

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 29 SEPTEMBER 1885

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, 29 September, 1885.

Petition.—Question.—Motion for Adjournment.—
 Probate Act Amendment Bill.—Victoria Bridge
 Closure Bill—third reading.—Pacific Islanders
 Labourers Act of 1880 Amendment Bill.—Victoria
 Bridge Closure Bill—third reading.—Undue Sub-
 division of Land Prevention Bill—second reading.—
 Supply.—Adjournment.

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

PETITION.

Mr. SMYTH presented a petition, signed by
 1,200 residents on the Gympie Gold Field, in
 favour of the provisions of the Licensing Bill
 before the House, particularly those relating to
 local option; and moved that it be read.

Question put and passed, and petition read by
 the Clerk.

On the motion of Mr. SMYTH, the petition
 was received.

QUESTION.

Mr. HAMILTON asked the Minister for
 Works—

1. How many survey parties are engaged in making a permanent survey of the Cairns and Herberton line?
2. How long have these parties, respectively, been so engaged?

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

1. Two survey parties have been engaged in making the permanent survey of the Cairns and Herberton railway.
2. These parties have been engaged on that survey since December last.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HAMILTON said: Mr. Speaker,—An article appeared in the last issue of *Figaro*, relating to our penal establishments, which contains some very grave charges, and I consider that when papers of standing such as *Figaro*, or the *Courier*, or *Telegraph*, contain articles of this kind, an investigation ought to take place, because it is not likely that the editors of papers of this character would authorise such articles unless they had some good reasons for making the statements they contained. I shall not refer

to all of those charges, but shall confine myself to some of the more important ones. I think it is in the interests of public justice that these matters should be inquired into. In the first place, it is stated here that persons who are simply committed for trial, and who are, therefore, presumed innocent, are forced to associate with criminals of the lowest class. If this be the case, certainly some action should be taken, because any person, although liable to be accused, is always presumed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty, but under the circumstances I refer to a mere accusation entails severe punishment. Then, again, certain specific charges are made against warders. They are actually accused of accepting bribes from prisoners in order to allow them to contravene the regulations. One case has actually come under my notice, or, rather, a statement was made to me which I took a note of at the time. It was that of a man named Day, who is now at St. Helena. When this man Day was accused of some offence—I do not know what it was—he was taken from the gaol at Roma and put into the Brisbane Gaol, and while there he was induced to transfer his banking account from the bank there to one of the warders at that gaol, and he was treated very well. Since then he has been transferred to St. Helena, and has made repeated applications to have the account transferred from the warder to some safer custody; but he has received no reply to his application. I see one charge is actually specified—that a warder received £80 from the wife of a prisoner, no doubt in order that the prisoner should receive clemency from that warder; and I believe that has been brought under the notice of the Premier. A charge has also been brought against overcrowding in the gaol; and even if the gaol is not as large as it ought to be, there must be some fault on the part of the authorities, because persons sentenced for a lengthened term are sent at once to St. Helena, while prisoners sentenced for several years still remain at the Brisbane Gaol. I would ask why, in the particular instance of the "Hopeful," prisoners who were sentenced to imprisonment for life are still residing at the Brisbane Gaol? I move the adjournment of the House.

The PREMIER (Hon. S. W. Griffith) said: Mr. Speaker,—I have not heard of these charges before, nor have I seen the paper in which the statement appears. I think that when any serious charges are made against the working of a Government establishment they ought to be communicated to the head of the department. I do not read all the newspapers in the colony, but when I notice in a paper reports which make it appear that there is something wrong in any branch of the department under my charge I invariably cause inquiry to be made. In this case, however, the charges have never been brought under my notice. The hon. gentleman referred to three matters. He said that prisoners committed for trial are obliged to associate in the Brisbane Gaol—I understood his remarks to apply to the Brisbane Gaol—with long-sentence prisoners, persons of very bad character. I believe that has been so to some extent; I have observed it myself, and instructions have been given to alter the arrangements, so that in future it shall not be the case. The gaol is unfortunately a great deal too small, and it will be necessary to enlarge it at the earliest possible time; in the meantime instructions have been given to the officers of the Works Department to carry out as speedily as possible such alterations as will provide for the separation of such prisoners in future. Then the hon. gentleman spoke of warders treating certain prisoners with favour. I have not heard of that charge. I believe the condition of the Brisbane

Gaol is not as satisfactory as might be wished, but I believe it will be more satisfactory in the future. I have not heard of any case of that kind; but I have heard of the third case mentioned by the hon. gentleman—where a warder borrowed money from the wife of a prisoner. I may say that the warder was very promptly dismissed as soon as the fact was brought under the notice of Government. That is all the information I can give at present; but when the vote for Gaols comes under our notice in Committee of Supply I shall be glad to give any further information that may be required.

Question put and negatived.

PROBATE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge) moved—

That the House will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Probate Act of 1867.

Question put and passed.

VICTORIA BRIDGE CLOSURE BILL— THIRD READING.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that this Bill be now read a third time.

Question put and passed; and Bill read by the Clerk as follows:—

"A Bill to amend the Brisbane Bridge Act, and to provide for the permanent closure of the Victoria Bridge."

The PREMIER: That is not the title of the Bill as reported from the Committee. I beg to move that the Bill do now pass.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the title of the Bill be "A Bill to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge."

The HON. SIR. T. MCILWRAITH: As a point of order, I would ask how we stand with regard to the amended title?

The PREMIER: It was reported as amended.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: The Bill we have before us is not amended. The Clerk has the report of the Committee in his hands. What I wish to know is whether it is competent for us to receive a report that is inaccurate, as we are doing at the present time, and to amend the title on the question passing as a formal motion. The whole of our work just now is formal; but as a matter of fact the Premier has moved an amendment which is not formal—an amendment on the reported Bill.

The SPEAKER: I think it would be somewhat inconsistent with the Sessional Order of the House for the title of a Bill passed through committee to be amended while the Speaker is in the chair, and upon a formal motion.

The PREMIER: No doubt it would be inconsistent to move any amendment upon the title; but I move a motion—"That the title of the Bill be," &c., supplying the proper title. I move the title as actually amended by the Committee—"A Bill to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge." Of course it should have been reported from the Committee in that way. A mistake has occurred through a clerical error, and I propose to correct it by moving the correct title of the Bill, as agreed to by the Committee.

The SPEAKER: The error is clearly a clerical one. The Bill as passed through committee is correct, but the error has been made in the printing. It is for the House to decide whether it will allow the amendment to take place. Of course the House will understand that the Bill which has been read a third time was "A Bill to amend the Brisbane Bridge Act, and to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge." That is the

title as read by the Clerk. The hon. Premier now seeks to amend that title by substituting the words "A Bill to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge."

Mr. SCOTT: Do I understand that the Bill certified to by the Chairman of Committees is correct, although the amended form is not correct?

The SPEAKER: The parchment copy, which which bears the signature of the Chairman of Committees, contains the clerical error complained of.

The PREMIER: The difficulty having arisen in this way it is not competent for the House to deal with it on a formal motion without contravening the Sessional Order. It will be better that a fresh report should be made by the Chairman of Committees, and the present proceedings, which are irregular, should be discontinued. There should be an amended certificate from the Chairman of Committees, and the proceedings, taking this as a formal motion, being irregular, should be treated so and discontinued. That appears to me the simplest way out of the difficulty. It appears that the Standing Orders have not been complied with in respect to the report from the Committee, so that the order for the third reading of the Bill is premature and should be taken again in proper form.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: The facts are these, so far as I can see: We, in committee, passed a Bill with a certain title, and the Chairman of Committees reports the Bill to the House, but in his manuscript puts the title of the Bill down incorrectly; further, he makes a certificate with a title differing from what he had written, and also from what was actually passed by the Committee. He does not write what was actually passed, and he does not certify either what he has written or what actually passed; so that there is a double error. The Bill, as passed in committee, according to the Chairman's manuscript, is "A Bill to authorise the Victoria Bridge." He certifies that what the Committee did do was to pass "A Bill to amend the Brisbane Bridge Act, and to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge." That does not agree at all with what has been done by the Committee nor with what he himself has actually certified to as having been done by the Committee. The whole thing is a bungle from the commencement. We should hand the Bill back to the Committee for a fresh report. The Chairman's manuscript is not at all what the Committee passed, and the certificate is neither what the Committee passed nor yet what the Chairman of Committees said they passed, and the report is different from either. Before the title can be amended the whole thing should be referred back to the Committee for a fresh certificate.

The PREMIER: I will withdraw my motion as to the title of the Bill, and I propose to follow that by moving that the two previous orders be rescinded.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

The PREMIER: I beg to move that the orders for the third reading of the Bill and for the passing of the Bill be rescinded.

Question put.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: Of course we know that this is entirely a formal motion, and it is not competent to discuss it, or to make an amendment upon it. But the motion which the hon. member has made is virtually an amendment.

The PREMIER: We have made a mistake and we must get out of it.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: Yes; but we should get out of it properly.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is right that no debate can take place upon the third reading of the Bill when the motion is called formal; but in this case there is a palpable and serious error, and the only way in which the House can relieve itself is by making this motion though it appears to be necessary to put it in contravention of the Sessional Order.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH: I think the better way would be to rescind the formality of the motion.

The PREMIER: I propose to do that afterwards.

Question—That the motions for the third reading and passing of the Bill be rescinded—put and passed.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I make the third reading of the Bill "not formal."

PACIFIC ISLAND LABOURERS ACT OF 1880 AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House resolved 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.

The PREMIER moved that it is desirable to introduce a Bill to further amend the Pacific Island Labourers Act of 1880, and to put a limit to its operation.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the Chairman leave the chair and report to the House that the Committee had come to a resolution.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH said he would like to know what the intentions of the Government were with regard to that Bill, which the Committee saw that afternoon for the first time. It was a measure that would affect the people of Maryborough, Bundaberg, Mackay, and Townsville. When would the second reading be taken?

The PREMIER said he proposed to fix the second reading of the Bill for next Tuesday. The provisions of the measure principally related to hospital and capitation fees, and he thought that nearly all the provisions would meet with general acceptance. He had not thought it necessary to point out the provisions of the Bill, as that was only done on rare occasions on the introduction of a Bill. He might, however, now state briefly what the provisions of the Bill were. It was proposed to repeal the provision of the Act of last year requiring a person who engaged an islander whose term of service had expired to repay the £5 passage money to his former employer. That was one provision. The next was that the provisions of the Act should continue to apply to islanders from New Guinea, and New Britain, and New Ireland, which had now come under the dominion of a civilised power, so long as they remained in the colony. Another provision was to increase the capitation fee payable by an applicant previous to the issue of a license, to £3; and it was also proposed to increase the hospital capitations from 10s. to 20s., the reason being that the present Pacific Islanders' Fund did not nearly pay the expenses of looking after the islanders, and the matter would, in a very short time, become a serious burden on the revenue. Provision was made for the payment into the Pacific Islanders' Fund of money due to deceased islanders; and for the hearing of complaints of offences against the principal Act before a police magistrate only. It was further proposed that after the 31st of December, 1890,

no license should be issued for the introduction of islanders. Those were the principal provisions of the Bill.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he did not care so much to know the earlier provisions of the Bill as the provision to put a limit to the operation of the Act, which was by far the most important. The planters were deeply interested in a Bill of that sort, no matter what its provisions were, and he thought they should be allowed an opportunity of expressing their ideas upon it to the House. Tuesday next, he thought, would be too soon to move the second reading. They would only receive the Bill, or the remarks of the Premier on it, on Tuesday, at Townsville, and most of the planters would not have an opportunity of touching it before Wednesday or Thursday in next week. The second reading might well be postponed for another week.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, and reported the resolution to the House.

Report adopted.

The Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

VICTORIA BRIDGE CLOSURE BILL— THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER, this Bill was read a third time and passed.

The PREMIER moved that the title of the Bill be "A Bill to authorise the Closure of the Victoria Bridge."

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I do not think we can get over the difficulty, before referred to, in this way. It is not competent for the House to amend the title of a Bill; it must be done in committee.

The PREMIER: It was amended in committee.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: If we are going to pursue this course, why could we not have done so on the former occasion? We are asked to do now exactly what we considered to be wrong then. No amendment has been made in committee since that time.

The PREMIER: The Bill was read a third time, and the title of the Bill as read was found to be erroneous. A clerical error had been made in the Bill which the Clerk held in his hands, and which he thought was correct.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: But how has it been corrected since?

The PREMIER: I presume that the Clerk has since received another certificate from the Chairman of Committees.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I do not think amendments of this kind should be made by a kind of conspiracy between the Clerk of the House, the Premier, and the Speaker. If we had been informed before, that an amended report had been received from the Chairman, the whole difficulty would have been got over.

The SPEAKER: I may inform the House that I have received an amended report from the Chairman of Committees, which certifies that the title of the Bill is now in accordance with the title of the Bill as passed by the Committee of the whole House.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: But even now the title does not disclose the real nature of the Bill. The Bill itself is a Bill for the temporary closure of the bridge, while this title refers to it as an absolute closure.

The PREMIER: That is the title agreed to in committee.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: It is wrong for all that.

The PREMIER: You can move an amendment in it.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I move that the word "temporary" be inserted before the word "closure."

The PREMIER: I have no objection to the amendment.

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

The Bill was ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

UNDUE SUBDIVISION OF LAND PRE- VENTION BILL—SECOND READING.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—This is a Bill introduced to meet a growing evil. The title of the Bill is "A Bill to make provision for regulating the Width of Streets and Lanes and to prevent the Subdivision of Land in such a manner as to be Injurious to the Public Health." There is no doubt as to the existence of the evil; land has been subdivided in some cases in absurdly small portions; and while there is no objection theoretically to the multiplication of allotments of land and the multiplication of titles, still when buildings come to be put up so close together the public health is endangered. There are two ways in which the undue subdivision of land may be injurious; one is by making the streets so narrow that there is not a proper access of air between the houses, and the other is by allowing too little open space to each house. It is not an easy subject to deal with, so as to conserve the public health without doing an injustice to individual owners of property; but at the same time I think it is generally recognised that it is time something was done in the matter. It is a great many years now since the subject was brought up in this Parliament by Dr. Challinor; I do not know exactly when—it was before our *Hansard* was commenced. This Bill provides that a street which forms the principal means of access to any allotment shall not be less than 66 feet in width, and that a lane forming a subsidiary means of access shall not be less than 22 feet. Similar provisions to that are in force in some of the neighbouring colonies. The difficulty in enforcing that provision is proposed to be met in this way: As soon as a street is laid down—no matter how narrow it may be delineated in the plan—the dimension of the street shall be 33 feet on each side of the middle line; so that even if a man chooses to lay off a street 10 feet wide—although that land belongs to him—nevertheless a space of 33 feet on each side of the middle line will by virtue of this Act be available to the public as a street. In the case of lanes, which are of course necessary in many cases as a means of back access to allotments, they are to be 22 feet wide—11 feet on each side of the middle line. Moreover, it is provided that the Registrar of Titles shall give effect to the provisions of the Act with respect to any land transferred under the provisions of the Real Property Act which may have been laid out contrary to the provisions of this Act. A simple means of evading that would be to lay out a piece of land as a lane, and then build a house fronting it, so that there would be a street only 22 feet in width. To meet that it is proposed to provide that it shall not be lawful to erect a dwelling-house fronting a lane at a less distance than 22 feet from such lane, so that, if a person chooses to build houses fronting a lane, there shall, nevertheless, be 66 feet between

the lines of the buildings. The aim of that is not so much to give room for traffic as to give sufficient air between the buildings, and if the space is occupied with flower gardens I do not think any harm will be done. It is also proposed that—

“It shall not be lawful to erect any dwelling-house after the passing of this Act unless there is attached to such house an area of sixteen perches at the least (including the ground whereon the house stands) available as a yard or garden for such dwelling-house, and for no other purpose.

“The necessary outhouses and offices for the dwelling-house may be erected upon the land, but no part of the land shall be used for any purpose other than for the use of the inhabitants of the dwelling-house.”

Of course 16 perches is an arbitrary area. I do not think that it would be too small for town allotments; such an area would not be covered with buildings as a general rule, except in the business parts of the town, where all the land in due time will be covered. In that case the buildings would hardly be dwelling-houses, in the ordinary sense of the term, except in the case of large hotels; and that matter is dealt with in a clause which I shall refer to presently. There may be a difference of opinion on the subject. Some may think that a very much less area than 16 perches would be sufficient to erect dwelling-houses on. It might be sufficient for speculative purposes, but I do not think it would be sufficient for purposes of health. The area of such a piece of land is one-tenth of an acre, and its dimensions are half-a-chain by 2 chains—33 feet by 132. I believe myself that that is quite large enough and quite small enough for the purpose. If you get the allotments smaller than that, the population will be so crowded that the health of the public will suffer very materially. For the purpose of enforcing these provisions, it is provided that persons offending shall be liable to a penalty, and the buildings are to be considered a nuisance within the meaning of the Health Act—that is to say, they cannot be inhabited or let, and may be pulled down. I do not know on what grounds objections will be raised to this Bill. In many cases lately ground has been sold at a considerable distance from town in much less areas than 16 perches, and I think it is very undesirable that in the suburbs houses should be crowded in that way. Such pieces of land are too small for decent houses; they can only be used for very small places so crowded together that, though the present sellers may derive large profits, in time the death-rate will be very high. The loss that would be to the community is worth infinitely more consideration than the loss to the present proprietors caused by passing a Bill of this kind. For the purpose of dealing with the business parts of cities, the 8th clause provides that—

“The Governor, at the request of the council of a municipality, may, by Order in Council, and subject to such conditions as may be imposed by the Order in Council, suspend the operation of the Act, or any part thereof, with respect to any part of such municipality which is used principally for business purposes, and not for purposes of residence.”

That, of course, is desirable. I do not think there should be any such power of suspension with respect to those parts of a municipality that are occupied for the purposes of residence. I believe the provisions of this Bill are as good a mean between conflicting opinions as we are likely to arrive at. Even if there should be a difference of opinion upon these parts, which I hope there will not be, the provisions with respect to the width of streets and lanes will be certainly of great benefit; and these parts, I hope, will be accepted unanimously; and I trust the other provisions of the Bill, restricting the minimum area upon which buildings may be erected, will also

meet with the approval of both Houses of Parliament. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said: Mr. Speaker,—From the time that this Bill has been allowed to lie on the table of the House without any notice having been taken of it, I considered that the matter was shelved; and I had all the more reason for thinking that, considering the nature of the Bill itself. This is not a matter that has arisen from the gradual conviction forced upon members of the unhealthiness of some building allotments in Brisbane. That question has been before us on other occasions. But what has forced the question before us is this: that a few months ago, or longer, the neighbourhood of Brisbane was overrun with speculators, who were buying land in large quantities, cutting it up, and cutting it up in such small quantities that sufficient room was barely provided on which to erect a building sufficiently healthy for residence purposes. That was the evil that we should have tried to stop, and the Bill therefore should have been brought in before those men had completed their lucrative business. But we have allowed this state of affairs to go on until it has almost stopped itself, and nearly all the land has been parted with. It has been cut up into small allotments, and having been cut up the Government now come down with a Bill which will prevent the purchasers from building on their land. That is what the Bill actually means. That itself is a most unfair thing. With regard to the improvement that is to be worked in the width of streets and lanes, I do not know that much benefit will be derived. As a matter of fact, most of the streets are already a chain wide—that is, in certain localities—and I believe myself that a chain is too much to allow, and that the health of a district does not depend so much on the width of the streets. What the Government seem to have aimed at is a sort of crude building Act, and all they try now to attain could be attained under an ordinary building Act such as is in force in the neighbouring colonies. Clause 6, of course, will give rise to a very large amount of contention, and I fancy that under it a good many of the cabmen who live in the suburbs will be turned out. A great many of the artisans, too, who together with residence carry on a particular trade, will be turned out under this clause 6, unless under clause 8 the Government may use the suspensory powers they are given. I had hoped that the Bill dealing with this matter would have gone to the root of the question, and gone much more into detail than the measure before us. I question very much whether the first part of the Bill—making compulsory the width of streets and lanes—will be an improvement, and I do not see how clauses 5 and 6 are to work with any justice to those who have bought land at the present time. As to the measure having the effect of rendering the districts in which it will operate more healthy, it does not bear on that subject at all.

The PREMIER: It will prevent them getting more unhealthy.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Well, I do not think it will have much effect in that way, because a man can be as dirty upon a 16-perch allotment as upon a 12-perch one.

Mr. FERGUSON said: Though this is a small Bill it is a very important one, and it is a Bill that I hope will pass into law this session. We should see that its provisions are made as stringent and as defined as possible so that people may not be able to evade its provisions when it does become law. I look upon this Bill in the light of a building Act on a small scale, and we know very well how difficult it is to make people comply with any law in connection

with building. There is a portion of our Local Government Act providing that a certain class of buildings shall be erected on first-class blocks. The Government, at the request of a local authority, may proclaim a certain area in a town as a first-class block; and the usefulness of that is to prevent wooden buildings being erected, and to reduce the risk of fire. But, although that Act has been amended once or twice, still the people evade it in spite of the fact that at the time of the passing of the measure it was thought that it had been made so stringent, and been so carefully drawn, that it could not possibly be evaded. For that reason such a Bill as this should be very clear and very distinct. One clause of the Act I refer to was worded to this effect—that all external walls of buildings should be composed of brick, stone, or other non-combustible materials. Yet the people continued to erect wooden frames, and instead of sheathing the buildings with wood they sheathed them with galvanised iron $\frac{3}{16}$ th part of an inch thick. To my own knowledge there were seven cases which were tried by the local courts, and in each case the verdict was that the iron constituted the external walls of the buildings. Of course those were ridiculous decisions, and people were still allowed to erect buildings of that nature on first-class sections. Well, the Act was amended again, and the amendment was supposed to be so perfect that it could not be evaded. The amendment was to this effect: that the external walls of any building or part of a building should not be composed of wood, but should be of brick, stone, iron, or any other non-combustible materials. But although the Act was amended in that way, still it has been evaded. Of course, every building must have doors and windows. There is no limit to the number of doors and windows there may be in any building, and the plan adopted was this: People erected brick piers, the height of the ceiling of the building, 12 or 14 feet apart, put a roof on top of the piers, and filled in the space between the piers with cheap windows or double-leaved doors, and evaded the Act in that way. It is, therefore, very necessary that a Bill of this kind should be made so complete that it cannot be evaded. I find by the Bill that the Registrar of Titles is to enforce its provisions. That is, that when a block of land is cut up and applications for titles are lodged in his office, together with the plans, he is to see that the streets and allotments are in accordance with the Act. But how about a private block of land? A man may have a block of two or three acres; he may not want to sell but to build, and he may put up a lot of cottages as closely as possible together, and mark off private lanes any width he likes. I have seen that done myself; the lanes were only 12 feet wide, not 22 feet, which should be the narrowest lane allowed in any city with a climate like that of Queensland. I know myself of private lanes which do not go through the block—I suppose they become public once they are dedicated to the public use—lanes that are only 12 feet wide, and the owner can build houses facing them as thickly as he likes. That is a case the Bill does not provide against. Then there is another provision that should be in the Bill. When land is subdivided into allotments, a copy of the plan and the names of the buyers should be sent to the local authority—that is, to the town clerk of any municipality. At the present time there is a great deal of trouble experienced by corporations in finding out who are the purchasers of allotments, for the purpose of rating the property. Sometimes it is years before they find out, and all this trouble and inconvenience would be

remedied if provision is made in this Bill that the plan of the land and the names of the purchasers shall be sent to the local authorities, either by the Registrar of Titles or by the parties who sold the land. If that were made compulsory it would save a great deal of time and annoyance. There is no doubt that the Bill will be a valuable measure if it is passed. It is extending the principle of local self-government, to which I think we should give every encouragement. I hope that it will not meet with the same fate as the Local Government Bill that was shelved the other day. If that Bill and this had been passed this session they would have proved of great advantage for local self-government purposes. We passed a valuable Health Act last session, which is of great help to local authorities in carrying out sanitary arrangements; but without a Bill such as this that Act will not be as effective as it should be. Without this Bill there will be a link wanting in carrying out sanitary arrangements in the towns of the colony. I hope that the Bill will receive the support of the House, and that it will pass with certain amendments which will improve it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said: Mr. Speaker,—I certainly do not agree with anything that has fallen from the hon. member who has just sat down, except the intense desire he has expressed of preserving the public health as much as it can be preserved. I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are other matters to be considered in a measure such as I hold in my hand. I say that this House has a perfect right to consider, and should consider, how far such a Bill as this will affect proprietors of land. I consider the Bill as it stands a most unjust one, and one that I trust will never become law. I would ask the hon. gentleman in charge of it if he has any idea of the value of a street 66 feet wide in the city of Brisbane? Of course the question of a street of that width in Brisbane is not likely to arise under the Bill, but it is quite likely that lanes will be required to be made to give access to properties where land has been cut up. Twenty-two feet in Brisbane—in any portion of Brisbane—means a very large sum of money; and this Bill I hold is an invasion—a gross invasion—of the rights of property holders. I maintain that a lane 22 feet in width is an absurdity; it is not at all necessary. I do not agree at all with the hon. member for Rockhampton that it is necessary in a hot climate to have wide lanes and roads. I am convinced that moderately narrow streets and lanes are very much better than wide ones in a hot climate. We know well that in Eastern cities all the streets are narrow; and it is not from the narrowness of those streets, which by their narrowness afford shelter from the sun, that disease is rife in those places. It is through faults in the drainage and sewerage system; and to talk of lanes 22 feet wide in a city like Brisbane is absurd. It is excessive in every way, and by insisting on the Bill as it stands we shall do immense damage to property holders, not only in Brisbane, but in all large centres of population. The same contention applies in a minor way to those who hold valuable suburban properties. There are suburban properties about Brisbane worth £2,000 an acre. Only the other day—only yesterday—land was sold at Victoria Park at the rate of over £1,000 an acre. If a lane 22 feet wide had to be driven through that, immense loss would accrue to the holder of the property, whereas a very much narrower lane would provide all that is necessary for sanitary purposes. I contend, sir, that the Bill as it stands does not fall equally upon owners of inferior and valuable properties. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley knows as well as I do that land

in the neighbourhood in which he lives is worth over £2,000 an acre. In fact, out at the Albion land has been sold at £1,700 an acre; and I say that an invasion of the rights of the holders of property such as is proposed by this Bill will be a great wrong, and will probably have the effect of making them have their property cut up before the Bill passes both Houses. That is what I suppose they will feel bound to do. I say, sir, that the Bill strikes quite unequally, and I also say that there is no necessity for passing such a measure. I have spoken on the subject to probably the best authority on the cutting up of land in Queensland—Mr. John Cameron—and while he is strongly in favour of making all roads through suburban properties that are cut up a chain wide, he is of opinion that lanes may be made comparatively narrow—that 10 feet would be quite sufficient, as chain roads would give quite sufficient means of access and afford all necessary requirements for the proper sanitation of the houses that may be built upon the property. I hope that the measure will not become law. I shall certainly do all I can to alter it very materially if it goes into committee, on the grounds I have stated—that it will do immense damage to those who are owners of valuable property in and about Brisbane and other large centres of population—an injury which I do not think the State has any right to inflict upon such property holders. Therefore, if the question goes to a division, and I am here, I shall vote against the second reading of the Bill; and if it goes into committee I shall try my best to put it into such a shape that it will be less oppressive and damaging than it is at present.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I suppose the principle underlying the Bill which is now before us for consideration is one relating to public health. If such is the case, I presume no great fault can be found with the introduction of such a measure. There is a great necessity for some steps being taken to prevent what we see now coming near to us in the form of epidemics such as cholera. Did we not see in the last *Government Gazette* a proclamation showing the necessity of some measure being taken to provide still further for the preservation of the public health? The quarantine laws, I notice, are to be enforced in regard to vessels arriving from Sydney. It is said that Brisbane is a healthy city. If that is so, it must be so in spite of its surroundings, and not in consequence of them. A person has only to travel round Brisbane and its suburbs with eyes ordinarily open, to see things which certainly are a disgrace to our civilisation. I have been in the habit of driving round often for the purpose of seeing how the people live, and it really is striking to see the filth and the utter disregard to common decencies on the part of a great many of the inhabitants, and the unhealthy state the surroundings of Brisbane are now in. The question will assume a different shape before long. Just now we are passing through a series of dry seasons. They are getting drier and drier and drier; but a change will come before long, and we shall then go through a series of wet seasons. Then we shall see that we have been sowing the wind to reap the whirlwind. The ground which is now dry and cracked will become swampy, and will breathe forth diseases of every shape and form. The Bill certainly will not remedy any of those evils. In fact, it is hard to see where a remedy can be found for the existing state of things. If a Building Act was introduced perhaps it might prove a remedy; and, as the hon. member for Balonne said, the subject of drainage and sewerage is of far greater importance to the inhabitants of the city than such a Bill as this. In further proof of what I say, the Australasian

Sanitary Conference, held at Sydney in 1884, in referring to the disease then prevalent in Sydney, stated in their report:—

"It is not by any means too much to say that a moderately perfect scheme of drainage—which, be it observed, implies, as far as this disease is concerned, pure air and water—would abolish typhoid fever from cities, and would ensure the limitation of the disease to accidentally imported cases. Under the same conditions of good drainage and good scavenging, cholera, as has been seen again and again, does not spread, and the same may be said of yellow fever."

Further, the report says:—

"There are three things which Governments can provide for their people, and which, if they were provided, would go far to abolish, not contagious diseases alone, but in the long run all disease; they are pure air, pure water, and pure food."

I believe that some day Brisbane will be visited by some epidemic in consequence of the great filth there is now prevalent through all the suburbs of this city—some epidemic that will be a scourge, not only to the inhabitants who have violated the laws of nature, but also to the people who live out of town and who have, perhaps, provided the necessary means for living cleanly; they also, I say, will become subject to the epidemic, which, indeed, may overspread the whole country. There is no doubt that if cholera were once to take a hold in this city it would almost take up a permanent abode. The four principal diseases which affect cities are cholera, diarrhoea, dysentery, and typhoid fever; and I notice from the returns that in our four principal towns—Brisbane, Maryborough, Rockhampton, and Townsville—the deaths from these four causes are the most numerous. It is just the same in Sydney, for that city has lost 5,000 people from these diseases in the last seven years. This matter, indeed, was the subject of a deputation led by Dr. Mackellar, the health officer, who waited on the Premier of New South Wales to ask him to introduce a Health Act for the good of the city, for the thing had become so monstrous as to demand public recognition. In Sydney, too, they have for many years been inquiring into the condition of the dwellings and condemning houses found unfit for habitation—ordering them to be pulled down so that better buildings might be substituted in their places. There are many such houses in Brisbane—hundreds of places here that should be condemned at once, and that will become a source of disease when our present dry weather is followed by the series of wet seasons which I am quite certain will come. There is one part of this Bill which I do not quite understand. Clause 5 reads:—

"It shall not be lawful to erect a dwelling-house fronting a lane at a less distance than twenty-two feet from such lane, or to use as a dwelling-house any building erected after the passing of this Act, and being at a less distance than twenty-two feet from a lane, unless such building also fronts the street."

This means that you must keep a space between a cottage and a lane of 22 feet. I do not know whether the space is for a garden or not. And I do not know how this Bill will be applied to those who have already bought land of smaller areas than 16 perches. Working men have bought pieces of land of only 8, 10, and 12 perches quite recently, out on the South Brisbane roads, and they I suppose will now be prohibited from building on their allotments, if, as I suppose is to be the case, the Bill is to be retrospective. If the Bill does anything towards regulating the surroundings, not only of Brisbane, but also of all the other cities of Queensland, and improving the general health, it will deserve every credit.

Mr. MACFARLANE said: Mr. Speaker,—I may say that this Bill has my hearty support, and I do not think it has been introduced into the House one bit too soon. If it will not affect the

great number of properties that have been already subdivided, it will interfere with those that are at present unsubdivided, and on that account it deserves the support of members of the House. I do not quite agree with the 6th clause; I think it will interfere considerably with tradesmen, such as bakers, and will prevent them erecting their bakehouses on the premises. Of course that difficulty might be obviated by getting permission from a council, but it would not do in a divisional board; bakers and brushmakers, and such, would not be able to carry on their business on the land that their houses are built upon. That is the only difficulty I see in the Bill, and that may be amended in committee. I do not think that the argument used by the hon. member for Balonne, that property is so very valuable, ought to weigh at all with this House. We are looking at the matter from a sanitary point of view, and I do not think the interests of a few ought to be considered for a moment. We are here to legislate for the benefit of the whole community, and the private interests of a few large syndicates ought not to weigh for a moment in framing a Bill of this kind. I hope that the width of streets and lanes will not be reduced; and I trust that the prophecy of the hon. member for Burke will not come true so soon as he thinks. It would be a very alarming thing if these epidemics should afflict us at one time. This Bill has been introduced for the purpose of preventing such serious calamities as the hon. gentleman is so concerned about, and I hope that it will be amended in committee so as to make it as perfect as possible for so short a Bill. I shall give the Bill all the support I can.

Mr. SCOTT said: Mr. Speaker,—While not altogether agreeing with this Bill as it stands, I think it is a step in the right direction. I believe in the widening of streets and lanes on account of health, which should be a matter of paramount consideration in this House. Anyone who has been in the old country will have seen lanes and approaches that are mere dens in many places; and it will not do for such a state of things to exist here. The clauses referring to the width of streets and lanes are very good; but I am very doubtful about clauses 5 and 6. In fact, clause 5 is not very explicit. I do not know whether the proviso at the end of the clause applies to the first part as well as to the second: but whether it does or does not, there is a great deal to be said against it. Clause 6 is very doubtful to my mind, also. Both might be very easily evaded. There is nothing to hinder a man building a whole row of houses on one allotment in such a way that he can call them one, and there would be no yard at all. The clause will require a great deal of altering; but with regard to the width of lanes and streets I think it is a very good Bill.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I agree with this Bill as a whole. It only does what is necessary in providing breathing space for the inhabitants of houses. Clause 5 provides that no dwelling-house shall be erected at a less distance than 22 feet from a lane, which will give 66 feet of breathing space for the persons who live in the vicinity of that lane; the lane is to be 22 feet wide, and the houses fronting such lane on either side are to be 22 feet back, thus giving a clear space of 66 feet. A matter that strikes me as being somewhat objectionable is, that it may possibly interfere with persons who have already bought allotments of smaller dimensions, and fronting lanes of less width, than the Bill allows. It does seem somewhat hard that persons should have bought allotments, with the intention of building houses upon them, and then be prevented from doing so.

Still I think it is of more importance that the health of the community should be conserved than that even the rights of those individuals should be respected. In reference to what the hon. member for Balonne said concerning the value of land in the immediate suburbs of Brisbane and some distance beyond, I think it should be borne in mind that the Government have always surveyed public roads 66 feet wide, and the parties who bought the land have had that advantage, and in cutting up their land they should carry out the same arrangement. That is perfectly fair. They bought their land with 66-foot roads given to them, and it is not hard on them, if their properties have increased so much in value, to give 66-foot roads when they cut them up for sale.

Mr. BEATTIE said: Mr. Speaker,—I perfectly agree with the portion of the Bill referring to the width of streets and cutting up land, but not with some of the other portions, because I believe they are unworkable. Anyone who cut up a block leaving narrow lanes would not get the price he could get if he cut it up with good streets, because people are led to give higher prices in consequence of good roads and streets near their land. It is a good thing to provide that in cutting up land no street shall be less than 66 feet, and no lane less than 22 feet or 33 feet, but I do not believe in the clauses providing that no man shall build on an allotment unless it contains 16 perches, because the provision will be unworkable. And I do not believe in the statement made by the hon. member for Burke, who would lead us to believe that the suburbs of Brisbane and other towns in the colony are perfect nests of filth. I have seen a great many towns in my time in all the colonies, and I have no hesitation in saying that Brisbane is as clean a town as there is in the colonies. There may be some offensive portions, but the hon. member for Burke condemns the suburbs wholesale. I see some objectionable things in the suburbs sometimes, but I am not going to condemn thousands of cleanly people for two or three dirty ones, and I object to hon. members making these wholesale statements, because they lead the public outside the colony to believe that we are a dirty people and do not look after the sanitary conditions of our towns. I hope everyone is actuated by a desire to make the offensive places better; but we are not going to condemn those who keep clean places; and I am proud to think it is the majority who are cleanly and not the majority who are filthy. When the Bill comes under our consideration in committee I shall have something to say on the clauses making it compulsory on an individual who is going to build to have 16 perches. I am satisfied that such a clause if made retrospective would be a very serious thing; and where land has brought very large prices it would prevent such buildings as Harris' terrace being erected. Such buildings could not be erected with such a clause in existence; indeed, the clause would prevent the erection of a terrace of houses on Gregory terrace. Therefore, the clause would prevent, in the city of Brisbane and other cities of the colony, the erection of a class of buildings which are not only healthy, but are also an ornament to the place. With reference to the houses on the 16-perch allotments down a lane 22 feet wide, and 22 feet from the lane, I do not know where the earth-closet is going to be at the back of the buildings—I do not know where that convenience is going to be when people are looking into one another's doors; and I am satisfied that the provision will be unworkable, because there will not be sufficient land allowed for the necessary outhouses. I shall be glad, however, to give my assistance in passing the Bill, particularly in making it compulsory in all

future subdivisions of land to make the streets 66 feet wide, and the lanes 22 feet or 33 feet wide.

Mr. FRASER said: Mr. Speaker,—This Bill is a step in the right direction, but I am afraid the provisions of clause 6 will be found unworkable. The hon. member who has just spoken suggested that it was retrospective. The provisions are retrospective in a measure because there are many persons who have purchased allotments containing 8, 10, and 12 perches who have not yet built on them, and according to the provisions of the Bill they will be prevented from doing so. This will be a manifest injustice so far as they are concerned. The provisions of clause 6 restrict the building upon a 16-perch allotment to that of a dwelling-house, and this will interfere in a material way with many of our mechanics. A blacksmith, for instance, might wish to erect a comfortable house and a workshop on a 16-perch allotment; but according to this provision he will not be at liberty to erect the workshop upon it. Then, again, though it is competent for the Governor in Council to give permission for the erection of closer buildings in towns, and so forth, when they are principally for business purposes; yet in many of our streets they are erecting buildings two and three stories high, where it is intended that families shall reside; and to carry out the provisions of the clause a family would not be permitted to reside in a place of that sort. I have not the slightest objection to the width of streets and lanes as laid down in the Bill, because I think it will tend to improve the health of localities, not only round Brisbane but elsewhere; I fear, however, that the provisions of the 6th clause will be found unworkable, and if attempted to be enforced, will act with great injustice towards a great many who have already bought and paid for allotments not exceeding 8, 10, and 12 perches.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—I think this Bill is a measure in the right direction, and it shall have my hearty support. I cannot agree with the hon. member for South Brisbane (Mr. Fraser) as to the 6th clause being objectionable, because after 22 feet are taken from the front there would be 110 feet of a 16-perch allotment left on which to erect premises. The lane will be 22 feet wide, and the opposite house will be 22 feet from the lane; that leaves a space of 66 feet, which I think is very good indeed. I hope that when we get into committee the Premier will make the 6th clause so stringent that no verandahs or awnings of any kind shall be attached to the fence in front—as we have seen many times in this colony—whereby the lane will be only 22 feet wide. The hon. member for South Brisbane seems to think I have made a mistake, but the 16-perch allotment gives a frontage of 33 feet with a depth of 132 feet, so that there will be plenty of room to build a decent house and proper back premises on the same ground. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley seemed to object to the remarks made by the hon. member for Burke. I quite agree with that hon. member. I should like to think that Brisbane was a clean place; but it is very far from being a clean city, and the gentlemen who have charge of the sanitary arrangements of the city of Brisbane have a great deal to do before they can claim that Brisbane is one of the cleanest cities, not in the colonies, but in the colony. I am sure the hon. member for Burke has no desire to detract in any way from Brisbane; but one need not go into the suburbs, as in the heart of the city there are some places which want remedying. This Bill will be the means of remedying many of the evils which

exist at present, and I shall give it my hearty support. It is, I think, to be regretted that a Bill of this kind was not introduced into the colony a few years ago.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the commitment of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. J. R. Dickson), the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into Committee to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith), in moving that £10,316 be granted for Gaols, said there was no change in that vote from last year, except that a larger amount was required for contingencies and incidentals in consequence of the larger number of prisoners.

Mr. HAMILTON said there was one question which he had put that afternoon, and which the Premier had forgotten to answer, namely: Why the "Hopeful" prisoners were still in the gaol? It had been admitted that the present gaol was very much over-crowded; and there was a regulation—he did not know whether it was a written regulation—but there was a rule, and a very good one, that long-sentence prisoners were always sent to St. Helena. That rule did not appear to have been adhered to in the instance he mentioned, and one would think that if there was such a rule it would be adhered to, especially when the gaol was admittedly overcrowded. It appeared the more strange in this instance, because he had heard on two or three different occasions that those prisoners had been taken as far as the steamer for transit to St. Helena, and then sent back to the gaol.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not think that St. Helena was the proper place for prisoners who were in irons. There were many reasons why prisoners serving a sentence in irons should not be sent there. He had heard once that the prisoners were taken to the steamer to be sent to St. Helena, and he regretted to say they were taken from the gaol without the Government knowing anything about it. He had not had time to inquire into the matter before; but he then discovered that it was the practice to move prisoners about without the knowledge of the Government. The law required that no prisoner should be removed without the authority of the Governor in Council, so that there should be Ministerial responsibility for what was done. The removal of a prisoner from one prison to another should be submitted to the head of the department in the ordinary way. It was a fact that long-sentence prisoners were generally sent to St. Helena. It was very undesirable that short-sentence prisoners should be sent there, because at St. Helena they had the associated system, and there was no means of keeping the prisoners apart from each other. In point of fact both gaols were very unsatisfactory in that respect. The gaol at Brisbane was not half as large as it ought to be for the work to be done there, unless, indeed, they had two gaols at St. Helena—one for long-sentence prisoners and the other for short-sentence prisoners. It was extremely detrimental to men convicted of first offences that they should be associated with long-sentence prisoners, and no provision was made for keeping them separate at St. Helena. There was no provision in any of the gaols for reforming prisoners.

Mr. JESSOP said he had heard something in reference to the management of gaols, and he thought it was perhaps as well that it should be made known for the benefit of the country

and people who wished to do well. A man was convicted of crime in his district and his wife used to pay periodical visits to him. She told him (Mr. Jessop) that she could go and see her husband at any time; the warders were so very kind that she was allowed to see her husband when she chose, and stay an hour or two with him. It was made a boast in the district he represented that that woman could go and see her husband at any time. He (Mr. Jessop) thought that was a matter that required looking into. He was of opinion that persons sentenced to three or four years' imprisonment for crime should not have the privilege of having visitors. He would like to know what was the rule in reference to sending long-sentence prisoners to St. Helena. It appeared that some were sent there and some were not. He did not think the Committee had sufficient information on the matter.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not quite catch what the hon. gentleman said, but he understood him to state that he knew of a case where the wife of a prisoner was allowed to visit him in gaol. He (the Colonial Secretary) would be very glad if any case of that kind was brought under his notice. The hon. member did not say what year the case he referred to occurred.

Mr. JESSOP : About two years ago.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had never heard of a case of that kind, although he had heard of great laxities in the administration of the gaol where that was said to have happened. He thought that any hon. member who heard of a case of that sort ought to communicate it to the Government, as it was to the interest of the public that such irregularities should be put down at once. The hon. member asked what the rule was in reference to sending long-sentence prisoners to St. Helena. He (the Colonial Secretary) was sorry to say that there was no very satisfactory rule on the subject. Long-sentence prisoners were generally sent to St. Helena because it was considered very undesirable to send short-sentence prisoners there to associate with habitual criminals, also because there was no provision in the gaol at Brisbane for teaching prisoners a trade as there was at St. Helena. From time to time, when the gaol was full, it was necessary to send some prisoners away. On the last occasion that occurred, when he was informed of it he asked for a list of prisoners many of whom were sentenced to not more than three or four months' imprisonment, as he considered it very undesirable to send prisoners under short sentences to St. Helena. He went through the list very carefully, and then directed that those in gaol for a considerable period, and not likely to be injured morally by being sent to St. Helena, should be sent there, and that the others should be kept in Brisbane. He thought it better that the gaol in Brisbane should be overcrowded than that a number of prisoners convicted of minor offences should be sent down to St. Helena to herd with criminals at the risk to them of great moral deterioration. Owing, however, to the want of accommodation, satisfactory arrangements could not be made for classifying prisoners.

Mr. PALMER said he understood that the reason given by the Colonial Secretary why the "Hopeful" prisoners were not sent to St. Helena was because they were in irons. He would ask the hon. gentleman to inform the Committee whether all prisoners sentenced to punishment in irons were also kept back and not sent to St. Helena, or if any prisoners in irons had been sent there?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could not answer for anything that had happened before he was responsible for the management of

the gaol; but no prisoners sentenced to punishment in irons since he had had the management of the department had been sent to St. Helena to his knowledge.

Mr. SCOTT said he understood from what the Colonial Secretary had stated that there was not sufficient accommodation in the Brisbane Gaol. He remembered that not very long since large additions were made to the establishment at St. Helena, and it was not much more than twelve or eighteen months since the new gaol at South Brisbane was finished. He supposed the accommodation there was larger than in the old gaol?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : No; very much less.

Mr. SCOTT said he was not aware of that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : It will not hold one-third the number.

Mr. SCOTT said he knew the accommodation at St. Helena was very much extended, as he saw it himself not very long ago.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said St. Helena was not overcrowded, but there was no classification there, and no means of keeping the prisoners apart.

Mr. HAMILTON said he was very glad to hear from the Colonial Secretary that the reason the "Hopeful" prisoners were not sent to St. Helena was because they had been sentenced to punishment in irons, and it had been considered undesirable to send prisoners in irons to St. Helena. He (Mr. Hamilton) was under the impression—and he thought that the impression was a general one—that the reason was because the Governor refused to sign the necessary documents. The men had been taken down to the steamer twice but returned to the gaol again, and the general impression was that they had been brought back because the Governor refused to sign the documents authorising their removal, as he considered the sentence was an illegal one. It would be remembered that the prisoners were sentenced to five years in irons; it was thought that the Governor considered that was illegal.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member had been misinformed. There was no foundation whatever for such statements.

Mr. NORTON asked whether there was any officer responsible for the distribution of gratuities to discharged prisoners?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was informed that there was no regularly defined system in reference to the distribution of those gratuities. The sum was appropriated for the purpose of enabling discharged prisoners to get back to the place where they came from, and where they were most likely to be able to get employment.

Mr. JESSOP said the item for incidentals—£4,000—seemed large. Were tenders called for all supplies?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Tenders are called in all cases.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £10,430 be granted for salaries and contingencies, Penal Establishment, St. Helena. There was a small increase in the amount for provisions and incidentals, on account of the increase in the number of prisoners; the salaries for the bricklayer, baker, and sugar-boiler had been put down separately, and the small increases to warders were on the usual scale for length of service.

Mr. ALAND said he happened to be absent from the Chamber when the last vote was passed, but he intended to have asked for information as to who was to be appointed gaoler at the

Brisbane Gaol in the room of Mr. Bernard, dismissed? It had been reported in the papers that some gentleman from New South Wales had got the appointment; but it struck him, and no doubt many other hon. members, that one could have been found in the colony. There were many men who had been in the gaol service for twenty years or more, and it seemed hard to them that the Government should have gone to another colony for a gaoler for the Brisbane Gaol, when possibly some among them might have been found worthy and able to fill the position.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was true that a gaoler had been appointed who had not been in the colony before, but he had been a very excellent gaol officer in New South Wales, and had a natural aptitude for the work. Had there been anyone in the gaol service of the colony whom he could have seen his way to recommend for the appointment, he should have done so; but he was unable to do so. In fact, a radical change was wanted there in every respect, and the present was a very good opportunity of instituting it. The gentleman appointed had the very highest recommendations, and had besides a natural aptitude and a liking for the work. He believed the new gaoler would be a valuable acquisition to the penal service of the colony.

Mr. PALMER said he could not understand the meaning of the terms "trade supervisor" and "trade instructor." They seemed rather strange officers to be attached to a penal establishment. Perhaps the Colonial Secretary would give some explanation on the point.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that trades were taught to prisoners at St. Helena, and those were the principal officers who gave instruction to the prisoners. A great deal of work was done there, as hon. members could see from the superintendent's report.

Mr. PALMER said he could understand the terms now. Before the explanation was given he was under the impression that "trade" referred to commerce, and not to mechanical occupations.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £2,210 be granted for Reformatories, Lytton and Toowoomba.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £6,805 be granted for the Benevolent Asylum, Dunwich. Hon. members would observe that it was proposed that there should be a medical superintendent at Dunwich at £500 a year, provision for whom was made for nine months, and for the superintendent in charge for six months only. Parliament lately passed a Bill to provide for the better management of charitable institutions, and when that Bill was going through he intimated that the Government had come to the conclusion that it was not right that so large an institution as Dunwich, with so many hundreds of inmates, should be entirely without medical supervision. The time had arrived when it was absolutely necessary that the officer in charge should be a medical man, and a good medical officer could be obtained for £500, which was certainly not too much to give him. If the vote was passed the appointment would be made as soon as possible, and the salaries of the two superintendents were made to overlap in order to facilitate the transference of management. There was no complaint whatever to be made against Mr. Hamilton, who had been superintendent for many years, and who had done extremely good work there; but the change was desirable in the interests of the inmates of so

large an establishment. No increase had been made in the item for contingencies, £6,000, as it was believed that one result of the Bill recently passed would be to considerably reduce the expenses of management, for a large sum would be received from inmates and their relatives for maintenance. A good deal of work would also be done by the inmates themselves.

Mr. JESSOP asked how it was intended to dispose of Mr. Hamilton? Was it intended to remove him from the Government Service? Mr. Hamilton was a very old servant, and it would be very hard to remove him without giving him at least an equally good position elsewhere.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed Mr. Hamilton had expressed a wish to retire from the Public Service. He would, of course, ascertain whether that was so or not, and if it was not so he would endeavour to make arrangements for his services being retained in some other capacity.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he was glad the Colonial Secretary had expressed himself in such terms with regard to Mr. Hamilton, who was one of the most deserving officers in the Government Service. He did not think Mr. Hamilton should be compelled to leave the service, which was what the vote of three months' salary virtually meant. He did not believe in the Premier's idea that the superintendent at Dunwich should be a medical man. If the superintendent was not a medical man there should be a medical man with him; but that was a very different thing from confining the choice to a medical man. If they had the best doctor in Brisbane they would not get such a good superintendent as Mr. Hamilton, and such a thoroughly good manager.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not think that, as a general rule, the choice of superintendent should be confined to a medical man; but since they could not afford to pay two they must choose a medical man. If they got such a good manager as Mr. Hamilton they would be fortunate.

Mr. FERGUSON said that if they appointed a medical man as superintendent on the grounds of economy they would be making a great mistake. Medical men, as a rule, had no idea of business; they were a very extravagant class; and the increase in the cost of the institution in twelve months would probably be more than the salary of a superintendent.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he understood that Mr. Hamilton was to remain in the Public Service if he chose, in a position not inferior to the one he held at present. He believed the first act of the medical superintendent would be to have the salary of the assistant superintendent increased; he would be the nominal superintendent, and the real superintendent would be the man under him.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said Mr. Hamilton had expressed his preference for leaving the Public Service, to accepting anything the Government could offer him.

Mr. SCOTT asked if Mr. Hamilton declined to accept the offer because it did not come up to his idea of a fair thing—because the salary was less than he at present enjoyed? He had been a good many years in the Public Service, and it was hard that he should be shunted without consideration. Perhaps the Government had nothing to offer him equal to the position he now occupied, so that he was practically forced to retire from the Public Service.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said Mr. Hamilton was, he believed, entitled to a pension under the Civil Service Act. He could not be made a police magistrate or anything of that

kind. He was a very good man for certain work, and he was offered an appointment with emoluments quite equal to those he drew at present, but he preferred to withdraw from the service.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What was the appointment?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The charge of one of the gaols.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving that there be granted a sum of £1,870—salaries and contingencies in connection with the Government schooner, Torres Straits—said that before the item was put on the Estimates the schooner "Mavis" was just lost. The arrangement which would probably be made was to send up the schooner "Clara," pilot schooner in Moreton Bay—a vessel which would be particularly suitable for the work required, as she could lie very close to the wind. Probably some other arrangements would be made with regard to the pilots, which would result in considerable economy and greater efficiency in the service.

Mr. ARCHER said it appeared from the reports with regard to the wreck of the "Mavis" that she was lost in consequence of being badly found in anchors and chains. A vessel sailing amongst those reefs ought to be especially well provided with ground tackle.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the report of the captain of the "Mavis" certainly left it to be understood that she was wrecked owing to the want of ground tackle. He (the Colonial Secretary) was very much surprised at that, and had an inquiry made by Captain Williams, who reported that in addition to the ground tackle on board there was another complete outfit, which was left behind on Thursday Island.

Mr. NORTON asked if the captain was responsible for the "Mavis" having been deserted?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. NORTON said that from the newspaper reports it appeared that she floated off the reef herself and came down almost on the boat of the people who had bought the wreck. Surely there must have been some very bad management somewhere. Was she insured?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was not customary to insure Government ships; and the premium would probably amount to 30 per cent. per annum on a vessel employed at Torres Straits. As to the captain leaving the wreck, that seemed quite justifiable under the circumstances, and so was the sale. There were extraordinary stories about the vessel having floated off almost uninjured; but Mr. Douglas reported that she was really unfit for anything, and could not be made available for anything without an expenditure of £500 or £600.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What did she cost?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I forget.

Mr. BEATTIE said she was a very dear bargain whatever she cost. He was very sorry to hear the statement made by the hon. member for Port Curtis, that the "Mavis," after she went ashore on Dungeness Reef, had been floated off uninjured; but he understood that the statement was made by the hon. member merely as a rumour he had heard, and that there was no further authority for it. Of course that did take place, but not before a great deal of work had been done. The individuals who bought her had expended a great deal of labour on her, and had used a large quantity of canvas and oakum in trying to stop her holes. After having covered

the whole of the damage done to the vessel while on the Dungeness Reef, when the flood tide took place the vessel, in consequence of what had been done to her, floated, and went to Thursday Island. When she got there, of course, it was the object of the individuals who bought her to give information that there was nothing the matter with her. But when she was surveyed—and the hon. the Colonial Secretary had not got correct information again there—when she was surveyed the report of the surveyor was that it would take £1,000 to repair her.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: £700.

Mr. BEATTIE: £500 was what the hon. gentleman said, and the actual amount was double that. In fact, it was a great deal more than the vessel was worth when she was originally purchased by the Queensland Government. The Colonial Secretary, in answer to a question by the hon. member for Blackall, said that the captain had left her chains at Thursday Island, and in reference to that he (Mr. Beattie) could tell the Colonial Secretary that that was one of the questions put to the captain on the examination, and the chain that was left at Thursday Island was an old mooring chain—a chain half its size would not go through the "Mavis'" hawse-hole.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The chains were those that she had used for years before.

Mr. BEATTIE: It was very strange if they were, because he had had the pleasure—if there was any pleasure attached to it—in looking over her log-book during the time that Captain Williams had command of her, and had found that during that period she had lost nine anchors. She lay for thirty-four days on a reef—beating along the top of a reef for thirty-four days, according to the captain's own log-book—and in taking an anchor and chain in one of the boats to assist in getting the vessel off the boat cap-sized, and the anchor and chain were lying there yet on the reef. After providentially getting off the reef she came to Thursday Island, and with everybody there who knew her, or were in communication with the pearl-shellers or persons on the various steamers running through Torres Straits, it was a common saying that the "Mavis" used to take a look at every reef she came across; in fact, that, like the Irishman who knew every rock about Cape Clear, she knew every one she came across, and particularly those that she got on. When she came to Thursday Island—he was now repeating the log—she required a great deal of repairing, and of making good the stores that had been lost at various times when she had been ashore. Her requisitions were sent down to Brisbane, and certain anchors and chains were sent up to her. That could be proved by the requisitions that were sent in, and which were supplied by a firm in town. Then the "Advance" went up to Thursday Island. The captain of the "Mavis" was transferred to the "Advance"; the captain who took the "Advance" up being sent on board the "Mavis." Before taking charge of her it was necessary, for his own satisfaction, that he should take an inventory of all the things that were then in the vessel, and he also determined to examine her bottom, so as to see if she required any repairs. He did so. He took her down to a small island called Woody Island, laid her on the beach there, and when he came to examine her he found that she was in such a state that she required stripping. A very large amount of labour had to be expended upon her, and she was re-coppered. It was found that she had holes in her counter, under her stern, into which a man could put both hands; and they had been stopped up with

putty. He (Mr. Beattie) knew all about that; he could prove it by those who saw it. The captain who took command of her was ordered, in the course of the instructions he received from his superiors, to go down to the Fly River with some expedition that was going there with the Hon. John Douglas. He went there successfully, came back, and stopped at one of the islands—he thought Murray Island. Previous to this, he (Mr. Beattie) should say that before the captain referred to took command of the vessel her windlass had broken. There was only one pawl on her windlass, the consequence of which was that it was nearly useless for lifting her anchor in heavy weather. When at Murray Island she anchored in something like twenty fathoms of water with forty-five fathoms of chain; and when trying to lift her anchor it was found that the chain had swept round one of the ledges of coral reef and it could not be lifted. They made sail on the vessel, and worked her off and on from side to side, thinking that possibly the chain might slip from underneath the ledge of the reef. Then they commenced to heave on the windlass to try and lift the anchor, and the windlass broke down completely. He (Mr. Beattie) was stating those facts because he wanted to come to the point about her anchors and chains. There being only one pawl in the windlass-box it carried away and rendered the windlass, as he had said, perfectly useless. They had no blocks on board to assist them, and even if they had had all the blocks in a ship-chandler's shop in Brisbane they could never have lifted that anchor into the vessel. They decided to slip it, and they did so, thus losing forty-five fathoms of chain and fifteen fathoms of shackling belonging to the anchor. They then proceeded on their voyage, and shaped their course towards Thursday Island. It was at that time that the vessel fell in with squally weather; and the captain, he presumed, after having consulted the Hon. John Douglas, decided to anchor under one of the islands. He anchored under an island which he mistook for another one—in consequence, he supposed, of one island being so much like another. He tried to anchor under that particular island, but was afraid that he might lose his anchor, which was the heaviest one he had—the one on the port bow—with thirty fathoms of chain. He had no windlass that he could lift it with, and if he let it go he would have had to slip it, and consequently lose it as well as the other. He had on board three other anchors and a wire cable. He got one of those anchors from the hold, bent it on the wire cable, brought up under the lee of the island, and let go the anchor. Of course it did not hold the vessel; she dragged it, and afterwards the accident took place, and she went on Dungeness Reef. The chief officer of the “Mavis” was particularly asked what chain and blocks were on board the vessel; as a statement had been made that there were not only purchase blocks but also sixty fathoms of chain on each cable. The mate declared that he had the whole chain up, that both ends were shackled together, and that there were only forty-five fathoms of chain on each cable. The question was put to Captain Cater—was he sure that he had only thirty fathoms of chain on board the vessel? and he replied that the length mentioned was all he had. An inventory of the goods that were supplied to the “Mavis” was made, and it appeared that there were only thirty fathoms of chain and not a single block on board the vessel, and that evidence led the Marine Board to express an opinion that if the “Mavis” had been supplied with the ground tackle necessary for any vessel navigating in the waters of Torres Straits she would not have been lost, at any rate, on the occasion under notice. The whole matter ought to be cleared up, especially when statements were

made reflecting on the professional character of Captain Cater. Moreover, a letter had been written by the Hon. John Douglas, who was on board the “Mavis” when she was lost, in which he expressed an opinion as to the careful manner in which the vessel had been navigated. It was a serious thing to cast injurious reflections on a man who had merely met with a misfortune under peculiar circumstances—circumstances of a character that would try a man better acquainted with the locality than Captain Cater was. Captain Cater was, in addition, handicapped with a vessel totally unable to keep off a lee shore. When the Government purchased vessels like the “Mavis,” and sent them to make passages in the Torres Straits against strong tides and head winds, they made a great mistake. He trusted the Colonial Secretary would institute an inquiry into the whole case, and was sure that if he did so he would obtain information on the subject very different to that he had up to the present received.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said an inquiry had already been held by the Marine Board, who did not form an altogether favourable opinion of the conduct of the captain of the “Mavis.” It was very much to be regretted that the board did not call additional evidence on the subject of the ground tackle belonging to the vessel, which, as he (the Colonial Secretary) was informed, was taken out of her and left behind at Thursday Island. He alluded to ground tackle which she used for a considerable time—indeed, until the new ground tackle was supplied—and which was carried on board of her for a considerable period afterwards. When, however, the new captain took command of the “Mavis” he took out all that old tackle and left it behind. That fact did not come out in the evidence given before the Marine Board. He did not want to condemn Captain Cater, and would not go into the question of the navigation of the vessel or discuss the mistake that occasioned her loss, beyond remarking that she was steered straight on to the top of a reef through an error of judgment. His own impression was that the less said about the loss of the “Mavis” the better for the captain who lost her.

Mr. WAKEFIELD said he could endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley (Mr. Beattie), as he had an extract from the log of the vessel, which read as follows:—

“Got on shore on reef off Murray Island on Friday, January 23rd, 1885, and was bumping about the reef until 26th February, 1885, during which time six anchors were lost, and port cable.”

That was when the “Mavis” was in charge of her former captain. In reference to the cable left behind at Thursday Island the log said:—

“Before leaving Thursday Island for New Guinea I landed a quantity of old cable that was condemned.”

Those extracts quite bore out the statements of the senior member for Fortitude Valley, and in addition there was the testimony of the Government Resident, who had spoken in high terms of the captain. The Hon. John Douglas was present on board, and was one of the best judges of the captain's conduct.

Mr. ARCHER said that the statements of the Colonial Secretary and of the senior member for Fortitude Valley were not reconcilable. An inquiry should certainly be held to ascertain the true facts of the case.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it would be as well for some hon. gentleman who took an interest in the matter to move for the papers in connection with the loss of the “Mavis.” He was not speaking from imagination, but on the authority of official documents he had in his possession.

Mr. BEATTIE said he should be very glad to move for the papers. He had never seen the papers quoted from by the hon. member for Moreton, but he knew that the schooner had laid for thirty-three days on a reef, and had lost six anchors. But did she lose no chain with those anchors? The thing was ridiculous, and the report from which the Colonial Secretary received his information was evidently from the former master, who had lost six anchors off Murray Island. The hon. Colonial Secretary could easily communicate with Thursday Island, and find out what chain was left there, and see whether his information was correct or not. Statements had been made that evening very damaging to the character of a man who had been unfortunate, and he did not believe that when a man was unfortunate it was the duty of members of that Committee, Ministers particularly, to put their foot upon his neck and keep him down. That was why he mentioned the matter. With reference to the Marine Board, he could assure hon. members that they did all they could to obtain evidence; but the mistake was, that the inquiry was not held at Thursday Island when all the witnesses were there, instead of in Brisbane when the witnesses were all dispersed; the whole of the information would then have been obtainable by the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he had listened to the discussion with a great deal of attention, and had come to the conclusion that it was a very extraordinary thing for the vessel to go to sea without proper gear when it could have been obtained. He could see no reason whatever in the sidewind manner in which blame had been attached to the previous captain. He might have been thirty days on a reef, and lost eight or nine anchors; but that was no reason why the succeeding captain should go to sea without proper gear on board for safety. He had the pleasure of knowing one of the captains, and hoped that a strict inquiry would be made into the affair, so that justice might be done. It was a very great hardship to take away a professional man's character without giving him an opportunity of explaining himself. He believed Captain Williams to be a thorough seaman in every particular. He was not speaking from an ignorant point of view, because he had formerly held investigations into wrecks, and had frequently sent evidence taken before himself to the Marine Board, and could say that in no instance did the Marine Board find fault with him in the matter. He contended that branding Captain Williams's name, even by a sidewind, for something that occurred a long time previously, was not fair. Therefore he hoped that the investigation would be a rigid one, so as to give justice to all.

Mr. ANNENAR said that he, like the last speaker, was not a nautical man, and was not conversant with the fitting out of a vessel. He would like to know if the schooner was supposed to be loaded with anchors. One gentleman said that six anchors were lost, and another said that nine were lost. Did her cargo consist of anchors?

Mr. BEATTIE said that, for the information of the hon. member for Maryborough, he might state that he did not mention Captain Williams's name for the purpose of trying to blame him by a sidewind; what he said he stated openly. The hon. member for Moreton read an extract from the log, but he forgot to mention that that extract was dated two months previous to the captain who lost the vessel taking command. The Government would have to buy anchors wholesale, if they were going to lose them as they did.

Mr. SHERIDAN said all that occurred two months before the vessel was lost, and there was no occasion to bring it into the debate.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for Moreton quoted what he did as an extract from the log. He thought that a log was a daily entry; but what the hon. gentleman quoted summed up thirty-four days. The vessel got on a reef and remained there thirty-four days, and lost six anchors. It was a summary of the log.

Mr. WAKEFIELD said he did not read every daily occurrence, but only the record of that particular case. The hon. member for Maryborough talked about going to sea without sufficient tackle. Thursday Island was not a store for anchors and chains. They all came up from the South, and when a vessel was going to sea she could not wait two or three months for cables.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £5,598 be voted for the steamers "Lucinda" and "Otter." The "Lucinda," as hon. members were aware, was ordered by the late Government to take the place of the "Kate," nearly three years ago. She was a very fine boat, but was not equal to all the work that had to be done in Moreton Bay. It had become apparent to the Government about six months ago that the "Kate" was becoming quite unfit for the work she was doing; and after careful inquiry the Government came to the conclusion that the best thing to do was to sell her. At that time, also, the danger of war was imminent, and it was necessary for the Government to take some steps to provide, so far as they could, for additional defences for the colony, and it was desirable above all things to have some vessel easily handled, and of good speed, with no great draught of water, and capable of carrying a heavy armament. The Government, under the circumstances, considered that the "Otter," which had been offered to them at a price very little over her cost, would be suitable for the purpose, as she was built of steel and constructed so that she would be very well protected against a hostile fire. It was necessary to have a vessel supplementary to the "Gayundah," and the "Otter" was capable of carrying a 64-lb. gun at her bows, which was the heaviest used on merchant ships fitted as cruisers, and was the same as those put on board the "Massilia" and the "Lusitania," which were recently chartered by the Admiralty and fitted up at Sydney. The "Otter" was, therefore, purchased, and turned out to be admirably fitted for her work. She was at present doing the work formerly done by the "Kate," and it was thought better to put the two vessels together on the estimate, because very small staffs were kept on board of each, and sometimes the crew of one would assist the other, and *vice versa*. The allowances for victualling, coals, and stores were put together; the salaries of the officers and men were put down separately, and the vote was as small as possible consistent with efficiency. In the case of the "Otter" there were three firemen while there was only one on the "Lucinda"; the reason being that the "Otter," which had a twin-screw, required more.

Mr. ARCHER asked what had become of the "Kate"? The "Lucinda" was not particularly fitted for carrying stores, but appeared better suited to Cabinet parties, and no doubt it was better to have another steamer.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the "Kate" was sold some time ago, as it was found to be not worth while to repair her. The price realised was £900.

Mr. NORTON said that when the late Government made arrangements for the purchase of the "Lucinda" it was intended that she should take the place of the "Kate." He did not know whether the vessel was too good for the work, but

it appeared to him that the effect of getting rid of the "Kate" was to create a necessity for two boats to do her work. If the "Otter" was intended for defence purposes it was a mistake to let the boat brought out for defence purposes go on a surveying expedition, and thus have to employ another boat to take her place. He did not see any reason for maintaining two boats to do the work which one used to do before, though he did not wish to propose a reduction if the necessity for the two boats could be shown.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the "Otter" was bought mainly because she was adapted for defence purposes. The "Lucinda" was not adapted for carrying stores to St. Helena and Dunwich, and there was not sufficient deck-space for sheep and stock. He did not know by whom the design was prepared, but, though not fitted for carrying heavy stores about the Bay, she was admirably fitted for many other purposes. She was admirably fitted as a Government yacht, and there was no doubt the Government ought to have a yacht for travelling along the coast. He considered her perfectly fitted for travelling from Brisbane to the Gulf of Carpentaria or New Guinea, for which the Government ought to have a steamer. The "Lucinda" was admirably fitted for many other purposes, though not for all the work the "Kate" used to do; and the "Otter" did the rest of the work which used formerly to be done by the "Kate." It would be extremely unwise economy to dispose of the "Lucinda."

Mr. NORTON said that no doubt the "Lucinda" was a very good sea-boat; but he would ask whether the present was a time for indulging the Government in the manner proposed. He did not say that they should not have a yacht, but if they were to have one no more inopportune time could have been chosen for such a thing. The Treasurer always raised objections to granting money for any purpose not set down on the Estimates; but many such sums had been discussed, the expenditure on which would yield a far better return than the "Lucinda." Under the circumstances, he would move that the vote be reduced by the sum of £1,014 on account of the "Lucinda."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he hoped the hon. member would withdraw his motion. It was unwise parsimony to sell the "Lucinda" as soon as they had got her. The vessel arrived at the beginning of the year, and had scarcely got into use when a member of the Government who ordered her proposed to sell her. There seemed to be a certain amount of inconsistency, or at any rate infirmity of purpose, in the proposal. He did not think an extra £1,000 a year would ruin the colony, and there were many cases in which such a boat was very necessary. There was much work which the "Otter" could not do but which had to be done, and it was found cheaper to keep a boat than to hire vessels to do that work; so that it was not a matter of extravagance. He remembered that on more than one occasion during the last two or three years the Government had to charter vessels to do Government work which the "Lucinda" might very properly do, and the expenses thus entailed were more than would be sufficient to cover the expenses of the "Lucinda" for a whole year. They would be showing that they had a very poor opinion of their position and the work they had to do if they determined to sell that boat as soon as they had got her. The previous Government had ordered her, and he thought that instead of being ashamed of their bargain they ought to be very glad they had got her.

Mr. NORTON said he did not think there was anything inconsistent in the action he had

taken: though there had been a good deal of inconsistency in the remarks made by the Premier. Before he had moved his amendment the hon. gentleman said the "Lucinda" was not fit to do the work done by the "Kate"—not fit to carry heavy stores; now the hon. gentleman, before he sat down, said she was eminently fitted to do the work for which she was ordered.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Much of the work.

Mr. NORTON said it was never intended that they should have the "Lucinda" and another boat to do the work of the "Kate." It was intended that the boat brought out to replace the "Kate" should be able to carry on the work done by that vessel. The Colonial Secretary first told them that the "Lucinda" was not fitted to do the work of the "Kate," and then he told them that she was eminently fitted to replace the "Kate."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I did not say so. I said she was eminently fitted to do the work she has to do, and that she does work which the "Kate" never did and could not do.

Mr. NORTON: Yes; the hon. member said she was eminently fitted to do the work of a Government yacht, but he (Mr. Norton) said it was not desirable at the present time to go into additional expense for a Government yacht. The "Lucinda" was evidently unsuitable for the purpose for which she had been brought out, and they had better get rid of her. If the "Otter" could do the work which the "Kate" used to do let them keep the "Otter." There was nothing inconsistent in the position he took up—in fact the hon. gentleman had proved his inconsistency. The reason he proposed the reduction was, in the first place because it was undesirable that two boats should be employed to do the work of one, and he thought it desirable that members of the Committee should have an opportunity of expressing their opinions upon it. There was some discussion the other evening about a reduction of the votes, which many members were not desirous of supporting. The present was a vote by which the expenditure might well be reduced, because nobody would suffer by it; and if, as had been admitted, the "Lucinda" was not fitted for the purpose for which she was brought to the colony, they should sell her.

Mr. MIDGLEY said they had heard a good deal of retrenchment up to the present time, and several citizens of Brisbane had drawn his attention to the luxury they had been indulging in in keeping both of these boats, and employing a staff on each. He believed the "Otter" was wisely and well bought at the time of the war-scare; but now that the war-scare had passed away—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Has it!

Mr. MIDGLEY: Well, it had for all sensible people. There never was much of a scare for sensible people. The war-scare having passed away, perhaps, instead of being parsimony, it would be really wise to sell one of those boats, and not only get back again the money she had cost, but save the expense of maintaining her. Instead of keeping a boat for Ministers to hold Cabinet meetings in, they might very well take one of the war vessels when they wanted a cruise. They might use them also in another way—to do away with deadlocks—the Opposition might take the "Paluma," and the Government the "Gayundah," and go into the Bay and settle it. The present was a case in which retrenchment might very well come in, and he felt inclined to support the amendment.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was rather a singular thing that that discussion should take place the first time the "Lucinda" appeared on the Estimates. She had just arrived in the colony, and was ordered by the preceding Government for a particular purpose, and he thought was very wisely ordered. Some hon. members appeared to think her fittings too good, but that was scarcely a reason for selling the ship or for dismantling her. He had heard no reasons given for the amendment, except that some hon. members seemed to think that she was too good for her work. She had been in commission only about three or four months, and it was rather a short trial to give her and to tell them that she was useless and that they should sell her. If they did so they would be the laughing-stock of everybody.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman had given the reason himself, and he thought it was a very extraordinary reason. He said she was eminently fitted to do the work she had to do—that was as a Government yacht.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government ought to have a yacht.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not think the Government should have a yacht. They had two boats at present, and they should keep the one which was best fitted to do the work of the "Kate."

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that since it was the preceding Government who ordered the "Lucinda" he fancied it was due to them that she was fitted up in the way she was, and he was inclined to think that the fit of economy that had now come over them proceeded from a sense of disappointment because they could not make use of her themselves, and they did not want the Ministry of the day to enjoy the use of her. He thought himself it was a very sensible arrangement. The previous Government had ordered a very luxurious and comfortable boat, and they ought not now to begrudge the use of her to other people. Their turn would probably come again, and he supposed they would then arrange to buy her back or have her refitted. He thought it was a necessity that they should have a boat of that kind. An hon. member had talked of the war-scare being no scare at all to sensible people; if so, there must have been an uncommon lot of lunatics about at the time. The prospects of war were most imminent, and they did not know when they might occur again. The item of £1,014 for the "Lucinda" was a very paltry item to cavil about.

Mr. SALKELD said it was rather awkward that they should have a vessel ordered by the previous Government and then find that she was not adapted to do the work for which she was ordered, and that the present Government had to get another boat to do the work at additional expense. It was not only the cost of the two vessels in the first instance, but they had to consider the continual expenditure on them. The sum set down for the two boats was £5,598, so that they were paying annually about £3,000 more for that service than they previously paid. The "Kate" last year cost £2,676. He was inclined to think that a mistake was made—he would not say with regard to the "Lucinda," as he was not sufficiently acquainted with her qualities, but in the purchase of the "Otter." It was said that there was a war-scare on when she was bought, but did that justify the purchasing of the "Otter" and "Gayundah"? They could afford the colony no protection in case of war. It was simply ridiculous to think that vessels of that kind could protect the colony if it was in danger from European complications. Perhaps there was some justification for having

a defence force to prevent a marauding party landing, but there was no doubt that if a European naval force came here the gunboats possessed by the colony would be of little service. He would much rather vote money for torpedoes than for gunboats. He did not see any use in providing for a force which would have to run away when the enemy appeared; that was only wasting money. He thought one of the two steamers—the "Otter" or the "Lucinda"—ought to be sufficient for the Government service. He was of opinion that the present was not a proper time for the Government to have a pleasure yacht; the finances of the colony did not justify such an expenditure. He would like to see some reduction made in the vote, but did not know that it should be made in connection with the "Lucinda."

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that the Colonial Secretary, although he had not stated it in so many words, had led the Committee to come to the conclusion that the "Lucinda," which was ordered from home by the late Government, was unfit for the work done by the "Kate." That was not a fact. The "Kate" was not in a position to do the work required of her. Every officer connected with her reported that she was unfit to go to sea, and that it was scarcely safe for her to cross the Bay in rough weather, and the late Government came to the conclusion to get a boat better fitted than she was for the work, and one having more accommodation both for cargo and passengers. They accordingly ordered from home a steamer which was to be in every way capable of doing the work previously done by the "Kate" and a great deal more. The present Government, however, had two vessels, and neither of them was efficiently manned. If properly manned, the "Lucinda" could, he believed, do all the work of the "Kate" to-morrow, in regard to both stores and passengers, and be available for picnics for the Government as well. But, as he had said, both boats were insufficiently manned, and yet hon. members would observe that the amount put down on the Estimates was double what was voted last year for the "Kate." That the "Lucinda" required a larger crew was shown by the fact that when either she or the "Otter" was wanted a portion of the crew had to be transferred from one to the other. It would undoubtedly cost a great deal more to keep those two vessels than it did to keep the "Kate." No one, however, could deny, and nobody did deny, that it was a proper thing to supply the place of the "Kate" with a better boat, but when the Colonial Secretary said the "Lucinda" was not fit for the work done by the "Kate" he did not think the hon. gentleman was saying what was correct. She could do the work and a great deal more if she was constructed on the lines originally proposed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said exception had been taken to the phrase "Government yacht," but he thought that was not an inapt expression to use. It was right for the Government of the colony—he did not mean the Ministry of the day, but the colony—to have a vessel fit to go to sea, which might properly be called the "Government yacht," like the steamer of the New South Wales Government. It was proper that a Government should have a vessel not only fit, but also available, for that purpose. As the leader of the Opposition had said, the "Lucinda" was ordered to do the work of the "Kate," and a great deal more. She could do nearly all the work of the "Kate" and a great deal more, but he did not think she was fitted for carrying heavy goods on deck, as she had not enough deck accommodation. He thought she was certainly wanted. If they did not have

that boat the Government would have to charter another, and he was of opinion that in the present condition of affairs it would be very unwise to compel the Government to sell the "Lucinda."

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he remembered giving some attention to the "Lucinda" when she was ordered. He knew that she was ordered for the purpose of doing all the work that the "Kate" did, and the increased service that would be necessitated by Dunwich and St. Helena growing bigger places. The hon. gentlemen said she would not carry cargo.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Sheep on deck.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he saw the vessel on the stocks, and noticed that she was provided with double the amount of cargo accommodation possessed by the "Kate." He knew that that was the case, unless the Government had altered her construction.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: We have made no change.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said then she had double the cargo accommodation of the "Kate." He could quite understand that the captain, three seamen, and a boy would not care very much about carrying sheep near the fore-cabin, which was to accommodate members of Parliament. They were responsible for keeping the ship in good order and repair, and the boat was insufficiently manned. She was, however, capable of doing the work of the "Kate," and had more accommodation than that boat.

Mr. BEATTIE said there must have been a wonderful alteration in the boat since she was seen on the stocks by the leader of the Opposition. The "Lucinda" had only got a little space, about six feet broad, before the fore-cabin, near the men's mess-room. That was the whole of the hold-space she had for carrying, and he was satisfied that she was totally unadapted for the carrying of sheep or a large quantity of bricks on her deck, as had been done with the "Kate." Not many bricks could be put on the "Lucinda" without destroying some of the fine work about her. The late Government deserved credit for ordering a vessel of that description, and he should be sorry to see her sold. It was a great advantage to the Government to have a vessel like her. With reference to the "Otter," he had heard it said that the Government gave too much for her during the recent war-scare. Certainly there were some funny things done during that war-scare, to which he should refer later on; but as far as the "Otter" was concerned the Government got full value for their money. Some thought that £15,000 was a very long price to pay for her, but he had it on good authority that it cost £12,500 to get her out. Her original cost at home was £9,700, and after the cost of fetching her out was allowed for, the price paid for her by the Government would not leave a very large margin of profit. He hoped the hon. member would not press his amendment to a division, because, although the "Lucinda" might not do all that those who ordered her expected her to do, she was both a useful and an exceedingly ornamental boat. He had heard it stated that Mr. Denny, of the eminent shipbuilding firm of Denny Brothers, had said that, seeing it was the first order of the kind the firm had had from the Queensland Government, they would construct a boat that would do credit to themselves; and, instead of making any money on the building of the "Lucinda," their account was on the other side of the ledger. They had certainly turned

out a very fine vessel, with appliances and fittings second to those of no vessel which he had seen for many years come into Queensland.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was an absolute necessity, now that the outside ports were becoming of such importance, that the Government should have a steamer at their disposal to take the Governor or the Ministers up the coast occasionally. And with only one steamer, if the "Lucinda" was engaged in work of that kind, what would become of the necessary work in the Bay, at Dunwich and St. Helena?

Mr. HAMILTON said it was very unfeeling on the part of the hon. member for Port Curtis to make the proposition he had made. The hon. membersurely could not realise all that it involved. It meant that the Government would be debarred of their pleasant trips down the Bay, to which they no doubt looked pleasantly forward at the end of the exhausting labours of the week; and that in future they would have to go to sea at their own expense. The "Lucinda" might not be fit to carry sheep to Dunwich and St. Helena, but she was certainly fit for carrying the shepherd of the Opposition and his very docile flock when he wished to reward them for their proper conduct in the House.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What? Shepherd of the Opposition!

Mr. HAMILTON said he meant the Government. The Opposition had not had a chance. Perhaps when they got one their views might be somewhat modified. The "Lucinda's" luxurious cabins were beautifully suited for the shepherd of the Opposition—he meant the Government—to treat his flock by allowing them now and then to sniff the invigorating breezes of the briny ocean. Some might consider that it was rather hard, after having taxed the poor sewing-girls 10s. on each machine, that they should be reduced to such straits as to tax them in that way in order that the Government might be possessed of a luxurious steam-yacht. It had been said that if there was only one steamer and the "Lucinda" was up the coast with a Ministerial party there would be no vessel available for the ordinary work of the Bay. But the "Kate" was sufficient for all the work before, and no doubt the "Otter," which was a much better and faster vessel, would answer every purpose.

Mr. ARCHER said he was satisfied, after the speech of the hon. member for Mulgrave, that there had been a considerable deviation made in the "Lucinda's" accommodation from the original order. To fit her for her work it would be necessary to shorten her hurricane deck forward, or still better to send her down to Melbourne, where she would no doubt be much admired, for sale. It was evident she was not fit to do the work of the "Kate," and there was no use talking as if she was, as, according to the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, she had neither hold nor deck space.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH asked if the Colonial Secretary had any idea how often the vessels were used? He generally saw them moored, except on Saturdays. Hon. members need only look how the vessels were manned to see that they were not intended to be worked. The "Lucinda" had better engines and required less firing than the old "Kate," but there was only one fireman provided for her, and it was impossible that one fireman could do all the work of a sea-going vessel by himself. The vote had been cut down to the lowest farthing; it was even less than the amount voted last year for the "Kate."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they were not intended to be at work daily, of course. He could not say how many days in the week the "Lucinda" was employed; probably not as often

as the "Kate" used to be. The estimate was sufficient to meet the annual expenditure—for if she was not at work daily it was not necessary to keep up a full crew. When she went on a sea voyage she required extra hands. On broad principles, it was absolutely necessary that there should be a vessel at the command of the Government for cruising along the coast, for their use, or to accommodate His Excellency the Governor when he wished to go to the northern parts of the colony. If there were no other reason for keeping the vessel, that would be quite sufficient reason.

Mr. WAKEFIELD said that when they took into consideration the fact that fifteen years ago the "Kate" was fully occupied they could hardly be accused of extravagance in keeping two vessels for use on their very large seaboard.

Mr. HAMILTON said the argument was used that it was economical to keep the "Lucinda" in the event of the Governor or members of the Government wishing to go north. Well, during the last ten years he supposed the Governor had gone north about twice, and the members of the Ministry about half-a-dozen times. Supposing they went once every two years, it would actually cost £10,000 to carry the Governor and the Ministers up north three or four times, while in the ordinary way it could be done at the expense of as many hundreds.

Mr. McMASTER said that if the hon. member for Cook would look back ten years he would find there was much more importance attached to the Northern ports now than ten years ago, and it was necessary that there should be a vessel in the possession of the Government able to make a visit to those ports at any time. As a matter of economy it was desirable that the Government should have two vessels. He could quite understand parties speaking to the hon. member for Fassifern saying that one boat was enough and that the other ought to be disposed of. Those gentlemen probably had vessels to hire to the Government, and he would like to know what the Government had paid for the hire of vessels going to St. Helena and Dunwich. If the Government could not keep a boat like the "Lucinda" for Ministerial trips or for the Governor's use when he wished to go north, they must be poorer than he anticipated. It was far better to have a vessel of their own than to have to engage one of the A.S.N. Company's boats whenever they wished to make a trip. It would be absurd to sell the vessel after it had only been four or five months in the colony, and it did not look well for such a proposal to come from the very gentleman who ordered it, just because his party did not happen to be on the Ministerial benches.

Mr. NORTON said he thought the question might be discussed without imputing dishonourable motives to those who had raised it. The hon. member, as a new member, might be a little more guarded, and give members on the Opposition side credit for acting honestly. Did the hon. member hear what fell from the Colonial Secretary—that the boat was not fit for the purpose for which she had been ordered? The late Government did not order the boat with the idea of making it a Government yacht; they intended her to do the work previously done by the "Kate." The present Government said the "Lucinda" could not do the work. He did not profess to know much about vessels himself; he did not generally go on them when he could keep off; but his reason for proposing the reduction was that he believed one vessel was sufficient. He did not care a straw which boat they kept; it certainly seemed undesirable to part with the "Lucinda" if she could be made to do the work—and he believed she could. He had no doubt

that the real difficulty was that the Government did not want to dirty her, or she could be easily altered so as to do the whole work done by the "Kate," and do it far better. His object in proposing the reduction was to get an expression from the Committee as to the desirability of economising. Whenever a private member tried to reduce expenditure the Government always had a majority to prevent it. Almost every man on the Government side tried to support the employment of the boats, and yet they knew perfectly well that one boat was quite enough. If His Excellency or the Ministry wanted to go along the coast they could do it quite easily without keeping a boat for the purpose. It had always been done before. So far as he could remember, the Governor of the colony had twice gone to the Northern ports in a boat which was not usually running on the coast. In the first place, the Marquis of Normanby went up in the "Kate," and His Excellency, the present Governor, went up in the "Governor Blackall" to Mackay.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And to Cooktown.

Mr. NORTON: Those were the only instances he knew. Could anyone doubt for a moment that arrangements could be made with the A.S.N. Company, or any other firm trading on the coast, by which His Excellency, or any of the Ministers, could get up north without any inconvenience? It was for the Committee to consider whether at the present time it was desirable to incur the extra expense of keeping a separate boat for that purpose. An attempt had been made to fasten on members of the Opposition, who were in the late Ministry, the reproach of desiring to get rid of the boat now because they could not make use of it. That was a paltry, contemptible argument, because they managed to do very well with the "Kate" when they were in power. She did all the work required, and he never heard any complaint as to her not being sufficient. He repeated that it was a paltry thing, when a member proposed a reduction in the Estimates for the purpose of getting an expression of opinion, that hon. members should use such miserable arguments as had been used. He did not care whether the vote was passed or not. He would as soon withdraw the motion as divide upon it with the certainty of defeat, but at the same time he did think that when the Premier had invited members to point out any item in which economy could be practised—when members of the Committee occupied a considerable time in discussing small items in which they thought some retrenchment should be attempted—it was a most extraordinary thing that when a real attempt was made at reducing unnecessary expenditure members on the Government side should oppose it.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he could not support the motion made by his hon. friend the member for Port Curtis, because he did not think the "Lucinda" should be sold. He did not think they could get a better boat for the purpose, and no good could result by reducing the vote; but he would draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the item under consideration was a very gross piece of extravagance. They had not the slightest use for two steamers to do the work in the Bay. The Government confessed that the "Kate," so long as she was in work, could do the whole of the work. She could do the work for Ministers as often as they wanted, and she was often at the service of different members of the community; so much was she in request by the general public that eventually her use by them had to be put a stop to. Then again she was used by the Government Printing Office and other Government

departments, and also was frequently at the disposal of members of the Opposition. That the "Lucinda" was able to do the work he had no doubt, and the extravagance existed in keeping the "Otter" in work, and he believed that 50 per cent. more would be expended upon her than was put down in the Estimates. They knew very well, besides, that the "Lucinda" could not be worked with the staff provided for her, the cost of which was a few pounds less than the "Kate," and that altogether the two steamers would be a costly luxury. He had to urge that the present was an occasion upon which they had been able to find an item which could fairly be reduced, and in which the Government might show some economy.

Mr. SALKELD asked the Colonial Secretary how much the "Lucinda" and "Otter" cost, respectively?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said £15,060 was given for the "Otter," the odd £60 being for spare additional screws. He could not say how much the cost for working up to the present time, putting the gun on board, etc., was, but he believed the hon. member did not want to know that. The "Lucinda" cost £14,203—her first cost. Then there were some repairs, which cost £773. Her outfit cost £1,480, and expenses of the voyage out £1,327, insurance £494, and expenses since her arrival in Brisbane £1,096; total, £19,375. The expenditure for repairs was caused by her striking on a rock after leaving Dumbarton.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Was she insured?

The PREMIER: Yes. The accident was covered by insurance.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: What was her actual cost?

The PREMIER: About £17,000.

Mr. MIDGLEY said the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster, had mildly insinuated that he (Mr. Midgley) had said what he did because he or his friends or acquaintances were interested in or had a boat for hire.

Mr. McMASTER: No, no!

Mr. MIDGLEY said he had so understood the hon. member.

Mr. McMASTER: I said possibly some gentleman might have had vessels.

Mr. MIDGLEY said it was a mild insinuation.

Mr. NORTON: He might as well have said it straight out.

Mr. MIDGLEY: The hon. member must know him better than that. The people who had spoken to him were of this kind: they looked upon the colony as one containing only about 300,000 persons; they knew they were one of the most heavily taxed peoples in the world; they knew that they were passing through very hard times, and they looked to members of that House to do their duty in exercising economy and retrenchment where they could possibly do so. Now, he had been wondering, while listening to the debate, how the Minister for Works got on on board the "Lucinda." He would not like to be eavesdropping, but he should like to hear the hon. gentleman and see how his righteous soul must be vexed when he thought of the extravagance of employing those two boats when one would be sufficient. If the hon. gentleman could only be got on the cross-benches for a few minutes he would make a more able and telling speech against the vote than anyone there present. He (Mr. Midgley) did not think that the fact that the colony had grown somewhat during the last few years justified that extraordinary expenditure. The means of communication

during the same time had vastly improved. They had several shipping companies with good boats trading on the coast, and the occasional visits of the Cabinet or His Excellency the Governor to the Northern ports would not cost very much by those steamers. He understood that the proposal of the hon. member for Port Curtis was to do away with the "Otter," and that the hon. gentleman proposed the omission of the item of £1,134.

Mr. NORTON: No.

Mr. MIDGLEY said he thought that that should be the item to reduce, and that the hon. member had selected the wrong item. The opinion of the Committee should be expressed as to the advisableness of doing away with the "Otter" and making the "Lucinda" serviceable for the work she was required to perform. He should be sorry to see the hon. member withdraw his motion. He had always noticed that when an hon. member proposed a reduction of the Estimates, and his motion was met unfavourably, it was withdrawn. Now, that was not the way to reduce expenditure, and if a course of that kind was always pursued no economy would be effected. He was sorry that hon. gentlemen on his side did not take the same view with regard to the extra boat as he did, because he was perfectly convinced the want of the second one would not be felt. The hon. the leader of the Opposition had stated that there was only crew sufficient for one boat.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: I did not say that.

Mr. MIDGLEY: That there would be more common seamen required. If there had been only one boat some of the officers could be dispensed with—a master and engineer, for instance. He thought all the arguments were in favour of doing away with the second boat. If the "Otter" could be sold for a fair price they would have not only the money, but save the expenditure for the second crew and ship's officers.

Mr. HAMILTON said he hoped the hon. member for Port Curtis would not withdraw his motion, because it was only right that hon. members should have an opportunity of placing on record their opinion of the vote. If he heard reasons sufficient to justify the retention of the two boats he should vote for it. But the argument in favour of their retention was ridiculously absurd. The only reason that had been advanced was, that possibly the Governor might wish to go up north, and it was necessary that one of the boats should be kept to do the work in the Bay. But they had two other Government boats that would answer all the purposes required in the Bay—the "Laura" and the "Pippo." It was therefore clear that the reasons advanced for the retention of the two boats would not hold water, and he should vote for the reduction unless some sufficient reason was given against it.

Mr. FOOTE said he did not agree with the economy of the hon. member for Fassifern. The "Lucinda" had only arrived recently, and the "Otter" had been purchased this year in consequence of the war-scare. At the time the "Lucinda" was ordered she was considered necessary, and the contingency that had arisen since had caused the purchase of the other boat. So far as his experience in those matters had gone, he had always noticed that whenever the Committee had attempted to economise they seemed to go about it in the wrong way. As the boats in question had only just come into the possession of the Government, he should vote for the motion as it stood. If the Government were to attempt to sell the

"Lucinda," he believed that between reduction in value, agency charges, and so on, they would lose something like £5,000 or £6,000 before they parted with her, and that would keep her for four years at any rate. He did not believe in the cheese-paring system of economy proposed. It was quite clear to him that the "Otter" was very well fitted for the service she had to perform, and he was equally satisfied that the "Lucinda" was not well fitted for the work she was expected to do. However, she had been recently obtained, and if next year it could be shown that they had no use for her, he for one would go in for selling her. But until they had proof of that he should not do so. He was quite aware that considerable expense had been incurred from time to time by the hire or charter of boats for Government purposes. Even for Bay work large sums of money had been expended in that way when the Government had only one boat to do the work, and the same thing would result if they parted with one of the boats in question. He certainly was surprised to see the "Lucinda" fitted out in the way in which she was. He did not know who was responsible for it—whether it was the previous Government, who had ordered her, or whether the alteration had been made since. At the present time she was certainly a very handsome boat, and, in his opinion, the Government ought to have a boat of that sort, seeing that at any time His Excellency the Governor might wish to go north, or the Government might wish to dispatch parties along the coast. In the event of that happening, they would have a boat of their own at their command. He remembered an occasion, some years ago, when that House ordered boats to be built in connection with a mail contract. Supposing a contingency of that kind were to arise again, they would have the "Lucinda" on the spot quite capable of undertaking the work. He thought the Government should be in an independent position in relation to matters of that sort. He should therefore support the motion as it stood.

Mr. PALMER said there was one matter that he thought required explanation with regard to the "Lucinda." The hon. the leader of the Opposition had stated that he saw her when she was on the stocks, and that she had ample accommodation for carrying all that was required of her. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley—who, he believed, was an authority on those matters—had, on the other hand, assured the Committee that she had not six feet of space in her for stowage accommodation. The Premier had also assured them that she was not fitted in any way to do the work that the "Kate" was qualified to do. The question, therefore, arose—How, when, or where was the change effected, and by whose authority? It was originally intended that she should be built to carry cargo and make herself generally useful up and down the river; but it now appeared that she was not so, and somebody must be responsible for the change.

The PREMIER said he understood the change was made by the builders. He believed they tried to see how nicely they could turn the vessel out, and they had made no extra charge for the alterations, which, no doubt, improved her appearance, but at the same time prevented the carrying of cargo on deck to any extent.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he was perfectly certain that the builders would not alter the whole character of the ship unless they had some authority for the alteration. He knew perfectly well—having seen the ship on the stocks and almost finished—that she had then ample storage accommodation provided, but

somehow or another he believed the yacht idea had afterwards got into the heads of the builders. He did not believe that it got there spontaneously, but was satisfied that it came from the Government or from some people who had authority from them. He had not the slightest notion whom they got their instructions from that she was to be altered to a yacht, and he did not see why she should not be altered back again. Of course the motion of the hon. member for Port Curtis had not much meaning, because he simply proposed to strike off £1,014, which would mean doubling the allowance for stores and victualling to the vessel that remained. If that motion were carried, of course the Government must find some other means of doing the work of one of the vessels.

Mr. NORTON said it might be thought that the Committee always quoted economy when they wished to encourage extravagance. At all events, extravagance was certainly encouraged by those who supported the vote at present under discussion. The amendment would not bind the Government to do without either one or other of the boats, as it only meant the reduction of the vote by £1,014, the sum required for the crew of the "Lucinda." With the permission of the Committee, he would withdraw the amendment with the view of altering it by substituting the sum required for the crew of the "Otter," and half the amount set down as contingencies. In other words, he would move that the vote be reduced by £2,800.

Question—That the amendment be withdrawn—put and passed, and amendment withdrawn.

Mr. NORTON moved that the vote be reduced by £2,869.

Question put and negatived.

Mr. BEATTIE said there was one evident mistake in those Estimates. The seamen on board the Torres Straits schooner were paid only 1s. 10d. a day, whilst those on the "Lucinda" were allowed 2s. It was not fair to expect the Torres Straits men to work for less than those employed on the Brisbane boats.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed the present rates of pay had been in existence for many years.

Mr. BEATTIE said he was aware of that, but he also knew that there had been a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst the Torres Straits men on the subject. Those men also complained about the salt meat they had to live on. Those things he heard from the sailors themselves when they paid their visits to Brisbane.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Well, why do they not complain to the proper authority?

Mr. BEATTIE said that sailors, when they came on shore after sticking in the Torres Straits for six or seven months, never thought of intruding on the Colonial Secretary, and, indeed, had other business to occupy their attention. Those in charge of their department ought to have seen the injustice complained of and have had it rectified.

Mr. SALKELD asked what was the usual work done during the week by the "Lucinda" and "Otter"?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was not in a position to give exact information in reply to that question. The work of the two vessels was different. The "Lucinda" was engaged two or three days in the week. She was certainly away two or three days in the week from her moorings. Some ships of Her Majesty's fleet were here during the last week or two, and the "Otter" and "Lucinda" were engaged

continually in visiting them. If the Government had not had a vessel of their description they would have had to charter one.

Mr. SALKELD said the Colonial Secretary ought to be able to give more precise information as to the regular work of the vessels in question.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he could only state that the "Otter" had to attend to Dunwich, St. Helena, and Lytton, visiting them sometimes twice a week. She had also to do various other things. The "Lucinda" had another description of work to do. She was a yacht belonging to the Government of the colony. She was at the disposal of the Governor when he required her. Ministers sometimes used her. She had also to go sometimes to sea, and had to attend the ships of Her Majesty's fleet, and afford the means of showing those hospitalities which the colony was bound to show towards vessels of Her Majesty's fleet which could not come up to our wharves. Her duties were, in fact, of a varied character, and it was impossible to say how many hours she was actually employed per week.

Mr. SALKELD said the Colonial Secretary had now given the information he had asked for.

Mr. MIDGLEY said that what had fallen from the Colonial Secretary in no way justified the employment of the two boats. Hon. members had all known before that those vessels went to Dunwich, St. Helena, and Lytton, and that they paid their respects to the Admiral when he visited the Bay; but to his mind the latter duty ought, in the eternal fitness of things, to be done by the war boats. He supposed they were rotting through doing nothing. It was a very reasonable request of the hon. member for Ipswich to ascertain how many days in a week those vessels were engaged.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he thought the Colonial Secretary should seize the opportunity of getting himself out of a difficulty. How he was going to employ both the "Lucinda" and the "Otter" he did not know, nor did the hon. gentleman himself. There was not four days' work a week for one. During the time he was Colonial Secretary there was two days' work a week for certain, and all the work could have been done in three days. The rest of the time the steamer was at the disposal of the Ministry, and he could have had her three days a week down at Southport if he had chosen. The work was no heavier now than it was then, as there were more prisoners kept in Brisbane and fewer at St. Helena. The hon. gentleman ought to accept it as a relief, and as an expression of opinion from the Committee—as to whether they should vote all the money or not—that both those vessels were not wanted. With respect to showing courtesy to Her Majesty's fleet when they came, there was no provision made in the Estimates for that, as they found nothing for champagne, and only £7 a month for a cook. Such a thing was not contemplated by the Government. The hon. gentleman should make a clean breast of it, and be very glad for the Committee to tell him there was not work enough for both vessels.

Mr. NORTON said he did not think hon. members on the Government side ought to ask so many questions; they had got at the reason pretty well. The "Lucinda" was intended to carry the "pure merinoes" on excursions down the Bay, and the "Otter" had to take the "black sheep" to St. Helena. That was about the size of it.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £35,591 be voted for the Land Force. The items on the Estimates last year were to a certain

extent of a tentative character, as the Defence Act had not been passed, and it was uncertain how many men would be enrolled. A considerable saving had been effected out of the money then voted. The success of the Defence Act had been very gratifying indeed. No doubt it was assisted by the danger of war at the beginning of the present year. Some hon. members had spoken about a war-scare; but there was no scare in the colony, although the colony recognised the imminence of danger, and the Government took those steps they considered necessary in all parts of the colony. The most gratifying alacrity was shown on the part of the colonists in coming forward and enrolling themselves under the provisions of the Defence Act. A very considerable number of volunteers had come in, also, under the volunteer clauses of that Act. At the end of last year, when the Act came into operation, there were only 1,000 men in the colony altogether, and on the 30th June last they had 1,528 men of the Defence Force proper, effective for duty, and 718 members of volunteer corps, in addition to 339 members of rifle clubs. Since then 772 additional men had been added to the list during July and August; so that at the present time they could count upon 3,000 men, more or less effective, as against 1,000 men at the end of last year, which was a most satisfactory result. With respect to the details of the estimate, there was a slight increase in the permanent staff—that of a musketry instructor, for the benefit of the men in the Northern districts, and it was proposed that he should reside at Charters Towers, and act as a general instructor to the Northern Division. There was also a paymaster appointed, which was very necessary now that the clerical work had so much increased. There was an item of a "master tailor," which had been transferred from the Permanent Force; and also two additional sergeant instructors. There was an increase of six submarine miners whom it had been found absolutely necessary to get. There could be no doubt that a very important part of the defence of Brisbane and other towns on the coast, which were approached by rivers, would be by submarine mining, and when they had to make provision at the commencement of the year for defending Brisbane they found they were practically reduced to one or two men to keep that branch of the service going: so that had any accident happened to either of those men they would have had no means of working the mines. It was therefore recommended that they should apply to the Imperial Government for the services of some submarine miners, so that there would always be some men ready to take up that work. There was no change in the estimate for headquarters band, except £50 for extra parades. The vote for field artillery was the same as before, as was that for the garrison artillery. The vote for engineers was slightly changed, as the force was proposed to be divided into engineers and submarine miners. Under the heading of "Moreton Regiment" there was an increase of two companies, which were now filled up, and it was proposed to have four additional companies in other parts of the colony. There were fourteen companies outside the Moreton regiment and twelve of them were filled up. The Moreton mounted infantry showed a double amount of members, there being forty men in Beenleigh in addition to those in Brisbane. There was an increase of £1,000 for uniforms and equipments, as the amount was barely sufficient last year. There was a large increase in the item of "capitation allowance" for volunteers, as £1,500 was put down. It was expected that at the end of the year there would be 600 efficient

volunteers, at a capitation allowance of £2 10s. per head. At present there were more than 600 volunteers, and it was expected that there would be 600 "efficient." The amount for ammunition and stores was the same as before. The item "ammunition for sale to members" was omitted. The items with respect to "camps of instruction and maintenance of rifle ranges" were increased, and an amount of £1,750 was set down for a steam-launch in connection with torpedoes. The operations connected with the laying of torpedoes at Lytton were attended with the greatest difficulty. The only vessel available was a small launch belonging to the Harbours and Rivers Department, which had to be detached from its regular work, and which proved altogether inefficient. In order that torpedoes might be laid properly the men performing the work must be trained; but at the present time there were no means of giving men instruction, so that the work was done in a clumsy and unsatisfactory manner. There was no use in having torpedo corps and torpedoes unless the men knew how to lay them, and it could not be done without practice. The item for "horsing guns," etc., was the same as before. The sum of £1,500 was set down for deferred pay. To encourage men to remain in the force the full time some of their pay was withheld, and the money was payable at the end of their time. The amount now asked for would be payable to those who had been in the force under the old system. The sum of £58 allowance to infantry staff-officer, required some explanation. Captain Des Vœux was engaged for a period of four or five years, at £400 a year, and a claim was afterwards made by the Indian Government of one-seventh of his salary, whatever it might be; so that in paying that amount his salary would be reduced. The intention of the Government was that he should receive for his services £400 a year clear, and under the circumstances, to effect the intention of the Government, the amount of £58 was placed on the Estimates. Hon. members had, no doubt, recently seen the report of the Commandant, and he thought they might congratulate themselves on the force being in a satisfactory condition. He hoped it would continue so, though he trusted the necessity for active service would not arise. The danger, however, was by no means over yet. Something had been said in regard to danger, and he might state that those who knew most about it knew that there was a great deal of danger, that war was contemplated and expected, and that complete arrangements had been made for a raid on the Australian coasts.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the vote just passed was but a drop in the bucket compared with the one now under consideration. He looked upon the Defence Force as a delusion and a snare. To begin with, it would never be in a position to defend the colony, because it was far too small. Suppose the Russians had come at the time of the scare, what would the Defence Force have done?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They would have protected us.

Mr. MACFARLANE said there was a sham fight at Lytton, and the sham soldiers did their duty manfully in protecting the port of Brisbane and sending back the warship which came to destroy them; but it was only a sham fight after all. When the Act was under discussion he opposed it, but was supported by only one or two. He told hon. members that it would become such an enormous item on the Estimates before long that it would open their eyes, and he believed their eyes were beginning to be opened now. Last

year the vote for the Defence Force was £23,000, and now it was £35,591, besides which there was a sum of nearly £11,000 for the marine force. And that was not all, for if hon. members looked at the schedule they would find £510 set down for the officers of the Permanent Force; that was to say, £230 extra for the commandant, £150 extra for the brigade major, £50 for the infantry staff-officer, and so on. If to the amounts he had mentioned they added the items on account of the warships they would find that the defence of the colony cost pretty nearly £100,000 a year. That was rather a serious item, and he supposed it would grow. Hon. members had been fighting little things, but now they had an opportunity of fighting great things, and unless nipped in the bud those officers of the Permanent Force would have power to run the colony terribly into debt in a very short time. It was not a matter to laugh at, but a matter to be thought of seriously; and while the hon. and gallant member for Carnarvon would no doubt defend the vote with all his might and main, the Committee should take into their serious consideration the magnitude of the vote and the uselessness of the force it was intended to maintain. There would no doubt be another scare; they would always come, like smallpox and other scares, and the scare was simply used to keep the order in motion. The hon. member for Port Curtis had moved a reduction in regard to a little matter, and he hoped that hon. member would support him in opposing the item now under consideration.

Mr. NORTON said that the hon. member might have supported him when he moved the reduction on the last item.

Mr. MIDGLEY: You should have divided the Committee.

Mr. NORTON said he would have done so if he had received the slightest encouragement from hon. members opposite, only two of whom—the hon. member for Fassifern and the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Salkeld—gave him their support. Was it likely, under the circumstances, that he was going to waste time by dividing the Committee? So far as the senior member for Ipswich was concerned he did not know whether he had made out a good case or not. It seemed to him they were committed to the vote and could not get out of it. He took the opportunity, as he had got up, of asking the Colonial Secretary a question, but they had a volunteer corps formed at Gladstone not long ago; they were now in working order and all they wanted was a drill-shed. There was a shed on the wharf which might be used for the purpose, and which was applied for, but the Colonial Treasurer had written him to say that he had fully considered the matter, and the result of his consideration was that they could not have it. He (Mr. Norton) did not know whether any other arrangements had been made to enable them to get a drill-shed. He would suggest that they might use a large room in the town hall for the purpose, if the Government did not want to erect a drill-shed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know that any conclusion had been come to with respect to that question.

Mr. NORTON: The Colonial Treasurer wrote to me to say so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was a shed on the wharf which he thought might have been used for the purpose. If, as the hon. member said, there was a large room in the town hall which might be used for the purpose he should have thought the municipal council would have been only too glad to put it at the disposal of the volunteer corps. He should be surprised to hear that the municipal council wanted the

Government to pay for it. He was anxious to facilitate the efficiency of the corps, and if the Government had any room it should be put at their disposal.

Mr. NORTON said he did not wish the Colonial Secretary to understand that the municipal council asked for payment. He did not know whether it had been suggested or not; but when the Treasurer refused to give the use of the wharf shed he suggested that that room which was used for theatrical and such performances might be engaged for the purpose of a drill-shed. The Government ought to see that the corps got a drill-room somehow.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Government would make the best arrangements they could.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that now the hon. member had got his drill-shed he might say that the vote before them required to be dealt with very seriously. The hon. Premier had just told them that he viewed with great satisfaction the successful result of the Defence Act, and he instanced the gratifying report by the Commandant that had just been put into their hands. He had only seen it that day, and he did not know why it was so late in appearing. Hon. members had not had an opportunity of seeing it before that day. He had looked through the report, and did not find that any gratifying results had been accomplished as yet from the Defence Act. The hon. gentleman also pointed to the success of the Government efforts under the Act to resist the pressure of the war-scare as one of the gratifying results of the Act. He did not see himself that the Act had had very much to do with it. He was surprised at the ingratitude of the hon. member for Ipswich, who boasted now from his corner that he was the solitary individual who opposed the Defence Act last year. If the hon. member looked back to the columns of the debate upon that Act he would find how hopelessly he (Sir T. McIlwraith) appealed to the otherside to resist saddling the colony with the expenditure which the Defence Act was bound to entail upon it, and he would see further how little support he got. They really got very little assistance in economy from the hon. member. The other night he had listened to find what the result would be when another item was under consideration. The Colonial Secretary brought down his estimate for police magistrates and clerks of petty sessions, and that estimate was considered by everybody in the Committee a most moderate estimate. There was only an increase of a few pounds upon the previous year's estimate, and it was virtually a decrease upon the previous year's estimate on the whole; but the hon. member for Ipswich chose to take the opportunity of exercising his economical powers on that question, and asked the Opposition to assist him in reducing a vote which was actually less than the vote for the same purpose in the previous year. That was wrong. If he had taken the same opportunity in the year before he would have had good ground to act upon, because the estimate in that year was increased by 20 per cent., yet there was no effort on the hon. member's part to go in for economy then, although the increase was pointed out by the Opposition side of the Committee. That was the way they slipped into extravagance. He considered the £46,000 spent upon the Defence Force of Queensland one of the most extravagant items on the Estimates, and in spite of the expenditure he could not see that they were very much better defended than before. He questioned very much if the increase in the number of the Defence Force was due so much

to the Defence Act. During the war-scare there was an immense amount of military enthusiasm shown, and he hoped it would lead to good results. He attributed the good results which had been achieved in the Defence Force to that, because the people realised the danger. He could not attribute it at all to the Act passed last year. What they could attribute to the Act was the £46,000 placed on the Estimates. There was £33,591 set down for the land force, and £10,972 for the marine force. In round numbers, there was £46,000 set down between those two items. They would be only drawing a correct inference in supposing that that amount would increase and would be higher next year. If it was not higher next year it would be simply due to the whole thing being a failure and the men not coming forward. He did not believe that that would be the case, because they had only to look at the pay received by the men in the Defence Force. The quartermaster-sergeant got 5s. 6d. per diem, sergeants 4s., corporals 3s. 6d., bombardiers 3s., gunners, drivers, and trumpeters 2s. 3d.; and the Commandant in his report said:—

"From the above it may appear, at first sight, that the pay is very small, but when it is considered that the men are paid for Sunday and week-day, and whether sick or well, that they are housed, clothed, and fed, it will be evident that even the lowest ranks are as well off as men getting 3s. to 35s. per week in civil life, and they would rarely have to work so hard; consequently, although a high standard has been fixed, there has been little difficulty in obtaining recruits."

He could well understand that. Any man who knew the colony and what was going to take place in the next twelve months in the reduction of wages could well understand that there would be a large increase in the number of men joining the Defence Force when the men were paid at those rates. The question was whether, in saddling the colony with that permanent expense, they were any nearer their defence than they were before? He did not think they were. Suppose the Russians came down here, as it was at one time feared they would, would they, even if they voted that sum on the Estimates, be in a position to meet the Russian vessels? He did not think they would. The only effective operations that had been carried out were in the Brisbane River, and were very much for the protection of Brisbane. Not the slightest thing had been done to prevent an enemy doing any damage at other places. What was the opinion of the naval authorities who came here to view their efforts? He had never heard any of them say, nor had he ever read in any of their reports to their Government, that they regarded anything that had been done as a defence of the colony. They looked upon what had been done as entirely subsidiary to the defence of the colony. The defence must take place outside; they must not allow hostile ships to get into the Bay. But instead of paying money for the defence of their shores, which should be the joint work of all the colonies, this colony was spending £46,000 a year on a thing that was useless for that purpose. Of course, he considered that there should be a volunteer system, but not a paid defence force. He believed that the paid Defence Force would be a demoralising force. He did not think the colony was in a fit state to employ soldiers all the year round, and he hoped they would never have to do that. In his opinion it was better to pay men to be volunteers. They could not possibly employ a large defence force, giving the men very little work to do—and there was really very little work for them to do—without demoralising them and other portions of the community. But they were establishing a system which would result in that, and they were paying too high a price for it. £46,000 was too much. If they capitalised that sum they would be able to purchase two or three warships to keep off an enemy

from the coast, and if the other colonies did the same thing they would have a proper scheme of defence. He believed that an efficient volunteer force, not under the system propounded in the Act of which Colonel French was the founder, would be a great deal more effectual armament for the defence of the colony than the force they now had. The Colonial Secretary could himself remember that the Defence Act was taken on sufferance by the House. It was not approved of by the House. He (Sir T. McIlwraith) allowed it to pass because the Government and members on that side of the House had made up their minds that they would make the experiment. It was for that reason that the measure was allowed to pass, and not because hon. members believed it would be a great success. He thought that many hon. members doubted that it would be a success. He did not believe the system would be a success, because of the large expense it would involve compared with the advantage it would be to the colony. Considering that at the rate proposed they would expend £500,000 in ten years, the item of expense was a very serious matter. He believed they would have a more efficient defence with a little money spent on volunteers, and a great deal more spent on naval defence, which they had not touched yet. He would like to have been able to follow the Colonial Secretary in congratulating the Defence Force on having achieved such a success, but he could not find it from the report. He noticed that the report was devoted mostly, as they might have expected, to an account of the ordinary work at the encampment, and of the measures taken to defend the colony when the war-scare was on. There was nothing at all about the efficiency of the force. The great fact stood out that whereas a few years ago the Volunteer Force cost £20,000 a year they were now asked to vote £35,000, and were getting no nearer to the defence of the colony. He believed it was money thrown away.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was difficult to follow the hon. gentleman. If his argument meant anything it meant that they ought not to attempt to defend themselves on land but to confine themselves to defence at sea. Surely that was the height of absurdity. Suppose that a marine force were eluded or sunk, would they all lie down and allow the enemy to walk over them? Who ever heard of any marine force not being supplemented by a land force? Sometimes the hon. member said that the force was insufficient for protection, at other times that the force was no use at all and that they should not have any. He thought that whatever Defence Force they had, an efficient land force was certainly an essential part of it. Of course it was their business to keep the enemy off their shores if they could, and prevent them from landing, but they could only do that by having a sufficiently strong marine, capable of overpowering and sinking the enemy's ships. But surely they must have a land force to prevent the enemy landing, or, if they were not able to do that, to intercept them on the way to the capital, or any other town in the colony. Then, if they were to have a land force, what were they to have? They knew the hon. member believed in volunteers. They had tried the volunteer system for twenty years without success, and it was decided last year to try another plan, in which it was recognised that it was the duty of every person in the colony to defend his country, and by which it was provided that the men should be long enough in the force to become efficient soldiers—not in the sense of professional soldiers, but efficient in the use of arms and able to act together. They had tried that for six months, and so

far the results were very encouraging. The different companies had filled up, the men were taking an interest in their work, and, all things considered, the condition of the force at the present time was surprisingly good. The force, of course, was still on its trial. It had certainly been stimulated and encouraged by the circumstances that occurred at the beginning of the year, but they had now a force which, if it continued in its present position, would give them an army of 3,000 men, trained to arms and fit to take part in the defence of the country. Was that nothing? He thought it was a great deal. As to the expense of maintaining that, he thought if the cost per head they were asked to incur in Queensland was compared with the expense per head in other countries where provision was made for the defence of the country it would be found that the amount was less here than it was elsewhere. They could not in these days, when wars were going on, expect to be protected against invasion without putting their hands in their pockets and paying for it. It was no use looking to anybody else to defend them; they must defend themselves, and not depend on extraneous assistance. Nothing would be more lamentable than for an invading fleet to enter Moreton Bay, and, in the absence of their warships, come up to the capital and lay it under contribution. Nothing would be more lamentable or disgraceful than the loss occasioned by one raid of that kind; it would be more than the cost of the Defence Force for twenty or thirty years. The hon. gentleman seemed to assume that the money asked for was to be expended on a force that would not be efficient, and wanted to revert to a purely volunteer force; but, as he had already said, the Defence Force had only been in existence six months and was working well, while the volunteer system had been tried for twenty years, and was an admitted failure. With respect to the marine force—although the vote for that was not now before the Committee—the expenses asked for were for the "Gayundah," the torpedo boat, and the members of the Naval Brigade in the colony generally. That was the only floating defence the colony had at present—one ship, and a sufficient number of men to arm other vessels if the occasion arose. It was necessary to be, to some extent, prepared for contingencies. They could not go to the first shop in the street and order a fully equipped warship when the enemy's fleet was off the coast. Of the whole vote for the Defence Force £10,000 was for the gunboat, and when they reached that item he should be prepared to give the Committee some additional information as to the arrangements proposed to be made for naval defence. Those gunboats were not intended, nor were they fit, to go a long way from shore. Provision for fighting a hostile fleet at sea must be made by others than Queensland alone. For that purpose all the colonies ought to combine, but even if all the colonies were agreed upon that point it would involve the expenditure of money. It was no use at that time of day to think they could defend their coasts or preserve themselves from the danger of foreign invasion without the expenditure of money. His opinion was that the Australian colonies ought to combine to make an addition to the Australian Squadron, to be under the control of the Commander-in-Chief on the station, to be called the Australian fleet, belonging to the colonies, and maintained at their expense. It would cost some money, but so long as other nations were willing to make war and invade the colonies they must be prepared to meet them. The last was no idle threat of war. It was perfectly well known that arrangements had been made by the Russians for attacking the Australian colonies during the

late contemplated war. They had even arranged for an ample supply of coal for the purpose. The danger of invasion was not imaginary, but one that might occur again at any moment; and he should be sorry to think that the colony would be afraid to pay the necessary money for its own security. The mode in which the money was proposed to be spent was a wise and economical one. As to the permanent arm of the service, it consisted of fifty men, all of whom had plenty of work to do. They were actually serving as a school of instruction. Men were continually there from different corps and towns in the colony, learning their duties from day to day; and the officers of different companies were also engaged in drill nearly every day in the week. They were doing their work as a school of instruction, and in the course of a very short time they might expect to have a force of several thousand men ready at a moment's notice to take up arms, and not only ready, but who were drilled, and would work together under discipline. Such a force would make a strong defence against any attempted invasion of the colony. The work was not only a good one, but an absolutely necessary one if they were to deserve the name of a portion of the British nation; and he should be very sorry that any Parliament should ever take up the view that from motives of economy they should give up the notion of defending themselves.

Mr. SALKELD said his chief objection to the Defence Bill when it was passing through the House last year was that its tendency would be to saddle the colony with a military system, and the estimate they were now asked to grant only tended to confirm him in that opinion. He believed with the leader of the Opposition that the colony would be burdened with a constantly increasing expenditure on the Defence Force, unless the Committee expressed itself in a most decided manner against it. The amount last year, £23,000, seemed very large, but what was to be said about the vastly swollen sum now asked for, £35,000, to say nothing about an additional £11,000 on the marine force? Even those enormous sums would go on increasing unless a strict look-out was kept over them. He did not suppose any of the items would be reduced, though he would be glad to see a reduction in many of them. He would have voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Port Curtis had it gone to a division. He noticed that gunners, drivers, and trumpeters received 2s. 3d. a day. The hon. leader of the Opposition seemed to think there was no fear of the supply of men failing; but it seemed to him that the remarkable thing was that the Government in a country like this could get men to go soldiering for 2s. 3d. a day. He believed they would have too much volunteering and too many paid men. The Government seemed disposed to give the military chiefs full swing, and the whole colony would soon be under martial law. He noticed by the schedule that the Commandant received £900, £100 for forage allowances, and quarters valued at £130 a year. He would like to know where the quarters were situated?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are the quarters formerly occupied by the Commissioner of Police.

Mr. SALKELD said an approximate value ought to be given. It was a complete mansion, and no one could get anything like it for £130 a year. He knew a two-story house at the back of it, with four or five rooms, and a yard not larger than the floor of the House, that let for £2 10s. a week. The schedules were quite misleading. He thought there was too great a contrast between the pay of the privates and the

officers; they ought to be placed more on a level. He saw there was an amount for rations and fuel; he supposed all the officers and the men were provided with both rations and fuel.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not the officers.

Mr. MIDGLEY said the hon. member for Ipswich should know that it would not do for the men to get the same pay as the officers. The officers were paid the most because they were the least likely to be shot. It would not do to have so many highly paid men who were likely to meet with a violent death. There was an old saying that when rogues fell out honest men were likely to get their own. It was because the economical members so often fell out that the Government so often got their own way. Last year when those matters were under discussion he felt he could not support the economical members. The sentiments which had been expressed that night ought to actuate every patriotic Queenslander—they had something worth taking, and therefore worth defending, and they ought to take reasonable precautions to defend what they had. Something had been said by him about the scare that had been felt. The hon. member for Ipswich did not seem to understand the difference between a scare and a scar. The scare was when the Russians were coming, and the scar was when they were gone. His reason for what he said was this: There was great excitement and considerable friction between the country with which we were dealing and Russia, but the most sensible impression was that there would be no war, seeing that the Russians were not prepared for war, and seeing that at the head of affairs in England was a statesman who was not given to bombast, or overbearing, or domineering, but who was prepared to treat a great nation as it ought to be treated. Therefore, it was thought there would be ultimately an amicable solution of the difficulty. But the colony was perfectly justified in going in for a defence force. The volunteering had been a costly failure, and it was high time that, if they had a defence force at all, it should be on a better footing. He thought the present institution was something they were destined to have for a long time, and, with every regard to economy as well as efficiency, it was something they ought not to chafe and fret under. The colony was growing, and even if there was no danger in the time they had passed through, they should provide efficient means of defence for the future. The question was whether that efficient means of defence could be obtained without the rapid increase indicated on the Estimates. There was one question he would like to ask the Colonial Secretary. He had been told that since the Defence Act came into operation, volunteers, pure and simple, had been somewhat at a discount and in disfavour. Had not overtures made by young fellows in the city—patriotic, strong, and healthy—to form themselves into a defence corps been treated coldly and repelled? He thought the two things, a paid defence force and a volunteer force, might be made to work harmoniously together. He knew that a number of young men who offered their services as volunteers in a certain capacity found their services were declined in a way that was not pleasing or satisfactory to them. If they were to have an efficient defence force, and if there was to be a continuance of the present rapid increase of expenditure he would suggest that it would be far better to obtain regiments from England if possible, and to have two or three towns of the colony turned into regular garrison towns. He could not see that the cost would be much greater than under

the present system; and as there was no difficulty in obtaining from Great Britain assistance in the way of ships of war, so they would have no difficulty in getting two or three regiments from home, and carrying out his suggestion. He gave every credit to the gentlemen who organised the Defence Force, and yet at the same time he was free to admit that they were hardly deserving of such large salaries as they received. They should be well paid, but he thought it was hardly equitable that four officers should consume, by way of salary, one-twentieth part of the whole vote for defence purposes. It was a fact that the commandant, brigade-major, infantry instructor, and musketry instructor received between them a twentieth part of the whole vote, and he wished to draw the attention of the Colonial Secretary to that fact, and to the fact that for the services rendered some of those gentlemen were paid out of all proportion. He hoped the Government would be as rigid and resolute with regard to that branch of the Public Service as they appeared to be with others, and that during the coming year they would insist upon it that there should be no increase of expenditure. During the evening he had been informed by the Minister for Works that the Government were determined that there should be no increase during the coming year in any of the departments. He thought that was an excellent determination, and he hoped it would apply equally to the Defence Force.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he anticipated that no increase would be necessary on the vote for some years to come. Last year the amount required was merely conjectural, and in the coming year the only increase that would be necessary would be perhaps for extra companies. The Government had fixed the establishment that they considered would be necessary, but it would be hardly advisable at present to decline the services of any volunteers who might offer themselves. With respect to the question asked by the hon. member as to the discouragement which certain volunteers had received, he was not aware of anything of the kind having happened. He did not think the services of any volunteers had been discouraged, and to prove that he might just mention that in Brisbane alone there were 280 volunteers and in the colony altogether 925. He did not think that fact went to show that during the last six months volunteering had been discouraged.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he quite agreed with the leader of the Opposition that this was a very serious matter, particularly when they remembered that an expenditure at the present rate, if continued for ten years, would amount to half-a-million of money. Remembering that fact they had a right to consider that the force should be effective, to see that they got something for their money, and that the whole thing was not a delusion and a snare. The present force would cost £46,000 a year; and the other evening he drew the attention of the House to another fact—namely, that they sent £50,000 out of the colony to buy locomotives, when the work could be done as well and cheaply in the colony. They ought to be on their guard, therefore, against another invasion besides that of the Russians. They ought to be on their guard against those who were flooding their markets with goods and ruining their own industries. If they did not guard themselves with a judicious and bold national policy in encouraging their industries, then the sooner they did away with that vote the better, for if they went on at the present rate there would be nothing left to defend. The Republican fathers of America, who had a taste of all the experiences of colonial life, said the first duty of the Republic

was to render themselves industrious and independent. Without doing that it was no use having a defence force. They went at present to the London market, and borrowed money that they never got. Every article they wanted was sent from home, to the ruin of their own markets. The few industries they had for the raising of raw products were simply calculated on a foreign market; and no one stood up and fought for their own industries. Without a true national life it was useless to establish a defence force; and if they did not soon change their policy it would be better to adopt the suggestion of the member for Fassifern, and get Imperial troops to supply the place of their Defence Force. Last year, when the Defence Estimates were under consideration, he made the remark that the whole German army did not cost the State as much as the Queensland army of one man and a-half. Every penny spent upon the German army was spent in the country where the taxes were raised, whereas in their case every penny went out of the country to pay for articles that could well be supplied in the colony. He would ask the Premier whether he had gone carefully through all the items and seen that those articles that could be made in the colony were supplied here—whether the uniforms were made from cloth woven in the colony and woven from wool grown in it?—and whether he had contemplated that they should make their own arms? He (Mr. Isambert) had been informed that there were men here who were able to make all the cannons they would require; and unless they tried to keep money in the country and became independent industrially it was no use dreaming of becoming independent or of being able to defend themselves. Hon. members might find it rather obnoxious to hear so much of protection, but it must be within the knowledge of every one of them that almost every second word of the English people was “protection of English interests”; and he thought they ought to follow that example and think a little more of protecting Queensland interests. They should throw aside all policies except that which would enable them to become purely Australian—independent of everywhere—not only of England but of the Continent. However, those happy times had not arrived when “there will be war no more,” and at present they must go on, as it were, with one hand on the plough and the other on the sword. For the present year he should support the vote, but if, when it came before the House next year, the Government did not exhibit a more national spirit, and go carefully into the question of getting those articles that could be made in the colony supplied by the people who were in it, and did not look a little more after their own industries, so that they might have something to defend, they might expect some stormy weather.

Mr. WAKEFIELD said the remarks that had been made by the hon. member for Fassifern were quite correct. The hon. the Premier had stated that he was not aware of any volunteer movement having been checked. He (Mr. Wakefield) could state from his own experience that a few years back he was one of thirty who joined themselves together to form a cavalry corps in Brisbane. They met together for about three months, and practised in front of the old gaol. They then offered their services to the Government and stated that they were prepared to find their own uniforms, horses, and accoutrements; but their offer was refused, and in consequence of that he had never attempted to attach himself to any volunteering corps. He merely mentioned the fact with a view of showing that they should endeavour to encourage the volunteer system. It would have been no expense to the Government if they had accepted

the services of the corps he had mentioned; but he was so disgusted with the refusal they met with that he had never attempted to join anything of the kind again. Captain Bernard was one of the company.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That must be a long time ago.

Mr. WAKEFIELD: About four or five years ago.

Mr. PALMER said it was evident that the vote was not to be carried on party lines. The hon. the Premier seemed to be taken more in the flank than he was by the attack in front. He (Mr. Palmer) could not agree with the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Macfarlane, when he attempted to cast ridicule and contempt upon men for whom he must say he entertained certain respect—men who volunteered at the time of the general war-scare to put themselves in the front of danger to defend the colony. It was no use saying they could defend the colony without paying money for it; and if the colony could not afford to pay money for that purpose they had better give up altogether and let the enemy come in, although at the same time he thought that once the enemy landed upon our coast the worst would be over. The greatest danger would be in the enemy landing in the first instance. When the hon. the Premier introduced the Defence Act he said one of the great principles involved in it was that it should not be an actual defence force, but a nucleus round which a defence force could be concentrated in case of attack or danger—a means by which large bodies of men could be made available for defence in a short space of time. There was certainly a good deal in that argument, as was illustrated by the war in America. There they commenced with very few men, and in a few months they had large armies at their command, fit to serve all the purposes for which they were required. He noticed that one item of the vote was a sum for the "Queensland Rifle Association." By clause 53 of the Defence Act, rifle and drill associations were to be formed, and he should like the Premier to give them some information if any steps had been taken with regard to that, which was considered, when the Act was passing through, as likely to be a very efficient arm of the service. Rifle associations throughout the colony would not cost a great deal, and they would make the available population a rough and ready kind of soldier—a means of defence that could be easily collected and would be of very great service. Hon. members could easily imagine what service an expert body of riflemen or marksmen would be in case of an invasion. He believed that the hon. the Premier was favourable to the formation of rifle corps, and he would like to know what steps had been taken towards incorporating or carrying them through. He supposed that the Act had not been sufficiently long in operation to give that arm of the service time to be carried out.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there were already rifle clubs established at Rockhampton, Charters Towers, Herbert River, Brisbane, Darling Downs, Thargomindah, and other places, and their membership numbered 593.

Mr. FOXTON said he wished to throw a little light on the complaint made by the hon. member for Fassifern with reference to the rejection of the services of certain gentlemen who offered themselves as a volunteer corps. The hon. member, no doubt, referred to the offer made by a body of gentlemen to form a volunteer field battery in Brisbane. Four very excellent reasons were given for the refusal. The first was that there were no guns avail-

able; the second, that there were no horses; and the third, that there was no harness. It was evident that a field battery without guns, horses, or harness would be altogether inefficient. The fourth and best reason of the lot was that already there was a larger proportion of field artillery in the colony compared with the other arms of the service than was considered necessary or desirable by the best military authorities. The gentlemen who volunteered were many of them his personal friends and he would have been glad to see them in the force, but the reasons given for not accepting their services were unanswerable.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he wished to ask if the Government would confine their military stores as far as possible to colonial productions.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said his wish was that they would commence making rifles and guns in this colony. As it was, however, the Government were obliged to go for all their war stores to England. He would be glad when the day came that the colony could produce things she had now to import, and in the meantime he would do all he could to obtain articles of Queensland manufacture provided they were to be got at a reasonable price.

Mr. SHERIDAN asked if the boys at the grammar and State schools were being exercised in drill and educated to defend their country?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the drilling of State school boys was carried on at all the schools. At the Brisbane, Maryborough, Gympie and Charters Towers grammar schools the lads were being taught in the use of arms.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £10,972 be granted for the Marine Force. The vote, he said, practically represented the expense of the staff, the "Gayundah," and the Naval Brigade. He was not prepared to say that the estimate would be continued in exactly its present form. He had had some interviews with the Admiral as to the disposal of the "Gayundah," and would shortly have an opportunity of further consultation on the same subject. The arrangements were not yet completed, but, as was known to hon. members, the Government had offered the "Gayundah" to the Admiralty under the Colonial Naval Defence Act, the intention being that she should be completely under naval discipline and should be treated as far as necessary as a ship belonging to the Imperial squadron, but kept continually on the Queensland stations. The "Gayundah" would thus be rendered as efficient as possible. No more men would be employed on board of her than were absolutely necessary. She would visit the ports of the colony from time to time, so that the officers and men of the Naval Brigade might become acquainted with the work. The scheme was not yet completed, but it would be worked out in a week or two.

The Hon. Sir T. McILWRAITH asked if under the proposed scheme the cost of maintaining the "Gayundah" would be increased?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that a very much greater efficiency would be obtained at no greater expense. He held that a ship not on active service should have no more men on board than enough to keep her in order. Whether the present crew of the "Gayundah" could be reduced or not he could not yet say.

Mr. MIDGLEY asked what had become of the "Paluma"?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said she was engaged in Admiralty survey work at the joint cost of this colony and England. The colony

had to contribute £5,000 a year, and another £5,000 was paid by the Admiralty—£10,000 in all per annum; but the Admiralty paid Queensland £2,500 as hire for the “Paluma,” so that in fact the colony only contributed £2,500.

Question put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that this House do now adjourn. It is intended to proceed with the Colonial Secretary's Estimates to-morrow, and afterwards to take the Licensing Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at twenty-eight minutes to 11 o'clock.