon. member had against Colonel French it was very harmless. The hon. member also talked about the disgraceful state of the guns at Lytton. They were, as a matter of fact, in splendid condition. He (Mr. Foxton) had seen the guns on board the "Nelson," and he ventured to say that the guns at Lytton were in equally as good condition, and equally as well kept, as those on board Her Majesty's ships.

Mr. ANNEAR said he had nothing against Colonel French; but he had yet to learn that he was to be debarred from commenting on what he knew to be facts, by Captain Foxton, the hon. member for Carnarvon.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that if each item was to be discussed at such length they would not get through the Colonial Secretary's Estimates in less than two months. He rose now specially to ask the Colonial Secretary to make a further explanation with regard to General Steward. Was that officer paid on commission?—because if so, the more he ordered the more money he would receive.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that when professional men in England were employed as inspecting officers they were usually paid on commission. The goods were not ordered by General Steward, although his advice was taken as to the best things to order. The indent was sent from Brisbane in the ordinary course.

Mr. NORTON said that, with regard to the increase to Colonel French, he was very glad to hear the statement made by the Colonial Secretary. Although the gentleman who acted for the Government did his duty, he had placed the Committee in a rather unfortunate position. There was no doubt that when Colonel French arranged to come to Queensland he did so on the distinct understanding that the increased sum, though not actually guaranteed, would be recommended in such a form that the Committee could hardly refuse to grant it. It was not competent for hon. members not fully acquainted with the circumstances to judge for themselves how the matter stood; they were bound to trust a good deal to the representations made by the Colonial Secretary, because he had all the facts before him. On those representations he felt bound to vote for the increase, in case a division was called upon it; although he was exceedingly sorry that the Committee had been placed in such a position.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he was much exercised by the threat held out by some hon. members that if the vote was not treated on its merits, and the Committee decided according to its judgment upon it, they would make no further attempt to reduce the expenditure on the force. That would be a most unfair proceeding. The Colonial Secretary could put the matter right by being a little more explicit in describing how far the Committee were bound. According to his recollection, Colonel Scratchley was simply entrusted with the responsibility of selecting an officer who was to have a salary of £700 a year, and no instructions were given to him to hold out any prospect of a larger sum. If there really were no such instructions, the question could be considered entirely on its merits; and he should vote for the reduction. But the Colonial Secretary could easily put hon. members right on that point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had already explained the matter very fully. Instructions were given to Colonel Scratchley to engage an officer as commandant at a salary of £700 a year. Colonel Scratchley thought it would be difficult to get a competent officer at that rate, other colonies being also, at that time, in search of similar officers; and recommended that an increased amount should be given. That recommendation was sent to the Government; and he felt bound, under the circumstances, to ask the Committee to sanction the increase.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he understood that Colonel French's army rank was that of a major in the artillery, the pay of which was 16s. a day, or less than one-half of £700 a year; and it seemed extraordinary that they could not get an officer of that rank to accept £700 a year, with a guarantee of three or five years' employment. Colonel Scratchley must have gone far beyond his instructions, or any interpretation of the instructions he received

from the colony; and he did not see where the point of honour came in which bound them to support the proposed increase.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had pointed out the exact circumstances of the case. Colonel Scratchley was at the time the advising officer of all the Australian Governments, and what weight would be attached to a promise made by an officer in his position hon. members could judge for themselves. The recommendation having been made in accordance with the promise, he felt bound to ask the Committee to give effect to it.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman was bound to ask the Committee. He had asked the Colonial Secretary if anything had passed between either the present Government or the late Government and Colonel Scratchley that would lead him to suppose that he had authority to go beyond the £700 a year? The answer was, "No." It was ridiculous for Colonel Scratchley to assume such a position. He was their adviser for a long time, but he had no right to assume that any recommendation that he might make would be at once acted upon by the Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was nothing to bind the Government except the obligation of honour. He was not really more bound to vote the money than any other hon. member. Colonel Scratchley was not authorised to make any bargain, but only to engage an officer at £700 a year.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that suppose he instructed an agent in Melbourne to engage a man for him at £500 a year, and he engaged one at £600, and recommended that he should be given £700, when he (Sir T. McIlwraith) had made up his mind that £500 was enough, would it be dishonest to tell him that if he would not take £500 he could go? His agent would have exceeded his instructions.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that when the confidential agent of the Government, in accordance with a promise he had given, wrote to them that he had engaged an officer and promised to make a recommendation to the Government to increase his pay, he (the Colonial Secretary) considered himself bound. In such a case he should, for his part, feel bound by the promise of his agent.

Mr. KELLETT said the case quoted by the hon. gentleman about employing an agent in Melbourne was quite different from the position of Colonel Scratchley in London. Colonel Scratchley told Colonel French that he was authorised by the Government to employ him to go to the colony, and it never entered his head that his recommendation would not have been faithfully carried out when that officer arrived in the colony. He had no doubt that Colonel French would never have come out unless he considered that recommendation would be accepted; but, having come here, he was told that Colonel Scratchley was nobody because he had no written agreement. How was Colonel French to know that? He was perfectly satisfied that a recommendation made by a gentleman of Colonel Scratchley's standing should be carried out, and that he should receive an increase.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that, suppose Colonel Scratchley had recommended that the Government should pay Colonel French £500 in advance, would the Government have felt themselves bound to pay that sum? If they were not in honour bound to pay £500, they were not in honour bound to pay £700.

Mr. NORTON said there was one point he would refer to. The Premier said the recommendation had been made to Colonel Scratchley

and by Colonel Scratchley that it would be best to get an officer at £700 a year. Were those representations made by Colonel Scratchley to the Government before Colonel French was engaged?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not before.

Mr. NORTON said he had understood that it was before the engagement was made. If it had been made before, the Government would have been bound to carry it out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said instructions were given, and the arrangement was made by the Agent-General and Colonel Scratchley, and he thought Colonel Drury was there too. Representations had been made to Colonel Scratchley by the military authorities, and by Colonel Scratchley to the Government.

Mr. KATES said that, had the statement not been made by the Colonial Secretary that the Government was morally bound to grant the increase, he should certainly have opposed it; but from what he could gather the Government had, through Colonel Scratchley, engaged Colonel French, and that Colonel Scratchley had acted as agent for the Government.

Amendment put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 18.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Norton, Black, Aland, Macrossan, Annear, McWhannell, White, Buckland, Foote, Salkeld, Grimes, Macfarlane, Midgley, Higson, Horwitz, Bailey, and Moreton.

NOES, 23.

Messrs. Miles, Archer, Rutledge, Griffith, Dickson, Chubb, Brookes, Jordan, Isambert, Lalor, Kellett, Foxton, Beattie, Kates, Lissner, Mellor, Palmer, Ferguson, Stevens, Macdonald-Paterson, T. Campbell, Dutton, and Sheridan.

Question resolved in the negative.

Question—That £3,510 be granted for the Permanent Staff.

Mr. MIDGLEY said, during the debate he had been standing at ease, or sitting at ease; because he thought there were quite enough in the Committee to fight the battle. The Committee having divided on the question, he had a further amendment to propose—namely, that the item be reduced by £150. If he studied his own inclination he would move that it be reduced by £190; but in deference to the feelings of hon. gentlemen he had adopted the other course. There was a Ministry proposing to give a man more salary than they were paid themselves, and as far as he understood there was nothing binding upon the Government, the country, or the Committee. They were going to give that gentleman more than the Commissioner for Railways, and no one would say that there was any comparison between the work of the two men. They would probably have several divisions on the item; but he proposed now that it be reduced by £150.

Mr. FOOTE said he was only going to say a few words. He was not going to support the motion of the hon. gentleman, because he had been long enough in the House to accept defeat when he got it. The sense of the Committee had been taken, and they had decided that the vote should remain; but now it was proposed to reopen a question that had been worn threadbare. He could not support the hon. member in a factious opposition, and assist in wasting the time of the Committee when there was other serious business before it. He certainly thought the hon. member should accept defeat in good temper, and withdraw his amendment. There were plenty of other items to be voted, and he had no doubt that before they got through them they would find they had done considerable service after all.

Mr. SALKELD said he did not agree with the hon. member for Bundamba. He understood the Premier to say that the Committee was in honour bound to give the increase, but no amount was mentioned. When he heard the final explanation he came to the conclusion that the Committee were not bound either legally or morally, and he really hoped the amendment would be accepted. In that case an increase of £50 a year would be given, and he was sure that no one could say then that the officer was underpaid. Compared with other officers of the service who had had to work up, and had a great amount of responsibility, the Commandant would be too well paid; but if an increase was necessary at all he was inclined to adopt the suggestion that a bonus of £100 should be given to the officer in time of war. The hon. member for Carnarvon had said that the Commandant had lost the chance of promotion in India and elsewhere through coming out here; but it struck him (Mr. Salkeld) that he also had lost the chance of getting killed, and that ought to balance things. He hoped the Committee would agree to the amendment; because if they passed the vote they could not fairly refuse to agree to the other items. He was quite sure if the increase had been to a railway porter or a working man all promises would have been set aside, and that made him feel very much disappointed with the Government in trying to force the vote upon the Committee.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he was sure the promises of the House to a workman or anyone else would be equally respected, and he certainly should not have voted on the other side of the Committee if any promise had been given by the Government. But for all that he believed in fair fighting, and he thought they had got the sense of the Committee that the salary was to stand as it was. If the hon. member for Fassifern really thought he had a chance of inducing some members to vote for the reduction, he could understand the motion being made; but he did not think there was the slightest reason to believe that those who voted against the reduction of the whole sum would now vote for the motion as proposed. He did not think it fair to take up the time of the Committee in dividing, and trying to induce members to vote with the minority. That was not fair fighting. If the hon. member really thought he could convert any other members, he was entitled to try; but he would advise him to withdraw his opposition and not waste the time of the Committee, because there was serious work before them, and he hoped they would materially reduce the other items.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he voted for the motion of the hon. member for Ipswich, believing that £700 was sufficient and fair pay for a commandant. As they had sustained an honourable defeat he was quite satisfied. He should not vote for the amendment.

Mr. MIDGLEY said he had hoped, on making the amendment, that certain hon. members would change their minds. Notwithstanding the explanation that had been given, which, to his mind, showed that they were not obliged to give the increase, some hon. members voted for it because they thought the Government were bound by honour to give it. The hon. member for Northern Downs was one of those hon. members; and it ought to entirely satisfy his conscience—seeing that he had expressed his opinion that the amount was too large—if some increase was given. The increase now proposed was a very respectable one—more than was given to a good many officers, who, in other departments, had given years of faithful service to the colony. He would point out that

there was a danger of over-estimating the value of professional services; that was already seen in professional life; they were constantly disposed to overrate and to overpay professional services. He did not hold such an exalted idea of professional services over other services as some people, though he recognised a certain amount of difference. He had moved the amendment because some hon. members voted for the increase, believing a pledge had been given; and he intended to give the Committee another opportunity of dividing on the question.

Amendment put, and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 13.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Macrossan, Black, Annear, White, Foote, Salkeld, Grimes, Horwitz, Higson, Midgley, Macfarlane, and Moreton.

NOES, 25.

Messrs. Miles, Archer, Rutledge, Dickson, Bailey, Clubb, Griffith, Foxton, Palmer, Sheridan, Dutton, MacDonald-Paterson, Stevens, Ferguson, Mellor, Kates, Lissner, Buckland, Beattie, Kellett, Lalor, Isambert, Jordan, T. Campbell, and Brookes.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. BEATTIE said he desired to call the attention of the Committee to the permanent force. The permanent staff officers connected with the permanent force, and the majority of the officers, were artillery officers. Even the Commandant himself was an artillery officer. The whole of the artillery force was to be stationed at Brisbane, except the garrison artillery, at Townsville. There was provision for thirteen drill instructors, one at £150, three at £80, and nine at £60. Now there was a company of infantry at Mackay, one at Gympie, one at Maryborough, one at Rockhampton, and one at Townsville; and he would like to know whether the drill instructors were to be infantry or artillery instructors. It was a perfect waste of money to have all those drill instructors, especially if three or four of them were to remain in Brisbane. The whole force was an artillery force; and he would like to ask how many artillery instructors there were in the thirteen drill instructors.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that ten out of the thirteen were infantry instructors. The hon. member was quite under a delusion if he supposed the whole force was to be an artillery force.

Mr. BEATTIE said he did not expect there would be ten artillery instructors. Three were quite enough to instruct two corps.

Mr. ANNAR said the Colonial Secretary had stated that the new system was to have a fair trial. He wished to know what time the hon. member thought should be allowed to discover whether the system was a success or not.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was afraid that was rather a conundrum. It was impossible to say exactly; it depended a good deal upon the Minister. If he was determined to make it a success, it would not take very long to find out whether it would be a success or not.

Mr. BLACK asked out of what vote the allowances would come for the permanent staff—£200 for the Commandant, £150 for the brigade-major, £50 for the infantry staff officer, £50 for the sergeant-instructor in gunnery, and £50 for the sergeant-instructor in submarine mining.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they were provided for amongst the contingencies at the end of the Estimates, in the items "Horsing guns, forage, lodging and travelling allowances, repairs and contingencies, £2,500."

Mr. SALKELD asked for how long a term the Commandant was engaged. Was it for the term of his natural life?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: For three years.

Mr. HORWITZ said they had voted an increase of £400 a year to one officer, who had an allowance of 30s. a day for travelling expenses. He saw that nine drill-sergeants were down at £60 a year; he would like to know if that was enough for good men?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was sufficient remuneration for the services they performed. They were not employed all the year round.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY proposed that there be granted a sum of £4,603 for salaries and allowances for the Permanent Force and School of Instruction for six months.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman had got into a difficulty which he would have avoided if he had accepted the advice to take a general reduction. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) was now going to propose a reduction of that amount to one-half. He thought that, for a commencement, half of it was quite enough for a permanent force and school of instruction. He did not think the experience of the permanent force in New South Wales had been so favourable that they ought to rush into an expenditure of £10,000 a year right off. He thought the estimate could stand a reduction of one-half without interfering with the efficiency of the force at all. If at the end of the first year they found the force was efficient, and likely to be made more efficient by extension, they could vote more money afterwards. When he said half the amount he did not mean that they were giving the Government authority to expend half of it—he knew they would not spend half of it; he meant that the permanent force should be reduced by exactly a half. His motion was that the amount of £4,603 be reduced by one-half.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member did not seem really to be fighting the matter in the spirit of fairness, or with the intention of giving the system a fair trial. If he had the desire to reduce the number of men one-half, that did not involve the reduction of the vote one-half. A great deal of the vote was not solely for the officers of the permanent force, but for allowances to members of the Volunteer Force who were attending the camp of instruction. There was a provision for one captain and four lieutenants, £986, and that sum could not be reduced without deliberately striking at the efficiency of the defence force. One of the principal objects of the permanent force was that they should be a school of instruction, and the hon. member wanted to strike out the pupils of that school of instruction. Then there was £1,475 down for non-commissioned officers and men, and he would strike out half of that too. If he did not want the permanent force let him say so, but to attempt to destroy it in that manner was not fair and open opposition. The clothing, rations for horses, and medical attendance might be reduced if half the men were struck off, but many of the items could not be reduced without impairing the efficiency. If the hon. member would propose £3,000 for the services of the half-year, he was prepared to accept that as a beginning.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that before tea the hon. gentleman argued that they should not tamper with the vote, as the reduction of the vote would really have the effect of reducing the men to very little. He must have seen since that that argument told very strongly against himself. Was it not an extraordinary organisation of a permanent force by which if they reduced half the men they only took

away £1,200 from the £9,207? Could they not possibly reduce the other items in proportion? Now, the hon. member had managed to flossick up the idea, after consultation with Colonel French, that some of those items could not be interfered with. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) proposed to have a less number of officers and men under instruction, and designedly so. He held that half the number of men, at a cost of £5,000, were perfectly sufficient for the first year to try Colonel French's experiment. The hon. member now said £6,000, and the difference did not seem much. But he wanted to affirm a principle. If the compromise were made, would the hon. gentleman assist him in getting the whole expenses of the force per annum reduced? He wanted to reduce the total amount of £34,000 by a third, or to between £20,000 or £23,000. It was said that he was by his action disguising an attempt to destroy the force. He did not think so. He had explained his ideas on the Defence Bill, and had not disguised his opinions as to the permanent force. The defence force was a great deal too expensive, and far too expensive an experiment to entrust to Colonel French. If they spent £20,000 on his ideas, they had gone quite far enough until they saw whether the development proposed for the colony was sufficient.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had asked at the rate of £6,000 for the first year, because he did not think it could be possible to do with a less sum. He had understood that the hon. gentleman was in favour of a permanent force, but what was the use of a permanent force of twenty?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he would give him fifty-three and a-half men.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they could not divide a captain into two. They could not have half a chief instructor or half a gunner. He said he could manage with £6,000 for the first year, although that was not reducing one-half, for the simple reason that it was not capable of being reduced by one-half. It was quite impossible to reduce the vote to £20,000, and retain the principle they had fixed. There would be £3,000, and £3,500, and £7,000, say £13,000, which left £7,000 for contingencies. That might be done by starving the force; sending them to practice or to drill without rifles or cartridges, to fire caps. That would be to insult the volunteers, and that was where the mistake had been made before, or in not giving sufficient opportunities for drill. What was the use of telling men to take out their rifles without powder and shot? It would be insulting them. One corps of volunteers served three years without rifles, but that sort of thing could not be expected to go on always. The amount last year for artillery and infantry was £7,940, and the previous year £5,720. This year he only asked for £7,200—a reduction of £700. He could not agree to reduce that further. There only remained the contingencies, in which there might, perhaps, be omitted the items of £1,750 for the purchase of a torpedo launch, £1,000 for additional companies, and £500 for stores for them—making a total of £3,250. With respect to the vote at present under discussion, he hoped the Committee would give the sum of £6,000, which would be sufficient for the first year, with a largely reduced staff.

Mr. BEATTIE said there were two items in the vote which seemed to need explanation. He noticed that there were, under instruction, one captain at 14s. a day, and four lieutenants at 10s. a day—permanent officers.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are volunteer officers.

Mr. BEATTIE: Then there were twenty-five non-commissioned officers and men under instruction, who were to get £59 each a year, while the sixty-two permanent men were to receive only 2s. 3d. a day.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the twenty-five non-commissioned officers and men, under instruction, were not the same men all the year round; neither were the captains and the four lieutenants the same officers all the year round. Taking the vote as a whole, and assuming that the staff could be reduced by one-half, not including the major commanding the battery, the reduction would amount to £2,750, which would bring the vote down to £6,500. It might be done for that amount by reducing the strength of the force one-half. He did not wish to reduce the strength of men attached to the permanent force to learn their business, because, after all, 25 men to be attached to the force out of 1,000 or 1,200 was not a very large proportion, and it would take a very long time before they were all trained, even at the rate of five times twenty-five a year.

Mr. CHUBB said he would ask the Colonial Secretary where were the men on the permanent force to live? No provision appeared to have been made for barracks, and no provision had been made for stabling horses. They would have to be provided somewhere.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they had a military barracks in Brisbane which was built a long time ago, and there were a small number of police there at present. The question of providing a barracks would depend very much upon the number of men there were to be.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the hon. member had shown them how to reduce the amount to something like £7,000. He might have shown them that it could be reduced by another £1,000 by striking out the instruction to captains and lieutenants, the former at 14s. and the latter at 10s. per day. It would be absurd to have a volunteer force if they had to induce men to be instructed as captains and lieutenants by paying them. Did the Colonial Secretary mean to tell them that they could not get men with sufficient public spirit to spend a little time at drill, to qualify them to be captains or lieutenants without paying them? It was an insult to the young men of the colony. It was at items of that kind that he especially struck, when he moved the reduction of the whole amount. If they could not get men without paying them, they had better let the Defence Force go, and consider for a year or two what they should do. They had been badly off for officers; but he did not think it had come to that. There would be plenty of captains by-and-by; every office-boy would be a claimant for a position in the defence force, if such terms were offered. There had been no provision made for other officers besides captains. They had got Colonel Foxton there, who wanted to be a major-general. Why should not provision be made for that? If it were proper to pay for the instruction that lay between the duties of a lieutenant and those of a captain, why should they not pay for the instruction between a captain and a major-general? He objected to that item, and would move its omission even if they agreed in reducing the amount to £6,000. Everything proved that the amendment he moved would have been perfectly satisfactory.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman seemed to forget that the captains and lieutenants who received training would not be wealthy persons, able to give up their avocations at certain times. They would consist of persons who were earning a daily living.

The provision was intended for the benefit and encouragement of men living in the country. It was not paying them for learning their duty; but only paying their expenses while learning their duty, and giving up their avocations for that purpose. It was for the benefit of country volunteers especially.

Mr. FOXTON said he was obliged to the hon. leader of the Opposition for having continuously styled him "Colonel Foxton." It was very kind of him; but possibly he had done it in the expectation of being called in return "Lord McIlwraith." Perhaps the hon. gentleman hoped, in the fulness of time, that Her Majesty would be pleased to bestow further honours upon him, and then he could take a seat amongst those highly privileged persons—who were, we were told the other day, about to be snuffed out—in the House of Lords. He had always understood that it was usual to address hon. members by their constituencies; but the hon. gentleman was setting the opposite example, and he should have no hesitation in calling him "Lord McIlwraith," and if he persisted, he should have to call him "Duke." He trusted the hon. gentleman's honours would sit well upon him. However, that was not what he rose to speak about. He wished to point out that the permanent force was being spoilt by the reductions; 100 men was little enough for any battery or company. There were divisions and subdivisions of batteries, and it was impossible to make a battery efficient and go through the proper battery drill and training without those proper divisions and subdivisions. He would compare the present amount asked with the amount voted in Victoria. They were asked here to vote for 107 men £9,207; while in Victoria, for 128 men—but little in excess—they asked £13,285. That was without making any provision for those officers and men who happened to be under instruction. In the present item there was something like £2,000 for officers and men under instruction. As for its being officers' pay, he might say it was a pity that matter was not considered when it was deemed necessary by the late Government to offer the pay that was being received at the present time. The officers got very little salary, which was not enough to keep them in uniform and defray other necessary expenditure, and if they were paid at all it ought to be sufficient to enable them, at all events, not to be out of pocket in providing the necessary equipment. As a matter of fact, at the present time many good men, who had not the means to incur the expenditure which a volunteer officer necessarily required, had to continue in the non-commissioned officers' rank, and remained there to the present day. As to the number of men who would avail themselves of the instruction without pay, he was inclined to think they would be very few indeed. The work was no child's play, and a man had to subject himself to the severest military discipline for the time being, and had to put up with rather hard lines. If the school of instruction was worth anything at all it should be strict in its discipline, and he did not think the allowance made was excessive. It was very probable, too, that men receiving a salary would only be able to get away on condition that they forfeited the salary for the month they were away, and besides it was not likely that the whole amount would be spent, because not a great number of men would be found who could spare the necessary time to enable them to attend the school of instruction.

Mr. MACFARLANE asked if instruction was supposed to be given on Sunday? He saw that the men were to be paid for the whole seven days.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the men were supposed to be in camp and under instruction. He did not know what the routine of camp was on Sunday, but the allowance was to the men while they were away from their usual avocations. The same pay was given to volunteers when they were in camp.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the drilling the hon. gentleman got when he was passing the Members Expenses Bill had not had its effect. The great grievance then was that the Northern and Western members had to come down at great expense, and the Bill was brought in for their benefit, but it ended in becoming a Payment of Members Bill, in which the Southern members got all the best of it. That was exactly what would happen in this case. The hon. gentleman explained that the Northern and Western officers anxious to get instruction would come down here, but he knew perfectly well that only those in and about Brisbane would take advantage of the school. The vote was excusable on no other ground than that of universal instruction, and taking that away it was inexcusable. The argument he used was plainly this—that if they could not get officers to be at the expense of their own instruction they had better give up the defence force altogether.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, then why should any allowance be put down at all for camps? That was the principle that had been adopted for years, and the hon. member himself initiated it. What was there wrong in it now? The men were paid for five days in camp; and if they were a month in camp, should they be paid less? If a man who was earning wages attended, he would have to forego his wages, and it was fair to recoup him. The whole system was in force every year in the annual camp, and he could not understand the objection to it now. He pointed out several times that the principal advantage of the permanent force was, that it was to be a school of instruction. Now the hon. gentleman wanted to take away from it almost the only advantage that it possessed.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was quite useless for the hon. member to think that he made an argument against him by saying that he (Sir T. McIlwraith) introduced the system of payment of officers. That was his grievance against the force. In 1882, the best military authorities recommended the payment of officers. That had been tried and had failed, and he confessed it. It was because it was such an utter failure that he objected to it now. The hon. member for Carnarvon had been more cautious, and handled the payment of officers in a different way. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) would like to know his real opinion, and whether he considered the payment of men and officers conducive to the efficiency of the force. He admitted that he had carried the system to a greater length than any of his predecessors, but he said it had been a failure, and because it had been a failure they should retrace their steps.

Mr. FOXTON said the hon. gentleman had forgotten what he really did say. He remembered very distinctly that when he was speaking on the Volunteer Force having been a failure the leader of the Opposition interjected, "In consequence of pay," and he (Mr. Foxton) replied "No; notwithstanding increased pay." He did not attribute it to pay in any way, but he said that the increased pay, with a better system, had not brought about that regeneration of the force which was so desirable. Now the hon. gentleman proposed to strike that pay off. Why should it be struck off? The men who went into the school of instruction or permanent force had to submit to discipline of the severest

character: and he could assure hon. members that the discipline provided under the Act was no child's play. It was all very well in the old days, when volunteering was volunteering, and the discipline was lax, and the men, as the hon. member had himself described it, had to be "coaxed"; but a new state of things would be brought about under the new Act. A man could not be asked to submit to heavy penalties and material inconveniences without giving him a *quid pro quo*. It might not be in all respects as large as it ought to be, but still if a man was made to work, and subjected to penalties, he at least ought to be paid his bare expenses. That was the view he took of it. He had never said that it was the pay that had brought about the disorganisation of the force; he repudiated that entirely. He said that the old system, under which the men had to be coaxed, was at the root of the evil.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked whether the hon. member meant to say that the pay given to the officers and men in 1883 had the effect of making the force better than before?

Mr. FORTON said he had stated distinctly that he did not think it had. For a short time there might have been some improvement, but since then the force had deteriorated; there could be no doubt about that. That he attributed to the want of proper organisation, and also to the knowledge on the part of the volunteers that a change was imminent. That was what was killing the force and would continue to kill it unless it was placed on a firmer basis. Men would not join at present, because they did not know what they were going into. They did not care about joining a force which they knew would be snuffed out and replaced by another which they might not be called upon to join.

Mr. ARCHER said he would not like to see the amount reduced, as was proposed by the hon. member for Mulgrave. It was very necessary that they should have a small body of men well drilled; in fact, it was desirable to have such a permanent force, if only to be an example in drill to the volunteers. He believed that one great reason why the Volunteer Force was in its present position was that there was not a body of permanent men to show what real drill was; and another reason was that a great many of the officers had not been sufficiently well drilled themselves, and were, therefore, not capable of fulfilling their duties. He was exceedingly anxious to see a small nucleus of a permanent force; he believed it was their duty to maintain such a body. It would be an advantage, not only for defence purposes, but as an example to the volunteers. He thought, therefore, that the offer of the Colonial Secretary should be accepted, and that the hon. member for Mulgrave, in proposing to reduce the amount by one-half, was doing what would prevent the force from being useful.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY asked whether the hon. member for Mulgrave intended to withdraw his amendment?

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he saw he would not have the support of the Committee in reducing the item so much. He would therefore ask leave to withdraw the amendment, and would accept the £3,000. Of course it would be distinctly understood that the Government had not leave to expend that amount during the year; but that the reduction was to be from £9,270 to £6,000 on the staff provided there when complete.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would ask leave to withdraw the motion, for the purpose of moving that the vote be £3,000.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the sum of £3,000 was voted for the Permanent Force and School of Instruction.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £7,586 be granted for head-quarters band, medical staff, veterinary staff, field artillery, garrison artillery, engineers, and infantry.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH moved that the amount be reduced by £2,529. That would be taking off one-third.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he supposed the hon. member knew that that meant reducing the Volunteer Force by one-third. He thought their object was to encourage the Volunteer Force; but the hon. member actually proposed to disband one-third of the men. Last year they had voted £7,940, and the year before £7,720, for the same service, for which they now asked £7,000. The hon. member proposed to reduce the strength of the Volunteer Force of the colony by one-third.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that what he proposed was to reduce the expenditure on the force by £2,529. Why should they be asked for an amount which was not likely to be spent? Why should the hon. member quote last year's Estimates when he knew that they had not spent anything like the amount voted, and under the organisation could not get men? Last year they had spent 40 per cent. less than the amount voted; and why should they make provision for a greater number of men than they were likely to get? His calculation was that for £5,057 they could get an efficient force, and a great deal better force than they had had for the last few years; and it was quite enough money to entrust to the Colonel of the defence force while he was working at an experiment. It was not reducing the actual force; it was simply reducing the number that they had expected to join last year. They had never had a force in Queensland that cost for that particular department £5,000.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member was speaking without book. Last year the amount spent on that item was £7,692, in addition to £500 for the head-quarters' band. They were actually asking less than last year.

Mr. FORTON said he did not think the hon. member for Mulgrave quite understood why the full amount had not been spent in certain years. It was not because the men had not been there, but because they had not all attended the maximum number of drills. They had to attend a minimum number in order to qualify for a capitation grant, and it was not compulsory on them to attend more; but every man in the force might attend the full number of drills prescribed by the regulations, and consequently he considered that it was incumbent on the Committee to provide the means of paying the men should they all attend. If it were proposed to reduce the number of men he should like to know whether the hon. member wished that certain corps should be struck out altogether, or that the strength of each corps should be reduced. If the hon. gentleman meant to reduce each corps by one-third he was making an egregious mistake, because it was necessary that the various companies and batteries that formed the units of the force should be composed of a certain number of men. He did not know much about battalion drill, but in the field artillery—the arm of the service to which he belonged—they must have a certain number of men to each gun, or the work could not be done.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that many hon. members had been addressing the Committee



who did not know what they were talking about. If the estimate was really meant for a defence force, they might move the reduction of the whole sum. But the fact was that it was a school. Playing at soldiers hitherto had been a failure, and it was high time that they set about a better way and reformed their doings. As he took it, the chief object of the permanent force was that it should be a school of training, and if so it ought to be properly equipped, or let alone altogether. Batteries and instructors should be established throughout the length and breadth of the colony, so that in time of danger they might have men to lead their forces. If they did not commence now when would they? He hoped the discussion that evening would not go abroad, and that men on the Continent would not read it. If they did so, it would be with a grin; he only wished that those hon. members who treated the matter so lightly could look in the faces of the military men and see how they laughed at the narrow-minded way in which they talked.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH wished the hon. gentleman would give them the benefit of his ideas. They might grin, too, or get a little further insight into their military duties. They wanted to know what danger they really were in. He knew what the hon. member would like them to provide against: the French, and perhaps the Germans, too. But they would like him to help them in working out the expenses. He would be very glad to enlist as his lieutenant if he would save them from a useless experiment, and what was simply playing at soldiers. The item under discussion had reference to the old volunteers. The Colonial Secretary thought to confuse the Committee by quoting statistics, but if he had wanted to carry forward his Estimates, he should have let the Committee know what they were voting, and given the details furnished now a great deal sooner. He had not got the details of the expenditure on the Volunteer Force up till last year; for the Auditor-General had not issued his report for 1883-84. But it was safe to go on the report of 1882-83, and he found that of the amount of money voted for volunteers that year only two-thirds was spent. From an admission made by the hon. member he gathered that less had been spent the last year. But as a safe thing he took it that the same proportion had been spent, which would give £15,000 out of the £23,000 vote. If that were the case, then full provision for the force as it had existed for the past two years—provided they attended drill and got paid—would be £15,500. But he went further. He thought it was time for the Government to consider the position of the officers. If the payment of the officers of the Volunteer Force had had no other effect than of making the officers dissatisfied, they must retreat from their position for that reason alone. An hon. member said that officers ought to be paid and reimbursed for all their expenses, leaving the Committee to conclude that all expenses had not been covered by the amounts voted. Did not the hon. member think that it would be a great deal better if officers were unpaid? He (Sir T. McIlwraith) believed that the result of paid officers at the rates mentioned in the Estimates had had a bad effect. It had certainly not induced a better class of men to join, but had made them look more to pay than to their position as officers of the Queensland army. It had destroyed that spirit which ought to animate men who went in for the defence of their country. It was the pay of the officers that swelled the amount so inordinately, and made it so large. Would the Colonial Secretary agree with him to keep up the number of men, and take the expense off the officers?

Mr. ISAMBERT said the leader of the Opposition invited him to assist him. He conceded that he knew very little of the details, but by his own words the leader of the Opposition confessed that he knew as little. And yet he amused himself and annoyed the whole Committee by criticising what he knew very little about. The country had engaged the services of a competent officer—at least it was supposed that he was competent. They must either give that officer an opportunity of showing his ability to reorganise the Defence Force and establish a military school, or let it alone altogether. The gentleman was either worthy or unworthy—if not worthy, then strike out his salary.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the total amount of the pay for officers was £623 out of the £7,000.

Amendment put and negatived.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH asked what the Colonial Secretary proposed to take out of Contingencies?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was anxious to reduce the vote, but there was little that could be spared without impairing the efficiency of the force. They might do without the torpedo launch. They could not do without stores; the engineers were very badly treated in that respect. There was however, the provision for additional companies and allowances and stores for them, £1,500. If companies applied to be enrolled they could be informed that Parliament did not want any more companies. Those were the only items which could be reduced without impairing the efficiency of the existing force.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman seemed to think that because it was the Government over which he (Sir T. McIlwraith) presided that appointed Colonel French, therefore he ought not to object to anything of which Colonel French approved. He did not intend to hand over his conscience or his reason to Colonel French or anybody else. If Colonel French could not prepare a scheme for a permanent defence force to cost less than £35,000 a year, somebody else ought to be employed to do it. Very few hon. members had the slightest notion what they were voting, owing to the Estimates not showing the corresponding sums voted last year. But the plain fact was that Colonel French wanted them to spend £35,000 on a force which the military authorities, three years ago, said they ought to obtain for £19,000. He believed the Defence Bill, which they had passed on the good faith of Colonel French, would be a complete failure; but whether it was a failure or not he objected to spending £35,000 a year on the land defence of Queensland, more especially as there was not a penny down for the first line of defence—the naval force.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, as an entire change in the system was proposed, it had been found impossible to put the Estimates for the two years side by side. The question was not whether they agreed with Colonel French or not, but whether they should have any more companies of volunteers or not.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he would bring the question to an issue by moving that £5,500 only be granted.

Question—That the amount be reduced by £2,086—put.

The Committee divided:—

AYES, 14.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Chubb, Norton, Foote, Moreton, Bailey, Lalor, Lissner, Macrossan, Ferguson, Black, Palmer, Macfarlane, and McWhannell.

NOES, 17.

Messrs. Griffith, Miles, Archer, Dickson, Rutledge, Sheridan, Dutton, Foxton, Smyth, Buckland, Kellett, Jordan, Isambert, Macdonald-Paterson, Mellor, White, and T. Campbell.

Question resolved in the negative.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £9,560 be granted for Contingencies. He had reduced the estimate to this extent—that he did not now ask anything for a torpedo launch, and proposed also to omit the items “Additional companies” and “Allowances and stores for ditto.”

Mr. ISAMBERT said that the vote was ostensibly for a defensive or protective force, and it was set down from a true freetrader's point of view. He hoped it would lead to the protection of the colony, and not only of their lives but of their industries. On former occasions, when uniforms were to be provided for the volunteers, it was proposed that they should be imported from England in true freetraders' style, and he knew that considerable objections were raised to it by many inhabitants of the colony. The item “Uniforms and accoutrements” could be provided here; and he would like to hear an opinion from the Colonial Secretary that whatever could be made and supplied in the colony would be so procured, with a due regard to their own industries.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had heard it stated that the uniforms were to be imported from England. On the contrary, he could assure hon. members that the uniforms were to be made in the colony.

Mr. BAILEY said that before the vote was passed he would call attention to one item which he considered much too small. There was an item in the vote, “Prizes for shooting and drill, £600.” He had voted hitherto for decreases in the Estimates, but if any vote on the Estimates required a larger amount he thought this one amply deserved it. He would like to see a few thousands put down for prizes for shooting and drill. It was only in that way, by giving good rewards to men who would take the pains to make themselves thoroughly efficient both as riflemen and in drill, that they could hope to have really efficient men. To promote ambition in this direction amongst the volunteers, he hoped the Government would, when the next Estimates were being framed, provide for a few thousands of pounds, instead of £600, for that vote.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had regretted, since the Estimates were printed, that that item was so small. It was too late now to alter it, but if he had opportunity of bringing in another estimate he would certainly provide a larger sum for that item. He hoped in the meantime an arrangement would be made not only for the defence force, but also for volunteer rifle associations, who needed encouragement and stimulation.

Mr. MACDONALD-PATERSON said that he and certain other members wished to place on record their conviction that no chief of any department in the Civil Service should become a paid officer in the defence force. There were many objections to it, and he took that opportunity of saying that there were a large number of members in that Committee who objected to it.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

1884—4 z

## PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS COMMITTEE.

Mr. FERGUSON brought up the report of the Joint Committee of the Parliamentary Buildings, together with minutes of evidence, and moved that the papers be printed.

Question put and passed.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER moved that the House do now adjourn.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: What is the intention with regard to making a House to-morrow?

The PREMIER: I understand that there is some important private business. There is the consideration of the Legislative Council's amendments in the Brands Act and the Pharmacy Bill, and a motion by the hon. member for South Brisbane, besides three motions standing over from last Friday. No Government business will be taken to-morrow. Supply will be gone on with on Tuesday.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 11 o'clock.