

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

THURSDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 1885

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

QUEENSLAND PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

THIRD SESSION OF THE NINTH PARLIAMENT,

APPOINTED TO MEET

AT BRISBANE, ON THE SEVENTH DAY OF JULY, IN THE FORTY-NINTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF HER
MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA, IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1885.

[VOLUME 2 OF 1885.]

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Thursday, 24 September, 1885.

New Member.—Questions.—Opening of the Northern Railway to Torrens Creek.—Formal Motion.—Victoria Bridge Closure Bill—committee.—Supply.—Customs Duties Bill.—Victoria Bridge Closure Bill—committee.—Adjournment.

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

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. Charles Lumley Hill was sworn in, and took his seat for the electoral district of Cook.

QUESTIONS.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked the Colonial Treasurer—

1. What lands comprised in the schedule to the Brisbane Drainage Act of 1875 were sold during 1884-5, for the purposes of the Act, and how were the proceeds applied?
2. What lands in the same schedule are still available for the purposes of the Act, and how is it proposed to apply the proceeds of the land when sold?

The COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson) replied—

1. No lands comprised in the schedule to the Brisbane Drainage Act of 1875 were sold during 1884-5.
2. Lands in the same schedule still available for the purposes of the Act:—Parish of North Brisbane, allotments 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, of section 51, allotment 16 of section 52, and about 7 acres not yet surveyed—in all about 8 acres 2 roods 14 perches. In replenishment of the Drainage Fund Account charged with the construction of an open canal lined with masonry through Bowen Park, tunnel under O'Connell terrace, and channel thence between Campbell street and Breakfast Creek.

Mr. BUCKLAND asked the Colonial Treasurer—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to provide a temporary supply of water for the use of the residents of Hemmant, Wynnum, Lytton, and other parts of the Bulimba electorate, now suffering from the long continued absence of rain?
2. If so, what steps are likely to be taken with a view to permanently supply the localities referred to and other parts of Bulimba with water?

The COLONIAL TREASURER replied—

1. No.
2. Government will be prepared to consider suggestions from the local authorities.

Mr. McMASTER asked the Premier—

1. Do the Government intend to erect a post and telegraph office in Fortitude Valley?
2. If so, when will tenders be called for the same?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. W. Miles) replied—

1. Yes.
2. It is expected that tenders will be called in about a month.

Mr. McMASTER asked the Minister for Works—

When will the plans of the proposed extension of the railway through Fortitude Valley be laid upon the table of the House?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS replied—

Plans and sections will be placed upon the table of the House to be dealt with during the present session.

OPENING OF THE NORTHERN RAILWAY TO TORRENS CREEK.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said: I am in a position now to answer the question, notice of which was given by the hon. member for Burke yesterday. It is of some importance, and I propose to read a telegram I have received from the Chief Engineer containing the required information:—

“Overend has formally consented to open line and has signed necessary agreement. Line can therefore be opened for public traffic on Monday 5th October to Torrens Creek and I hereby certify that it will be fit for opening on that date.”

FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to:—

By the PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith)—

That this House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to further amend the Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880, and to put a limit to its operation.

VICTORIA BRIDGE CLOSURE BILL—COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill in detail.

Question put.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I would ask the Colonial Secretary if he will not further the public business by postponing the further consideration of this Bill? It is rather hasty to ask for the consideration in committee of a Bill the second reading of which was only passed the day before. I intended to have pointed out that last night. There are special reasons, I think, why the consideration of this Bill should be postponed for a day or two, because it is quite evident from the discussion which took place on the second reading that the merits of the Bill have not been fully considered by hon. members. The discussion which has taken place will enable the public to understand the Bill better than they did before. I ask the hon. gentleman, therefore, whether it will not contribute to the furtherance of public business if he takes Supply instead?

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—The reason the committal of the Bill was fixed for to-day is because the Government think it will be conducive to the furtherance of public business to take it to-day. It has been before the House now for some time, and I consider we shall be furthering public business by going on with it now.

Mr. FOOTE said : Mr. Speaker,—It looks to me very like undue haste in legislation to bring a Bill on in committee the day after we have read it a second time. The parties, *pro* and *con.*, in reference to the Bill, are pretty evenly balanced, and we should have further time to revolve the matter in our minds. It will be much better to make the committal of this Bill an Order of the Day for some day next week or the following week. I see the Licensing Bill, which is looked upon by the outside public as one of the most important Bills of the session, is put down at the bottom of the paper. It would be better for us to go on with the consideration of that Bill than to take the Bridge Bill this afternoon. I hope the Government will postpone the committal of the Bill until we have had time for further consideration of it.

Question put, and the House divided :—

AYES, 19.

Messrs. Rutledge, Griffith, Dickson, Dutton, Moreton, Sheridan, Bailey, Fraser, Aland, Mellor, Jordan, White, Buckland, McMaster, Annear, Lumley Hill, Beattie, Macfarlane, and Higson.

NOES, 9.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Archer, Norton, Hamilton, Ferguson, Scott, Lissner, Foote, and Macrossan.

Question resolved in the affirmative, and the House went into Committee.

Preamble postponed.

On clause 1, as follows :—

“So much of the first section of the Brisbane Bridge Act as is contained in the words—

‘And provided also that no bridge erected by the said municipal council shall be so constructed as to obstruct the navigation of the River Brisbane by any sea-going vessels’— is hereby repealed.”

The PREMIER said that during the debate on the second reading some hon. members seemed to think they were not looking far enough into the future, and that it was desirable to leave the question open in the event of its being found expedient in the course of a few years to rebuild the bridge or make a wider swing. He confessed that when he heard the argument it struck him that there was something in it; and he would entertain no objection to having the Act made temporary—to expire, say, in five years. He thought that would meet the views of those hon. members who considered it would be undesirable to permanently close that part of the river. If that suggestion were adopted the clause would have to be negatived.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he thought the Premier had correctly appreciated the decision that the House actually came to on the second reading; and he thought the proposition the hon. member made now would meet the whole difficulty. He did not think much injury would be done to anyone by closing the bridge for five years, but there ought to be a clause providing that in case anyone was injured he should be compensated.

The PREMIER said he could not agree with the hon. member as to the propriety of giving compensation, which, of course, would have to come out of the public funds. The passage of the Bill would not alter the existing state of affairs, as practically the bridge always had been closed. He had also an amendment prepared to make it clear that the Bill did not affect actions already pending.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he did not attribute much importance to the compensation clause; and certainly he did not contemplate that the country should pay any compensation. If it were paid at all, it should be by the municipality of Brisbane.

The PREMIER said the amendments would consist of the omission of the 1st clause, the verbal alteration of the 2nd and 3rd clauses, and

an addition to the 4th clause, that the Act should continue in force till the 31st December, 1890. There would be a new clause providing that nothing in the Act should destroy vested rights.

Mr. CHUBB said he thought there ought to be a proviso that the House should have power to open the bridge at any earlier period if it should be thought desirable.

Clause put and negatived.

The PREMIER said it had been suggested to him that it would be better to have the amendments printed and placed in the hands of hon. members, and he would therefore move that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again at a later period of the day.

SUPPLY.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith), the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £5,635 be granted for salaries and contingencies, Colonial Secretary's Department. There was an extra item of £75 for a junior clerk, and an additional £100 for postage and incidentals.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £12,557 be granted for salaries and contingencies, Registrar-General's Department. There was an apparent diminution in the estimate, as the salary of the chief clerk was reduced from £300 to £250; but there was a considerable increase in the fees to district registrars in consequence of the large number of births, marriages, and deaths; and there was £5,000 put down for the census, which would be taken next May. Of course it would cost a great deal more than that; but it was thought that all the preliminary expenses would be covered by that amount.

Mr. NORTON said he observed that the item “Printing indexes of births, marriages, and deaths” had been increased from £500 to £800. That seemed a very sudden increase.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not give any very accurate information on the item without making inquiries. £800 was the usual amount of the vote, although it was not voted last year, and that sum would be required this year.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving £7,713, salaries and contingencies, office of Registrar of Titles, said that the department was established last year, and the sum voted then was for nine months only. There were no increases in salaries, but some additional clerks had been appointed and others had been moved up. It was one of the most profitable departments in the Public Service. The receipts from the public very much more than covered the expenditure; but the Registrar of Titles had represented that in consequence of the enormous increase of work his staff was insufficient to keep pace with it, and hence the delays sometimes complained of. He had requested to be authorised to employ additional hands, but the Government were very reluctant to do so. He (the Colonial Secretary) mentioned that because, although there were scarcely any increases this year, it had been represented that considerable increases would be necessary to get the work done.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving £400 for the department of Registrar of Patents,

said it was a new office. The actual expenditure in connection with it was £150—salary of a clerk who did all the clerical work—and £250, fees to examiners and contingencies. The Registrar-General discharged the duties of Registrar of Patents.

Mr. NORTON asked if the sum was made up by the fees collected?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the initial fees a great deal more than covered the expenditure. In fact it was rather a profitable business. In addition to the initial fee there was an annual fee paid as long as the patent was in existence.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said the work referred to used to be done gratuitously by Mr. Gray.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: He might be wrong, but he had always understood so. Who were the examiners now? They used to be Mr. Gregory and any official in the Government service who had technical knowledge of the patent applied for. Was the same system carried out now?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the system was the same. In cases where general scientific knowledge was required Mr. Gregory was generally asked to examine, and when special technical knowledge was necessary some officer of the Government was selected just as before. The only difference was that the selection was now made by the Registrar, subject, of course, to supervision; whereas previously the nomination was made by the Executive Council.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that £145,736 be granted for salaries and contingencies in connection with the Police Force, said an additional clerk in the Commissioner's office was asked for. Under the head of "Executive," an increase was asked for of 10 senior-constables and 40 constables—50 in all. Last year the same increase was asked for, and even with the additional 50 now proposed it would be almost impossible to supply stations in the places asked for all over the colony. In fact, the Commissioner asked for 70 or 80, but under the circumstances the Government did not feel justified in asking for an increase of more than 50, with which they would endeavour to do until the end of the year. Hon. members would observe that the 128 native troopers provided for last year were now called "native trackers," indicating an intention on the part of the Government to make a change in the administration of the native police branch of the force. The system which had been adopted hitherto, by which a comparatively large number of native police were accompanied by only one white officer, was not at all satisfactory. He should be very glad if the Government could see their way to abolish the native police altogether, and there were many parts of the colony where they were no longer required—where the work could be done quite as well, and in some respects better, by white men, except, perhaps, tracking. There were, however, other parts of the colony, he was bound to admit—having struggled all he could to see his way to abolish the native police altogether—where white troopers could not penetrate. For instance, in the Northern jungles it was absolutely impossible for a white man to get through. It was, therefore, impossible to abolish them altogether, and what was proposed to be done was that in all cases at least two white police should be attached to every detachment of native police; and by degrees the whole system would be abolished. That was as far as he was at present able to see

his way to make a change in the system. Very numerous complaints had been made of late from various parts of the North about the depredations by blacks, and urgent requests had been made that something should be done to prevent them—sometimes it meant to be revenged upon them. Where, however, lives had been taken something, of course, must be done; but he did not think the native police ought to be employed to avenge the killing of cattle and horses. The Government had been unable to meet all the requests that had been made. It must not be forgotten that the progress of settlement in the North had been of such a nature as to destroy the food supply of the blacks to a very great extent, especially where they were very numerous; and it was not to be wondered at that they occasionally helped themselves to the settlers' stock. He could quite sympathise with them when they were suffering from starvation. Some of the stations there were left in charge of a stockman and a couple of blackboys, and the owners expected the native police to act as stock-riders for them. That was no part of the duties of the native police; and considering the owners were put to so little expense in managing their stations they might very fairly allow a bullock now and then to sustain the life of the aboriginal inhabitants, whose means of subsistence had been taken from them. The Government were also endeavouring to make some arrangement for civilising the blacks in the northern parts of the colony. Overtures had been made by two missionary societies to render their services, but their proposals were not yet definite enough; he trusted, however, that before long a great deal would be done in that direction. At Cooktown and the neighbourhood a start had been made, and a good many aborigines were now at work on the plantations. The difficulty was to get anything of that sort properly supervised. Under the heading of "Contingencies" there was an increase of £4,800, attributable to the increase in the number of police. The work could not be done for less money, and, comparing it with the expenditure last year, he believed it would cover the expense.

Mr. ARCHER said that some time ago he noticed in the *Telegraph*—a paper supposed to be in the secrets of the Government—that there was going to be some change made in the department of the Commissioner of Police. Would the hon. gentleman tell the Committee what amount of truth there was in that statement?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he saw the paragraph alluded to by the hon. member, and that was the first he heard of it, and the last. He did not know where they got the information from—certainly they did not get it from him. He made no inquiries about it, for he had no reason to believe that the statement was true. He had omitted to mention that it was intended to allow the Commissioner of Police £200 a year in lieu of residence. The Commissioner had had a residence provided for a good many years at the barracks; but on its being required for the Commandant it was thought only reasonable that he should have an allowance in lieu of residence.

Mr. ARCHER said he noticed that the additional pay for sergeants and constables who had been over five years in the service was exactly the same as last year, £3,000. How was that conclusion arrived at?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there were 300 men who had been in the force more than five years, and the number passing in every year just about balanced the number who passed out.

Mr. NORTON said he was glad to notice that the Government had been studying the native

police question, and he must congratulate them on the first result of it. The number of native police was exactly the same—200—but their cost had been reduced by exactly £1; the amount last year being £1,621, and this year £1,620.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if the hon. member would take the trouble to reckon up the figures he would find that the totals for each year were accurate. This year they were all put under the heading of "Native Trackers," while last year they were divided into two separate bodies—which accounted for the difference.

Mr. PALMER said that scarcely a single word of the Premier's had reached him, because he only addressed himself to those nearest to him. He would like the hon. gentleman to explain again the system on which the Native Police Force was to be continued. There was evidently to be a change, and he wanted to know what the change was.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he endeavoured to explain that, as far as the arrangements had yet been made, it was proposed that at every station for native police there should be white policemen, and that the black trackers should be attached to the white police. The present system had been very different from that. The practice had been for a number of native troopers to go out into the bush accompanied by not more than one white man, and sometimes without even one, although he believed the instructions were that they should not be allowed to go out except in charge of a white man. It was intended to assimilate the system as nearly as possible to that of the white police.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would like to know whether the camps for native troopers would be the same as hitherto, and whether it was intended that there should be two white constables with each detachment of native police in addition to the officer in charge?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there would always be two white constables at a camp, and sometimes a senior-constable would be in charge. There were to be the same camps or police stations, not in charge of an officer, but of a senior-constable or sergeant, with a smaller number of black trackers. The practice of the black police making raids through the country as in times past would not be allowed any longer.

Mr. PALMER said he was afraid that, even with the proposed alteration in the system of the native police, if the native police were anxious to make raids through the country they would do so; they would lose or slip the white police as they had often lost their officers on previous occasions, of which the Herberton case was an instance. He was quite certain that the native police, if properly officered and properly looked after, could be made of great service in outside places, especially such districts as the York Peninsula district, which was now being settled and through which a telegraph line was being constructed. He believed that two or three detachments of police would be necessary to keep that line clear.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is an exceptional case.

Mr. PALMER: The great drawback hitherto had been not having officers who were enthusiastic in their work. Generally speaking young and inexperienced officers were placed in charge of five or six troopers, and when they were out on patrol the officer lost control of the troopers. He thought some old experienced sergeants of the force would make better officers for the native police than the men who were usually appointed.

Mr. DONALDSON said there was another matter on which he would like some information—namely, the amounts paid to police officers as inspectors of brands. He found that A. L. Morisset received £100 a year; F. J. Murray, £50; A. F. Mossman, £50; T. Judge, £50; J. Ahern, £100; R. B. Sharp, £100; James Lambert, £100; R. K. Little, £50; F. M. Thomson, £50; and F. C. Urquhart, £50. He would like to get some information as to what work was really done by those inspectors for the amount of money they received. It looked to him like a subsidy to police officers, as they were paid from a fund which it was never intended should be applied in that way. He would like to have some information on that subject before the vote passed, in order that they might be in a position to form an opinion as to whether it was desirable to continue the present system. He believed the interior of the colony was not properly looked after in that matter; and that there were stations not registered, and where there was really no control over cattle-stealers. The position of inspector, in the cases he was referring to, seemed to him to be a perfect sinecure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it had been represented to him that it was convenient in many respects that the principal police officer in a district should be an inspector of brands, because the result was that the police under him also became inspectors of brands, and he believed a very great deal of cattle-stealing had been prevented in that way. Those were the representations made to him, and he had never heard anything to the contrary, although, to his mind, making a police officer an inspector of brands looked very much like giving him additional pay. That was all the information he could give on the matter.

Mr. DONALDSON: Have you no reports?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had no reports either one way or the other, and had received no complaints. Sometimes, however, complaints were made that there was no inspector at a place where it was desirable there should be one. He remembered particularly a case in the extreme north-western part of the colony, where a large number of cattle were driven over the border into South Australian territory. It was represented to him that it was very important that the chief officer of police should be made inspector of brands there, and he recommended the appointment, which was made.

Mr. HILL said he quite endorsed the remarks of the Premier that the system which prevailed of making police officers brands inspectors was a good one. They had, to his (Mr. Hill's) certain knowledge, been of great use in the district in which he had resided for many years.

Mr. DONALDSON: Give an instance.

Mr. HILL: The hon. gentleman should ask the men in his own district. In the Mitchell district a great deal had been done in putting down cattle-stealing some years ago, and he attributed that to the new Pounds Act and also to the appointment of brands inspectors. He did not wish to particularise, but he knew that the work of those inspectors was done well and in a thoroughly useful way. It was done by the police, and as it entailed additional work on them they were entitled to additional pay. If they had to pay a man as brands inspector they would have to give him £400 or £500, whereas the police officer received about £100. He considered it a most economical and effective way of getting the work done to appoint police officers as brands inspectors. The hon. member's experience might have been different to his, but in his experience in the West he had found the system most useful and satisfactory in every way.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was something like the Colonial Secretary in the matter, as he had had no experience of cattle-stealing; but he had made inquiries and had had the same explanation given him as the Colonial Secretary said he had received. He had, however, also had other information given him; and his own opinion, from the information given on both sides, was that the system was worked to give additional salaries to certain officers, and the work which they were credited with having done so well was really done by individuals who never received a penny for doing it—the sergeants and constables under the inspector. He drew the salary, got all the credit, and did no work; whereas his subordinates did all the work, got no credit and no money.

Mr. NORTON said he thought it was four or five years since those appointments were made; and reports were sent in after the first appointments were made, which were most satisfactory. Those reports were, he thought, made by the Inspector of Brands. All the reports that he had seen in connection with the matter were unquestionably in favour of the appointment of police officers as inspectors of brands, as opposed to the appointment of special persons to do the work. He did not know what system was carried out now, but he knew that great complaints were made of inspectors of brands who were not police officers, both as to their inaction and their inability to have the work carried out properly, because the police would not take instructions from them. It was impossible for a man who was not in a position to give instructions for carrying out the work to carry it out properly. He had heard of cases where, although the inspectors had been appointed for years, they had not yet visited the whole of the districts over which they were appointed to act. The system of appointing police officers to do the work was a good one, but the persons who did it should be the persons paid. In some cases the inspectors did the work thoroughly, but he had heard of other cases in which they did no work at all which they could possibly avoid.

Mr. MOREHEAD said there was one question raised by the hon. member for Warrego which was not met by the Colonial Secretary or any other member who had spoken, and that was in regard to supplementing the salaries of those officers out of a fund, not gathered from the general taxpayer, but from a certain section of the community who were in no way consulted as to the distribution of the money. In the case of sheep inspectors there were boards established throughout the colony who had some control of their contributions, and had practically the appointment of their own sheep inspectors. The cattle-owners had no such power, as the money gathered from them was distributed by the Government. It was unjust and unfair that the persons directly interested in the impost should have no voice in the distribution of it. That was a very important question raised by the hon. member for Warrego, and which had not, so far, been answered by the Colonial Secretary. Surely those people should have something to say in the disposal of their fund!

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was no machinery provided by law under which they could have anything to say. The Brands Act was not administered by any board, and he could not see how the stock-owners in a district could exercise any patronage in the appointment of inspectors. The hon. member for Townsville had said that sometimes men got paid who did not do any work. There might be something in that; but if the inspector of police did not do all the work he saw that it was done.

Mr. DONALDSON said that what he contended was that those inspectors were paid large sums of money—there were two or three cases of £100 each—because they were sent to outside districts, and the money he ventured to say was given to them as a subsidy, and was taken from a fund provided by people who had no control over its disbursement: to give that money to the inspectors instead of giving it to their subordinates, who really did the work, was grossly unfair. The reasons given for subsidising the inspectors of police in that way was not a good one. Surely they should take sufficient interest in the suppression of crime as policemen to undertake those duties without additional pay! He did not wish to individualise, but he knew of two or three instances where inspectors were receiving large sums of money and had not sent in a single report, and he was certain they had done nothing whatever for the extra salary they received. The fact that the squatters had banded together and offered large sums—in some cases as much as £200—for a conviction had done more for the suppression of crime of that kind than all the inspectors had done.

Mr. STEVENSON said he believed the system of appointing police officers as inspectors of brands had worked very well. As the hon. member for Cook (Mr. Hill) had said, the system had worked well in their district, and they had a great deal to thank the inspector of police for in his capacity as inspector of brands. No man was better fitted to carry out the duties of inspector of brands than a police officer, if he was any good at all, and he was satisfied that no more economical way could be found for dealing with the matter than those dual appointments.

Mr. HILL said he had a word to say in respect to the argument used by the hon. member for Warrego, who said that the cattle-breeders had nothing whatever to say on the distribution of the fund provided by them.

Mr. DONALDSON: No control over it.

Mr. HILL said they could exercise control through their representative. If they found they had got a duffer who did not do the work for which he was appointed, they could put the matter in the hands of their representative in that Assembly, and he fancied he might manage to effect an alteration for them. He would be able to make such representations as would bring about an alteration.

Mr. BEATTIE said that when the police had extra duties to perform he did not think the Committee should grudge a small increase to their salaries, but he thought it should apply to all the police alike. Some of the police were appointed inspectors of slaughter-houses, and had very onerous duties to perform; yet they received no extra salary for them, although the people engaged in the business had to pay fees, which were pocketed by the Government. That was not at all fair. The pay was not large, and the work was sometimes very heavy. If the inspectors of brands received an addition to their salary, then the same rule ought to apply to other officers in the Police Force who had extra duties to perform. The inspectors of slaughter-houses used to receive the fees, but now he supposed the Treasurer, being hard-up for money, stuck to everything he could get hold of.

Mr. PALMER said he believed the police showed more activity in inspecting brands and overhauling cattle than the officers who were actually appointed inspectors of brands. The hon. member for Warrego seemed to overlook the fact that the amount necessary to pay the salary of one inspector of brands was sufficient to provide four or five sub-inspectors, so that

the money went farther when distributed in that way. While on the subject of stock he would be glad to know from the hon. the Colonial Secretary whether it would not be possible to have warrants countersigned in some way so that they could be used across the border. Horse-stealers in the northern and western part of the colony took advantage of their knowledge of the country to get across the border into South Australia, and the police could not arrest them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the matter had been brought under his notice on several occasions. It seemed a very simple thing to do, but the South Australian Parliament could not do it alone, nor could the Queensland Parliament, nor could they do it between them. Perhaps it might be done by the proposed Federal Council, and it would be very salutary. It was becoming a very serious matter. He was told that even the blacks had learnt the position of the border, and after the commission of an offence would get across and defy anyone to follow them.

Mr. ANNEAR said the matter mentioned by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had been brought under his notice. It used to be the custom to pay the sergeants of police, who acted as inspectors of slaughter-houses, a fee of 3d. a head for the cattle slaughtered in the district; but that fee had been taken from them, and although they were promised an increase of salary in lieu of the fees, no such increase had been as yet given. He would ask the Colonial Secretary whether the fees were going to be paid or the salaries increased?

Mr. DONALDSON said, with reference to the inspectors of brands, he would point out that although it was more than likely that cattle stolen would be removed into the other colonies, not one of the officers who received that subsidy—he could call it nothing else—lived within 200 miles of the border. Taking some of the largest crossing places—Barrington, Hungerford, Wompah, and Innaminka—there were no police within 100 or 200 miles of any of them. The complaint he made was not that officers were paid for extra work, but that many of them did no work at all for the subsidies they received.

Mr. CAMPBELL said that so far as his experience of inspectors of slaughter-houses went, their duties were nil. In his district they never saw the inspector of slaughter-houses. The slaughterman filled in a form and sent it to the proprietors, who supplied it to the sergeant of police every Monday morning.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, with respect to the fees paid by the proprietors of slaughter-houses under the Act dealing with the subject, they were paid to the inspector; but under an Act passed last session they were paid into the consolidated revenue. When that Act was passing through the House it was pointed out that consideration would be given to the representations of any persons suffering serious loss of income in consequence of the withdrawal of the fees; but so far as he knew no claim had been made by any of the inspectors of slaughter-houses. Of course he was not anxious for any claims of that kind to come in; nor did he say that they would be favourably received when they did.

Mr. BEATTIE asked into what office fees were paid?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Into the Treasury.

Mr. BEATTIE said he saw a copy of a return sent in by an officer who used to get fees, and no notice was taken of his application. It was very unfair for the Government not to take

notice of small amounts as well as large ones. The money was paid into the Treasury, and when an officer had been in the habit of receiving a gratuity for extra work the head of the department ought to be duly informed of the fact. Such men had cause for complaint, and he hoped the Treasurer would inform the Colonial Secretary that some officers under him were not receiving justice.

Mr. NORTON said he thought the complaint made by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley was a very good one. When the Act was passed which made all fees payable into the Treasury, it was promised that no injustice should be done. The Government were supposed to know who were in receipt of fees, and should require such officers to send in a statement of the amount so received. Many of those officers did not like to send in applications to the Government.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was generally agreed last session that persons who had been in the habit of receiving fees should suffer no loss, but that it should not be perpetuated in the event of a successor being appointed. The claim made by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley on behalf of those inspectors of slaughter-houses who had been deprived of the emoluments they had been receiving was a very fair one, and should receive consideration at the hands of the Government and not be received in the way in which the Premier had indicated. It was distinctly the opinion of the Committee that no injustice should be done to the occupant of any office, part of whose salary consisted of fees; and that anyone succeeding such officers should receive a fixed salary, all fees being paid into the consolidated revenue.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the amounts were often only a few shillings, and he did not consider it his duty to inquire into them. In the cases of officers whose fees amounted to a considerable sum, they had been dealt with in the Estimates last year, and he had not heard a single complaint yet.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the Colonial Secretary talked in a very lordly way about a few shillings. A few shillings might be very little to him, but it might be a great deal to men in the position of those the hon. member for Fortitude Valley pleaded for. Those officers should not be deprived of what they had been receiving. The Colonial Secretary said he did not consider it his duty to inquire after a few shillings; but nobody expected him to do so in person. The officers in his department could do so with very little trouble, and men who were entitled to a few shillings should receive those few shillings.

Mr. BEATTIE said the claim which he had referred to amounted to over £60, and the officer had been receiving that sum annually for a long time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Special arrangements were made in that case.

Mr. ANNEAR said that in the case he referred to there had been no special arrangement made. The amount was about £50 a year, and it had been £30 and £40 for many years. He was referring to the town of Maryborough. Those fees had been received by the senior sergeant of police, and no provision had been made for him since they had been withdrawn. The last account sent in by him had never been paid, although frequent applications had been made for it.

Mr. NORTON said the amount down for the burial of paupers had suddenly risen from £300 to £500; he would like to know whether that was on account of the drought or the general depression of the colony?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the only explanation he could give was that the vote last year was found to be insufficient, and it was not desirable that an addition should appear upon the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Port Curtis. He would like to know whether it was a sign of the progress of the colony; and would also like to call attention to the next item, "Fees for examining lunatics." The action of the Government seemed to be not only to kill people, but those whom they could not kill they would drive mad. It was an extraordinary thing that should occur during the existence of a Liberal Government. They had had to increase considerably the vote for the burial of paupers, and also, in a not quite equal ratio, the fees for examining lunatics. The facts spoke for themselves.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he noticed there as a great increase in the number of constables.

Mr. MOREHEAD: That is in consequence of the blue-ribbon movement.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the increase was 50 this year and 50 last year, or 100 in two years. That was an increase of 30 per cent. on the total number of the force, which was at a greater ratio than the increase of population during the same period. That increase could not be owing to the opening of new towns and districts, or to railway works requiring increased protection on account of the presence of navvies. What was the necessity for the increase?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had already explained that the reason for the increase was the immense number of police stations that had been formed in different parts of the colony. It was impossible to keep pace with the demand for the formation of new police stations. The increase was entirely outside the settled districts. Either police protection in the settled districts must be diminished or additional constables must be appointed, and it was impossible to hesitate as to what should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON said the vote for the police showed a large increase every year. This year the increase was £11,000, and the previous year showed a similar increase. At the same time there was an enormous increase in crime—far beyond the proportion of increase of population. Either the Police Force was not properly organised or the sentences passed on criminals were not sufficiently deterrent. According to the report of the Commissioner of Police the increase was in the larrikin class of criminals. That must be owing to the light sentences previously passed upon them. He hoped the sentences lately passed would have the effect of thoroughly frightening that class of offenders. He trusted that corporal punishment would continue to be meted out to them. Some hon. members seemed to sympathise with that class of criminals, but he held that that was the only punishment which would have any effect upon them.

Mr. ALAND said the last remark of the hon. member should not be allowed to pass unchallenged—that some members sympathised with the class of criminals who received the punishment of flogging a short time ago. When the matter was brought before the House no expression of sympathy with the criminals themselves was made by any hon. member. All that was said was that possibly too many lashes were inflicted upon one of the criminals.

Mr. PALMER said that in connection with the item for conveyance of constables and prisoners he might state that while going through Townsville recently he saw the prisoners brought from the gaol to the court-house. They were dragged, handcuffed on a chain, from the gaol,

over a mile away, along a dusty, hilly road, under a scorching sun. No doubt some of those prisoners were innocent men—indeed he saw one liberated, the verdict having been given in his favour—and it certainly seemed cruel to drag an innocent man in that way to court, handcuffed to a coolie or a Chinaman.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he fully agreed that that ought not to be done. He had never heard of it before. There was a vehicle at Townsville for the conveyance of prisoners.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that although the number of native police was not altered, yet their rations were to cost £250 more this year than last. Were they starved last year, or was it intended to fatten them up this year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the vote last year was found to be insufficient, and this year they were asking for a little more. The Estimates were cut down as low as was consistent with safety, but it was not desired to make the expenditure appear less than it would really be.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Colonial Secretary mentioned some time back that owing to the settlement that had gone on so rapidly in the North and North-west the aboriginals were deprived of the ordinary means of getting their subsistence. They occasionally speared a bullock, but the wonder was they speared so few. But it must be remembered that those bullocks were the property of the pioneer settlers, and the question arose, ought not the Government to do something to feed the famished blacks? He had it on good authority that the blacks in the northern part of his electorate, and in the whole of Cook, were about the most miserable objects of humanity on the face of the earth. They were nothing but skin and bone through starvation. It would be a good thing if the Government were to ask for a vote of £1,000 or £2,000 to supply them with flour and beef, and that might prevent them spearing the pioneer settlers' cattle and occasionally human beings. It was well known that they often speared human beings for the purpose of eating them.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Do you think so?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was positively certain of it, and the fact was known to everyone acquainted with the North. He thought the best way to prevent that, seeing that they had become so few in number in that district, would be to supply them with at least half-rations.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had stated that the Government were endeavouring to take some steps to civilise those blacks as far as they could. At page 35 of the Estimates it would be found that there was an amount of £1,000 set down for aboriginal reserves. That might be voted in whatever way was found most expedient.

Mr. BAILEY said that in connection with that vote he wished to bring under the notice of the Government what he considered was a rather important matter. He desired to call attention to the treatment to which people who were charged with an offence—very often innocent people—were subjected. They presumed every person charged with an offence to be innocent until proved guilty, and certainly they ought not to practise cruelty upon people who were presumably innocent even in the sight of the law. In visiting different towns, both north and south, he found that lockups and places of confinement for persons charged with offences were in a most deplorable condition;

there was not ordinary accommodation in them, and in some cases the ordinary laws of decency were not provided for. A person charged with an offence, no matter how innocent he or she might be, was placed in a cell of a lockup in which there was not even a wooden bench upon which they could lie down. Indeed, the treatment in lockups was far more severe than the treatment in gaols. He would just give one instance—a case that occurred in Brisbane. A short time ago a man was supposed to have committed a theft, and the police, failing to find him, took his wife into custody. The woman, with a child at her breast, was taken to the lockup and put in a cell with nothing but the floor and a blanket to lie upon. She was kept there until her husband surrendered himself; and he believed both man and wife were afterwards found to be innocent of the offence with which they were charged. They were arrested simply because they happened to be in a house where there was some stolen property. Another case, worse still, occurred up north, where he found a man who had been some six or seven weeks penned in a cell with no proper ventilation, and with no pretence of a bed or bench on which he could lie down. The police told him (Mr. Bailey) that they had to get witnesses in that case from a distance of 500 miles. That was to secure a committal; and how long that poor fellow would have to stay in that cell he did not know. The only exercise, if exercise it could be called, the man was allowed to have, was to sit on the verandah an hour or two a day whenever there was a spare policeman to watch. He asked the man what he did all day, and he replied that he walked round and round the little narrow cell until he felt tired and then tried to go to sleep. He (Mr. Bailey) inquired whether he had any books to read or anything to pass the time away? and he replied, "Nothing at all." That man might have been a criminal, and he might not; but he was then only an accused man. He (Mr. Bailey) thought it was perfect cruelty to subject any man to duration of that kind. He knew many men who would be driven mad if they were placed in such a position, and he thought the very least the Government could do was to see that prisoners should be treated with common decency. He knew cases where five or six men were huddled together in one cell. Two or three of those men were presumably innocent of any offence, and yet they were huddled with the worst of criminals. They had to pass night after night and day after day in a position that would disgust any hon. member of that Committee. Even the ordinary decencies of life were not taken into account in their treatment of men locked up on mere suspicion.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Send them to an hotel.

Mr. BAILEY: He did not want to send them to an hotel. The hon. gentleman might himself be put in the same position to-morrow. He might be run in in the same way, and then he would speak more feelingly than he had done. He (Mr. Bailey) spoke on behalf of those people who were innocent, and did not plead on behalf of criminals. He spoke on behalf of that poor woman and her child, in the lockup on a cold night, and who was afterwards proved innocent; and he said it was horrible cruelty to treat a woman like that. Some inquiry should be made in the matter, why people who were innocent should not be treated as human beings.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said some cases of hardship must arise in a colony like this, where persons were arrested in outside districts. Where progress in settlement was very primitive large accommodation could not be provided;

the colony could not afford it. The people who lived in those places did not get the same comforts as those who resided in the more settled districts. They knew that in many parts of the colony there had been no lockup at all, and chains were the only means of confinement. Those things the Government endeavoured to remedy as they could. He believed the hon. member referred to Cooktown, Charters Towers, and Normanton when he spoke of insufficient accommodation. In those cases steps had been taken to provide better accommodation. With respect to the case the hon. member referred to as having occurred in Brisbane, in which a woman was said to have been arrested for the purpose of catching her husband, he knew nothing about it, and could not express any opinion upon it until he was acquainted with the circumstances.

Mr. JORDAN said the hon. member for Wide Bay had described the condition in which he found persons who had been put in lockups in various parts of the colony. That state of things must have existed, otherwise they would not have been so particularly described by the hon. member. He would like to make this remark in reply to what the Colonial Secretary had said: that no lockup in which there were not proper conveniences should be allowed to exist in the colony. According to the hon. member for Wide Bay, people who were innocent—to say nothing of the woman referred to—were confined in lockups destitute of even a decent form or bench on which they could sit. He (Mr. Jordan) thought that was a matter that required immediate investigation, and hon. members could not sit easily on those comfortable seats when they knew that there were lockups in the colony which could be found in the wretched and miserable condition described by the hon. member for Wide Bay.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not understand the hon. member for Wide Bay to complain of the lockups being constructed in a particularly objectionable manner, but of their being too small, and insufficient in size and accommodation, and that they were sometimes filthy, though that was a temporary condition. The hon. member had not complained of any defect in their construction.

Mr. JORDAN said he understood the hon. member to say that there was no form to sit upon, and no pretence of a bedstead. That was what he was speaking of. There should be a form and a bedstead. Persons were placed in the lockups who were not convicted, and they should be provided with decent accommodation.

Mr. BAILEY said he could say a great deal upon the subject, because he had made it a point when travelling both north and south in the colony to inspect those places. What he had seen he did not like to say too much about. He had said enough. But it was a shame to them as a civilised people that persons not convicted of crime—persons presumably innocent—should be treated in the cruel and disgusting way in which they were treated at present. He was quite sure that when the Minister made an investigation into the state of their lockups he would find that what he had said was not one-tenth part of what was the truth. He had seen men confined for weeks in cells where there was hardly breathing room. It was perfect cruelty, and his only wonder was that they did not send madmen out of these places. All he wanted was that the matter should be investigated and then some alteration would be made, and some separation would be made of those of a very low criminal class and those people who were kept in the cells on mere suspicion. People were

kept in the cells on mere suspicion, in the North, for weeks and weeks, and he was sorry to say that they were getting into the same habit of remanding prisoners in Brisbane. The remands were becoming frightfully frequent, and in many cases there was not a sufficient reason for them. It should be remembered that, during the time those persons were being remanded, from remand to remand they were suffering worse punishment than they would have to suffer in any gaol in the colony. Passing by that question he wished to ask the Colonial Secretary a question concerning an item on the vote. Mr. William Harris, of Toowoomba, was put down as getting an allowance in lieu of quarters of £50 a year: Was it correct that Mr. Harris had got very good quarters and got the £50 a year besides?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was informed that there was a mistake in the schedule, and that it should read, "Quarters valued at £50 a year."

Mr. FERGUSON said that in accordance with the Defence Act passed last session the police were liable to be called out at any time in the defence of the colony, and he would like to know whether the Government had power to appoint special constables to take their place should such a necessity arise? He knew they had power to appoint special constables in case of a disturbance in the colony, but had they power to replace constables called out in the way he had mentioned?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; the Government have every power to do that when necessary.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that the sum of £2,999 be voted for Water Police, said that the only change was caused by an increase given to coxswains and boatmen over three years in the service.

Mr. BEATTIE said that when that vote was before the Committee last session he drew the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the necessity of having some water police stationed in Brisbane. The shipping that now came up to the city of Brisbane required some water police to look after it, as a great many offences were committed against the regulations and there was no one to look after them. In every other place in the Australasian colonies there were water police appointed to look after the shipping, to see that the harbour regulations were carried out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was much obliged to the hon. member for reminding him on the subject. It had escaped his memory, and that was the only excuse he could give for not having taken some action in the matter. He thought himself it was time water police were appointed to look after the shipping in Brisbane.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that the sum of £900 be voted for the Government Resident, Thursday Island, said that a change had taken place with respect to Thursday Island. Previously there had been a police magistrate appointed there, but the place had of late become of considerable importance, and, as it was so far removed from the capital and unconnected by telegraph and likely to be so for two or three years, it was thought desirable, for many reasons, to appoint an officer there of a higher standing than a police magistrate. Mr. Douglas was appointed to the place with the title of Government Resident—a title well known in the colonies. In old times there used to be one here at Brisbane, and later, one

at Port Curtis; and there was a Government resident at Port Darwin. The services of the appointment at Thursday Island were analogous to those of the other appointments of the kind mentioned. He had not heard a word said in depreciation of the choice of the Government in Mr. Douglas for that position, which was a dignified and honourable one. The salary paid to the police magistrate was £400; but that had been increased by £300, and £200 allowance was set down, as the gentleman filling the position had to expend a good deal in entertaining people.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that there be granted a sum of £34,789, salaries and contingencies for Petty Sessions. He would call attention to all the changes, except a few cases where a whole year's salary was voted instead of a half-year's. In the case of Aramac it was proposed that the allowance of £100 to the police magistrate for visiting Muttaborra should be discontinued, as it was considered necessary to appoint a police magistrate at Muttaborra. The present police magistrate's salary would not be reduced by that change, as it cost him more than £100 to go to Muttaborra and back; and it was proposed to increase his salary from £400 to £425, the same as that paid to police magistrates in corresponding places. There was an apparent change at Clermont and Townsville. The police magistrate at Clermont had been exchanged with the police magistrate at Townsville. The actual emoluments of the police magistrate at Clermont and Copperfield were £110 more than the salary stated, so that it was actually £610. At Townsville it was proposed that he should receive £600, so that he was transferred without any material loss of emolument. It was proposed to increase the salary from £550 to £600, which was by no means too much for Townsville. The salary of the clerk of petty sessions at Clermont was put down at £300, but a change had been made since the Estimates were framed, and the salary would in future be £250. It was proposed to appoint a clerk of petty sessions at Cloncurry; there was a large increase in the amount of work, and the Government thought they were justified in proposing the appointment. There was a small increase owing to the appointment of a clerk of petty sessions at Jericho. It was proposed to discontinue the office of police magistrate at Mount Britton, and only three months' salary was asked for. The population had decreased so much that the police magistrate was no longer necessary. It was proposed to appoint a police magistrate at Normanton. Up to the present time one officer had performed the duties of police magistrate, clerk of petty sessions, and recording clerk; but the work had become far more than one man could do properly. An assistant clerk of petty sessions had to be appointed at Charters Towers, as the clerk of petty sessions also acted as mining registrar, and the work was becoming more than he could do. He had heard that that officer had paid for assistance out of his own pocket, and it was not fair that a man should have to work all day and part of the night, and then pay away part of his salary to get his work done. The total increase was very trifling—£600.

Mr. SCOTT said he did not quite follow the Colonial Secretary's explanation about the change at Townsville. It appeared that the salary of the police magistrate at Clermont was reduced from £500 to £450, and that of the police magistrate at Townsville increased from £550 to £600. As he understood it, Mr. Morey, who was now at Townsville, was formerly at Clermont, and had the higher salary of the two; so that he had not only changed positions, but

also changed salaries. He knew both gentlemen, and he had not a word to say against Mr. Henry, but he did not see why Mr. Morey's salary should be reduced, even if he was removed from one situation to the other, unless there was some reason for his being disrated.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had explained that no change had been made at all in the salaries of the two officers when they were transferred, except that Mr. Morey got an extra £10, and Mr. Henry lost £10, which was not worth troubling about. The salary of the police magistrate at Clermont was formally £500, and in addition to that there were extra emoluments amounting to £110, so the salary of Mr. Henry there was actually £610. When he was moved to Townsville, he took the salary of £600 with him, an increase of £50 being made in the salary hitherto paid at Townsville. Mr. Morey drew £550 at Townsville, and being transferred to Clermont, he took a salary of £450 with extra emoluments amounting to £110; so that he now drew £560 at Clermont instead of £550 at Townsville.

Mr. SCOTT asked if there were not some fees which Mr. Morey received at Townsville which he did not receive at Clermont? It was peculiar also that particulars were given regarding the salary of the police magistrate at Clermont, but none regarding the police magistrate at Townsville.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: There are no emoluments attached to that office. He gets one salary, and that is all.

Mr. SCOTT: Am I to understand that Mr. Morey's salary is the same now as it was before?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is £10 more.

Mr. SALKELD said he understood that the clerk of petty sessions at Townsville was getting £400 a year. Was he getting any equivalent for fees he received previously?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The salary was raised last year from £250 to £400.

Mr. DONALDSON said he thought it was objectionable that the police should act as clerks of petty sessions where there were police magistrates. No doubt it was necessary to have them in places where police magistrates visited only fortnightly or monthly. He called attention to the matter last year, and thought it would be remedied this year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not remember the hon. gentleman calling attention to it last year, but the matter had attracted his attention since then. Where a magistrate was resident in town he ought to act.

Mr. SALKELD asked if he understood the Colonial Secretary to say that the clerk of petty sessions at Townsville received fees? The salary in the Estimates was £400 a year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was raised last year.

Mr. FERGUSON said that according to the schedule the clerk of petty sessions at Townsville received £492. He received £30 as registrar of the district court, and £62 as land agent. The estimate only showed £400, while the real salary was £492; therefore it was misleading the Committee to a certain extent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said hon. gentlemen used to complain that they were confused by marginal notes, so they were left out and put into the schedule. The hon. gentlemen should refer to the schedule.

Mr. FERGUSON said it was understood when the Estimates were going through last

session that they should be framed in such a manner that the Committee could see at once the full amount paid to each officer.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You will find that in the schedule.

Mr. SALKELD: Will the Colonial Secretary inform us as to the exact amount received by the clerk of petty sessions at Townsville?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that he received £400 for that office, £30 as registrar of the district court, and £62 as land agent. In addition to that he received fees as district registrar at the rate of 8s. 6d. per entry.

Mr. JORDAN said the fee used to be 2s. 6d., but it had been raised to 3s. 6d.

Mr. HAMILTON said he wished to know if the police magistrate at Townsville received any emolument in addition to his salary? He was under the impression that he did.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: None that I am aware of.

Mr. SALKELD said that what he wished to arrive at was the actual amount that the clerk of petty sessions at Townsville would receive for the present year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could hardly say. He would receive £400 salary, £30 as registrar of the district court, £62 as land agent, and such fees as might come in to him as district registrar. Last year they amounted to £145. If the hon. gentleman would refer to page 9 of the schedule he would see for himself.

Mr. SALKELD said he understood that the fees of district registrar were not paid into the Treasury. What fees were so paid?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: All fees that are paid under the authority of any Act of Parliament.

Mr. CAMPBELL said he noticed that at several places clerks of petty sessions were receiving higher salaries than the police magistrates. In some instances they held other appointments as well, and they had a junior to do their official work for them. There must be something wrong in a system of that kind.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know what clerks of petty sessions the hon. member referred to. The one at Townsville had a very large amount of work to do—more than he could possibly do himself. The salaries seemed high, but they were really less than they were two years ago. They had practically been reduced by the Act of last year.

Mr. CAMPBELL said the clerk of petty sessions at Toowoomba held several appointments outside those which were shown in the schedule. Amongst other things, he was secretary of the marsupial board. Not two years ago that clerk complained of having too much work to do, and an assistant was appointed at £150 a year.

Mr. SALKELD said he noticed that some officers who acted as land agents were paid salaries, while others received fees. What fees did land agents receive?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that fees were given in cases where the work was too small to warrant a fixed salary. They were paid according to the quantity of work they did.

Mr. SALKELD said he also had noticed that some clerks of petty sessions received larger salaries than the police magistrates, the inference being either that the clerks were overpaid or that the magistrates were underpaid. Hon. members had been asked to point out items where reductions could be made. It was a very difficult thing for a private member to cut down the Estimates, and it

looked invidious to select particular cases for the application of the pruning-knife. There were very few increases on the present Estimates, they being based on those of last year, which, as hon. members knew, were not sufficiently discussed owing to the late period of the session at which they came on for consideration. The fault of the Government lay in making the increases in the Estimates for 1883-4. But for that there might have been no necessity now for fresh taxation. To test the feeling of the Committee, he proposed to move reductions in those cases where the clerk of petty sessions received a higher remuneration than the police magistrate. He would first move that the item, "Clerk of petty sessions, Cooktown, £300," be reduced by the sum of £50.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the salary of the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown was increased last year from £250 to £300, in consequence of the taking away of all fees attached to the office, the amount of which was certainly over £50. So that, instead of having his salary increased, it had been practically reduced. Although, in his (the Colonial Secretary's) opinion, the salary of £300 was too large for Cooktown, still it had not been the practice to reduce the salaries of officers while continuing to perform the same duties. Opportunity might be taken when a change was made in the office to reduce the salary of the office, as was done at Clermont, where, on a change taking place, the salary of the office was reduced from £300 to £250. A reduction would be made at Cooktown when a change took place there, but it would be hardly fair now to reduce the salary of an officer who had been receiving the emoluments of the office for some years and whose duties had not been diminished in any way. No doubt, considerable abuses had crept in under the old system. No one knew what the real income of an officer was; he might be nominally getting £100 and really £500. But that was now altered, and all fees were paid into the Treasury, so that it was now known exactly what each officer was getting. At an earlier part of the evening it was urged that police officers who were also inspectors of slaughter-houses should have their salaries increased, but he did not see his way to do it. In the present case and many others analogous to it, the salaries had been really reduced by the officers receiving a fixed rate instead of an uncertain rate, and he did not think it would be fair to further cut down the salaries.

Mr. KATES said he found that the hon. gentleman had in some cases compensated clerks of petty sessions for the loss of fees. For instance, he noticed that the hon. gentleman had compensated the acting clerk of petty sessions at Aramac.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; that is a mistake.

Mr. KATES said he did not see any compensation allowed to the clerk of petty sessions at Allora, who had lost fees to the amount of £25 a year, which he had been receiving for five or six years before the present arrangement came into force.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that in cases like that, where the amount was only £25 a year, it was not considered desirable to make any increase in the salary. The office to which the hon. gentleman referred was purely a temporary arrangement and might be taken away any day. It would be very inconvenient, in a purely provisional and temporary arrangement, by which the officer was liable to be moved at any time, to grant any compensation for the loss of fees.

Mr. KATES said he did not think the hon. gentleman could call that case a provisional 1885—3 F

arrangement, when the gentleman who had been acting clerk of petty sessions had held the position for ten years.

Mr. PALMER said he supposed he must accept the explanation the Colonial Secretary had just given as to the difference between the salaries received by the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown and that paid to the clerk of petty sessions at Cloncurry. The difference in the cost of living between those two places was greatly in favour of Cooktown.

Mr. SALKELD said he saw that there was a sum of £150 down for an assistant clerk at Cooktown.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that was so. He did not think he was responsible for the first appointment, but if the work was so great that one man could not do it, they must appoint another. There was really a very large amount of work at Cooktown, and it had previously been found necessary to authorise additional expenditure to get the work done.

Mr. BEATTIE said he could understand that, and he perfectly agreed with the Colonial Secretary that when one officer was unable to do the work it was necessary to appoint another. But he would point out that in the present case, not only did the person hold the office of clerk of petty sessions but he was also district registrar, registrar of the district court, and land agent, and he also conducted insolvency business at Cooktown. Why could not an officer be appointed to conduct that business and allow the clerk of petty sessions to confine himself to the duties of his office?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would involve more expense.

Mr. BEATTIE said he did not think so. He was sure two officers would be better than one. The salaries would keep two officers, and he believed the officer in that case had a very great deal of work to do, and that it was necessary for him to have an assistant.

Mr. FERGUSON said the clerks of petty sessions paid their assistants.

Mr. BEATTIE: Do they?

Mr. FERGUSON: He knew that in some cases they did.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is abolished now.

Mr. FERGUSON said he believed the fees now received by clerks of petty sessions were paid into the Treasury, and he understood that when that was the case the clerks of petty sessions were to receive a fixed salary which would be sufficient to compensate them for their loss of fees. That, however, he believed, was not the case with the clerk at Rockhampton.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had explained earlier in the evening that all fees payable under any Act of Parliament were now paid into the Treasury. Of course the Government had no means of ascertaining exactly what those fees were before they were paid into the Treasury. In the case of the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton, he was told that that officer really had less by about £200 a year by getting an increased salary.

Mr. SALKELD: He was making £1,000 a year.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed he was. With respect to the office of district registrar, which had been referred to, he would point out that the fees of district registrars were not fees properly so-called. That was the mode by which district registrars were remunerated. They were paid 3s. 6d., he thought, for every entry they had to make. That was the remuneration they were getting, and it was paid

out of the Treasury. Those emoluments were so large that it did not seem desirable to provide a permanent increase to their salaries to the corresponding amount. It was thought better to leave the present arrangement as it was, until a change was made.

Mr. HAMILTON said the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown was, pecuniarily, actually in a worse position than he was last year, as the perquisites he then obtained actually gave him a larger salary. He was also in a worse position than many others, because whilst he had not a larger salary than many other clerks of petty sessions he had a great deal more work to do.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought it was rather strange that the hon. gentleman in charge of those Estimates could not tell the Committee the amount of fees received by those officers at the time they received fees. Surely he could ascertain from his colleague what fees had been paid into the Treasury since the clerks of petty sessions lost their fees. If the Colonial Treasurer had the information—and he had no doubt the hon. gentleman had—then the Colonial Secretary could inform the Committee. There might be some difficulty in ascertaining the amount of fees received before they were paid into the Treasury, but there could be no difficulty in finding out the amount taken since then.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the hon. member for Townsville must know that a question like that could not be answered at a moment's notice. He (the Colonial Treasurer) could not be supposed to carry in his head an account of all the fees paid into the Treasury by clerks of petty sessions. If, however, the hon. member wished it he would be glad to give him what information he could on the subject.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not ask for the information for himself, but for the Committee, and he did not expect the hon. gentleman to have it in his head; he should have it in his box. The fees he referred to had been paid into the Treasury since the alteration was made twelve months ago, and therefore the hon. gentleman should be in possession of the information.

Mr. SALKELD said that if the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton received £200 last year less than he received in the previous year, he must have been getting something over £944. He failed to see that because a man was receiving a much higher salary than it was supposed he was in receipt of he should therefore receive an equally high salary now. It appeared to him that the Committee were losing all control over the expenditure. The Civil Service was a very powerful body in the colony, and its power was felt to such a degree that it was very difficult to make any retrenchment whatever. It was time steps were taken to see that their balances should not be in the state it was expected they would be in, and that they should not have to impose additional taxation. It was, therefore, the duty of the Committee to carefully scrutinise the Estimates. He should not be prevented from making any amendment he thought fair, and he hoped the Committee would give it due consideration. The police magistrate at Rockhampton was getting £600 a year and the clerk of petty sessions at the same place got £744. That was an anomaly which should be set right. The hon. member for Cook, speaking of the officer in his own electorate, said he had a large amount of work to do; but there was an assistant provided for him, and in his opinion the assistant usually had to do the lion's share of the work.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he quite sympathised with what had fallen from the hon. member for Ipswich; and he agreed with most

of what he had said. Still, he thought the hon. member was making a mistake in making an attack upon men whose income was being actually reduced through the alteration made last year. He should rather attack the salaries of those who had all along been in receipt of large salaries, and who were to have increases. The clerks of petty sessions at Cooktown and other places were receiving less now than they were before. It was well known to those who knew anything about Rockhampton that the clerk of petty sessions there was receiving £1,000 a year, and now he was reduced to £700; that was still a very large sum, but it would not be fair for the Committee to reduce it further. But when a change took place in the offices, as the hon. gentleman in charge of the Estimates had stated, the salary of the successor could be reduced.

Mr. FERGUSON said he agreed with what the hon. member for Townsville had said. He knew that the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton engaged an assistant, and paid him himself. He did not know whether he had done so since the reduction took place, but he believed he did. If he did not, he would have to take work home, because it was so great that he could not do it in the office-hours.

Mr. SALKELD said that he found that the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton received £400, and there was an assistant clerk at £150 put down on the Estimates; so that the hon. member was in error in supposing that the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton paid his assistant clerk himself. He did not think the remarks of the hon. member for Townsville were in good form, when he said that they ought not to interfere with those officers who were receiving more than the Committee expected, and reduce their salaries. He considered that they should reduce their salaries to what they ought by right to receive. There was no justification now any more than before for their receiving more than a fair salary. That Committee had no control over the appointment of those officers, and the misfortune was that they had to discuss those Estimates after half the year was past. It was wonderful how men got on in the Public Service; they started as boys, and were getting £500 or £600 a year in no time. It was the duty of the Committee to insist that the public officers should be paid something in proportion to the services they rendered.

Mr. HAMILTON said that if the hon. member for Ipswich wished to go in for economy and retrenchment he should strike at home first. The clerk of petty sessions at Ipswich got £50 a year more than the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown.

Mr. SALKELD: No; the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown receives £419 according to the schedule.

Mr. HAMILTON said that according to the Estimates he got £50 less than the clerk of petty sessions at Ipswich; but at any rate he could say from his own knowledge that the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown was a first-class man, and had exceptionally hard work to do; and the Colonial Secretary was perfectly right in putting down the sum he had for that officer. It was not an exceptionally high salary, and there were other instances where clerks of petty sessions were paid equally high salaries, though they had not to work any harder or perform greater duties than the officer at Cooktown.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member for Ipswich was, in his opinion, to be commended for the action he had taken in setting his face against the increase of expenditure which was going on every year. When the Public Officers Fees Bill was passed last year it was distinctly

understood that the officers who had previously received fees should get something like an equivalent in their salaries. They did not know what those fees were, but, according to the explanation given by the Colonial Secretary, the salary of the officer in question was less now than when he received the fees, and for that reason many hon. members would have some hesitation in supporting the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Ipswich if it came to a division. He was glad to see an economic attack coming over hon. members, and the only regret was that it had not come over them about twenty-four hours earlier. It struck him that about the same time last night hon. members opposite were not troubled with that economic attack. He was sure that their constituents would appreciate them more highly if they showed themselves more disposed to give way a little when their own pockets were concerned, and a little more liberal to unfortunate men living far back in the country in an unhealthy climate, who probably worked hard for what they got. He believed there were some items farther on that might well be reduced, but he thought the hon. member had chosen badly in pitching on that particular one.

Mr. HAMILTON said he would suggest that they should make a reduction in the expenditure by abolishing the office of police magistrate at Ipswich. Judging from the expressions of the members for that district there were no bad characters there, and it would be far more economical to send Mr. Day up from Brisbane once a month.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he did not agree with the hon. member for Port Curtis that his colleague had been unfortunate in the instance he had chosen, because he had distinctly explained that he did not wish to deal with any particular man, but simply to uphold the principle that a clerk of petty sessions should not have a higher salary than the police magistrate. Many members of the Committee thought that the salaries of clerks of petty sessions were far too high, but all attempts made to have them reduced had been in vain. New members coming into the House were horrified at the expenditure, but after trying for two or three years to bring about a reformation they generally gave it up as hopeless. Unless some stand was made by the reformers, things would go on in the future as they had in the past. He would suggest that a Royal Commission of the House should be appointed to investigate the salaries of the Civil Service, and put them on some sort of fair footing. As to the reference that had been made to the payment of members, he could only say that those members who spoke so strongly against it would be in a very invidious position if they accepted the money for themselves. He supposed they would all refuse it, and let it go to the hospital or other public charities. Hon. members of the House were doing more work and sacrificing more time for the country than many clerks of petty sessions, and yet they were expected to work for nothing. It was simply mock modesty for a man to say he would not accept a fair reward for labour done. Such a man did not take the independent position he ought to take; he was simply trying to impose on the country by saying that he did not want the money, while perhaps he was more anxious to get it than those who voted for it.

Mr. FOOTE said he was glad to hear the unusually vigorous speech of the hon. member who had just spoken, but he was not going to bother that hon. member. With regard to the matter referred to by the junior member for Ipswich, he had long thought it was inconsistent that clerks of petty sessions should receive

higher salaries than the police magistrates. Some of them had a good deal of work to do, but, as a rule, in that case they had an assistant. Hon. members were led to believe when the Bill was passed last session that the fees were to be done away with, but he saw they still existed in another form. For instance, the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown held five offices. If he had too much work to do some of the offices should be given to someone else. There might be some necessity why he should be registrar of the district court and also insolvency agent, but what necessity was there that he should be land agent? He presumed there was a land agent and a land commissioner. It might be the most economical way for the Government to heap those offices on one man, but it was clearly shown that both there and at Rockhampton the officers were overworked. If they could not accomplish their duties in the daytime, but had to sit up at night till the small hours of the morning, it was clear they had too many duties to perform. It was impossible that when so much work devolved upon one man it could be properly performed. It would be much better if some of those offices were given to other persons.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Government were trying to bring about a proper state of things; but the present system had been going on for many years during which no one knew anything about it. The clerk of petty sessions in Ipswich received some £800 or £900 a year, and when he ceased to hold that office his successor got £350, and £50 as registrar of the district court. That was one case where a change had been made. Others would be made in time; they could not be made at once.

Mr. BEATTIE said he was rather astonished to hear the Colonial Secretary say he did not know that the clerk of petty sessions in Ipswich received such a large salary. He had known it for the last seven or eight years. He was getting nearly double the salary of the police magistrate. The Colonial Secretary was carrying out his promise—that when new appointments were made the officers would not receive emoluments outside of their salaries. The clerk of petty sessions at Brisbane was a new officer, and was put down at a certain salary and received no emoluments. There were two police magistrates in Brisbane and one clerk of petty sessions to do the whole of the work. That officer was at work from the time he went to his office until the end of his office-hours. The clerical work that he had to do kept him continually at it, and when there were two courts sitting there was an immense amount of work.

Mr. CHUBB : There are four clerks there.

Mr. BEATTIE said the clerk of petty sessions had to issue all the summonses and take all informations, and that was sufficient for one man alone. What he rose particularly to say was that he did not object to clerks of petty sessions up north receiving such large salaries, because living in that part of the colony was so much more expensive than in the South. But the principle was bad that clerks of petty sessions should receive larger salaries than police magistrates, and he hoped it would be altered.

Mr. CHUBB said he hoped the hon. member for Ipswich would not persist in his amendments. Supposing the reduction was carried, it would simply be making a scapegoat of one individual, while others would get off without any reduction at all. It was a wrong principle that clerks of petty sessions should get larger salaries than police magistrates, who were their superior officers. The person who discharged the duties of clerk of petty sessions was also district registrar and registrar of the district

court, and held several other offices; and as he could not do the work alone an assistant was appointed to enable him to draw all those large emoluments. The Colonial Secretary had told them that alterations would be made by degrees; that the change could not be made all at once without doing injustice to the persons who held the offices, and that when they were promoted those who came after them would be started upon a proper salary; thus it would not be fair to reduce their incomes by half at once, as it was singling them out for a punishment which they did not deserve. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley said that the clerk of petty sessions in Brisbane only received £400, whilst the clerk of petty sessions in Ipswich received just the same amount. If the hon. gentleman would refer to the Estimates he would find that the cost of the police court in Brisbane was £1,050, which was nearly three times the cost of working the court in Ipswich.

Mr. BEATTIE: There is six times the amount of work.

Mr. CHUBB said that might be so, but the person who discharged the duties of clerk of petty sessions was supposed to be a man of intellect and education, and must keep up some position. They could not give him a small salary and expect him to be honest. With regard to the proposed amendments, hon. gentlemen who had not been in the North did not know what sort of place it was. The hon. member for Ipswich had not been there, and did not know that the cost of living there was 50 per cent. greater than it was in Ipswich, therefore it was not fair to put all those officers in the same category. He hoped the hon. gentleman would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would first ask the Colonial Secretary whether the schedule was part and parcel of the Estimates before them?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. It was laid on the table on the 13th August.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it seemed to him that there was a slight discrepancy in the sum that the Committee were asked to vote in the Estimates-in-Chief and the sum set against the same item in the schedule. They were asked to vote £450 for the salary of the police magistrate at Clermont and Copperfield, and there was a reference on the 16th page of the Estimates to page 6 of the schedule. On page 6 of the schedule they found that his salary was set down at £500—an allowance of £50 as gold warden and land commissioner being granted. There was a discrepancy of £50 between those two items. He should be glad if the Colonial Secretary would explain the discrepancy.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if the hon. gentleman read what was on the front page of the schedule he would find that his question answered itself. In the case he referred to the salary for 1884-5 was £500, and the salary for the present year was £450.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the reply of the hon. gentleman showed that Mr. Morey, who had been removed from Townsville, suffered a more material reduction than he had supposed, whereas the individual who was transferred to Townsville was to receive a very large increase. The time had arrived when they should discuss the propriety or otherwise of those changes. They had seen the Government shifting magistrates from one place to another at great expense, and also with a great loss of absolute income. There might be a great deal said in favour of all police magistrates being placed on an equal footing, and of each magistrate not remaining in one district more than a certain number of years. He could understand that, but he

could not understand why men who had worked for years and years, who had made homes for themselves under circumstances which had existed almost since the colony came into existence, should be transferred at the mere whim of the Ministry, not only having their homes broken up, but also suffering a diminution of income. Unless some solid reason could be given for such changes—and in that case simply transferring an officer from one place to another was not sufficient—the Government were greatly to blame in making them. He could point to half-a-dozen instances in which the magistrates had been moved in the most capricious way, so far as the outside public and hon. members, except the hon. member in charge of the Estimates, could judge. There was the transference of Captain Goodall to Roma, of Mr. Morey to Clermont, of Mr. Macfarlane to St. George.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Very properly too.

Mr. MOREHEAD: It might be so, but some reasons should be given. The mere *ipse dixit* of the Minister for Works was not worth much at any time, or in any place; and the mere statement, "Very properly too," would not satisfy members of the Committee or the outside public.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: They have no pre-emptive right.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he could not follow the hon. gentleman. He seemed to have been dreaming, and on waking up to have thought they were dealing with the Land Bill. It gradually occurred to him, however, that the hon. gentleman meant "prescriptive right." No one said they had prescriptive rights; but if the Government decided to remove them they might have been removed without expense and loss of emolument to themselves. That was one of the axioms promulgated by the present Ministry, but their actions were the very opposite. He would now point out that gentlemen who really had no claim on the State had been given positions with very considerable emoluments, as against men who had seen considerable service; and he would take the case of the police magistrate at Charleville, Major Moore. He had been in the Government Service in the quasi Defence Force, at a salary of £400 a year, but he was sent to Charleville, where he drew a salary of £607 a year according to the schedule, having been passed over the heads of hundreds of Civil servants who had borne the heat and burden of the day. It was time attention was called to the action of the Government in that direction. He could point out numerous other instances in the schedule where large sums of money had been received in excess of what should be paid to police magistrates, when compared with others who had been in the service a much longer time. The police magistrate at Springsure, Mr. J. G. Macdonald, had not seen nearly as much service as the present police magistrate at Roma, who, almost ever since he had been in the colony, had been a well-tried servant of the State. That officer was now landed in Roma with a salary of £525 a year, losing a great deal by the transfer, while the police magistrate at Springsure received £622 a year; but to compare the work of the two places was simply absurd. Springsure was a small bush township, which had a railway at last in consequence of the peculiar action of the Minister for Lands; and to compare the work done there with that done at Roma was to compare night with day. And the same remark applied to a comparison between St. George and Springsure. The work done by the magistrate at St. George was immensely greater than that done by the magistrate at Springsure. But the policy of the present Government seemed to be, when they

wished to increase a police magistrate's income, to pile upon him a large number of other offices. That was the policy they deprecated so strongly while the late Government was in power, and they said it was a wrong thing to bolster up salaries in an adventitious manner. But he found that the police magistrate at Springsure was also clerk of petty sessions, district registrar, acting land commissioner, registrar of the district court, and savings bank officer, in order to swell up his emoluments. The Government were surely inconsistent in perpetuating a system which they condemned so bitterly while out of office. A great deal had been said by the hon. member for Bowen and others as to the enormous cost of living at the northern coast towns, and they argued that on that account great consideration should be shown to officers who had to live in those places. He (Mr. Morehead) maintained that the cost of living in the coast towns—no matter how far north—was very much less than the cost which had to be borne by those officers who had to live in the towns in the far interior of the colony, and it was to them that concessions ought to be made. The climate also of the interior was much more trying than the climate on the coast; and if concessions were to be given to officers living on the coast they should be given doubly to those who had to endure the intense heat, the enormous discomfort, and the tremendous expense of living, in the western interior of the colony. No man who knew the colony would deny that what he was stating was perfectly true. Officers who lived in coast towns also had far greater facilities for educating their children. At every town on the coast the officers had the opportunity of sending their children to a good State school—an opportunity which did not exist in the western interior. Then, again, the climate in the West was not altogether a good one for children, and in many cases the officers had to send their wives and children to the sea-coast after a year or two—a difficulty against which officers living in the coast towns had not to contend. The Government ought to take into consideration those disadvantages; and he trusted the Colonial Secretary would yet see his way to bring in a supplementary estimate giving to those men well-deserved concessions. He did not object to the salary of the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown, and should vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Ipswich.

Mr. ARCHER said there might be very good reasons for shifting police magistrates from place to place occasionally, but he did not think it was always done quite fairly. If it was to become the practice of the Government not to allow a police magistrate to remain more than a certain time at any one place, some new arrangements would have to be made or great injustice would be done. The first thing a man did after he was appointed was to make for himself a comfortable home. That was a very costly affair in some places; and when the officer was removed he was compelled to sell off everything at often a ruinous sacrifice, and start to make his home all over again. Even if he received a slight increase of salary on removal, so far from being promotion it was a great punishment. That was not the case in other Government departments. For instance, if a sub-collector at Cooktown was removed to Townsville, or one at Rockhampton was removed to Maryborough, and so on, he went to a place where the Government had provided a comfortable house for him, or else he got a certain allowance in lieu thereof. Indeed, the salaries and emoluments of some of the sub-collectors on the coast were greater than those of similar officers at Brisbane, who had a vastly greater amount of work to do. He did not quarrel with the fact of their being provided

with houses to live in. What he wished to urge was that it was the duty of the Government, if they were going to make it a practice to shift police magistrates from place to place, to see that they did not put them to the great loss of breaking up their homes and the great expense of making new ones. Houses ought to be provided for them at the various townships where they were stationed. There were many reasons why a police magistrate should not remain too long in one place—so long as human nature remained what it was—but the removal ought to be done with justice and without involving those officers in enormous expenses. He did not agree with the suggestion which he understood had been made by the last speaker, that there ought to be fixed salaries for police magistrates in the interior. It would not be right that a young man just entering the service should receive as large a salary as a man of long experience and good conduct. There was no calling that he knew of where experience and good conduct did not raise a man into a higher position than he held when young and untried. Then with regard to the other matter of shifting police magistrates about, making them sell their houses and furniture, and break up their whole establishment, and turning them out into the bush on a bare western plain, where no house could be hired, he thought that was a great hardship, and he hoped to hear from the hon. gentleman that the matter would receive consideration.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for Balonne had called attention to what he supposed to be the reduction of one officer's salary, and the increase of another's. He (the Colonial Secretary) had pointed out on more than one occasion that that was a mistake. Two officers were transferred, carrying their salaries with them. In reference to the remarks made with regard to the changes of police magistrates, anyone who had any experience of the government of the colony must know it very frequently happened that it was necessary to remove police magistrates from one place to another, and that it was not always convenient or desirable to assign any reason. In some cases a man, although he endeavoured to do his best, outlived his usefulness in the particular place in which he was located. He quite agreed that in a case of that sort a change ought to be made so as to cause as little inconvenience as possible. In every change the Government had made they had endeavoured to avoid causing any inconvenience that was not absolutely necessary. The hon. member for Blackall had spoken of sending an officer from a coast town to a bare western plain. The only change to his knowledge of that kind had been made by the hon. gentleman himself, or by the Government of which he was a member. The hon. member for Balonne had mentioned especially the case of the police magistrate of Springsure, and stated that he had larger emoluments than anybody else. As a matter of fact the salary of that officer was reduced by £50 last year, and he was deprived of all the fees he formerly had.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I am speaking of him as he is now.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was done last year; and if any unkindness had been done it was done then, in singling him out for a reduction of salary. As to providing private residences for police magistrates, that was a matter that had often been mentioned in that Committee. He did not see his way to do it. If they provided a house they would also have to furnish it, and he was not prepared to ask the Committee to sanction an expenditure of £100,000 for that purpose. It would cost all of that. He did not think it was desirable to do that for many years at any rate. As to the desirability

of equalising the salaries of magistrates and arranging them according to different grades, there was something to be said in favour of that suggestion. He was disposed to think that magistrates should receive salaries according to their grades—some at £600 a year, which he believed was the highest salary now paid; some at £500 and some at £400; and that they should obtain promotion from one grade to another by good service and by length of service, and not according to the place in which they were located. Practically, the Government were endeavouring to carry that out now.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the hon. gentleman had referred to what he had said about the reduction in the salary of the police magistrate of Springsure last year. How did that come about? Was it by the action of the Government, or by the action of that Committee? The hon. gentleman took credit to himself for having done it, but he (Mr. Morehead) would point out that it was not done until after the discussion in that Committee.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that no change was made in the Estimates at all in respect to the salary of the police magistrate at Springsure last year; it was voted as proposed by the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON said one would imagine that it was quite a revelation to hon. members that clerks of petty sessions were in the habit of receiving a larger income than police magistrates, but it was well known that by means of their perquisites they did get a larger remuneration. The work done by them was certainly greater than that done by police magistrates. The hon. member for Bowen was right in saying that some consideration ought to be shown to officers living in the tropics, and he (Mr. Hamilton) thought that even the hon. member for Bulimba would admit that, as the hon. gentleman did not think he was paid too well when he received an amount of £450 for a few weeks' work in the tropics. He (Mr. Hamilton) thought the same consideration should be extended to those clerks of petty sessions who lived in the Far West, because they were not surrounded with the advantages of civilisation, nor were they able to obtain the necessaries of life at the same price as those who lived in the metropolis. If there was anything in the content on that a clerk of petty sessions should not receive as large a salary as a police magistrate because he was a subordinate officer, he would point out that the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown received nothing like the salary of the police magistrate, as he only received £300 a year as clerk of petty sessions. The rest of his salary was made up of the remuneration received for other offices which were independent of the position in which the police magistrate was his superior. For instance, as district registrar, he was directly responsible to the Registrar-General; as registrar of the district court, to the Attorney-General; as land agent, to the Minister for Lands; and as trustee in insolvency, to the Official Trustee in Insolvency; and since he performed those additional duties it was only right that he should be paid for doing the work. He thought that by giving that officer those extra sums they were studying economy, as it would be perfectly impossible to get any outside man to do the work for the sum paid to the clerk of petty sessions; they would not, for instance, get anyone to perform the duties of district registrar for £30 a year.

Mr. SALKELD said he would take the sense of the Committee on that matter, and if he succeeded in reducing the vote for the clerk of petty sessions at Cooktown by £50, he would also move that the salary of the clerk of petty sessions at

Gladstone be reduced by £50, at Mackay by £50, at Maryborough by £50, at Rockhampton by £100, at Townsville by £50. Those were the six places at which the clerks of petty sessions received more than the police magistrates.

Mr. NORTON said the better way to deal with clerks of petty sessions such as the officer in question, who fulfilled other offices, would be to deprive them of some of the extra offices rather than to reduce their salaries as clerks of petty sessions. They were officers in charge of two or three departments, some of which did not properly appertain to their positions as clerks of petty sessions. It should be an understanding that any clerk of petty sessions, or any other officer who took up the duties of another department, should be prepared, when the secondary office became more important, to give it up. The fact was that in certain cases, the clerks of petty sessions having a certain amount of time on their hands, it paid the Government better to give them a small increase of salary to carry out the second office than to appoint a separate officer to fulfil the duties. If the Committee would take advantage of the present opportunity to endorse the principle he had mentioned, it would bring about the change which the hon. member for Ipswich had proposed to effect by the reduction of the salaries of clerks of petty sessions, which he (Mr. Norton) thought were low enough now. If the hon. member was going in for retrenchment, it was not fair to deal merely with two or three cases. The same system should be carried throughout the Estimates. The hon. member hardly realised the difficulty in which he placed the Committee by proposing to reduce a few salaries without previously having gone through the whole of the Estimates, and considered what would be a fair reduction throughout. With respect to what the Colonial Secretary had said of classification of the officers, he thought the officers should not be classed, but the places to which they went should be classed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is what we do now.

Mr. NORTON said it had not been always so, and he was inclined to think it was one of those points on which the Colonial Secretary was not quite clear. Fresh appointments might be made from the lower officers, and changes could be made by promotion of officers.

Mr. HAMILTON said the member for Ipswich stated that if he succeeded in passing his amendment he would move the reduction by £50 of five other salaries. If the amendment passed he (Mr. Hamilton) would move the reduction by £50 of one officer, and that was the clerk of petty sessions at Ipswich. If it was right that the others should be reduced by £50, it was right that the salary of the officer at Ipswich should be reduced by the same amount.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was satisfied with the assurance given by the Colonial Secretary that he would gradually bring the salaries of the clerks of petty sessions to something like a fair proportion in comparison with those paid to police magistrates. It should be remembered, however, that clerks of petty sessions who were receiving more salary than police magistrates would scarcely be prepared to accept the position of police magistrates. It would, therefore, in his opinion, take a very long time indeed before any reformation could be made so as to put the salaries paid to the clerks of petty sessions and police magistrates on anything like an equitable basis. In the meantime, if the amendment went to a division, he would support it.

Mr. SALKELD said that, although he was new to parliamentary life, he was not such a

novice as to think that he would succeed in reducing the whole of the Estimates by moving a reduction in the salaries of one or two officers. He had fully considered the matter, and though he supposed the amendment he proposed would meet with the usual fate of such amendments—namely, that it would not be carried—he believed a great object had been gained in calling attention to the matter, and having a discussion upon it. That was his object in pressing the matter upon the Government, and the Government would do nothing unless such matters were pressed upon their attention in a vigorous manner. He hoped, before the Estimates went through, that the Committee would give them to understand that they should study economy in preparing the Estimates. It should not be left to private members of the Committee to reduce the expenditure, because a private member was not sufficiently competent to deal with it; he had not sufficient data to go upon. The first step the Government had taken after coming into office in this respect was a false one. They reduced the working hours of the Civil Service by one hour. He was sorry to see it, and he believed it entailed a large amount of additional expenditure, because the officers of the Civil Service had to work after office-hours. They only had to work up to 4 o'clock, and they could not get through a fair day's work in that time. They did not commence work until about ten minutes past 9, and about a quarter to 4 they began to get ready to go. They were given to understand that they were to have no dinner-hour, but the fact was that if a person went into any of the public offices during dinner-hour he would not be attended to; he would be told "The officer had gone out," or "He would be back in a minute," or something of that kind. They had their dinner-hour now just the same as before, and it was only right that they should, for no man could work from the morning till the afternoon without having some luncheon. The Committee had had an expression of opinion upon the matter, and it was desirable that the Government should bear the matter in mind in framing the Estimates for the ensuing year. As for the remarks of the hon. member for Cook, he treated him as a man who was sore, and hit out blindly and wildly, and did not know what he was doing. What did he (Mr. Salkeld) care about the police magistrate or clerk of petty sessions at Ipswich? He could live in Ipswich if there were no clerk of petty sessions or police magistrate there; and he had no doubt that the people of the Cook district could live even if they had not the hon. member for Cook to represent them. However, in view of the expression of opinion which they had had, he would, with the permission of the Committee, withdraw his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked why the police magistrate at Charleville, who was newly appointed over the heads of a large number of competent Civil servants, should receive £550 a year when many old and tried public servants received very much less?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not consider that that position was a very great prize. The salary was £450 for Charleville and £100 for visiting Augathella and Morven. The police magistrate had to ride sixty miles to those places, and pay for his own horses. He would probably be better off if he were to stay at Charleville and have £100 a year taken off his salary.

Mr. MOREHEAD said there was a coach running between the two places, and the magistrate had to visit them very seldom, so that the expense was trifling. Tambo was quite as im-

portant a place as Charleville, yet the police magistrate there, an old and tried Civil servant, only received £400. The police magistrate at Thargomindah only got £400. The police magistrate at Toowoomba got £500, and £50 for visiting Highfields, and as much was given to a perfect novice in the Civil Service. The hon. member spoke about it as if it were a very insignificant salary. It might be a small sum to men who were accustomed to handle thousands, but in the Civil Service it was looked upon as a prize worth striving for. He entered his protest against a position of that sort being given to a gentleman who had not won his spurs in the Civil Service of the colony. He would ask whether the police magistrate at Charleville drew £607 this year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed the police magistrate was registrar of the district. The place was not large enough to appoint two separate officers.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that showed how misleading the schedule was. He was led to believe, when he asked a question previously, that the schedule showed what the officers received last year, and that the Estimates showed what was to be drawn by each Civil servant this year; but now it seemed to be confusion worse confounded. They did not know whether they were required to vote the sum put on the Estimates as the sum required for the year 1885-6, or whether they were to turn to the schedule and vote something more. He was glad to learn that that officer was to receive £607 instead of £550. It bettered the position of the officer himself, and also the position he (Mr. Morehead) was taking up, that it was improper—more, it was indecent—that that gentleman should have been put over the heads of a large number of Civil servants who were certainly as competent to fill the office, and who from their long service were more deserving of it. If they were to take the schedule as an authoritative document, how was it the police magistrate of Townsville did not appear on it at all?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Because he does not receive any other emolument.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he received £600 a year at Townsville and now he received £610 at Clermont.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he now received £560 at Clermont, and he got £550 at Townsville last year.

Mr. MOREHEAD said they were told by the schedule that Mr. Moore received £607, and they were told that the magistrate at Clermont was to receive £560; therefore the schedule was incorrect and misleading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was £610 last year, and the schedule says so.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was what he wanted to show. The Colonial Secretary said that Mr. Moore was to draw £607, although on the Estimates he was put down for £550. He thought really that the contention he had set up was a correct one, and that the two documents he held in his hand were misleading. No other hon. member but the Colonial Secretary would deny that he was right in what he said. If the case with regard to the £650 paid to Mr. Moore was correct the other case was in the same position.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In one case a change has been made, and in the other there has been no change.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Well, they could not get much change out of the hon. gentleman evidently, for he was endeavouring to hoodwink hon.

members. In some cases hon. members were told to refer to the schedule, and in other cases they were referred back to the Estimates. To get back to the case of Mr. Moore, he maintained that the appointment was highly indecent and would be destructive of the good conduct of the Public Service. That an appointment of £607 a year should be given to a novice was monstrous, especially when they considered that there were many men as well able to fulfil the duties of the office, who had been in the service for a much longer period than Mr. Moore, and who were fairly entitled to and would have gladly accepted such an appointment.

Mr. PALMER said Thargomindah was a much worse place to live in than Warwick, and yet the police magistrate at the latter place received £100 a year more than the one at Thargomindah. Why was that so?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not understand what the hon. gentleman wished to know. He would willingly answer plain questions, but the hon. member was too vague. He understood the hon. gentleman to say that £400 a year was not a large salary for the police magistrate at Thargomindah. It was not, he confessed, but a gentleman could be found who would accept the position at that rate. Mr. Hamilton Scott was one of the youngest police magistrates, and he was seldom at his post more than half his time.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £28,900 be granted for Government Printing, &c. The salaries were really the same, although some officers were on leave last year, and special allowances were put down for their *loca tenentes*. There was a small increase in wages and contingencies, and a reduction on account of electric lighting, which was provided for by a special vote last year.

Mr. CHUBB asked whether the Government Printing Office did private work?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Will the hon. gentleman specify exactly what he means?

Mr. CHUBB: Does the Government Printing Office do work other than departmental work, and charge for it?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not even now quite know what the hon. gentleman meant. The Government Printing Office did some work, and charged for it. Everything that was not done strictly for the Government was charged for, but it was not work done for other people that could be done elsewhere. Would the hon. gentleman give him an illustration?

Mr. CHUBB said he mentioned the matter because he had seen in one or two newspapers that the Government Printing Office did work for persons that could be done at other establishments. The hon. gentleman had told the House that the pressure of work at the Government Printing Office was so great that certain returns could not be prepared when they were wanted. He now wanted some information on the subject.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said so far as he knew there was no actual private work done in the Government Printing Office. Only a few days ago a request came in to provide some forms for divisional boards and he disallowed the request, but he had since been told that no other printers would do the work; if so he would have to withdraw his disallowance. If the work could be done outside the Government Printing Office it ought to be done, and he should very much regret to learn that it could not be done in other offices.

Mr. NORTON said he had heard the same complaint made as the one mentioned by the hon. member for Bowen. The work was done, not for private individuals, but for divisional boards, and the newspapers he referred to complained of that, because they could do the work with their own presses.

Mr. BEATTIE said when the Divisional Boards Act was passed the necessary books and forms were provided by the Government; consequently, when divisional boards wanted ledgers or other books to carry out the Act in its proper form they applied to the Government Printing Office, and the books were sold to them. He thought that the Government got a very good price for those books, and that they could be bought cheaper at any stationer's in town than they were supplied by the Government Printing Office. One of the instructions given to the divisional boards was that when they wanted the necessary books and papers to carry out the Act they could get them from the Government Printing Office.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought that was a very good thing at the time it was done, and the late Government deserved credit for their action. The system was then coming into operation, and it was desirable that all the boards should have uniform books; but the time had passed for that now, and it was proper that divisional boards should get their books and papers from other sources.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked if he was to understand that the salary of the Government Printer was £650, besides the £100 shown in the schedule? The schedule was so misleading that one did not know whether the salary was £650 or £750.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they were only asked to vote £650. In addition to that Mr. Beal received quarters, fuel, and light, which were valued at £100.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked if it was not a bogus thing, and the Government Printer received an allowance of £100 for quarters, fuel, and light?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not a bogus thing. He lives on the premises.

Mr. MOREHEAD: I do not envy him.

Mr. SALKELD said there was an item of £3,500 down last year for the electric light; could the hon. Colonial Secretary give them any information as to when it would be in working order?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he explained last night that it could not be in working order this session. The permanent bed for the engine was being laid down at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked if he was to distinctly understand from the Colonial Secretary that Mr. Beal lived on the premises, and did not really receive any money on account of the vote. There was no payment made?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. NORTON said that whilst they were on the subject of the electric light he would ask the Colonial Secretary whether the Government had appointed a Government electrician?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; the salary is on the Estimates further on.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £3,300 be granted for the Agent-General. There was no change in the vote.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £7,665 be granted for Immigration.

The only change in the item was £100 for the messenger, which had previously been paid from contingencies.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £22,389 be granted for Insanity. The only real change was the addition of three attendants. He might add that although the bringing into operation of the Insanity Act would occupy some time, great progress had been made by the Curator since the Act came into operation. He had gradually got under his control the property of the patients, which amounted to a considerable sum in some cases.

Mr. CHUBB asked if the Colonial Secretary had received any report from the Curator in Insanity on the working of the Act so far?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had not received any official report, as the Act only came into operation on the 1st January last. He had received various reports from time to time on particular cases. He had forgotten to mention a small increase to the superintendent at Sandy Gallop. That officer was appointed on probation originally, at a reduced salary, and was now put upon full salary.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £2,480 be granted for Reception Houses. There was an additional attendant at Rockhampton, who was urgently required, according to reports he had received, and there was also another attendant appointed at Townsville.

Mr. NORTON asked if the patients detained in reception-houses were compelled to pay as they were in the asylum?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that, strictly speaking, they were; but he did not know whether any attempt had been made to enforce it. They could scarcely take possession of a man's property if he had only been in a reception-house for a fortnight or three weeks. If he afterwards went to the asylum he was compelled to pay for maintenance.

Mr. NORTON said he thought the rule should be put into practice. Many persons detained in the reception-house were so detained because of the effect of drink beforehand. Therefore they ought to be compelled to pay.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £31,733 be voted for the Colonial Stores and contingencies. There was a slight error in the item, the salary of a clerk being put down at £120 instead of £150. It was increased last year on the Supplementary Estimates, and by some clerical error it appeared in the estimate at the reduced rate. With regard to the contingencies, there were a lot of things that required additional expenditure, and it required the greatest economy to keep the amount down to the present estimate.

Mr. NORTON said the item "Blankets for aborigines" required some notice. Complaints had been made that they were of the poorest description, and that, instead of getting a pair, the blacks now only received one. Considering that that was all they got in return for their country, the least that could be done would be to give each aboriginal a pair of good blankets.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed the blankets supplied under contract were very good, but the demand last year had been larger than was anticipated, and more blankets had to be obtained. The blankets bought afterwards were not equal to those supplied under contract.

Mr. PALMER said that so far as he knew the complaint was that the blankets were distributed on the Queen's Birthday, and that it would be better if they were larger and were distributed a month earlier.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to call attention to a matter connected with a return for which he called some time ago, showing the tweeds purchased by the Government during the last seven years, and distinguishing between those made in the colony and those which came from the home markets. In the year 1879 the total quantity of tweed used by the Government was 1,593 yards. Of that amount 1,094 yards were bought at the Ipswich mills, and 499 yards came from foreign markets. That was the year showing the largest amount bought at the Ipswich mills, and it showed very distinctly that the Government of that day were anxious to support native industries as far as they could. In the year 1880 the total amount bought was 2,392 yards, and of that amount 987 yards came from the Ipswich mills, while 1,404 yards were English tweed. In 1881 the total amount purchased was 2,722 yards, and of that amount Ipswich supplied 890 yards, while 1,832 yards came from home markets. In 1882 the total quantity purchased was 2,884 yards; of that amount the Queensland Woollen Company supplied 759 yards, and 2,124 yards came from foreign markets. Coming to 1883, when the present Government took office, he found that the total quantity bought was 4,962 yards, and the quantity of Ipswich tweed supplied was 546 yards, leaving 4,416 yards as the amount supplied by English manufacturers. In 1884, which was the worst year, the total quantity purchased was 6,362 yards, the total quantity supplied by the Ipswich mill being 162 yards—almost nil—and that supplied by English markets, 6,199 yards. In the present year there was a slight improvement. The total quantity bought was 5,741 yards. The quantity supplied by Ipswich was 722 yards, and that supplied by foreign markets, 5,018 yards. The total quantity of home-made stuff consumed by the Government during the seven years was 5,163 yards, while the total quantity purchased by the Government, but manufactured abroad, during the same time was 22,110 yards. He had always maintained that the country lost money in buying goods composed of a mixture of cotton, wool, and used-up wool—shoddy—instead of buying the home-made article. Anyone who tested the two tweeds at the same price would come to the conclusion that the home-made article was far better value for the money than that which was imported. Since the Woollen Company's mill had been started he had tried to induce the different Governments to do their best to encourage local industry instead of buying tweed made in England. In the latter case the wool was sent from Queensland, the tweed made in England and sent out to the colony again; but by encouraging the local company, which turned out a better article, the colony was benefited in two ways: employment was given to a greater number of people, and those people consumed dutiable goods and thereby added to the revenue of the colony. Objection had been taken to the mode of calling for tenders on the part of the Government. All kinds of goods were included in the same tender—tweeds, flannels, blankets, and coating—and the Queensland Company could not manufacture all those goods; but if separate tenders were called for each article, the Ipswich tweeds would show to such advantage that the Government would see the advisableness of buying them in preference to any other. He hoped that would be altered in the future. Formerly he had blamed both the Government and the departments; now

he would blame no one, but would ask the Committee for an expression of opinion on the subject, which would form some kind of instruction to the Government as to whether they were to encourage a struggling local industry or take the imported article.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he remembered the discussion which took place on that subject last year; and he had hoped that when the next tenders were called the Ipswich Woollen Company would have sent in a tender that could be accepted. He was extremely disappointed that he was unable to accept any of their tenders. They were so very much higher than any of the others that he did not feel justified in recommending his colleagues to take them. In one case the tender of the company was 25 per cent higher, and in another case 50 per cent. higher, than others; and in the latter case they did not even undertake to supply their own manufacture. There was another difficulty: their blue dye was not satisfactory—it would not stand. He was prepared to have gone a good deal above the other tenderers for the sake of encouraging that local industry; but there was a limit beyond which it would be unwise to go. As to the suggestion that tweeds should be tendered for separately, he should be very glad to accept it; and he hoped the tenders would be such that the Government could accept them.

Mr. CHUBB asked how much of the £30,000 would be appropriated for the purchase of blankets for aborigines?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that the amount expended last year was £5,640. This year it would be a little more.

Mr. CHUBB said it might be advisable, perhaps, to give the Ipswich Woollen Company the benefit of that expenditure if they could supply blankets as cheaply as they could be got elsewhere. But he had been informed that their blankets were neither so large nor so good as the imported blankets—that better blankets could be purchased for less money elsewhere. With regard to their tweeds, he had been told by a shareholder in the company that since they had opened a shop in Brisbane they had become so popular that merchants had offered to buy up every yard of tweed they could make at good prices. If that were so, he did not know what the hon. member had to complain of.

Mr. ISAMBERT said the Government were quite right in buying in the cheapest market, and on principle he objected to any favouritism. If the Ipswich Woollen Company could not sell as cheap as the imported article, it served them right to be left out in the cold. So long as freetrade was the law of the land, so long should the Government buy in the cheapest market; and that would open the eyes of the Ipswich members who had shares in the company, and induce them to agitate for a change in the fiscal policy of the colony, so that the Government might find it to their advantage to buy articles manufactured in the colony. If that change in their fiscal policy were made, many woollen factories would be established, and they would be able to turn out goods cheaper and better than they could be imported. The Ipswich members had received a very wholesome lesson, and if they were swearing by freetrade it would open their eyes to the benefits of protection. Talking about freetrade, he would read a paragraph of news which appeared in that afternoon's *Observer* :—

“In view of the increased and increasing demands for rolling-stock and locomotives on the Queensland railways, it has been decided to order five locomotive engines for passenger trains from the Baldwin Company, Philadelphia, U.S., at a total cost of £9,250. Further,

twenty locomotives, known as Class F, have been ordered from Messrs. Kitson and Company, of Leeds, Yorkshire, England, at a cost of £2,000 each. These engines are to be similar to those of the same class already supplied by the same firm.”

That represented an expenditure at home of about £50,000, and before the engines were landed in Queensland the cost would be much more. But that was the manner in which they got their loans out. He knew for a fact that through the depression in the sugar industry the engineering shops of the colony had suffered severely, large orders having been withdrawn on account of it. Why did not the Government give them the opportunity of tendering for those locomotives? Even supposing they had paid 20 per cent. more they would have firmly established an industry, and the next order would be carried out cheaper, no doubt, than the engines could be imported for. That had been the experience of Victoria and New South Wales, greatly to the advantage and benefit of those colonies; and it would also be the case here if proper encouragement were given to the fostering of local industries.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that, with reference to the depreciatory remarks of the hon. member for Bowen as to the size and quality of the blankets manufactured by the Ipswich Woollen Company, he might inform him that they made blankets of all sizes, just the same as they were manufactured in England and imported to the colony. As to the quality, it was so good—he was in the trade, and could speak from his own knowledge, both as to the goods themselves and their manufacture—that there were no blankets that came from a foreign market equal to them. They could get a far prettier blanket with a fine fur, but that fur was produced by taking the heart out of the blanket and bringing it to the surface. Ipswich blankets were not made in that way; they were made light and durable, and had all the qualities of first-class blankets. It had been said by the hon. member for Bowen that there was such a demand for the Ipswich tweeds by the wholesale merchants that it was not necessary for them to open a shop in Brisbane. He could tell the hon. member that they could supply double the quantity that they were now producing with the same machinery, if the shops would only sell it. The hon. gentleman had only to test the quality of those goods, and he would see that he was losing by not buying the Queensland-made tweeds.

Mr. GROOM said he sympathised with the hon. member for Ipswich in what he said with reference to the small amount of colonial tweeds sold as compared with the imported article. He took a very considerable interest in the establishment of the Ipswich mill. Many years ago he introduced the Bill which had the effect of establishing the Ipswich cotton and woollen manufacturing mill, and his only regret was that in place of one they had not a dozen such mills in the colony. He could assure the hon. gentleman that as long as the present fiscal policy adopted by this colony was continued they would not see much progress in that direction. In that House on the previous evening they were informed that Ipswich was going to become a great manufacturing district; that possibly in the distant future—in the far distant future he imagined it would be, if they made no better progress than they were making now—there might be such a scheme proposed as the Manchester ship canal, a scheme to connect Ipswich with Brisbane. Well, after a long agitation, the Manchester Ship Canal Company had got their Bill passed through Parliament, and he hoped it would have the effect its promoters imagined. He might

inform the hon. member for Ipswich that in the last twelve months three woollen mills had been closed in the neighbourhood of Sydney, having been completely driven off the market by the immense quantity of shoddy material imported from Great Britain, and consequently hundreds of men, women, and children had been thrown out of employment. As he had said the other evening he repeated now—that this colony would never have manufacturing industries established here on a large scale until they had a change in their fiscal policy. In Canada when a shoddy article was imported in that way, they not only put a duty of 25 per cent. on it, but so much per pound, and the result was that it was driven out of the market, and the manufacturing industries in that country were never in such a prosperous condition as they were at the present moment. They would have to pursue a similar policy here, if their industries were to be encouraged and established. Some years ago Parliament offered particular advantages to those who established certain industries in the colony. The Ipswich Woollen Manufactory had received a bonus of £1,500 in cash and a grant of 1,000 acres of land for the establishment of their mill, and that offer was still open to any company who would establish an industry of a similar kind. But from the time that Act was passed in 1869 up to the present moment only one solitary mill had been started, and so long as they only imposed a small duty of 5 per cent. *ad valorem* on imported goods they would not be able to compete successfully with the manufacturers of Great Britain. The matter of the manufacture of locomotives, referred to by the hon. member for Rosewood, was worthy of consideration. Perhaps that gentleman might have peculiar views, but the opinion he entertained in that matter was one that was rapidly growing amongst hundreds and thousands of people in Australia. A telegram appeared in the Brisbane *Courier* not many days ago, stating that the tender of the Phenix Foundry Company, at Ballarat, had been accepted by the Victorian Government for the manufacture of twenty locomotives. Yet here they had the Government of the colony sending to America and England for engines. He had been to the Phenix Foundry at Ballarat, and without doubt it was one of the most wonderful institutions of the kind in the southern colony. It was almost worth the while of hon. members to go to Victoria to see what a protective policy had done for that colony, and what a similar policy on a broad and well-considered basis would do for Queensland. Two hundred men and boys were employed in the Ballarat Foundry. He was taken by the manager to where the foundation of a locomotive was being laid, just as they might go into a dockyard and see the keel of a ship laid, and he saw that every part of the locomotive was made in the establishment. The company had competed successfully against some of the finest engines imported from England, which showed that the engines they produced were equal to those made by foreign manufacturers. Queenslanders might, he thought, learn a lesson from that, and see whether they could not make their locomotives in their own territory, and give employment to their own workmen. Instead of doing that now they were sending money away out of the colony, and they had the melancholy spectacle that even the solitary woollen manufactory was languishing. And they would have the same thing year after year until hon. members devoted their attention to the necessity of formulating a policy which would protect their own industries and give employment to the people in the country. He hoped that the time when that would be done was not very far distant. He did not hesitate to say that he was of opinion that freetrade was all very well as far as Great Britain was

concerned, but it was totally inapplicable to a young and struggling colony like Queensland. Victoria was now reaping the benefit of a protective policy, and hundreds of people in New South Wales were now seeing the necessity of encouraging the establishment of manufacturing industries in their own colony. He was convinced that at the general election in November they would see a large protection party returned in that colony—he did not say a majority, though he would not be surprised to see that—in favour of modifying their tariff in order that their industries might revive and not be in the languishing condition they were now in. He sympathised with the hon. member for Ipswich, and would tell him that they must have a change in the fiscal policy of the country if their industries were to be prosperous, and they would see Ipswich, as was predicted by hon. members last evening, become a large and important manufacturing district.

Mr. NORTON said he did not intend to go all round the country as the hon. member for Toowoomba had done. The fact that a Victorian engine had taken a prize at a Victorian Exhibition did not prove that it was a better article than a locomotive manufactured in England. A commission was appointed in that colony to decide on the respective merits of the Woods and Westinghouse brakes, and they decided in favour of the Woods brake; but he did not think there was anybody in Victoria but Mr. Woods himself, and perhaps a few of his personal friends, who believed that the Woods was better than the Westinghouse brake. Nor was it a fact that the closure of those three mills in New South Wales was a proof that such manufactories would not pay. It simply showed that, if a shoddy article was imported, and they were making a better and more expensive one, it would not pay unless they made a cheap and nasty stuff which people would buy. In New South Wales some time ago there was a soap manufactory which made soap of an exceptionally good quality, but they could not sell it, and to meet the wants of their customers they absolutely reduced the quality and then the article sold well. That was what the Ipswich company should have done. If they chose to make shoddy at a cheap price they would be able to supply the market now supplied from abroad. That was what the hon. member for Ipswich had himself done. He showed that he liked a cheap article, as he went in for a cheap thing when he advertised the company in that Committee. Instead of going to the Press with his advertising, he did it in the Committee, because he knew it would be sent all over the colony in *Hansard*, and would be the best advertisement he could have. He did not agree with what had been said in disparagement of the goods produced at Ipswich. He knew a number of people who had used the tweeds made there, and had spoken very highly of them. Of the blankets he knew nothing; but he knew that in the other colonies blankets could be made equal to the imported article, and he thought they could be made here. The hon. member was not wise in asking an expression of opinion from the Committee on the subject. The Committee were not likely to give an expression of opinion upon the matter, and thus give the Ipswich company an advantage they ought not to have. There should be a fair field. At the same time, if tenders were called for and the Ipswich company were able to supply goods at the same price as they could be supplied elsewhere, everyone would be glad to see their tender accepted. But the Colonial Secretary had pointed out that they had sent in tenders 25 per cent. above the price for which the goods could be supplied

elsewhere. Their tender ought not to be accepted on those conditions, but when they could produce goods of the same quality and at nearly the same price as the imported article, the Government would be justified in accepting their tenders.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they had adjourned the consideration of the Victoria Bridge Bill until the amendments to give effect to the proposed alterations in the Bill were ready. They were ready now, and he thought it a convenient time to resume the discussion upon that Bill. He would therefore ask the Colonial Treasurer to move the Chairman out of the chair.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of a message from the Legislative Council, intimating that the Council had agreed to this Bill without amendment.

VICTORIA BRIDGE CLOSURE BILL— COMMITTEE.

On the Order of the Day being read, the House went into Committee to further consider this Bill in detail.

On clause 2, as follows :—

“ Notwithstanding any provisions of the said Act or any other Act or law to the contrary, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, or for the said municipal council, or for any other corporation or person charged for the time being with the control or management of the said Victoria Bridge, to keep the said bridge permanently closed.”

The PREMIER moved that the words “ said Act ” in the 1st line of the clause be omitted, with a view of inserting the words “ Brisbane Bridge Act.”

Amendment agreed to.

The PREMIER moved the omission of the word “ permanently ” in the last line of the clause.

Mr. MOREHEAD said there now appeared to be one of those compromises between the two sides of the Committee which he most distinctly objected to. A strong issue had been raised on the previous night as to whether the bridge should be closed or not; and what was proposed by the amendment was to temporise with the difficulty. The present House was quite competent to deal with the question, and why should there be the interregnum of five years, as proposed in a subsequent amendment to be brought in by the Government? The Government were strong enough to insist that the highway across the river should be maintained as it had practically been for the last seven or eight years. It was simply postponing the evil day, which must come sooner or later. The question would have to be definitely settled some day, and why not settle it now? He held that the river highway was practically closed years ago, so far as the Ipswich portion of those who now claimed that it should be opened was concerned, by the extension of the railway system at enormous expense in that direction. They had had three examples during the week of that temporising policy to which he objected. They had first the case of the Elections Bill, then the difference with the other Chamber, which was got over by laying the Bill aside instead of the question being settled, and now they were asked to temporise again. The Government had showed great weakness, not occasioned so much perhaps by the Opposition as by the fear of losing some of the

supporters who had been heretofore so facile and anxious to help them on. But for that, there would have been no temporising on the part of the Government. He would rather see a strong Government do wrong than see a Government vacillate and veer about at the beck and call of the tail of their following, as the present Government seemed inclined to do.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 3 was amended, on the motion of the PREMIER, by the addition of a proviso, and passed as follows :—

“ No action, suit, indictment, information, or other proceeding, shall be commenced, presented, prosecuted, or maintained against the said municipal council, or against any other corporation or person, for or in respect of the erecting or maintaining of the said bridge, or the closure thereof, or the obstruction of the navigation of the River Brisbane thereby, or for or in respect of any damages, loss, or expenses occasioned or alleged to be occasioned by reason of such erecting, maintaining, closure, or obstruction, or in anywise whatsoever arising therefrom.

“ Provided that nothing herein contained shall affect the right of any person to recover damages in any action commenced against the said municipal council before the commencement of this Act.”

On clause 4, as follows :—

“ This Act shall be deemed and taken to have come into operation and have been in force on and from the twentieth day of August, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five.”

The PREMIER proposed an amendment, by the addition of the following words :—

And shall continue in force until the thirty-first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and ninety, and thenceforth until the end of the then next session of Parliament.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked why that particular date was fixed. He did not know why five years should be fixed upon by the hon. gentleman who was such a strong believer in triennial parliaments. Why should it not be three years, or fifty years, or seven years, or fourteen years, or any other number? Was it the hon. member's idea that the present Parliament would last two years, and that then there would be a three years' parliament, so that it would be a mixture of a triennial and a quinquennial parliament? He would like to know why five years was chosen as the time when the question should be opened again, and perhaps the bridge with it.

The PREMIER said the period proposed in the amendment had nothing more to do with quinquennial parliaments than it had to do with the fact that five was the second odd number. It was chosen because five years was considered a convenient period for the purpose of ascertaining whether it was desirable that the bridge should be permanently closed; and also because it would be convenient by justifying the corporation in incurring the expense of the improvements they contemplated.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would ask if the Statute of Limitations came in with regard to the closing of the bridge? The corporation might not be bound to open it at the end of five years. He was certain the hon. gentleman had got a deeper reason for fixing the period at five years than he would disclose. He always doubted the hon. gentleman, and he doubted now whether he had told the whole truth. Why should seven years not be fixed? That term would be more convenient still as far as the corporation were concerned. Nine years would be better than seven, and eleven better than either. He did not think the reason given by the Premier would commend itself to the intelligence of the Committee, and he was certain the chairman would vote for a longer term of closure, or, as his colleague

had done last night, for the permanent closure of the bridge. He was glad to see that that hon. gentleman, the junior member for South Brisbane, was at all events consistent in his inconsistency, and voted in favour of the Bill although he spoke against it. However, he should like to hear some better reasons advanced by the Premier for fixing on the term of five years. The reason given was certainly a lame one. The hon. gentleman had tried to square matters and had met with ignominious failure.

Amendment agreed to; and clause, as amended, put and passed.

The PREMIER moved the following new clause to follow the last clause as passed:—

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to confer any vested right or interest upon any person or corporation, or to give rise to any claim for damages or compensation in the event of this Act being repealed before the expiration of the term hereinbefore prescribed for its continuance.

That clause would effectually preserve all rights that could possibly arise.

Mr. FERGUSON said he wished to ask the Colonial Secretary what steps the Government intended to take with regard to other bridges throughout the colony which would have been affected by the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, if it had become law. There were several bridges which he could name which were at present not under the charge of anyone, and no one was responsible for their repair. Of course if the Bill he spoke of had passed the remedy would have been provided at once, and he might mention that a great many local authorities had been anxiously waiting for the passing of that measure, and it would be a great blow to them to hear that it had been laid aside. Did the Premier intend to bring in any other Bill during the present session to replace the one which he had laid aside?

The PREMIER said he was not prepared to give the hon. member an answer to his question that evening.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—"Short title"—passed as printed.

Preamble passed with consequential amendments.

The PREMIER moved that the title of the Bill be amended by the omission of the words "provide for the permanent," with the view of substituting the words "authorise the."

Amendment agreed to.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the Bill with amendments, and with an amended title.

The report was adopted, and the third reading of the Bill made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—There are several private motions on the business paper for to-morrow, and I am not sure whether the hon. gentlemen in whose names they stand want to go on with them then or not. If they do not wish to do so, I shall move that the House adjourn until Tuesday. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. JORDAN said: Mr. Speaker,—To-morrow will be a broken day, as some hon. gentlemen intend to go to the Beenleigh Show. Perhaps the Premier had better move that the House adjourn until Tuesday.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I wish to consult the convenience of hon. members. Besides the motion of the hon. member for South Brisbane, there is one in the name of the hon. member for Darling Downs, who intimated to me that he was not anxious to go on with it to-morrow.

There is also a motion by the hon. member for Wide Bay (Mr. Mellor), who is of the same opinion. I think I shall best consult the convenience of hon. members if I move that the House adjourn until Tuesday, and with the leave of the House I will so amend my motion.

Question—That the House adjourn until Tuesday—put.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I hope that in depriving private members of their day the Government will not allow those motions to lapse for want of time.

The PREMIER: There is no danger of that.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Yes, there is. I have seen motions of the kind left till the end of the session. I have no intention of opposing the adjournment until Tuesday if the Government will take that into consideration.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—On Tuesday we propose to take, after the formal business, the second reading of the Undue Subdivision of Land Prevention Bill, and then proceed with Supply.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at eighteen minutes past 10 o'clock, until Tuesday next.