Queensland

Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER 1885

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 30 *September*, 1885.

Customs Duties Bill.—Petition.—Questions.—Friendly Societies Act of 1876 Amendment Bill.—Probate Act of 1867 Amendment Bill.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Message from Legislative Council.—Printing Committee.—Licensing Bill—committee.—Beer Duty Bill.—Adjournment.

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

CUSTOMS DUTIES BILL.

The SPEAKER said: I have to inform the House that I this day presented to His Excellency the Governor a Bill for granting to Her Majesty certain increased duties of Customs, and that His Excellency was pleased on behalf of Her Majesty to assent to the Bill.

PETITION.

Mr. FOOTE presented a petition from the trustees in the estate of the late Ann Eliza Noble, praying for a Bill to enable them to dispose of certain trust properties. He might mention that the Standing Orders had been complied with so far as advertisements and documents were concerned.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. KATES asked the Colonial Secretary—

Is it the intention of the Government to re-introduce the Local Government Act Amendment Bill during the present session?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. W. Griffith) replied—

The Legislative Council proposed to amend this Bill in a matter relating to the public revenue, and insisted upon their amendment after its nature was pointed out to them, accompanying their insistence with a claim to co-ordinate rights with this House in the amendment of all Bills.

Under the circumstances the Legislative Assembly, in defence of its undoubted and exclusive right to deal with all matters affecting the revenue, had no alternative but to lay the Bill aside, that being the recognised mode of action adopted by the House of Commons as well as by the Legislative Assembly of this colony when action is taken by the Upper House inconsistent with their privileges. The result is that the Legislative Council, by refusing to agree to the Bill except upon conditions at variance with established constitutional principles, have in effect rejected it.

The Government have no reason to anticipate that if the Bill were again introduced the Legislative Council would be willing to accept it without similar amendments. They have, therefore, come to the conclusion that it would be undesirable to introduce the Bill again this session—a result which they much regret, as the Bill admittedly contains many very valuable amendments of the law.

Mr. NORTON asked the Minister for Mines—

About what date is it probable that Mr. Jack will visit the Port Curtis district to report in connection with deep sinking on goldfields?

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

The Government considered it advisable that before proceeding to Port Curtis Mr. Jack should visit the Blackall district, with a view to select a site for deep boring for water in connection with the Hydraulic Department; it will, therefore, probably be three or four months before Mr. Jack will be able to visit the Port Curtis district.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES ACT OF 1876 AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion of the PREMIER, leave was given to introduce a Bill to amend the Friendly Societies Act of 1876.

The Bill was presented, read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

PROBATE ACT OF 1867 AMENDMENT BILL.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge), the House, in Committee, affirmed the desirableness of introducing a Bill to amend the Probate Act of 1867.

The Bill was read a first time, and the second reading made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY—RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

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

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £47,550 be granted for Charitable Allowances. There was an increase of £2,500 under the heading of "Hospitals." Of that, £2,000 was for the endowment of hospitals generally, at the rate of £2 for every £1 subscribed. There were two fresh items, £200 for the Charity Organisation Society, Brisbane, and £300 for the Industrial Home, Brisbane. The first item was intended, really, to be a particular mode of disbursing the amount voted for the Relief Board, Brisbane. The Charity Organisation Society did very much the same work as the Relief Board, and in many respects they could do it better; so it was thought desirable to entrust the expenditure of a portion of the sum to that institution. The other item, "Industrial Home, Brisbane," was a new one. The institution was intended for the reformation of fallen women, but it was not of exactly the same character as the Female Refuge. So far as he had been able to learn, the Industrial Home had done very good work in reclaiming women. They were struggling along, and made a good deal of money by their laundry. He thought reformation of that sort might very well be assisted by the State. In the vote for Relief Boards there was an increase of £250—£50 for Blackall, a new item of £100 for Geraldton, and an additional £100 for Townsville.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he would like to know why, since they gave £200 to the Female Refuge, they should also contribute £300 to another institution characterised by the same work? What was the difference between the two institutions, and what was the necessity for supporting two?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they dealt with somewhat different classes of persons. The Female Refuge dealt with the very lowest class; the other institution dealt with persons who had gone astray, and who found it difficult on that account to obtain employment, but had

not become so low as to belong to the class for which the Female Refuge was maintained. He believed a great number had been reclaimed.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said there was a kind of fashion in distributing the public funds to those charitable organisations. He had heard a different account of the Industrial Home. Certain ladies who were anxious that their own particular opinions should be made public had established what they called an industrial home, where they removed girls on the day they arrived in the colony; while if the girls were left in the depôt they could find service at once.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that was a different institution altogether. The hon. gentleman was talking about the Lady Musgrave Lodge.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he was told that was the institution the money was to be voted for. He did not see what was the use of the two homes. The Government should have a very plain story to tell them before they subsidised all the old ladies who pleased to squander money. It was a lot of sentimental nonsense.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked where they could find the estimate for the Lady Musgrave Lodge? There had been public money expended in connection with it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said a small amount of public money had been spent in connection with the Lady Musgrave Lodge under these circumstances: The present immigration depôt had no place for women to stay in for any length of time—no place they could make a home of—and they would be compelled to take the first place that offered, however bad, rather than stay there. The new immigration depôt, which he hoped would be commenced shortly, would have provision for them to stay there for a little while—a place, at any rate, where they could go for two or three days after their arrival in the colony. In the absence of any accommodation of that kind, the Government accepted the offer of the manager of the institution called the Lady Musgrave Lodge, to allow immigrants to go there for two or three days on their arrival.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: At the Government expense?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Government were paying partly for their maintenance; he forgot the exact amount, but it was very small. If they got a place and went back, they did so at their own expense. The attention of the Government had been directed on many occasions to the importance of doing something of that kind for young women arriving in the colony. He did not know the total expense incurred in that way, but it was not more than would have been incurred had the girls remained in the depôt.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would like to know why it was established. Was it not under the jurisdiction of some ladies who expended the sum for the Industrial Home—that was the Social Purity Society?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was not, to his knowledge. He certainly had never entrusted any money to the Social Purity Society, though some of the ladies of the Industrial Home might be members of the Social Purity Society.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said there seemed to him to be a strange sort of association in charge of these things, and the less the Government had to do with them the better. If certain ladies and gentlemen had fads and fancies, let them carry them out at their own expense. There was no necessity for the institution in question, as if the girls were allowed to remain in the depôt they would get places immediately. It was a common complaint that servants could not be got at the depôt. If a person went the first day they arrived there was difficulty in getting a servant, and if a person did not go until the second day it was found they were all gone or engaged—they were taken away by those ladies to operate upon in that institution. He thought the expenditure was altogether unwarranted. The item was not on the Estimates, and they could not tell where the money came from. From what vote did the money granted to the Lady Musgrave Lodge come?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought he had explained that it came from the Immigration vote; it was part of the expense of immigration. He recognised it as part of the duty of the Government, who introduced young and friendless women here, to see that they did not get into trouble. They ought to take all reasonable precaution against their going wrong. He had been told that a great deal of harm had been done in many instances in the first three or four days after they landed. Complaints of that kind were made in England, and persons there taking an interest in immigration had frequently complained of the absence of any means of protection for the girls on their arrival in the colony. He did not know that the Lady Musgrave Lodge was established for that reason. He did not think it was; but while it was being established the Government were asked to assist in that way, and they had intimated their willingness to assist temporarily.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: For what purpose, then, was it established?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: As a home for girls, I believe.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: At the expense of the State?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; the State only pays for the girls' food, which they would have to pay for if the girls remained in the depôt.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the State might have to pay for the food, but they would not have to pay the expenses for a fortnight or three weeks if the girls remained in the immigration depôt.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Nor do they there.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Because the girls would get a place immediately from the depôt. A great deal of harm might be done in any three or four days of a girl's life as well as after she landed, so that reason was not a sufficient excuse. They all knew of the large immigration society that was carried on in New York, and there, instead of encouraging them to stay a single hour in the depôt, they bundled them off immediately. They were given every information as to where to get work or find their friends, but they were not kept in the depôt a single hour longer than was possible. The same thing should be done here. They came here to work, not to be coddled. It was wrong of the hon. gentleman to throw the money of the State away in that way. They could not afford to indulge people in fads which were mere sentimental notions and nothing else.

Mr. PALMER said he wished to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary to disparities in the amounts granted to relief boards. They should bear in mind that there was a great difference between coast towns and towns far inland as to the convenience for sending sick people away. In the coast towns people had the advantage of steamers leaving for other parts two and three times a week. He noticed that

in the case of Georgetown there was only £50 allowed to the relief board; whereas other towns, and chiefly those on the coast, had got £100, and some as much as £200, in addition to their having the advantage he spoke of in having steamers passing two or three times a week, by which sick people could get away to other parts. Georgetown was the centre of one of the largest mineral fields in the North, and was under the disadvantage of having no medical man resident there. The people had endeavoured to establish an hospital by subscriptions and in every way they could, and they were as well entitled to £100 as many of the towns for which that amount was granted. He saw that the grant to Blackall was increased by £50, and that place laboured under the same disadvantages as Georgetown. In common fairness £100 might be granted to the centre of such a field as that as well as to many of the coast towns which were so favoured.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought the hon. gentleman ought to congratulate himself that the residents of Georgetown did not require more assistance from the State for that purpose. He always regarded those items with the greatest regret. A certain amount was placed upon the Estimates one year, and if it was found sufficient the same was voted next year. Surely the hon. member did not expect the Government to increase the vote where it was sufficient! He could scarcely understand that there should be a rivalry amongst the towns in respect of the amounts granted to relief boards.

Mr. PALMER said he always understood those amounts were spent by the hospital committees.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said most of them were expended by hospital committees, but some of them were entrusted to police magistrates.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to know if it was to be understood that in future moneys paid into hospitals by patients were not to be entitled to endowment? He knew that had caused a sensation in some places, and he wished to know if all hospitals were to be served alike in that respect?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said a case came under his notice some months ago in which the moneys received by an hospital from persons who declined to go into the institution as paupers, as the recipients of public charity, were treated as subscriptions on which endowment was obtained from the Government. That was certainly contrary to the intention of Parliament. He did not think that payments made by persons for the attention they had received could be regarded as voluntary subscriptions. Since then numerous other cases had come under his observation, and it appeared that the first one to which his attention was drawn was by no means an isolated instance. The Government would not be justified in authorising the payment of endowment on money received by an hospital for services rendered, which was quite distinct from voluntary subscriptions.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the hon. gentleman spoke as if he had worked a reform in the department, which was not a fact. Parliament had always expressed its intention that the endowment should only be paid on *bonâ fide* subscriptions, but hospital committees had treated moneys received from pay patients as subscriptions. Probably they would now refuse, under that new practice, to receive money from persons who were able to pay as payment for services rendered, but would receive it as a subscription to the hospital funds.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if the hospital committees set themselves to deceive the Government they might succeed, but he trusted they would not do anything of the kind. He did not think they would.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said if the kind of thing to which the hon. member for Mulgrave alluded was carried on by hospitals, schools of arts and other public institutions would try to get as much money from the Government as possible without appearing to deceive, and it was known that that practice had existed for years. But what he wanted to know was, who managed the Female Refuge in Brisbane, and what authority over the management had the Government for the expenditure of the £200 on the Estimates?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was sorry he could not give very much information on that point. The refuge had been under the charge of Mrs. Drew for a great many years. She was entrusted almost entirely with the expenditure. Mrs. Drew had just gone to England—she left about a fortnight ago, he thought—and he then inquired what arrangements were proposed to be made for the management of the institution? He received a reply, but he could not remember at that moment exactly what it was. He knew, however, that there was given to him the name of someone who had had very large experience, who was to take charge of the institution during her absence, and he was satisfied with the information he received.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Is the institution wholly maintained by this £200?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the inmates earned a good deal of money. He thought there was also an infants' home in connection with the institution. There was a sum of £170 on the Estimates for the maintenance of very small children.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: By whom is the Industrial Home managed?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was under the management of a committee which consisted of a large number of ladies.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: What is its name?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Brisbane Industrial Home. He had the last report there, and if the hon. member wished to see it he could do so. The institution was managed by a president, two vice-presidents, a secretary, a treasurer, and a committee of thirteen ladies.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would put it to the hon. gentleman whether it would not be better if those young children, who he said were now sent to the Female Refuge, which was where the worst females were sent, should not be sent to the Industrial Home, where the females were of a much better class, or at least a class not quite so demoralised? Would it not be better for the children to have the example of those less immoral females before them? He thought it would, unless they were only infants.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are only infants.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said if the children were only infants they could take no evil; but still he would ask if it was a right place to send children to? It would be much better for the hon. gentleman to hire decent women as nurses for the children than to send them to a place like that. The Female Refuge was the very last place they should be sent to.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. B. B. Moreton) said that, generally speaking, the mother of the children went with them, and the children were mostly illegitimate children. On looking through the books, he

found that nearly two-thirds were illegitimate children, and in cases where the mother did not go with them the records showed that they died.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that was about the most disgusting arrangement he had heard of having the sanction of the Government. Because the Female Refuge dealt with badness, they started another for the more genteel class of women who had fallen in the same way. Then there was another branch of the Government Service to which sick children with their mothers were sent. They were actually obliged to separate one class from another, and yet at the same time the Government sent sick children and their mothers among the most depraved. That was a most disgusting arrangement.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Industrial Home was entirely a new institution. When he was in charge of the Education Department he was very much dissatisfied with the arrangements at the Female Refuge for taking care of little children. The children were nearly all illegitimate, and as soon as they were old enough they were sent to one of the orphanages. While they remained babies in arms something must be done for them. He understood that the mothers of the children, while there, were kept apart from the other women. The arrangement was certainly not a very satisfactory one.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was evident the Colonial Secretary did not know what he was asking the Committee for. He had told them that the Industrial Home was a refuge for fallen women of not so low a class as those who frequented the Female Refuge. Now the hon. member said it was for children.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was speaking of the Female Refuge.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that to send the mothers of those children to the Female Refuge with them was a piece of brutality which he could not comprehend.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Premier's own moral sense must show him that it was wrong to send the mothers of those children to the establishment containing the worst class of fallen women, when there was another establishment for a class of women who were not quite so bad.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he admitted that the arrangement was very unsatisfactory, but he understood that those women were kept apart from the others as far as possible.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN : But you do not know?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he understood that that was the case. He hoped the arrangements that were now being made would work a great deal better.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the Infants' Home was quite a distinct and separate building from the Female Refuge. They were close together, but really separate buildings. The mothers were only kept there until the children were old enough to be weaned.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked whether the mothers were kept there in idleness during the whole of that time?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that they were expected to work in the home.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said it was disgusting to think that those women who had fallen, and had had illegitimate children, should be made to work along with the most depraved class of all. The hon. member was really proving that there was no use for the Industrial Home.

Mr. SCOTT said it was not yet quite clear where those children went to. The Committee had been told that they went to the Female Refuge; now they were told by the Minister for Public Instruction that they went to another establishment altogether. Were children sent to both the Female Refuge and to the Industrial Home? And how was the distinction made?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he supposed the misunderstanding into which the Committee had been led arose from his having associated in his mind the two institutions under Mrs. Drew's management. The two institutions were alongside of one another. As a matter of fact the infants were not sent to the Female Refuge, whose inmates were the very worst class of fallen women, and they were taken care of as well as they could be.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that if the Colonial Secretary had told them that at first a good deal of the time of the Committee would have been saved. He was very doubtful now whether they had got to the truth of the matter. With regard to the Industrial Home, he fancied the Premier had been got at by some sympathetic ladies who wanted to do the work at the expense of the Government. It had not been shown what necessity there was for it. What Government supervision was there over the expenditure of the vote, and to see that it was only spent on the object aimed at?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the department would not interfere with the details of management, but the accounts would be audited by the Auditor-General.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that unless some special officer was appointed to look after the management the vote could not be administered satisfactorily. He doubted whether either the Premier or the Minister for Public Instruction knew very much about it, and he himself doubted the necessity for two institutions of the same kind. He knew nothing of Magdalen asylums except from what he had read, but he had never heard of any place where two classes of them were established. He did not know how it was possible to separate the fallen into the indifferently bad and the very bad—if they had fallen they had fallen. The establishment of a second asylum was only adding expense to the colony without any possible good result. In addition to the Female Refuge and the Industrial Home, there was the Lady Musgrave Lodge, and on the top of that the Infants' Home which was said to be unconnected with the Female Refuge—four different asylums, when really two would be quite sufficient. He failed to see the necessity for that expenditure. He believed in people being as benevolent as their means would permit them to be, but not at other people's expense. To manage institutions of that kind was a very pleasant way of spending other people's money, and he was rather inclined to think that that was what those institutions were for. They had not been told that any subscriptions had come in on which the Government could give a subsidy of £1 for £1, or 10s. for every £1, as was the case with hospitals and other institutions. It was all Government money, and those who managed the institutions had no doubt great pleasure in spending it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the subscriptions last year, according to the balance-sheet he had before him, amounted to £150—rather more than that, nearly £160.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: To the Industrial Home?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON said he understood the Premier to say that for the future no endowment would be allowed on money received from pay patients who were treated in hospitals. He knew that a good many people went to hospitals because they preferred to be treated there to outside. The regular charge was very small, and in a great many cases the patients made a donation to the hospital before leaving. Instead of paying the regular charge, which might be £8 or £10, they might make a donation of £20. Would the Government refuse to pay endowment on such an amount as that?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. FERGUSON: Would they only decline to pay on the amount of the actual charge, or if persons did not want to have a charge made but gave a donation of £20 or £30, would the Government pay endowment on that sum? It had always been done.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not want to point out to hospital committees how the rule might be evaded. Let those committees act fairly and honestly, and there would be no difficulty. Endowment would be paid upon all *bonâ fide* subscriptions, but payments for services rendered ought not to receive endowment. He was prepared to trust to the honour of the hospital committees.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the case mentioned by the hon. member for Rockhampton was just a case in point showing how the regulation made by the Premier was evaded, and had been evaded all along.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not going to assist in evading the law.

Mr. MACFARLANE said, under the head of "Charitable Allowances" there was £500 for the benevolent asylum, Rockhampton, and under "Relief Boards" there was a similar sum put down for that place. He should like to know if the two sums were paid to the same board, or to two distinct boards?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the benevolent asylum at Rockhampton was of the same character as the asylum at Dunwich, but of course very much smaller. It was quite a distinct institution from the relief board, which was for the relief of paupers.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that, as the Under Colonial Secretary was then present, perhaps the Premier could ascertain the name of the matron of the Female Refuge.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said Mr. Gray did not remember her name.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving £4,145 for Medical Officers, said there were three increases in the vote—£50 for a medical officer at Geraldton, with respect to which nothing was necessary to be said; £50 increase to the medical officer at Mackay, whose work had increased very much. That increase was promised some time ago, as £80 was not sufficient remuneration for the work. The third item was £300 for a medical officer at Thursday Island. He thought all hon. members would agree that it was time they had a medical officer at Thursday Island. The amount of traffic through Torres Straits was very great, and communication with the East was increasing considerably. The inhabitants of Thursday Island had guaranteed £200 a year to a medical officer, so that his income would be £500 a year certain; and he (the Colonial Secretary) believed that for that amount they would be able to secure the services of a competent man.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN thought £500 would not be sufficient to command the services of a competent medical man at Thursday Island. If they were going to appoint a medical officer there let them pay such a salary as would ensure the services of a thoroughly competent man, in whom the Government and the country would have confidence. It was a most important point at which to station a medical man. There was great chance of disease coming into the colony through Torres Straits, and he was sure that £500 would not be enough to secure the services of a first-rate man.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was very much astonished to find that when the large vote for Hospitals was under discussion no notice was taken of the statements that had appeared in the newspapers respecting the management of the Brisbane Hospital. He knew it was out of place to refer to it now, the vote having been passed; but he thought the matter should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. Very serious charges had been made about the management of that institution. The *Courier* reporter had published his experiences, and there had been numerous letters in the newspapers on the subject. If the statements that there was gross mismanagement in the institution were correct, he thought the Government should, if they had not already done so, institute the most searching inquiry into the matter, because rumours were thick in Brisbane respecting the mismanagement of the place, and the neglect of patients there. Those rumours ought to be dissipated or confirmed, and he thought they should hear something from the hon. the Premier with reference to that really most important matter. If the statements made, or one-third of them, were true, the Brisbane Hospital was a disgrace to their civilisation; if they were not true, the sooner they were authoritatively denied and put on one side the better.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the committee of the Brisbane Hospital had been holding an inquiry into the management of the institution, and he expected to have received their report yesterday or to-day. It was promised yesterday, but he had not received it yet. He could not express any opinion on the merits of the case until he had further information. If the statements that had been made were well founded no doubt there must be something very wrong in the management of the institution.

Mr. MOREHEAD asked if when the hon. gentleman received the report referred to he would let the House know what was the nature of it; and if it was not satisfactory would he cause further inquiry to be made? The matter was one of supreme importance to every sick person in the city, and to those who were in good health as well. He had heard very serious charges—which he did not wish to repeat to the Committee, but which he believed had foundation in fact—as to the conduct of the hospital; and the sooner the matter was sifted to the bottom and set at rest one way or the other the better.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he should be very glad to give the information to hon. members when he got it, and if the report was not satisfactory he should take such steps as might be considered necessary to obtain further information.

Mr. NORTON asked if the inquiry which had been made by the committee of the Brisbane Hospital had been conducted privately, or if representatives of the Press had been admitted?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he understood that the Press was not admitted to the inquiry.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he would ask the Colonial Secretary what conclusions he drew from that fact; and also what steps had been taken to secure the right sort of witnesses? Was the evidence taken that of patients or ex-patients? Were witnesses invited to attend by advertisement? Through the Press not having been admitted to the inquiry a great wrong had perhaps been done to the community, as the public would now be asked to rely on the conclusions the committee might come to on the evidence taken. The members of the committee were, to a certain extent, on their own trial, and if they were allowed to sift the evidence for themselves and place their own opinions before the Colonial Treasurer the outcome of the inquiry would not be very satisfactory.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked the Colonial Secretary if he had in his mind any gentleman who would accept the position of medical officer on Thursday Island?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had not one in his mind at the present moment. One gentleman he had been thinking of had gone to England. He had no other in view at present, but he did not expect any difficulty in filling the position.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that £150 be voted for the Pharmacy Board. The board, he said, was established under the Pharmacy Act of last session. He proposed to give the secretary £50, and £100 was provided for contingencies.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked if any profits were derived from the board?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked if the board was self-supporting?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he could not see why they should spend £150 on a pharmacy board. The thing was absurd. The Act was passed on the understanding that it was to cost the Government nothing, and it would never have been passed unless that had been understood. The vote should not be allowed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know why the Pharmacy Board should be self-supporting any more than the Medical Board. He understood that the Pharmacy Act was passed in the interests of the public. It provided that fees should be paid as follows:—For every examination, £3 3s.; for registration as a pharmaceutical chemist, without examination, £2 2s.; and on registration in every other case, £1 1s. To that extent the board was self-supporting, but he was not prepared to say how much the fees amounted to. One thing was certain, that the Pharmacy Board could not be carried on without some expense any more than the Medical Board could be.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he differed from the Colonial Secretary as to the object of the Pharmacy Board. The Act for its establishment was not passed in the interests of the public, but in the interests of the chemists of the colony. For many years it was introduced to Parliament as a private Bill, and that, too, by the present Colonial Secretary himself; and Parliament would never have entertained it at all except on the understanding that the chemists should bear the expenses of the board themselves. Why should the State bear the expense of preserving the profession from homeopathists and others poaching on their domain? Of course, the Act was not entirely in the interest of the profession, but it was introduced as such, and the Government had no more right to pay any expenses in connection with it than they had to pay for the working of any other private Act.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that as far as his memory served him the Act when it was last brought forward as a Bill was introduced in the Upper House. The fact that it was introduced in the other Chamber was evidence that the measure contained no provision for the taxation of the people as was now proposed to be done in the Estimates. It was worse than absurd that the State should be called upon to pay for what the apothecaries wanted to make a close corporation. The Act was solely for their benefit and nothing else. The Bill was practically a private one, and when he was in another place he shelved it by getting it referred to a select committee. He hoped the vote would not be passed.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the fact was that the chemists asked Parliament for a charter, which was given to them, and now they had the impudence to ask that the charter should be maintained at the expense of the Government. The thing was preposterous.

Mr. SALKELD said the Act was certainly passed in the interests of the chemists. He thought the fees payable under it should be quite enough to pay expenses, and he certainly should vote against the item.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was his duty to point out that the fees provided for under the Act were not intended to go into the general public revenue. That accounted for the fact that the Bill was introduced in the Upper House, by which the board might impose fees when they were not to be paid into the general revenue and were simply used to carry out the Act. He might also mention that the Government had provided the Pharmacy Board with office accommodation.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the vote should be allowed to drop out of the Estimates. The chemists had no more reason to ask for the money than shoemakers or tailors would have to ask for like sums if Acts were passed in their interest. He hoped the Colonial Secretary would allow the vote to be negatived.

Mr. BAILEY said that he was greatly in favour of the Pharmacy Act, but he never anticipated that its passing would bring any charge upon the revenue, and he should certainly vote against the item.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he hoped the item would be withdrawn. The Good Templars might as well send in an application of the same kind; it was quite as reasonable, as they did quite as much good.

Question put and negatived.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £1,200 be voted for the Central Board of Health. There was an increase of £300 for fees and contingencies.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that the Colonial Secretary had given no reason for the increase of £300, and he did not think it was justifiable. Anyone who read the newspapers would see that the duties of the Central Board of Health were the same as those performed by local boards of health everywhere else, and he did not see why the general Government should pay in Brisbane what the local boards in other places actually paid for themselves. The business before the Central Board was nothing at all, with very rare exceptions, beyond what came before local boards. Why should the Government pay fees to that board to meet weekly and perform duties that local boards performed for nothing?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the fees allowed were £2 2s. a sitting, and if the work was well done it was cheaply done. The Health Act was a good one; but its administration required supervision. The Central Board was the motive power which kept the local bodies in order. He had not attended many of their meetings; but a great deal of work had been done, and they could not get good men to sit on that board unless they were paid for their services. That was understood when the Bill was going through. If the Health Act was to be a good Act there must be that central power; it was an important part of the scheme of the Act. The Central Board had also to give advice to the Government in cases of sudden danger, or an epidemic. It was very poor economy to starve a good institution in order to save fees, and good men would not give their services for nothing. They had a good Act, and it was beginning to work well.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he never recognised the good that the Central Board of Health would do to the colony except as a board of advice to the Colonial Secretary when any emergency arose, and good medical advice was really required. The hon. gentleman had not been speaking about what the board had done since the Act was passed. The Central Board had only been doing what local boards did—that was, looking after the nuisances in the municipality. The working of the Health Act ought never to have been delegated to the Central Board at all. When he was Colonial Secretary, and the amount for fees was deficient, he used to make them suit by telling them not to have their meetings so often. They had nothing to do but local business, and if they met once in three months it would be sufficient unless there was another smallpox scare. Unless something like that happened the Central Board of Health was not wanted.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Government approved of the appointment of an inspector for the Central Board, at the small salary of £150.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that every other town in the colony paid for its own inspector.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Central Board could not supervise the work of the local boards without eyes and ears; he did not see how it could exercise any supervision if they could get no information. The hon. gentleman said the board was inefficient; but did he propose to insure that it should continue inefficient for the future, by depriving them of the means of doing their work, so as to be able to say, "I told you it would be a failure"? If they wanted to make the Act a failure let them do so, but it would be a great pity to cripple it before it had had time to do any work. He did not know that the board had done any startling work yet; but great trouble had been taken in advising the local bodies. A great deal of time and attention had been given to matters which were brought under their notice. The number of times the board met depended upon circumstances. Once in three months would be treating the board as non-existent, but once a month would be quite often enough. They must meet, and must be remunerated and have means of getting information. That was certainly essential to do any work at all.

Mr. SMYTH said it seemed to him to be purely a local matter—to supply the city of Brisbane alone. As regarded the constituency he represented, they had received no benefit whatever from the Central Board of Health. The municipal council should pay for it. The members of that board were what were commonly called "guinea pigs," only they were not satisfied unless they received two guineas, and could meet as often as they pleased. The number of meetings should be restricted, and the members of the board should not be able to draw more than a certain amount per annum. He did not care what arguments might be brought forward in favour of that board, he did not believe in it, but thought that the municipality of Brisbane should pay for it themselves. There was a medical officer appointed, and he could do all there was to be done in cases of smallpox. He should vote against the item.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member was entirely under a delusion in supposing the Central Board of Health had anything to do with the city of Brisbane. It had no more to do with Brisbane than with Rockhampton or Normanton. Of course they had to sit in Brisbane; they could not sit all over the colony. The secretary was general health officer for the colony; he was there to give advice and assistance to the local boards, and to receive complaints if the local authorities failed to do their duty. Of course, if they were all doing their duty, the work was so much less. The functions of the board had nothing to do with Brisbane.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the Colonial Secretary was right and the hon. member for Gympie wrong. He believed the Health Board did no more for Brisbane than for any other part of the colony. He did not think they did any good for any part of the colony. He did not know of anything they did except drawing two guineas for every sitting. They seemed to have a quiet chat about things in general, without reaching any conclusion in reference to any particular matter; then they separated and apparently met again when they wanted to draw another two guineas. He did not see why the constituencies of the colony should be taxed for a useless body, and he would support any amendment to reduce the amount or even abolish the thing altogether. He would ask the Colonial Secretary whether any report had been received from the board, such as other departments had to supply, setting forth the work they had done. He did not know of anything they had done beyond drawing the money, and he did not believe any hon. member, including the Colonial Secretary, knew of any good work they had done; yet, not content with taxing the people £900 last year, they were now, without rhyme or reason, to have the vote increased by £300.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said some hon. members were extremely unreasonable. There was a new Act passed at the end of last year, which did not come into operation till the beginning of the present year. It had only been in operation three-quarters of a year, and hon. members wanted to know what work had been done. A system of that kind could not come into operation at once. The board had not done any startling work yet, and could not be expected to have done it. The members could not visit all the different localities in the colony, turn everything upside down, and rearrange the whole administration of the local authorities. Sufficient time had not elapsed for anything of the kind. Several hon. members disapproved of the Health Act when it was passing through the House, and several amendments were proposed which if passed would have had the effect of rendering its provisions less effective. Those amendments were not agreed to and the Act was agreed to by Parliament. It was also agreed that the secretary of the board should be the principal medical officer of the colony, and that his salary should be paid

partly as secretary of the Central Board of Health, and partly as health officer for the port of Brisbane. The system had not yet been in operation nine months, and now hon. members asked what had been done. The thing was scarcely in working order yet. There was an immense amount of work requiring to be done, and if it was not done properly when the board had had a reasonable time given to them, the remedy would be, not to render it inefficient by depriving it of means, but to appoint more efficient men. Hon. members complained that the board did not do the work it should, and the remedy they proposed amounted, in effect, to saying, "If the members of this board do not do their work we will take care that their successors shall do less." The meetings were not held whenever the board pleased; they were summoned by the direction of the Colonial Secretary, and if they were too frequent they could be fewer. If the work of supervising the public health was to be carried on there must be some means at the disposal of the board to enable it to be carried on.

Mr. SCOTT said there used to be a Central Board of Health before the Act came into operation, but he did not know that it did very much. He was then a member of one of the local boards. They did a good deal of work, but they never had any assistance from the Central Board of Health in any shape or form.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You never asked for it.

Mr. SCOTT said they asked on several occasions, and never got a satisfactory reply. He did not know whether those local boards still existed; he supposed their places were taken by the local authorities. It would be interesting to know how the Act was working—whether those authorities were giving satisfaction to the public and to the Central Board of Health, and whether the Central Board of Health was in communication with them or gave them any assistance. The reports in the papers gave no idea how the Central Board was working in connection with the local authorities.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there was a Central Board of Health for many years under an Act passed in 1872. They had no authority, and the system entirely broke down. It was practically abandoned some time before last year, when the present Act was introduced as a substitute. Under that Act the different municipalities and divisions were the local authorities having charge of the health of the district, and very stringent powers were conferred upon them by the Act. They were under the general supervision of the Central Board of Health, which existed, to a very great extent, for the purpose of assisting them in doing their work and compelling them to do it if they were not so inclined. The board had very great powers to compel the local authorities to do their work. One of their most important functions was to assist the local authorities in preparing proper by-laws. In England, the local government board, he thought, had charge of the public health. They provided model by-laws which were sent round to the different local authorities, and if the local authorities did not take proper steps the central authority could make them do so. He knew the Central Board of Health had taken considerable trouble towards assisting the local authorities in that way. The work had been considerably delayed, partly because they wished to consult him (the Colonial Secretary) upon some matters before they were finally agreed to, and he had not had much time to give to the work. The work of the board required continuous time and attention. They had a great deal to do. He knew that at least twelve or thirteen subjects were submitted to him as subjects upon which it would be desirable for them to assist the local authorities by model by-laws. He had given what assistance he could in the way of general suggestions. That work was still going on, and of course all those things could not be done at once. It was necessary they should have good men there, and that they should have assistance. Parliament, he was sure, would not be willing to entrust all those powers to any one individual. If the matter was left to a Minister, he would have to get competent assistants before he could exercise any supervision. It was necessary the boards should have eyes and ears before they could find out what was wrong, or where or by whom the law was evaded. Complaints were being continually made that the local authorities did not carry out the by-laws, and how was the truth of those complaints to be arrived at if assistance was not granted? £800 was not, he thought, a large amount to ask for a whole year. There was really work to be done, and the amount set down might very well, in the interest of the country, be expended for doing that work. If no money was expended the work could not be done. If Parliament did not give proper facilities for doing the work they could have no right afterwards to blame the board for not having done it.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that when the hon. member accused him of desiring to see the Health Act prove a failure he was only using a style of argument he was accustomed to use when he had nothing else to his hand. He did not desire to see it a failure, and had assisted in its passing, though he disagreed with parts of it. The Central Board of Health were not doing the work for which they were appointed under the Act, and for which every local authority in the colony had to pay. He would read the report of the last meeting of the Central Board of Health to show, as he contended, that they did the work of a local board:—

"The ordinary meeting of the Central Board of Health was held yesterday afternoon, at the board-room, Edward street. Present: Messrs. T. Finney (in the chair), the Hon. W. H. Wilson, Drs. Bancroft, Marks, Thomson, and Wray (secretary). The minutes of the previous meeting were read and confirmed.

"The principal business arising out of the minutes was in connection with a letter from the Booroodabin Divisional Board, calling attention to the fact that a child within that division was suffering from fever and had no medical treatment."

Let them listen to what followed. Dr. Wray was the secretary to the Central Board of Health, and he thought it his duty to go and inspect the locality mentioned himself—doing, as he had already stated, the work of the local board:—

"Dr. Wray stated that he had made inquiries as to the locality, and had visited the house where the child was ill. He found the child convalescent. He could not say what disease it had suffered from. It had all the appearance of being a sickly child, but there was no fever about it. The child was taken to the hospital, but cried at being left alone, so the mother, who had lost four children previously, did not care about leaving it. It was not true that the child had no medical treatment. The father intended leaving the place when he found work. There was nothing dangerous to the public health about the child.

"With reference to the appointment of inspector to the board, the secretary stated that he had written to the mayor, giving the name of Mr. Marlow, at the salary of £120 per annum."

All of that was purely work which should be done by the local board.

"CORRESPONDENCE.

"A letter was read from Mr. Campbell, of Ballymore, asking Dr. Wray to go out some day when the wind was blowing from the east and have a look at the manure depôt.

"Dr. Thomson said that it was not part of the secretary's duty to go around sniffing every offensive smell."

That was the work the Central Board of Health was doing. The Premier had told them that the board must have eyes and ears ; but Dr. Thomson evidently considered they had no right to have noses.

"It was derogatory to the dignity of the office. Why did not the inspector of the particular divisional board do it? It was only lately they went out and examined the place themselves and saw all the operations at the depôt. Their examination was looked upon as fairly satisfactory. Dr. Wray might go out there when a westerly, or southerly, or northerly wind was blowing, or he might go and live there altogether. He quite agreed with Mr. Campbell that the depôt should not be there at all."

Dr. Thomson had awakened to the fact that he was a member of the Central Board of Health, and should not be pressed to do that little business. The report went on—

"Dr. Wray stated he would go out and have a look at the place.

"A letter with reference to the drainage from the bath of the Governesses' Home in Manning street was left in the hands of the secretary to reply to."

They should remember he was reading the report of a meeting of the Central Board of Health. He hoped the hon. gentleman understood that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Hear, hear!

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said the report further stated—

"A letter from the trustees of the Victoria Park, with reference to the removal of the smallpox hospital at that place, was, on the motion of Dr. Bancroft, referred to the Colonial Secretary.

"A letter was read from Dr. Taylor calling attention to the state of the water-table near the Queensland Club Hotel. The sewage from the houses between the hotel and George street flowed into this table. No attempt had been made to cleanse it, and the odours arising therefrom were most injurious to health. His (Dr. Taylor's) children were at present suffering from sore throats, undoubtedly caused by this nuisance."

"Dr. Thomson said he inspected the drain mentioned on last Monday. He found that kitchen waste flowed into the drain. It was decidedly dirty, but no more so than the other gutters in the town. They were all alike, and this was the effect of a defective system of scavenging. He moved that the letter be forwarded to the municipal council, pointing out the necessity of having a proper system of scavenging.

"A letter was read from Mr. Maynard, chairman of the Woollongabba Divisional Board, with regard to a nuisance on the property of Mr. Wm. McBride.

"Dr. Wray said that he had seen Mr. McBride and visited his place at South Brisbane. He found adjoining the premises a quantity of sacking in a semi-burnt state, and near the river bank there was some débris from the Struan Bond fire. There was nothing in it dangerous to the public health. Mr. McBride said he would do anything at all to abate the nuisance complained of, but stated that he thought there was a good deal of feeling about the matter. He instructed Mr. McBride to have the sacking removed, and disinfect the place with a solution of common carbolic acid. This Mr. McBride willingly promised to do. He (Dr. Wray) had written to Mr. Maynard informing him of the result of his visit."

Then followed the information that the Maryborough Board actually wrote for information, and the proper way to get the information they wanted was to write to the Central Board. That they did, and there was a case in which the Central Board really had work, and see what they did:—

"A letter was read from the Maryborough Municipality, asking if a general health rate could be struck on ratable property within a certain area of the municipality, according to subsection 4 of the Health Act. They had written to the Colonial Secretary for the information, but received the reply, which was enclosed, that that department did not undertake the interpretation of statutes. The board were of opinion that it was not their duty to interpret the Act, but decided to help the municipality in their desire to obtain information. The secretary was instructed to reply that the subsection of the Act referred to was very clear on the subject—that the rate should be made on the whole and not on a part of the district. It should be a general health rate.

"THE CHOLERA QUESTION.

"A telegram was read from the secretary of the Sydney Board of Health, asking what action the Brisbane Board had taken to prevent cholera making its way into the colony?

"The Chairman said that this was a very important question. It appeared that the cholera was not now far away from Australia, and it was not at all impossible that it would make its way amongst us. It was absolutely necessary that they should take into consideration what should be done to prevent this disease from entering the colony. The reply to the telegram read would be that up to the present they had done nothing. The disease was now at the island of Timor, and the question deserved their most serious consideration. He would sooner see the Russians invade the colony than this dreadful disease should break out here.

"Dr. Bancroft asked if there was any information about a medical man going to Thursday Island?

"The Chairman stated that there was no information before the board, but he believed that there was a sum on the Estimates to make provision for a medical man at Thursday Island.

"Dr. Wray: Yes; £300, and the public guarantee some £200 more."

And so on. Then there was a general conversation; but that was all the business before the board. He would ask any hon. member to take the proceedings of the Central Board of Health since it was established under the present Act, and they would find exactly the same thing. He did not say they ought not to have a central board of health, but he believed they had proof that a great deal better work would be done by a board of advice that could be called in by the Colonial Secretary, because he was the person they were likely to come to after all when they really wanted anything. He said the Central Board of Health remained the same as ever it was—simply a local board of health for Brisbane. The gentlemen who formed that board would make a very good board of advice to the Colonial Secretary. But at present the report he had read showed that the people of the colony were paying for a local board for Brisbane, while at the same time every other part of the colony had to pay as well for its own local board. The Central Board of Health should do their work, and leave the local boards of health to do theirs.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. gentleman thought, no doubt, that he had shown that the Central Board did not do their duty; but by reading the report he had shown that they were doing their duty. Everything the hon. gentleman had read were instances of their functions, and it was one of the proper duties of the Central Board, under the 15th section of the Act, to enforce the performance of their duties by local authorities. The case of the manure depôt was a most serious thing, and a case of which the Central Board was especially bound to take action. When a complaint made by individuals was not attended to, as stated by the hon. member, the local authorities failed to do their duty, because they were allowing a dangerous nuisance to exist. And that was a case provided for by the Act, which gave the Central Board power to compel local authorities to take the necessary steps to remove nuisances. As to the idea that it was not the duty of members of the Central Board to go and see where there was a smell, he wondered how the Health Act was to be administered if smells were to be disregarded.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: One member of the board said it was not the business of the secretary.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was his business to inquire into such matters, and when it was found that a nuisance dangerous to the public health existed it was the duty of the Central Board to compel the local authority to remove it. In a case of fever which occurred in

the Valley the local authority had no power to act, but the Central Board had power to deal with such cases, and ought to do so when a complaint was made. If all the local authorities in the colony woke up to their duties and brought matters affecting their districts under the notice of the Central Board from week to week, or from month to month, they would have plenty to do. At the present time the Act was not in thorough working order; but all the work he had alluded to had to be done. He was anxious that the expenditure should be as little as possible, but he was also anxious that the work should be done efficiently.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that the hon. gentleman, in stating that the board were acting legally, seemed to consider that he had disproved all that he had said; but he admitted that the board acted legally. The hon. gentleman had passed a wonderful Health Act, and the principal function of the Central Board provided by that Act was to keep the local board in Brisbane at work; but to make the law perfect there should be a central board at Cooktown, as well as every other town along the coast and in the interior. It seemed that the local board in Brisbane could not do their work; but it was not the duty of the Central Board to look after details. Suppose the complaint which came from the Queensland Club Hotel, Mary street, had come from the Royal Hotel, Cooktown, would it not have been ridiculous for the board to take up its time by discussing a letter of that sort? And why not deal with a complaint from one as well as from the other? The Central Board made itself ridiculous by attending to small matters not affecting general principles—by doing the work of local boards.

Mr. BEATTIE said he believed the Central Board sometimes did good work and at other times did not; but from the statement of the Colonial Secretary the division to which he (Mr. Beattie) belonged seemed to have been guilty of very serious neglect of duty.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I said a complaint was made.

Mr. BEATTIE said he would give the whole history of the complaint. They were accused of not taking action with reference to the manure depôt; but he had been trying for the last four years to get it removed. When they made application to the Government, however, they could not get it removed, and the Central Board of Health condemned them for not having it removed. The Government had leased a piece of ground to the municipality in their division over which they had no control, and the Central Board came down on the local authority for not taking some action. If the Colonial Secretary would tell him that they had the power, the municipality would get notice to-morrow to remove the manure depôt. With reference to the case of sickness, he agreed with the Colonial Secretary that it was a case for the Central Board of Health. A man reported to him, as chairman of the division, that there was a child in a portion of the division suffering from a very dangerous fever, that Dr. Thomson had seen the child, and said it was a most dangerous fever and it was necessary that the child should be isolated. He (Mr. Beattie) thought it his duty to put himself in communication with the Central Board of Health; and he did so, pointing out that the parents of the child refused to provide medical attendance, though possessed of ample means. Dr. Wray went to the locality and said the child was not suffering from an infectious disease. Dr. Thomson had said that the disease was dangerous—so that doctors differed—and between the two he did not know what had become of the child. Yet the divisional board had been condemned.

Mr. SMYTH said he did not see why any comparison should be drawn between municipalities and the Health Board. The Health Board had done nothing for the outside districts at all, and the municipalities in which health boards sat should pay for them. In his district they had an inspector of nuisances, and whenever a nuisance existed there the matter was attended to by that officer. The Board of Health was not like a municipality or a divisional board, because if the ratepayers were not satisfied with the members of a municipality or a divisional board they could turn them out; but if a stink or a nuisance existed in a locality under the supervision of a board of health the residents had no power to turn out the members of the board. As he represented a district deriving no benefit from the Board of Health he should vote against the increase.

Mr. SALKELD asked how many towns included in the schedule of the Health Act had been brought under its operation?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Act was in operation in all the places mentioned in the schedule, but the schedule only related to the 3rd and 4th parts of the Act, dealing with sewerage and drainage; the rest of the Act was in force all over the colony.

Mr. SALKELD said he believed nothing had been done in Ipswich under the provisions of the Health Act.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that was the fault of the municipal council.

Mr. SALKELD said that, according to the explanation of the Colonial Secretary, the duty of the Central Board of Health was to look after the nuisances about Brisbane. There were plenty of nuisances about Brisbane to keep them going, but the leader of the Opposition said it was the duty of the local authorities to do that work.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said perhaps the hon. gentleman in charge of the Estimates could tell the Committee how much of the £500 voted last year was paid as fees, and how much as contingencies?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was not in a position to give that information. The Act had only been in operation for six or seven months. It was assented to on the 21st of October last year, and the board was not appointed for some little time after that.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Will the hon. gentleman point out the necessity for the increase of £300 in contingencies?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had not the details before him. In a matter of that sort it was the practice to take the recommendation of the officers of the department as to the amount required, and he did not remember to have seen so much curiosity exercised about that vote previously. As to the amount paid for fees, that would depend upon the Colonial Secretary, who called the meetings of the board.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: Does the Colonial Secretary call the meetings as a matter of form?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was a matter of form. He meant to say that he did not personally direct every meeting to be summoned. Arrangements were made for the board to meet at least once a fortnight, and that was certainly not too often to meet until things were in working order.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked whether members of Parliament were paid nothing, and the other members of the board £2 2s. a sitting?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: The hon. gentleman was not mistaken? It used to be £1 1s. a sitting.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And no work was ever done.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Exactly; and no work was done now, though the board met often enough.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he was sorry to hear the Colonial Secretary say he had no details at hand in reference to that vote. He recollected the time when hon. members now in opposition were sitting on the Government benches; if a similar answer were given to the Committee then, the present leader of the Government, who then led the Opposition, would certainly have made a very long tirade against the Government. He did not wish to say that the Colonial Secretary should know all the details, but he thought the hon. gentleman ought to know something about a vote to be discussed, especially when there was an increase in it. If there was no increase it would not matter much as the vote would probably go through committee as a matter of form. But in the case under consideration there was an increase of one-third over the vote for 1884-5. That was a large increase. He understood that there were seven members on the board.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That includes the Colonial Secretary. There are only six members without the Colonial Secretary.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: And seven with the Colonial Secretary. Well, supposing there were six members and they met once a month, their fees would only amount to 144 guineas a year. What was to be done with the balance of the vote? Were the members of the board to meet oftener, or was the number of members to be increased? And what was the nature of the contingencies? It was not sufficient for the hon. gentleman to say that he had taken the recommendation of somebody else; he should know what the recommendation was for—whether for an increase of fees or contingencies, or for both. He was certain that no member of that Committee wished to do anything to render the Health Act or the Health Board inoperative, but at the same time they should be very careful in voting the proposed increase. He did not think they should vote the increase at the present time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thought that item was about the only one on the Estimates concerning which he could not give the most minute details. He supposed that was the reason why it was the one about which minute details were wanted. It had not been the practice to ask for such details in connection with that vote. It appeared to him that £300 ought to be sufficient for fees, even supposing that they met once a fortnight. Then there was the salary of the inspector, which made £450. There was also stationery—and there was a good deal of stationery required.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: Why should we pay the salary of an inspector? That ought to be paid by the municipality.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the Act provided for the appointment of officers of the Central Board of Health.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Would they send an inspector to Cooktown?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said they would, if complaint were made to them and it was thought necessary; or they would appoint some other person there in their confidence. It was quite clear that the board could not go in person. They could not have all the board go. He was satisfied that for the efficiency of the board it was desirable that they should have someone to fill that office. It was pointed out when the Bill was read a second time that it was all very well to make laws for work to be done, but that it was useless unless it was made somebody's business to see that the work was done. That was referred to by himself, and he pointed out that provision was made for that in the Bill. The hon. member who led the Opposition took up the idea and said he considered that was one of the keys to the working of the Bill. And so it was. He was not particular to a pound or two in that vote. The Government would spend no more than was absolutely necessary, and all they asked was that they should have sufficient to carry out the work efficiently.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he must refer to a remark made by the hon. gentleman just now, as it was wrong. The hon. gentleman said it had not been the custom to ask for such very minute information as was asked for in connection with that vote. According to the practice of the hon. gentleman when he was in opposition he kept the Committee two or three or four hours over a vote, and exhausted the matter over and over again until he found some way of getting out of the dilemma. So far from very minute information being asked for on the present occasion, the very opposite had been the case, because when the hon. gentleman had explained courteously that he had forgotten to inquire, or that he did not know, hon. members had accepted that explanation. Certainly no such consideration was shown to the previous Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that in answer to the statement made by the hon. gentleman that he had kept the Committee three or four hours over a vote of that kind, he would ask the hon. member to point out one single instance in which he adopted such a course.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said it was perfectly ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to ask him to point out such a thing, as he knew that a great deal of the sub-talk that followed asking for information on the Estimates was not reported at all. The hon. gentleman had pursued that course from the year 1879 to the year 1883, and notably in 1880, when he nagged members of the Government almost to death.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman is wrong. I never did.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said he challenged the hon. gentleman to point to a single instance, while the late Government were in office, in which a Minister got his Estimates through without being constantly badgered with requests for particulars.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that some hon. members wanted to know a great many things at that time. The hon. member had accused him personally of a particular course of conduct, and he believed he had answered him.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that, when he held a portfolio, after his first year's experience of office he took very good care to have all the information the department could furnish him with; and it was always ready, too. He knew from past experience that if he had not that information his Estimates would not get through. Whether the hon. gentleman asked the questions or not, he was at the bottom of the asking.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is another thing.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that what they were objecting to now was the increase

proposed, not to the amount as passed in previous Estimates; and in order to shorten the discussion he would move, as an amendment, that the vote be reduced by £300.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that before the amendment was put he would remind the hon. member that the amount voted last year was for a part of the year only. The Act was in operation only ten months—practically only six months—and that accounted for a part of the increase.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: That is not the case.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: What was the use of the hon. gentleman talking in that way when the Act only came into operation at the end of October? He would be content with an increase of £100 on last year's vote.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Did they not receive fees for the whole year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he believed they did. When the fees were only £300 a year they did absolutely nothing; now that they were increased to £500 there was a chance of some actual work being done.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that if the hon. gentleman had only looked at his own Estimates he would have seen that he was giving the Committee wrong information. Last year the vote for the secretary was taken in two portions. First, in the Colonial Secretary's Department, £150 was voted as salary, and then an additional sum of £250 was voted on the Supplementary Estimates—so that the whole amount for the year was voted in last year's Estimates.

Mr. NORTON asked how many of the six members of the board were in receipt of fees?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that they all received fees up to the end of the last financial year, up to which time none of them were members of Parliament.

Mr. NORTON: Are fees ever paid to members of Parliament serving on boards?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he understood that in some cases fees were paid to members of Parliament serving on boards.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: I thought that was stopped. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley can give us some information on that subject.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: Does Mr. Wilson, a member of the Upper House, receive fees as a member of the board?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Not since he has been a member of the Upper House. He has not asked for any.

Mr. KELLETT asked whether the amount of fees to members of the board was fixed by the Act, or by the Government?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: By the Government.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that as the fees had been doubled he could quite understand why more money was asked for; but he wanted to know whether Mr. Wilson was to get fees, seeing that he was a member of Parliament? The principle had been adopted by resolution of the House, and acted on for years, that members of Parliament should not receive fees as members of boards.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he understood that members of the Marine Board who were members of Parliament always received fees, and he did not see why they should be treated differently from other members of boards. It was not a desirable thing as a general rule that members of Parliament should be members of boards, but while they were he did not see why they should not receive fees for their services the same as the other members did.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said a resolution was passed by the House a few sessions ago that no member of Parliament should receive fees as a member of a board. He knew that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Beattie, did not receive fees as a member of the Marine Board for years. He also knew that the late Hon. George Edmondstone, who was a member of the Waterworks Board, did not receive fees after the passing of that resolution, which he was not aware had been rescinded.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was notorious that the resolution was departed from almost immediately after it was passed—as it deserved to be. It did not apply only to members of Parliament sitting on boards, but to members of Parliament receiving emoluments of any kind from the Government.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said his belief was that it was acted on for years. However, he would ask the hon. member for Fortitude Valley if it had been departed from as far as the Marine Board was concerned?

Mr. BEATTIE said the resolution was acted upon for a little while and then departed from, and he had received fees since that. He believed the reason why it was departed from was this: Hon. members would remember that Dr. O'Doherty, who was a member of the Upper House, was also a member of the Central Board of Health when the resolution passed. He expressed his dissatisfaction in regard to it, and it was seen that they would lose the services of professional men who were members of Parliament, on the board, if it was adhered to. For that reason it was departed from. For some time he (Mr. Beattie) did not receive fees, but after that he did.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that when he was in the Treasury the rule was acted upon that members of Parliament should not receive fees. He remembered the resolution perfectly, and the change could not have taken place immediately after it was passed. It must have been some time after—not very long ago.

Mr. SCOTT said after the resolution referred to was passed it held good for some time, but at last it was broken on the plea, he believed, that the lawyers in the House held that it was only good for the session in which it was passed.

Mr. KELLETT said the hon. member who had just spoken was perfectly correct as far as his (Mr. Kellett's) memory went. He remembered that when the resolution referred to was discussed a good many hon. members—who were not up to the facilities that members of the Government had of getting out of little difficulties—thought that after it was passed it would hold good always, and that no member of the House should receive fees for committees or anything else—that they should receive no public money. However, after that the then member for Cook (Mr. Cooper) received fees for compiling the Statutes, and then the argument was brought forward that the resolution of the House only held good for one session. There were other instances of the same kind. Although it was understood that no member of Parliament should receive public money, a member of the Upper House had been receiving it year after year, and no one could ever find out how much he got. At any rate, he was receiving money from the Crown as Railway Arbitrator, and it had been a matter of comment in the country generally that it was entirely against the resolution passed by that House. Then the other day a member of the Assembly was paid for

sitting on the Kanaka Commission; so that the resolution had been broken all round, and he did not think that one Government was more in fault than the other. He had always objected to such payments, and understood that the resolution would have held good; but the lawyers held that it only had effect for one session, and money had been paid to members ever since.

Mr. JORDAN said hon. members had stated that the resolution referred to—that members of Parliament should not receive payment from the Government of the day—was held to have weight or authority for only one session; but he had always understood that resolutions passed by that House held good until they were rescinded. Although he was not a member of the House at the time referred to, he believed that by virtue of that resolution two gentlemen who had been for a very long time members of Parliament —the late Mr. Thornton, Collector of Customs, and Dr. Hobbs — had to retire from that honourable position. The Committee were now informed that the resolution had been broken through, but they did not know how or why. They were told that certain lawyers held that it only had authority during that one session of Parliament. He should like to question the principle of that. He did not see it at all; because that resolution having been passed he should suppose that it would hold good until it was rescinded. His own view was that no member of Parliament should receive money from the Government. He could see great danger in it. For himself he would not receive a fraction from the Government.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about payment of members?

Mr. JORDAN said that was voted by Parliament, and was a very different thing from the Government having their supporters in their pay. He repeated that such a thing might be attended with very great danger. He remembered the respect in which the two gentlemen to whom he had referred—the late Mr. Thornton and Dr. Hobbs—were held for a great number of years, and they were compelled to retire from the positions they held as members of Parliament because that resolution had been passed. He did not understand how it could have been broken through immediately afterwards — and broken through all round. He did not think that the House would approve of the breaking through of that resolution, and of breaking it through all round. He believed it would be of great benefit if it was in force at the present time.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had stated that he would be prepared to accept a reduction of £200 on the vote, and he would, therefore, withdraw his previous motion and move that £1,000 only be granted.

Motion withdrawn; and question, as amended, put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY, in moving £4,400 for Public Institutions, said there was an increase of nearly £1,000 for schools of arts. The amount voted last year was found to be insufficient, and therefore the increased sum was now asked for. The aid granted was not to exceed £1 for every £1 subscribed, nor was any grant to exceed £200. With regard to the item of £400 for the Thursday Island School of Arts, he might state that last year there was a special vote on the Estimates for that purpose, but he withdrew it although he had previously promised it. His reason for withdrawing was that they had just arranged to build a State school at Thursday Island, and it was thought that the building would be suitable for the purpose of a school of arts as well. It turned out, however, that the State school was unsuitable, both from its situation and for other reasons, and he therefore felt bound to redeem the promise made by putting the amount on the Estimates again.

In answer to the Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN,

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that the amount — £300 — voted for the Herberton School of Arts last year was a special vote.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked if £400 would be sufficient for the school of arts at Thursday Island?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the people of Thursday Island had raised £100, as he had explained last year, and it was proposed to supplement that by £400. He might state that they received a large amount of revenue from that place and gave very little in return.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that a sum, not exceeding £24,600, be granted for Miscellaneous Services (subdivision). The first two items, for agricultural and horticultural reserves, and repairs and additions to country court-houses and police buildings, were the same as last year. The item for incidental and miscellaneous expenses had been increased from £2,000 to £3,000, while the expenditure for European telegrams was reduced from £3,000 to £2,000. Loans to cemeteries were the same as last year. Fire brigades, expenses of elections, and Acclimatisation Society, all required the same amount as was voted last year; but for the erection of pounds, £500 was asked instead of £300 as formerly, as there had been an unusual demand for pounds, which was likely to continue. The items for Foreign interpreters and for the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals were the same as before. The next item of £3,000 for the Indian and Colonial Exhibition required some explanation. That amount was estimated to be the cost for the current year. That would be the cost of the collection of exhibits within the colony and sending them to England; but of course the ultimate expense of the undertaking would be considerably more. The exhibition was to be a peculiarly colonial one, and it would be a mistake not to have the colony adequately represented. The next item of £3,000 for a marble statue of Her Majesty the Queen deserved some attention. Some years ago an order was given by the then Government to Mr. Marshall Wood, a celebrated sculptor, to prepare a statue of Her Majesty the Queen, and Mr. Wood did all the preliminary work. He did the designing and modelling, and the model was brought out to the colony for approval. The work remaining to be done was to reproduce the model in marble, and before that could be done Mr. Wood died. He (the Colonial Secretary) understood that the practice among sculptors was that when they had done the work of modelling, the actual work, except the finishing touches, was usually left to their assistants; so that Mr. Wood had really done most of the work which would entitle him to the money. He had a great many commissions on hand when he died, and in most cases the persons had committed the fulfilment of them to his son, who was himself a sculptor of considerable merit. Various communications had been made to the Government on the subject, and the conclusion ultimately arrived at was this: that they were bound in honour to Mr. Wood's representatives to allow his commission to be carried out as he had done the greater part of the work. As to the advisability of having a statue of the Queen he need say nothing, but whether it would have been suggested at the present time, in their present condition, to expend that amount of money for

the purpose, he did not know; but the Government being committed and the model having been prepared, they came to the conclusion that they were bound in honour to allow the work to be completed. He had had some hesitation at first in coming to a conclusion, but finding that other persons, including the Government of Canada, had allowed their orders to be completed by Mr. Wood's son, the Government came to the conclusion that the work should be carried to completion. The following item of £1,000, to the Geographical Society of Australasia towards the scientific expleration of New Guinea, was one that the Government felt themselves justified in authorising in anticipation of the sanction of Parliament. The society, which was a purely Australasian one, arranged an expedition to New Guinea, a country in which Queensland was peculiarly interested. The colonies of New South Wales and Victoria had contributed to the expedition, and the Government thought they were similarly bound to contribute. The expedition had been fitted out and had started, and he hoped it would lead to satisfactory results. The item for aboriginal reserves he had explained the other day when the police vote was taken. The Government proposed to do what they could towards collecting the aboriginals together, and civilising them as far as possible, in the northern parts of the colony, where there were great numbers, and in those places where they had been deprived of their natural means of subsistence. The Government believed their services could be made available in many ways. The item, "Electrician in charge of electric light," was placed on the Estimates under the following circumstances: They had the electric light in the Houses of Parliament, and they also had it at the Government Printing Office and the Railway Station. Those sorts of things required particular attention to be paid to them, and it was thought more economical to engage the services of a competent man. Tyroes could not deal with matters of that sort, and if anything broke down, the expense of seeking elsewhere for a competent man would be much greater than the salary provided for the electrician. The last item of £50 to the Royal Humane Society of Australasia had been put on the Estimates at the request of that society, and after consideration of representations which were made and the correspondence which had taken place on the subject. The colonies of New South Wales and Victoria each contributed considerable sums—he believed, £250 each—Tasmania, £50, and Western Australia a smaller amount; and, under those circumstances, seeing that the society had been taken up by the whole of the Australian colonies, it appeared to the Government that it would be undesirable for this colony to stand alone.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said there was a mistake surely in the heading of the vote proposed. It could never be intended that miscellaneous services, such as were down on the Estimates, were a subdivision under the Audit Act.

The PREMIER: They always have been.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said it must have crept in by some error. It was never intended that the £3,000 voted for agricultural and horticultural societies should be in the same subdivision as the vote for the marble statue of the Queen.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Of course not.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the last year he was in office such things were not in the one subdivision. Of course, if hon. gentlemen looked at the items, they would see it was absurd to place them in the same subdivision. The 20th clause of the Audit Act said:—

"If the exigencies of the public service render it necessary to alter the proportions assigned to the particular items comprised under any one subdivision in the annual Supplies it shall be lawful for the Governor in Council to order that there shall be applied in aid of any item that may be deficient a further limited sum out of any surplus arising on other items under the same subdivision and every such order shall be delivered to the said Auditor-General but nothing herein contained shall be deemed to enable the Governor in Council to direct that any such sum as aforesaid shall be applied in augmentation of or as an addition to any salary or wages the amount whereof respectively shall have been fixed by law Provided that every such order shall be laid before both Houses of Parliament within fourteen days after the signature thereof if Parliament is then sitting and if not then within fourteen days after the next meeting of Parliament."

Of course that practice had only been applied in cases where the items were homogeneous. It could never be expected that, if there was a deficiency in the amount that was required for erecting a marble statue of Her Majesty, and that £5,000 would be required, the Government would be empowered to deduct £2,000 from the vote for agricultural and horticultural societies. Yet they would be authorised to do so if all those items were put in the one subdivision. He understood the Colonial Secretary to say that the sum for incidental and miscellaneous services had increased from £2,000 to £3,000, and that that for European telegrams was altered from £3,000 to £2,000; but he would seek to rearrange all those matters. With regard to the item of "Loans to cemeteries," he would like to have some information from the Government. No interest had been paid upon those loans, or had even been asked, and unless an alteration were made he did not see the use of continuing that item, because if no interest were paid it might be put in as "Grants to cemeteries." Fire brigades were in the same position. There was an additional item for the Royal Humane Society of Australasia. He did not exactly catch what was the object of the society and why they should subsidise it. The next item was the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886, and he thought the Colonial Secretary should favour them with some estimate as to the probable cost that the country would commit itself to, because it should not be left for the Government to come down when the money had been spent and say it had cost so much. They ought to have a voice in the matter, in saying how much they wished to spend. They ought to be well represented at the exhibition; but members of the Committee ought to fix the amount that they considered should be spent. With regard to the item of a marble statue of Her Majesty, he was sure that the hon. gentleman had not read the correspondence. He had told them that an arrangement was made with Marshall Wood to make a statue, and that after he had done the preliminary work of making a model and submitting it for approval, and having it approved by Parliament and the money voted, the proceedings were stopped by the death of the sculptor. Marshall Wood came here of his own accord to get orders, and had a model of the statue that he proposed to erect if the proposal met with the sanction of Parliament. He went to the expense himself, without any request being made to him to do so. He went to the expense himself to encourage customers, and erected a plaster cast in front of Parliament House. That was the preliminary work that he did, and it was not at the request of the Government, but entirely of his own accord. So far as Marshall Wood was concerned he had never done sixpence worth of work. He simply erected a duplicate of a model, and Parliament approved of giving the order, but

Mr. Wood died in the meantime. It would be absurd to give the completion of that statue to his executors. The whole value of the statue was in Mr. Wood's completing it. His executors never claimed it, and said they had no claim to it. His son was a sculptor also, but not the man from whom they should order a statue to the amount of £3,000. The two points upon which the Committee had been misled by the Premier were: first, the late Government had never sanctioned or asked Mr. Wood to go to any preliminary expense in the matter at all; and secondly, the expense incurred by him was of his own accord. It was perfectly his own idea. He asked him (Sir T. McIlwraith) to select such a model as he would be prepared to put into marble if he received an order. It was distinctly stated in the agreement, as the hon. gentleman would see if he chose to produce it, that there was no business to be done unless it received the sanction of Parliament. It did receive that sanction; but the death of Mr. Wood prevented it being carried out. A statue which cost £3,000 should be obtained from a celebrated artist, and if they were going to expend such a large sum they ought to get the work done by a first-class sculptor, and not by a man whose celebrity consisted in being the son of his father. There was another item for the Geographical Society of Australasia, towards scientific exploration of New Guinea, £1,000. That was an amount of money which was promised to the Geographical Society two or three years ago, and then the benefit which would have accrued to the colony justified the Ministry in taking the action they took. The Geographical Society of Australasia stood in a very different position now. The Sydney society had assumed the title of the Geographical Society of Australasia, with branches in Melbourne and Brisbane. He did not see why Sydney should be considered the centre of Australasia, considering the action New South Wales had taken with regard to New Guinea. If it had not been for the action of that colony, New Guinea at the present time, with the exception of the part belonging to the Dutch, would be now a portion of the British Empire. The agreement with the society was made at a time when it was very desirable that the most accurate information should be got with regard to New Guinea; but now the people of New South Wales had taken such action, he did not see why this colony should give them £1,000 to help them to explore the portion of New Guinea remaining to Great Britain. This colony had just as much right to found an Australasian Society, and it was quite able to do its own exploration without the aid of the Sydney society. He could understand becoming affiliated to the Royal Geographical Society of England, but not to the Geographical Society in New South Wales, whose principal object, now they wanted money, appeared to be to explore Queensland, which the colony was quite able to do herself. He did not think the vote was justifiable unless the Government had committed themselves to it. Three years ago the conditions were very different, and he thought the aid ought now to be withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that when the Geographical Society was established some years ago in Sydney the other colonies agreed that it should be a society for Australasia. There was not room for more than one society, and it must have some local habitation; and Sydney was agreed upon. When they were making arrangements for the exploration of New Guinea, they represented that New South Wales and Victoria would contribute £1,000, and asked this colony to do the same. The Government thought they ought to do it—not that they owed anything to New South Wales. He was quite in agreement with the hon. member that this colony owed New South Wales nothing at all. They had thwarted Queensland and the other colonies in every possible way in every thing they had tried to do for Australia, and he was inclined to think they should be treated as outsiders—left alone till they found it was convenient to join with the other colonies. That was the position he intended to take up. But with regard to that vote the Government had committed themselves to it, and he thought the colony would reap good results from the expenditure. As to the Royal Humane Society of Australasia, that was a society established in Melbourne. There had been considerable correspondence between the different colonies as to the title, and finally it was agreed, on the assurance that the Society was to be an Australasian one, and not merely a Victorian one, that the other colonies should contribute. When the co-operation of this colony was asked, the Government declined for some time to agree to the request; but it was pointed out that the other colonies had recognised the society; Victoria contributed £350 a year, New South Wales £250, South Australia £50, Tasmania £50, and Western Australia some smaller amount. Under those circumstances, and seeing that the society did really extend its operations over all Australia and had made awards for saving life in Queensland as well as in the other colonies, the Government thought it would be churlish to refuse any assistance, and the amount of £50 was put down. With respect to the item of £3,000 for the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, it was difficult to say exactly what would be the expense. The sum put down was estimated as likely to be spent during the current year. If the exhibition was to be a satisfactory one, expense would have to be incurred. He was not prepared to say what limit there would be to the expense, but it would be as little as possible. Hon. members who had had experience in connection with exhibitions knew how difficult it was to say beforehand what the expense would be. The item "Loans to cemeteries" was an item in accordance with an Act which provided for loans being made to cemeteries, and for the payment of interest on the loans. The interest was paid in some instances, not in all.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: More than one?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; more than one, unless his memory failed him. When a cemetery was started in a remote place, where the wilderness had to be cleared, the Government felt justified under the special circumstances in advancing a small amount without the expectation of any return. However, in some instances the trustees did pay the interest, and in all cases he believed they recognised their liability to do so. With regard to the statue of the Queen, the information he had given the Committee was the impression conveyed to his mind by a careful reading of all the correspondence that had come under his notice, and by representations made by the gentleman who was Colonial Secretary when the arrangement was made. If the facts were as the hon. leader of the Opposition had stated, it was certainly a very different matter. He was certainly under the impression that the model was prepared by Mr. Marshall Wood after the order was given.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: It was a sample he produced of his work.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that was not the impression that the correspondence produced on his mind. He asked for the vote on the understanding that so much of the work was done after the order given by the colony.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH: There was no work done; that was the reason it lapsed. Not one sixpence was spent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that placed an entirely different aspect upon the matter. He had come to the other conclusion from reading the correspondence.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said it was right the Committee should understand exactly how the matter stood, so that they might know how far the Parliament was committed to carrying out the agreement. When the vote was introduced in Committee of Supply in 1882, by the present leader of the Opposition, he read the letter which was written to Mr. Marshall Wood by Sir A. Palmer, who was then Colonial Secretary. He would not trouble the Committee by reading the whole of the letter, but it was stated that the statue was to cost 3,000 guineas, and the concluding paragraph of the letter said:—

"It is distinctly understood that beyond placing the amount on the Estimates, and supporting the item, the Government undertake no further responsibility, nor will they consider themselves in any way liable for any expenditure beyond what they have already incurred should the item be rejected by the Committee of Supply."

That was the full extent of the liability of Parliament. Marshall Wood was dead at the time the vote came before the Committee. There was a small debate upon the question, in which the hon. gentleman who now led the Government took part, and on which he made some very pertinent remarks. In vol. xxxviii., page 1106 of *Hansard*, it would be found that—

"Mr. GRIFFITH said the only question on which he desired to say a word was with regard to the item of £3,150 for a statue to Her Majesty. He did not think it undesirable to have a statue of Her Majesty in the colony, however much she might live in their hearts. It would be a good thing if they had a few more statues; they would familiarise the people with works of art; but he hoped the Committee were not going to vote 3,000 guineas for a particular piece of sculpture when the sculptor himself was dead. There seemed to be no sense in voting the money; and besides, the bargain was at an end. It was not a question of giving 3,000 guineas to anybody to make a statue of the Queen. If they had one at all it should be a good one, and by someone to whom Her Majesty would sit for it. They did not want an imaginary ideal statue of Her Majesty, and he presumed that Her Majesty had sat to Mr. Wood. If the money was voted it would leave it open to the Government to give 3,000 guineas to anybody they liked to make a statue. He understood the Premier invited the omission of the item. If any expense had been incurred it ought to be recouped to Mr. Wood's representatives, and the Committee would have no objection to do so; but it seemed absurd to vote a sum of money for a statue to be executed by a gentleman who was dead."

It seemed quite as absurd now as it was then. They had no knowledge whatever of Mr. Marshall Wood's son—whether he was a painter, sculptor, or poet, or all three or neither. It seemed they were asked now to commit the absurdity which the hon. gentleman himself said, in 1882, should not be committed. The hon. gentleman would have moved the omission of the item only the hon. member for Port Curtis made a mistake in saying that he had read somewhere that before Marshall Wood died the statue for Queensland was almost completed. Only for that Mr. Griffith would have moved the omission of the item, as could be seen from a subsequent speech he made, when he said:—

"He should have felt inclined to move the omission of the item but for the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Norton). It was highly improbable that the statue was finished before Marshall Wood's death, but he was satisfied with the assurance the Premier had given. It would be a very unfortunate thing if the Government were to offer 3,000 guineas to anybody who would make a statue of the Queen, which, perhaps, might not be worth 300 guineas."

That was what transpired when the item was first before the Committee, and hon. members could understand and could approach the question without any thought of responsibility. If they passed the vote it would be on their own responsibility, and they would not be saddling any responsibility upon the previous Parliament.

Mr. KATES said he did not think the Government were wise in introducing the vote of £3,000 for a statue of Her Majesty the Queen. In view of the deficiency in the Treasury, and the additional taxation which had just been imposed, he did not think he should be justified in supporting the vote. He believed the Colonial Treasurer expected only about £3,000 from the timber duty, and that amount would be absorbed by the vote for the statue of the Queen. Until they were in a better position, and had turned their deficiency into a surplus, he did not feel that he could support the vote.

Mr. ARCHER said he would like to ask the Colonial Secretary if he was aware that Mr. Forbes, who was lately in Brisbane, was attached to the expedition sent to New Guinea by the Geographical Society?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No.

Mr. ARCHER said he would much rather expend the £1,000 to supplement Mr. Forbes than to give it to the Geographical Society's expedition. Anyone who had read that gentleman's works and descriptions of his travels would be perfectly prepared to supplement the expenses of his expedition. He had never read any works which showed a more indomitable courage or greater perseverance than Mr. Forbes had exhibited. Concerning the statue of the Queen, he hoped the money would not be voted. His principal reason for saying so was not that he should not like to see a good statue of Her Majesty here, but he would certainly much rather never see a statue here, than that they should have a chance one by a gentleman who had not already won his honours in that particular line. A gentleman who could cut the statue which they would think worthy of the Queen must be a born sculptor. If they were to have a statue of Her Majesty, they should take very great care that they should have such a one that they would have no reason to be ashamed of, for a bad statue was the vilest thing that could be seen.

The HON. SIR T. McILWRAITH said that his memory was now quite refreshed with regard to what passed when the vote was before the House in 1882. Hon. members would see that he said, when moving the item—

"That it was in accordance with an arrangement made with Mr. Marshall Wood, who, he learnt from late intelligence from home, was now dead. In order that the Committee might understand what that arrangement was he would read the letter in which the agreement was embodied. The letter was as follows:—

"'SIR,—With reference to your letter of the 17th ultimo, and to your subsequent interviews with the Colonial Secretary upon the subject of the erection of a marble statue of Her Majesty the Queen in the vicinity of the Parliamentary Buildings, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that, as Sir Arthur Palmer is of opinion that it is advisable to place on record the terms on which your proposals have been made, he desires me to state that the arrangement, as he at present understands it, is that the entire cost of the terra-cotta statue already erected is to be defrayed by yourself, the Government merely providing the pedestal upon which it stands; that this statue is to remain in its present position for the inspection of members of both Houses of Parliament and the general public, until after the end of next session; that the Government undertake to place a sum of 3,000 guineas upon the Estimates for the ensuing year for the erection of a marble statue of Her Majesty similar to that now erected in the less costly material, which, in the event of the vote passing the House, you undertake to execute for that sum; and that

it is distinctly understood that beyond placing the amount on the Estimates, and supporting the item, the Government undertakes no further responsibility, nor will they consider themselves in any way liable for any expenditure beyond what they have already incurred, should the item be rejected by the Committee of Supply.'"

He went on to say—

"He had heard nothing from the executors of Mr. Marshall Wood to show whether or not that gentleman had taken any action with regard to the statue, and he thought that if any action had been taken and the statue had come into existence he would have heard of it. He put the item on the Estimates for the purpose of keeping faith with the sculptor, and he believed the best thing the Committee could do would be to pass the item, for he did not think it would come to anything, as he did not believe that the statue was made before Mr. Marshall Wood died, and the agreement he had read was made on the distinct understanding that the statue should be made by Mr. Wood and by nobody else."

It was the duty of the Government at that time to put the money on the Estimates, because it was for a duplicate of a statue he had erected somewhere else, and it was possible that a great deal, if not all, the work had been done by Mr. Wood himself. After waiting a reasonable time they communicated with the executors, but nothing came of it, and he did not see why they should now recognise a claim made by Mr. Wood, junior, to carry out an agreement with which he had nothing to do.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if those facts had been placed before the Government—as they ought to have been—when the Estimates were framed, the sum would not have been put down, and he had no objection to its omission.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked whether the sum of £1,000 for the Geographical Society of Australasia had been paid?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that but for that fact he would have moved its omission. He believed, with the hon. member for Blackall, that it would have been a great deal better to have given similar aid to Mr. Forbes.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN asked where the aboriginal reserves were situated for which the sum of £1,000 was put down; and what had become of the reserves at Durundur and Mackay?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said nothing had been done yet, because the Government were waiting for the money to be voted; but it was proposed to establish one on the north side of the harbour at Cooktown, and the other in the neighbourhood of Bloomfield. The reserves at Durundur and Mackay had both been abolished, because they had ceased to serve any useful purpose.

Mr. PALMER asked what would be the nature of the expenditure of the £1,000 for aboriginal reserves, also the £500 for relief to aboriginals? Was the latter sum to be expended on food for the blacks, whom he knew to be starving in different parts of the colony?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that sum was for food. He had already said that the arrangements with regard to the reserves were not completely matured. At Cooktown it was proposed to establish a reserve for aboriginals on the north side of the harbour, under the superintendence of the inspector of police and the police magistrate. The Government had received offers, from two missionary societies, of services in connection with civilising the blacks in the northern parts of the colony; but they had not sufficient information respecting the constitution of those societies to come to any definite conclusion. One society was carrying on a mission for blacks in Victoria, but the other had not any experience of that work in Australia, so far as he knew. Negotiations were still going on, however, and it was certain that the Government should do something to ameliorate the condition of the blacks in the northern parts of the colony. He therefore asked the Committee to trust the Government to do the best they could.

Mr. PALMER said that if the Government gave the aboriginals some assistance in the way of providing boats or nets for fishing it would be more serviceable than any missions.

Mr. NORTON said the Government would have to be very careful, where the blacks were treacherous, in making their selection of the sites for aboriginal reserves. There was a reserve at Fraser Island which had for many years been the resort of all the ruffians in the surrounding district. With respect to the vote for the exploration of New Guinea, he would ask whether the Royal Geographical Society in Sydney made it a condition with the exploring party that Sydney should receive all the curiosities collected during the expedition?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he was certain, from the communications he had received from the society, that they would not insist on any such condition.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that aboriginal reserves were established some years ago at Durundur and Mackay, and there must have been some very good reason for abolishing them. They must have failed in some particular, and he hoped the Government would find out the cause of failure and avoid it in establishing reserves in the North. A reserve on the Bloomfield might do very well, but he was doubtful what occupation could be found for aboriginals on the north side of the river at Cooktown. The Colonial Secretary had informed the Committee that the sum of £500 for relief to aboriginals was to provide good food for the blacks, and he did not think any member of the Committee would grudge double that amount. He really believed that double that sum would not be enough at the present time for the blacks in the northern part of the colony who were on the verge of starvation, or dying of starvation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that under the circumstances he thought he had better withdraw the item of £3,000 for a statue of Her Majesty the Queen. He did not know whether it would be in order to move the omission of the word "subdivision" from the heading of the vote "Miscellaneous services (subdivision)." There were two or three items—"European telegrams," "Fire Brigades," "Expenses of elections," and "Relief to aboriginals"—which ought properly to be in a subdivision. With reference to the amounts set down for "Agricultural and Horticultural societies," the "Acclimatisation Society," the "Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals," and the "Geographical Society," they ought not to be enlarged from any other votes. The word "subdivision" meant that the items of the vote might be applied in aid of other objects than the particular purposes for which they were voted. He thought the Committee might accept his assurance that one vote would not be increased by taking from another.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he understood that the hon. gentleman said the amendment could not be moved. That was evidently a mistake. Because it happened to be in the message from His Excellency that was no reason why it should not be amended. The Committee had often made a verbal amendment in the heading of items on previous occasions. He had not the slightest doubt that the Chair-

man would not raise any point of order if the Colonial Secretary moved that the word "subdivision" be left out.

The CHAIRMAN said that, inasmuch as it did not alter the destination, the motion would, he thought, be in order.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: That is just what it will do.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if the Chairman ruled that the motion was in order he would accept his ruling. He moved that the word "subdivision" be omitted.

Question put and passed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that under the circumstances he did not feel justified in pressing the item of £3,000 for a marble statue of Her Majesty the Queen, and with the permission of the Committee he would withdraw that item.

Item, by leave, withdrawn.

Question—That there be granted a sum of £21,600 for Miscellaneous Services — put and passed.

The COLONIAL TREASURER moved that the Chairman leave the chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. NORTON said before that question was put he would like to refer to what took place the other night with regard to the question he asked about the electric light. The Premier then led the Committee to understand that the light had been given up because the engine had broken down. He did not know whether the hon. gentleman had received any information since. There were two engines at work, but there was nothing the matter with them; they were in perfect working order, and the representations made to him (Mr. Norton) were that when the engine was said to have broken down the second dynamo was working perfectly well. He understood that the gentleman responsible for the proper working of the engines was aggrieved at that statement having been made.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the information he gave was as he understood the matter at the time, and he had received no further information since. From the report he got it seemed that the best thing to do was to cancel the contract, as it was not worth while paying £12 a week for the light for the remainder of the session, and the contractors were willing to cancel the contract. What he said on the former occasion was that the engine was not sufficiently rigid, not that it had broken down.

Mr. NORTON said the information he had received since that statement was made was to the effect that both the engines were in perfect order, but that one of the dynamos would not work.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was very possible that he had made a mistake, and confounded the dynamo with the engine; but the result was the same—that the apparatus was not working satisfactorily.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Are we to understand that we have done with the electric light?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: For this session.

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

MESSAGES FROM LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER informed the House that he had received messages from the Legislative Council returning the Beer Duty Bill without amendment; and intimating their concurrence in the resolutions sent up from the Assembly with respect to the proposed railway from Rockhampton to Emu Park, *viâ* Lake's Creek, and the proposed Isis branch railway.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. FRASER, on behalf of Mr. Speaker, as Chairman, brought up the fifth report of the Printing Committee, and moved that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

LICENSING BILL—COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into Committee of the Whole to consider this Bill in detail.

Preamble postponed.

Clause 1—"Division into parts"; clause 2—"Short title and commencement"; and clause 3—"Acts repealed—exception—procedure and penalties begun or incurred before repeal, continued";—passed as printed.

On clause 4, as follows:—

"In this Act, unless the context otherwise indicates, the following terms shall have the meaning and include the matters following—that is to say:—

'Minister'—The Colonial Secretary or other Minister charged for the time being with the administration of this Act;

'Licensing District' or 'District'—A district duly constituted for the purposes of this Act;

'Special District'—A district proclaimed as a special licensing district under this Act;

'Licensing Authority'—The justices having jurisdiction under this Act within the district;

'Licensing Justice' or 'Justice'—A justice of the peace having such jurisdiction;

'Licensed Premises'—The premises in respect of which a license or certificate granted under this Act, or any Act hereby repealed, is in force;

'Licensee'—A person holding a license or certificate under this Act, or any Act hereby repealed;

'Municipality'—A municipality constituted under the Local Government Act of 1878, or any Act amending or in substitution for that Act;

'Town'—Any town to which the provisions of the Acts commonly called the Towns Police Acts, or any Acts amending or in substitution for those Acts, are applicable for the time being;

'Division'—A division constituted under the Divisional Boards Act of 1879, or any Act amending or in substitution for that Act;

'Local Authority'—The council of a municipality or board of a division, as the case may be;

'Chairman of a Local Authority'—The mayor or president of a municipality, or the chairman of a division;

'Clerk of Petty Sessions'—The clerk of petty sessions for the time being of the principal court of petty sessions in the district;

'Inspector'—Any inspector or sub-inspector appointed for the district under this Act; or, if no inspector or sub-inspector is so appointed, any inspector or sub-inspector of police in the district; or if there is no inspector or sub-inspector of police in the district, the senior member of the police force in the district:

'Ratepayer'—Any person whose name is duly entered in the ratepayers' roll of a municipality, or in the rate-book of a division;

'Brewer'—Any maker, for purposes of sale, of beer, ale, porter, or stout, or any other fermented malt liquor, or any fermented liquor made from sugar or other saccharine matter;

'Liquor'—Wines, spirits, beer, porter, stout, ale, cider, perry, cordials containing spirits, or any other spirituous or fermented fluid capable of producing intoxication;

'Licensed Victualler'—The holder of a licensed victualler's license under this Act or a publican's license under any Act hereby repealed;

'Wine Seller'—Any person holding a license under this Act to sell wine made from grapes the produce of the colony;

'Regulations'—Regulations under this Act."

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that if the Premier would look at the definition of "brewer" he would see that it would apply to a man who made hop-beer. It included "any fermented liquor made from sugar or other saccharine matter." Hop-beer came within that, so that a hop-beer maker on any of the Northern goldfields would be made into a brewer and have to pay £5 for a license under the Act they passed the other day. Then "liquor" included "cordials containing spirits or fermented fluid capable of producing intoxication," and, as the hon. the Treasurer a short time ago read over a list of teetotal cordials containing a very large quantity of spirits, they would come under the term "liquor" and have to be retailed the same as brandy or whisky. Did the hon. gentleman mean that?

The PREMIER said if teetotal drinks contained spirits they ought to be sold only by licensed persons. But there were no teetotal drinks that he knew that contained spirits. It was a contradiction in terms. With regard to "brewer" it would be convenient to insert the same definition that was used in the Beer Duty Act. He proposed to amend it in that way.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said before coming to that amendment there were other new interpretations in the clause that he wished to refer to. "Licensing authority" was defined as "the justices having jurisdiction under this Act within the district," and virtually was the same as the licensing board under the present Act, with the exception that the board was a limited number. The "licensing authority" seemed to have all the duties, responsibilities, and work of the licensing board under the present Act; and what was the reason for the change? He could not see from reading the Bill why the term "licensing board" was changed to "licensing authority," which seemed to be a board after all. Then the definition of "town" was altered, and limited to places in which the Towns Police Act had been proclaimed. Under the present Act it was defined as a place having a certain number of inhabitants. He would like to know if there was any reason for these changes from the old definitions? Of course "brewer" would have to be altered to make it consistent with the definition in the Beer Duty Act, and so would "liquor."

The PREMIER said with respect to "licensing authority" the term was adopted to signify the persons who for the time being had jurisdiction, for the purposes of the Bill, in any district. Where special justices were appointed it meant special justices, and where they were not appointed it meant the ordinary justices of the district. It was a simple formula for convenience and shortness in framing the Bill. With regard to "town" the definition based on the number of the population was impracticable, because they never could say what the population was. He thought the definition given was a very convenient one, because the towns to which the Towns Police Act applied were well known in all parts of the colony. It was a definition that would be perfectly understood by everyone. As to "brewer," it would be necessary to amend the intrepretation given so as to make it agree with the Beer Duty Act just passed. The definition of "liquor," he thought, was correct.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the Premier had better stick to the old definition of a town—namely, any town or village containing within a radius of one mile from the centre thereof more than 300 inhabitants. Some such definition was essential, because on the number of inhabitants would depend the amount chargeable for the licenses. The number of the inhabitants in a town was always ascertainable without a census.

The PREMIER said the definition of a town contained in the present Bill included all that the hon. member desired. There was no town of more than 300 inhabitants in which the Towns Police Acts were not proclaimed.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the Police Acts might be enforced in towns which did not have 300 inhabitants, and the local publicans would there be made, unfairly, to pay the higher license fee.

The PREMIER said the definition covered towns of more than 300 inhabitants, and also any towns in which the Towns Police Acts were applied irrespective of the number of inhabitants. He moved that the subsection "Brewer" be amended by striking out the words "made from sugar or other saccharine matter," with the view of inserting the words "brewed wholly or in part from malt."

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said a much better definition was required for liquors containing spirit. He thought the words "cordials containing spirits" should be omitted from the subsection. A great many of those cordials were taken as beverages by people who were not in the habit of indulging in intoxicating drink. The words he objected to would, for instance, cover such drinks as orange bitters, hop bitters, and other non-intoxicating kinds of liquor. The remaining words in the subsection "or any other spirituous or fermented fluid capable of producing intoxication" should suit the hon. gentleman's purpose.

The PREMIER said that cordials containing spirits should surely be sold by licensed persons, He confessed he could not see the objection to the words, unless it was intended that cordials containing spirit should be sold by unlicensed persons.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said that in the North he had seen such liquors as were mentioned drunk in large quantities, and sold by people who certainly did not hold a license to sell spirit. The drinks for all that did contain spirit.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he thought it but right to acquaint his teetotal friends with the fact that a great many of the cordials most enjoyed by them contained a large quantity of spirit. Sarsaparilla contained at least 15 per cent. of spirit; aniseed, peppermint, hop bitters, ginger-ale, ginger-wine, mead, metheglin, rum shrub, and many others all contained spirit, and it was necessary that they should do so in order to preserve them. He thought it right that teetotallers should know exactly what they were doing, and not have all the credit to themselves of refraining from indulgence in intoxicating drinks.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. member for Maryborough had just delivered one of the most unkind speeches he had ever heard. Here the teetotallers had been for years taking harmless little "pick-me-ups" for which they were very much the better, and now the hon. member for Maryborough had exploded the whole business. He might have allowed those poor people to go on taking their little drop of peppermint, no matter what it contained. But to get back to the point at issue, he thought it rather hard upon people who had been accustomed to take those cordials that they should be compelled for the future to go to a public-house for them. There were lots of cordials containing a certain amount

of spirit—such as sugar-beer and hop-beer—which would not make a hard-headed member of the Committee any the worse after drinking them; but if a young girl or child were to drink them in any quantity the result might be different. He knew mead was intoxicating, but there were many other cordials which were perfectly harmless, although containing a small proportion of spirit.

Mr. JORDAN said the hon. member for Port Curtis generally spoke seriously, but he was sure he did not mean what he had said. If the speech of the hon. member had been made by the hon. member for Balonne he (Mr. Jordan) could have understood it, but when the hon. member talked about teetotallers taking "pick-me-ups," then he did not know what he was talking about. Teetotallers were quite aware what the drinks they took really contained. They were very much indebted to the hon. member for Maryborough for the information he had given them, but he (Mr. Jordan) could assure the hon. member that he might rest perfectly contented that no one of those who called themselves teetotallers drank peppermint cordial, or mead, or rum shrub.

Mr. SHERIDAN said the hon. member for Port Curtis had said that the drinks which had been mentioned were perfectly harmless, but so were whisky, and brandy, and rum, unless too much of them was taken.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member for South Brisbane must be labouring under a delusion if he thought that teetotallers did not take any of the drinks enumerated by the hon. member for Port Curtis. He had seen them take them himself.

The PREMIER: How do you know they are teetotallers?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said because the people had said so themselves. He had seen raspberry-wine taken, bottle after bottle, by the teetotallers: it was a favourite drink.

The PREMIER; Is there any spirit in it?

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: Yes; but a very small quantity—not sufficient to make a man drunk. That was the point he wished hon. members to understand. He did not think raspberry-wine or peppermint cordial would produce intoxication unless a man took a bucketful of it, but it might give him the stomach-ache.

The PREMIER: Move the amendment.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said he would move that in line 15 of the clause the following words be omitted—"cordial containing spirit."

Mr. NORTON said he hoped the hon. member for South Brisbane did not think he was serious in the remarks he had made. He did not mean that teetotallers were in the habit of taking drink that contained intoxicants, but seeing that they derived considerable benefit from what they did drink—whatever it was—he thought it was rather hard that they should be deprived of those drinks. As a matter of fact, he had seen numbers of teetotallers use those liquors which had been named in perfect good faith, and they took them because they were teetotallers. They thought they were on the safe side when drinking those liquors, but the hon. member for South Brisbane, being only a new blue-ribbon man, did not drink anything that was likely to be at all dangerous.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 5—"Establishment and constitution of licensing districts—Existing districts continued"—passed as printed.

On clause 6—

"1. The licensing authority for each district shall, except as hereinafter otherwise provided, consist of the justices of the peace exercising ordinary jurisdiction within the district.

"Provided that—

(1) The Governor in Council may from time to time, and subject to the provisions of this Act, appoint certain justices of the peace to be the licensing justices for a district:

(2) When licensing justices are so appointed for a district all the powers and authorities by this Act conferred on the licensing authority or licensing justices shall be exercised by the justices so appointed collectively, or by one or more of them, as the case may be, and all other justices not so appointed shall cease to have any jurisdiction under this Act within the district.

"2. In the appointment of licensing justices for a district, regard shall be had to the following provisions:—

(*a*) The police magistrate (if any) appointed for any town or place within the district, shall be appointed one of such justices:

(*b*) When a district comprises a municipality or division or part thereof, the chairman of the local authority shall be appointed a licensing justice, unless disqualified as hereinafter provided; and if he is so disqualified, the local authority may nominate some other member thereof, being a justice of the peace, who shall be appointed in his stead. But no chairman of a local authority, or justice so nominated and appointed in his stead, shall, as a licensing justice, adjudicate in any case arising under this Act in respect of premises situated, or of an offence committed, outside of the boundaries of the municipality or division.

"3. Any licensing justice appointed for a district, who is absent from any three consecutive meetings, inclusive of adjourned meetings, of the licensing authority (except in case of sickness or other lawful excuse) shall vacate his office, and shall cease to be a licensing justice for the district."

The PREMIER said it had been suggested that the last paragraph of the clause was inconvenient, and had no particular object. He did not see any particular necessity for it, and unless an earlier amendment was proposed he would move to omit the paragraph.

Mr. NORTON asked if there was any limit to the number of justices to be appointed?

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. NORTON asked if it would not be advisable to have a maximum fixed number?

The PREMIER said he had considered the matter carefully and could see no reason for fixing a maximum number, or a minimum. On more than one occasion it had been necessary to abolish a licensing board altogether, because they could not get more than one or two justices to sit upon it. Two justices could act where there was no board. Places varied very much. In some it might be desirable to have a considerable number of justices to get a quorum together. He did not see any object in drawing a hard-and-fast line. That was his experience of the working of the Act.

Mr. JESSOP said that in some parts of his district it was impossible to get a licensing board together. The police magistrate had to go to Chinchilla and Miles, and various other places, and had to hold the board himself. In some cases men could not get their licenses at all.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said that before any amendment was moved he would call attention to something he considered faulty in the construction of the clause. The second part of the clause contained sub-paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*). Then nearly the whole of clause 7 referred to the second part of clause 6, and the conditions that were enumerated there marked (*a*), (*b*), and (*c*) ought to have formed part of that subclause.

Looking at both the clauses, it occurred to him that there was a serious defect in their construction. It was only the 1st paragraph of the clause which had anything to do with appointments; the rest of the paragraphs of clause 7 related to disqualifications arising after appointment, not to the appointment of licensing justices. It would be more convenient to put them together with the original disqualifications in one clause, so that all disqualifications would be together. It was simply a matter of convenience. There was no doubt that clauses 6 and 7, with the exception of the part mentioned by the Premier, referred to the same thing—to disqualifications after the appointment. That part would not come in the former clause but the rest would; and it would be better to keep all the provisions in subclause 2.

Mr. PALMER said that part of subclause 2 said that licensing justices should be appointed for a district; and all other justices not so appointed should cease to have jurisdiction under the Bill in that district. If the licensing authority were composed of justices appointed in that district, who failed to attend, how were the provisions of the Bill to be carried out? Could there be a dispensation in any way by which the justices so appointed should be compelled to act?

The PREMIER said that in cases of that sort there were two remedies—either to appoint more licensing justices, or abolish them all. That was one of the difficulties that arose under the licensing board system when a maximum number was fixed. If it did not seem advisable to appoint more licensing justices they could be abolished; then all the justices could act.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the reason the hon. member had given for not including clause 7 in subclause 2 of clause 6 applied equally to part of subclause (*b*), which referred to the action of certain individuals after their appointment. He thought it would be better to include all the qualifications and disqualifications in clause 2.

Mr. BAILEY said that subsection 3 of the clause would enable two or three members of a licensing board to get rid of a disagreeable member. Some day, when he was away, they might meet in the morning, adjourn till the afternoon, and then again till the evening; he would then have been absent from three consecutive meetings, and his office would be vacated.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: That is going to be omitted.

The PREMIER said it might be more convenient to put together the provisions relating to the same subject. He had not the various drafts before him, and he did not remember exactly the reason that led to the rearrangement of the clauses. Probably one reason was to avoid a cumbrous subdivision of the clause. He certainly thought it would be more convenient to make the change, and he would incorporate in clause 6 the amendments he had contemplated moving on clause 7. He therefore proposed to omit all the latter part of clause 6, commencing with the words "But no chairman," in subclause (*b*).

Amendment agreed to.

The PREMIER moved the insertion of the following words at the end of the clause, as amended:—

"No person who is—

(1) A registered spirit merchant or the holder of a licensed victualler's or wine seller's license, or of a billiard license or bagatelle license; or

(2) The owner, landlord, or mortgagee of any house or houses within the district used or licensed for the sale of liquor, or for playing at billiards or bagatelle; or

(3) A brewer or distiller; or

(4) A paid officer or agent of any society interested in preventing the sale of liquor; or

(5) A director, manager, or officer of a joint-stock company carrying on the business of registered spirit merchants, or of brewers or distillers; or

(6) A director, manager, or officer of a corporation, joint-stock company, or building society, being mortgagees of any house used or licensed for the sale of liquor, or for playing at billiards or bagatelle, or in respect of which an application is made for a license under this Act;

shall be appointed or act as a licensing justice."

Mr. JESSOP said the clause referred to the exclusion of any person who was the paid agent of any society interested in preventing the sale of liquor; but it should be remembered that there were numbers of persons interested in the sale of liquor who were not paid agents, and it was only fair that they should be included. The word "paid" should be struck out.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that if those persons were included shareholders in breweries and wine and spirit merchants should also be included.

Mr. ANNEAR: What about the chairmen of Good Templar societies and those people?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: They are excluded.

Mr. BAILEY said the hon. member's question might arise in a very much more serious way than that. The clause provided that any paid officer or agent of a society interested in preventing the sale of liquor should be excluded from sitting upon a licensing board. Well, as a matter of fact, they had at least three secret societies in Queensland, every member of which was an agent for the prevention of the sale of liquor. How could the Government get at the fact that any person proposed as a member of the licensing board was not a member of one of those societies? They had not merely to consider the secretaries and chairmen of those societies, because every member of them were active agents, and they should be excluded from those boards, as it was wrong that any man who had taken a solemn promise or oath such as they took should be allowed to sit upon a licensing board. It would be unjust and unfair to the licensed victuallers that they should be subjected to the decision of men sworn to put down their trade.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: Will not the words "a member of" meet that?

Mr. BAILEY: That has been purposely left out.

The PREMIER: I explained that that was left out on the second reading.

Mr. BAILEY said his contention was that every member of the Good Templar and Rechabites societies—and he thought there was another one—was an active agent for the prevention of the sale of liquor, and they should consequently be prohibited from sitting on a licensing board.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that as there were so many restrictions placed upon licensed victuallers, and as they had excluded anyone interested in the sale of liquor—even the shareholders in a brewery, or a wine and spirit merchant's company—they should also exclude every member of a temperance society whose tenets were to prevent the sale of liquor.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that if that were done he would be anxious to know where they would get their licensing authorities? As things were now there was scarcely a church in the colony that was not being formed into a temperance society, and they were having, besides,

bands of hope. Was not everybody interested in temperance? He believed that every member of that Committee was interested in it, or interested in preventing the sale of liquor. With the exception of brewers and public-house keepers, nearly every respectable member of society was interested in preventing the sale of liquor. He supposed hon. members knew how the words "a member of" got into the Bill. They crept in through the hon. member for Balonne. When the Bill was before the Committee on a previous occasion the hon. member in a jocular way proposed that a member of any temperance body should be excluded from the licensing bench.

Mr. NORTON: He was quite serious.

Mr. MACFARLANE said they all knew how serious the hon. member for Balonne could be. The matter was taken up by the then Government, and when the Bill was passing through the Upper House, somehow or other, those words "a member of" got into it. He was sure that very few members of the Committee would agree that those words should remain in the Bill.

Mr. BAILEY said that the hon. member for Balonne was in the habit of doing careful things in a careless way, and he was perfectly right in putting those words in, especially when they knew that members of those societies were actually active agents in preventing the sale of liquor, and he could not see the propriety of placing them as judges over the licensed victuallers.

Mr. SALKELD said that the contention of the hon. member for Wide Bay and the hon. member for Rosewood—that the members of certain temperance and total abstinence societies should be excluded from sitting upon the licensing benches—was, he presumed, based upon the fact that in the amendment, wine and spirit merchants, brewers, etc., were excluded from sitting on the licensing benches. The great difference between the members of total abstinence societies and the persons mentioned in the clause as being excluded from the licensing benches was that the one class was pecuniarily interested in the sale of liquor; in the other case, the members of total abstinence societies were not necessarily interested in the prevention of the sale of intoxicating liquors. It would be interfering with the liberty of thought to debar a man from taking a seat on a licensing bench because he believed it was good for the community that the sale of intoxicating liquor should be restricted or even prohibited altogether in a legal manner. If it could be shown that a man was pecuniarily interested he should be debarred, but not otherwise. There was a marked difference between the two cases.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the object of the Committee was to find justices who were not biased. A brewer was not allowed to act as a licensing justice, simply because he was biased on account of being pecuniarily interested; and teetotallers ought to be excluded because they were biased on account of being fanatics — they were not fair judges as to whether there should be a public-house in a district or not. He held in his hand the original Bill introduced in 1881; and it provided that no member, or paid officer, or agent of any society interested in the prevention of the sale of liquor should act as a member of a licensing board. The Government of the day fully considered the matter, and put in that proviso; so that it was not put in jocularly.

The PREMIER said that Bill did not go through.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: It did.

Mr. MACFARLANE: Not through the Upper House.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: No; but it went through the Lower House. There was another matter to consider in connection with the clause. Until the different districts contained the proper machinery required for the purpose of deciding whether there should be any public-houses there or not, he did not think it should be left to the justices of the peace to decide the question. That was a point not yet taken up by the teetotallers, but they should have his hearty assistance in preventing the "first efforts at civilisation" in the outside districts by refusing to grant licenses to miserable shanties in the interior. They should not make easy the granting of licenses in those places.

The PREMIER said he now remembered the reason for putting the disqualifications enumerated in clause 7 in a separate clause. That clause applied to all justices of the peace, while the other applied only to licensing justices. The 7th clause not only disqualified certain persons from being appointed special licensing justices, but from acting in that capacity as ordinary justices. He did not hear what conclusion the hon. gentleman opposite drew from the remarks he had just made.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he would state it now. No licenses should be granted in any district until that district contained properly constituted licensing authorities. It looked like a radical proposal; but it would be a very good reform, because public-houses were built in the interior to the detriment of the whole population. There was no greater curse to a station and the employés than a public-house established in the vicinity.

The PREMIER said he thought the hon. member was going to suggest that the granting of licenses in such places should be in the hands of the police magistrate.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he suggested they should be granted by a properly constituted licensing authority.

The PREMIER said that in some cases public-houses helped to give a start to civilisation. In many places they were necessary to give shelter to the wayfarer, and if houses were not licensed there would be places where people sold grog on the sly. If special justices were appointed in such districts for granting licenses, he believed it would be so difficult to get them to meet from time to time that it would be a long time before a license was granted. He proposed to withdraw the amendment before the Committee.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said there was no doubt that where there was no licensing authority in the interior of the colony, if the first effort at civilisation was not made and a public-house started, sly grog-shops would be established. They had, however, always got a power of repression over them that they had not over public-houses. If hon. members went into the interior of the colony they would see public-houses defying the law in the most outrageous and barefaced way. The persons who kept them had not the slightest regard as to the quality of the liquor they sold, and often retailed the rankest poison. They had no fear of a prosecution in those districts—in such a place, for instance, as the Diamantina. The proposal in the clause under consideration was, that before a licensing authority was properly constituted the licensing authority was to consist of whatever number of justices might sit. The number was not limited, but it was provided that two justices should constitute a quorum. Now,

there might be two men in a district interested in the trade in a way that the provisions of clause 7 would not catch, and they would have the power to grant or refuse a license; and it would be an easy matter to influence unprincipled or good-natured justices. He did not think that provision made the matter any better than it was before.

The PREMIER: It makes no change in that respect.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said it did not, but they wanted to make a change in that respect. Just now a question of the kind which he was discussing would virtually be referred to the police magistrate of a district, and the practice was not to grant a license unless there was a police magistrate in the district. He did not remember any cases where licenses had been granted when there was not a police magistrate in the district. There was no doubt a certain amount of safety in that.

The PREMIER said that the present practice, as the hon. member had stated, was that a license was seldom granted except where there was a police magistrate. But there were some places where there was no police magistrate. For instance, there was none at Adavale, and the work in that district had to be done by the unpaid magistrates. He thought it would be a mistake to insist that there should be no licenses granted except in places where there was a special licensing bench appointed. They must take things as they found them. People who travelled in the interior of the colony wanted refreshments as much as people in other parts of the colony; they wanted accommodation and expected to be able to get something to drink. He thought it was far better that the houses where those were obtained should be under control than that sly grog-shops should be established.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he was not in the Chamber when the former part of the clause was discussed. He had intended to move an amendment in the first three or four lines, but as that could not be done now, the only course open to him was to propose that a proviso should be added to the effect that no licenses should be granted until a properly constituted licensing authority had been appointed. That, however, would be absurd since it was enacted by the previous part of the clause that the licensing authority should consist of the justices of the peace exercising ordinary jurisdiction within the district. He would, however, like to get the idea put into some part of the Bill. What he wanted was to provide that until a licensing authority was properly constituted, and the members of it appointed specially for that purpose, no license should be granted.

The PREMIER said that if there were only two justices in a district those two could be appointed the licensing authority; and there were always two justices in a police district. If it was intended that there should be no license granted until the Government chose to nominate justices as the licensing authority, that would put it in the power of the Government to say that licenses should not be granted in a district. It would really place prohibition in the hands of the Executive Government for the time being, and he did not think that was a sound principle at all. He did not think that any Government should have such absolute power as that. There was a power in the existing Act to restrict the granting of new licenses for twelve months, but he did not think they should have the power to prohibit public-houses in any district.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said the Premier had stated that there were very few districts in the colony in which public-houses were asked for where two justices could not be obtained. No doubt that was the case, but it was not a reason for passing the clause as it stood; it was rather a reason in favour of the amendment he had suggested. If two justices were appointed a licensing authority in any district they would feel a responsibility which would lead them to exercise greater care and discretion than if they were haphazard justices who had gone on the bench to hear an application; they would listen to both sides of the question.

The PREMIER said it was proposed to follow the same course as had been adopted under the existing Act. Where it was practicable to appoint special justices as a licensing authority it would be done, but in those places where the number of justices was limited it was proposed to allow them all to act. At Dalby there was a licensing board at one time, but the number of justices qualified to sit on the licensing board was so small that they could not get a quorum, and the result was that the board was abolished, and practically the police magistrate now sat alone.

Mr. JESSOP said he was quite sure that the suggested amendment would be unworkable in many places. For instance: they could not get a magistrate within fifty miles of Chinchilla at the present time; he would like to know how they could appoint a licensing authority there. It would be impossible, unless they took the police magistrate from Dalby or brought down the police magistrate from Roma. The nearest places to Chinchilla were Roma on the one side and Dulacca on the other. How were they going to form a licensing authority there? And if they did form one, how were they to know that the members of it were not interested in granting licenses, or that they were not members of a society sworn to put down the sale of drink? He did not see how the difficulty was to be got over in thinly populated districts.

Mr. BAILEY said the longer the discussion went on the more surprising it must seem to anyone taking an outside view how anxious they were to fence the publican round. They could not hit upon the right sort of fence. Ordinary posts and rails were not good enough; wire fences and even rabbit-proof fences would not keep them in. They were devising all sorts of schemes to harass and annoy a particular set of men, and treating them as if they were rogues and ruffians, and blackguards; and that was just the very way to make them so. If they would only treat the publicans with more confidence and as ordinary traders, there would be very much less of what was complained of. He could say a good word even for shanties. He remembered a case not many years ago when a sergeant of police, travelling, lost his way, and was dying of thirst and dysentery, and his life was saved by his getting a drink at a sly grog-shanty; and he was man enough not to report the shanty-keeper afterwards.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH: I understood it was the other way—that the grog the sergeant got was so bad that it killed him.

Mr. BAILEY said the sergeant mixed the rum with flour and water, and drank it, and that saved his life. No doubt the hon. member for Mulgrave, who had travelled about a great deal, had, on more than one occasion, had a very welcome drink even at a sly grog-shanty. At all events, he (Mr. Bailey) had, and he openly confessed it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: So have I.

Mr. BAILEY said that occurred at places where there was not a licensed house within many miles owing to want of sufficient trade. He had not such a down upon those people as some hon. members seemed to have. Those

hon. members assumed an air of virtuous indignation, and said the shanty-keepers sold poison. Some of them no doubt did; if so, let them be punished. In districts where a licensed publican could not get a living there were times when an accommodation-house did a real service to travellers by affording them an opportunity to get a glass of beer. He remembered in the early days on Gympie buying a cork for 1s. and getting a drink given in; and he was very glad of the drink and gave the cork back afterwards. There was not a glass of beer or anything of the kind to be got openly on Gympie in those days, where hundreds of men were living in a state of the greatest discomfort; and he did not doubt for a moment that the refreshments they got under that sly grog-selling arrangement did many of them a great deal of good. He was as willing as anybody to put down the system of shanty-keeping, but there were two sides to the question even of shanty-keeping. What he wished to urge was that the Committee were treating the publicans unfairly, as if they were the enemies of mankind —harassing them in all sorts of ways. They expected the publicans to be the best of men, to be honest, to keep their houses clean and respectable, to preserve the goods of persons who would not take care of their own property—and yet they treated them as rogues all the time. He was glad the Committee recognised the point he had taken, that a member of those secret teetotal societies was an actual agent, and would be so to the end of the chapter; and he trusted the Committee would object to such an agent sitting as a judge over licensed victuallers.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH said he did not know what the hon. member meant by that tirade in favour of publicans and against everybody else. Leaving out the local option clauses, he believed that 99 per cent. of the publicans of the colony were pleased with the Bill as a whole, and would be far better off under it than before. He could not see what reason the hon. member had for making such a speech.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

On clause 7, as follows:—

"No person who is—

(*a*) A registered spirit merchant or the holder of a licensed victualler's or wine-seller's license, or of a billiard license or bagatelle license; or

(*b*) The owner or landlord of any house or houses within the district used or licensed for the sale of liquor, or for playing at billiards or bagatelle; or

(*c*) A brewer or distiller; or

(*d*) A member of or the paid officer or agent of any society interested in preventing the sale of liquor;

shall be appointed or act as a licensing justice.

"Any justice appointed as a licensing justice for a district, who, during his term of office, becomes such owner or landlord, or a member, paid officer, or agent of such society, shall immediately cease to be a licensing justice.

"Nothing herein shall disqualify any justice from acting as a licensing justice, by reason only of the legal estate in any such house as aforesaid, not within the district, being vested in him as a trustee for any other person."

The PREMIER moved that in paragraph (*b*) the word "or" be omitted before the word "landlord," with the view of inserting after "landlord" the words "or mortgagee."

Amendment put and passed.

The PREMIER moved the omission of the words "or houses" in the same line.

Amendment put and passed.

The HON. SIR T. MCILWRAITH asked why the owner, landlord, or mortgagee of a house containing a billiard or bagatelle table, where liquor was not sold, should be excluded from a board for granting public-house licenses?

The PREMIER said it would be very improper for the owner or landlord of a house which was licensed for billiards to sit on the bench and grant licenses for the sale of liquor, seeing that the same bench granted the license in both cases.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL asked how far the term "mortgagee" would extend? It might be made a very comprehensive term, and include the director or perhaps a shareholder of an institution which had a mortgage over licensed property. He could quite understand why the owner or landlord of a house for which application for a license was being made should be prevented from dealing with it, but why anyone who had no connection at all, as owner or mortgagee of a house for which a license was applied, should be debarred from sitting on the bench, he could see no justifiable reason. In an extensive district like Brisbane, for instance, why should any individual be prohibited from sitting on the licensing bench because he happened to have some indirect or even direct interest in some other house in the district?

The PREMIER said all licenses had to be granted annually, and it would not be right for a member of the board to have any interest in an application that might come before him. It would be very unseemly. Supposing there were half-a-dozen justices in that position, this might arise: "A" would retire while the other five granted the license in which he was interested; "B" would retire in the same way, and the license would be granted in each case. He thought that any man who had any interest in a licensed house should not be allowed to have a seat on the licensing bench. That had always been the rule. The clause, as it stood, would not touch a director or officer of a company interested as mortgagees of a licensed house, but he had given notice of amendments to that effect.

Mr. DONALDSON said he quite approved o the provisions preventing brewers, distillers, and others interested in the sale of liquors from having the power of sitting on a licensing bench. He quite agreed also with the provision in subsection (*d*), that members of teetotal societies should be excluded. Being a teetotaller himself hon. members might expect him to give his views on the subject, and he thought that what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. If it was fair that they should exclude persons who had any interest in distilleries or breweries, or who were wine and spirit merchants, from sitting on the bench, it was only fair to prevent extreme teetotallers from having the same powers. He believed that it would be more satisfactory to exclude both, and let the moderate men have the privilege of granting licenses.

The PREMIER said the remarks of the hon. member had just reminded him that the words "a member of" any society interested in preventing the sale of liquor had not been struck out of the clause. He (the Premier) intimated on the second reading that he would move the omission of those words, and he should now do so in order to raise the question and decide it. If teetotallers were excluded, practically it would prohibit anyone from sitting on the licensing bench unless he drank liquor. If they did that they should also exclude shareholders in all societies that had any interest in a mortgage upon a public-house. He moved that the words "member of or," in subsection (*d*) of the clause, be omitted.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to say with regard to the last subsection of the clause, referring to members of teetotal societies sitting on the bench, that he did not think they personally cared for the position. He did not know one who did; and, as far as he was personally concerned, he would not attempt to fill such a

position. At the same time, however, he did not think that the Committee would attain its object by leaving the words in the clause. There were many abstainers, such as the hon. member for Warrego, who did not belong to any temperance society, and they were just as much interested in the reduction of the consumption of strong drink as persons who were connected with temperance societies. He himself was not connected with any society, except the benefit society called the Rechabites. He thought that it would be unseemly to have the words left in the Bill, seeing that it was very difficult to ascertain whether persons who were abstainers were members of those societies or not. How was the Colonial Secretary, who appointed the justices, to know whether men were connected with teetotal societies or not?

Mr. FOOTE said he thought the clause was very good as it stood, and that it was only fair that the words mentioned should be left in. It had been asserted that they were hedging in the liquor traffic to what might be considered an unreasonable degree, but he did not consider so himself. He thought, as the hon. member for Warrego had said, that what was fair for one side was fair for the other; and, for his own part, he thought it only reasonable and proper that the words referred to should remain in the Bill. If, on the one hand, persons who were in any way, directly or indirectly, interested in the sale of liquor should not be allowed to sit on the licensing bench, neither should persons who were interested on the other side. He thought it only fair, as far as all parties were concerned, that the paragraph should remain as it stood. The leaving in of the words in question would not be unfair to any party. Total abstainers like the hon. member for Warrego, who was not a member of any temperance society, would be quite as eligible for a position on a licensing bench as any other ordinary member of society. Besides, it was only reasonable and fair to the other side that the words should be left in.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he decidedly thought that the words should remain as they were. One reason for leaving them in was, that a total abstainer could not be a judge of the liquor sold in the hotels. Licensing magistrates should always be good judges of the drink sold to the public, and they could be good judges without being good tipplers. He himself was a licensing magistrate for a good many years in an outside district, and whenever he found any publicans within his jurisdiction selling bad grog he immediately intimated that their licenses would be taken from them on the first opportunity. He endeavoured to see that the liquor was good throughout, as far as he possibly could. A licensing magistrate should certainly know what was going on in the liquor trade, and be able to sample the liquor vended. The Premier had said there was no means of knowing who the members of the temperance societies were; but as a matter of fact they were all well known to the people of the district in which they resided. He was satisfied that if such men were debarred by statute from acting on the licensing bench they would never attempt to do so. He had that much faith in those men; and he believed that their societies were very good and meritorious. He gave them all credit for their good intentions and for their way of living, according to their lights, but held at the same time that they should allow other people to live as they chose and to take a little spirituous liquor in moderation, as many members of the Committee did and were none the worse for it.

Mr. SALKELD said the interests of the two classes—of the publicans, landlords of public-houses, and mortgagees on the one hand, and of members of total abstinence societies on the other—were entirely different. The former were pecuniarily and directly interested in the liquor traffic. The latter had no more interest in preventing or regulating the sale of liquor than any good citizen. They believed that what they aimed at was the good of the whole colony, and they were actuated by no pecuniary motive. Surely, then, it would be an unseemly thing on the part of the Committee to endeavour to discourage in any way the members of the temperance societies. He himself was a total abstainer, but not a member of any temperance society whatever. Yet his feelings in relation to the drinking customs of the colony were perhaps quite as strong as those of his colleague or any member of the temperance societies. One of the main objects of those societies was to gather in the young people and many others who required associations to keep them away from habits they had formed or were liable to fall into. He would not discourage anyone from joining such societies, even in the most remote manner. If members of those societies were to be included in the disqualifying clause, there was no reason why shareholders in any financial institution and mortgagees of public companies should not be also included. If the words proposed to be omitted were left in, there was no reason why the words, "Director, manager, shareholders, and officers of any public company" should not be inserted. The real object was to prevent persons pecuniarily and directly interested in having public-houses licensed from acting as licensing justices. The hon. member for Wide Bay had told the Committee something about sly grog-selling. He (Mr. Salkeld) was sorry to hear a member of the Committee say he had at any time taken drink at an unlicensed place. It was very unseemly to come to that Committee and state publicly that he had done such a thing. As much might be said for brigands or highway robbers as the hon. member had said for sly grog-sellers. It was easily to be seen that he had constituted himself the champion of the licensed victuallers. But all that was beside the question. The object of the Committee was to cure an unmistakable and undeniable evil which was occasioned by the drinking customs of society. There was no bitterness of feeling against licensed victuallers. Was it not enough that they saw families ruined and incalculable mischief done? There were hon. members on both sides, who did not believe in total abstinence, but who clearly saw the great evils of the drink traffic, which, indeed, were patent to everyone. His own sympathies were entirely with all who were trying to do good.

Mr. ANNEAR said he agreed with the hon. member for Ipswich (Mr. Macfarlane) that every member of the Committee was interested in and believed in temperance. But did that hon. member believe in the men he worked with in this colony? Their objects were the total prohibition of intoxicating liquors, the shutting up of every hotel in the colony, and the stoppage of the drink traffic altogether. One temperance association he had heard of passed a by-law compelling its members, whenever they saw a bullock-team coming along the road conveying grog, to cross over on the other block and not pass within half-a-mile of it. The hon. member for Ipswich had been rather rough on the member for Wide Bay, but he (Mr. Annear) agreed with a great deal that had fallen from that hon. gentleman. Gentlemen who had never travelled beyond the smoke of Ipswich or Brisbane did not know the value of bush shanties, which had been the means of relieving many a traveller. He hoped the words would be

retained in the clause, and he agreed with the leader of the Opposition that a licensing bench should be an impartial jury. There could be no impartiality in men who took a declaration to prohibit, by all means in their power, the sale of intoxicating liquor. He thought there were two sides to the question, which should both be fairly and fully discussed. When the local option clauses came on he should have something further to say, as he was a believer in local option; but at present he should vote for the words proposed to be omitted being retained in the clause.

Mr. NORTON said he agreed with the hon. member for Ipswich that members all had the same object in view—namely, the promotion of the cause of temperance, but the difficulty was that they thought it ought to be brought about in different ways. All members honestly looked forward to making a Bill to promote the cause of temperance, but he would point out that this must be considered: that the more stringent the regulations were made the more probability there was of inducing people to keep unlicensed houses. He confessed he was not one who absolutely condemned all shanties and shanty-keepers. There was a control exercised over unlicensed houses by everyone who went there, but no control, in many cases, was exercised over licensed houses. He had frequently gone into unlicensed houses which were very well conducted, and obtained refreshments, and he had once heard a story of a certain Governor of Queensland who had obtained refreshment at an unlicensed house, and in the following year the person who occupied it was granted a license. Of course he did not believe in all the wretched shanties that were started in different parts of the country; but some of them were of real benefit to travellers. The question before the Committee was a rather difficult one to decide, because there was a sort of general belief that members of societies had to make a declaration by which they undertook to use all their influence to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors. If that was the case they would be rather objectionable men to have on the bench; but on the other hand, if it was not so, then there could be no objection to them. As to the phrase getting into the old Bill by accident, he thought the hon. member for Ipswich was mistaken. The hon. member for Balonne proposed that members of temperance societies should not be admitted on to the licensing bench, and there was a great deal of discussion upon the subject, but it eventually went to a division with the result they saw before them.

Mr. JESSOP said he understood the object of every hon. member was to make the Bill as perfect as possible. The hon. member for Cook had placed the qualification of a licensing member in quite a new light, and had said that no man should sit upon a licensing bench unless he was a good judge of liquor. He should advise the hon. member to propose an amendment to that effect. He would suggest to the Colonial Secretary that the word "paid" be added to the amendment, because he maintained that every secretary or treasurer of a society was just as much interested in preventing the sale of liquor as any other member.

The PREMIER said he would be content to take the amendment in that form; but he believed the majority of the Committee would accept the clause as it stood, and they had better take a division upon it.

Question—That the words proposed to be omitted stand part of the clause—put, and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 11.

Sir T. McIlwraith, Messrs. Norton, Nelson, Bailey, Lissner, Ferguson, Horwitz, Palmer, Annear, Isambert, and Lumley Hill.

NOES, 11.

Messrs. Dickson, Miles, Groom, Rutledge, Griffith, Moreton, Kates, McMaster, Jessop, Sheridan, and Dutton.

The CHAIRMAN said that as the numbers were equal, and there was no question or order involved in the matter, he would be consistent with his former vote, and give his vote with the "Noes."

Question resolved in the negative.

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

BEER DUTY BILL.

The SPEAKER said: I have to inform the House that I waited upon His Excellency the Governor to-day and presented the Beer Duty Bill, to which His Excellency was pleased, in my presence, to subscribe his assent on behalf of Her Majesty.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received messages from His Excellency the Governor, assenting, on behalf of Her Majesty, to the Beer Duty Bill and the Customs Duties Bill.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that the House do now adjourn. There are the two small Bills, which were introduced to-day, to be read a second time to-morrow, but I believe they are almost formal. Afterwards we propose to proceed with the Licensing Bill.

The House adjourned at half-past 10 o'clock.