

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

WEDNESDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1886

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 27 October, 1886.

Liquor Bill—third reading.—Formal Motion.—Question, —Question without Notice—anti-Chinese rioters at Croydon.—The Railway Accident at Wolston.—Local Government Act Amendment Bill—consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments. — Supply — resumption of committee. — Messages from the Legislative Council—Oyster Bill —Local Government Act Amendment Bill.—Separation of Northern Queensland.—Adjournment.

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

LIQUOR BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. Sir S. W. Griffith), this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

FORMAL MOTION.

The following formal motion was agreed to :—

By Mr. ALAND—

1. That the Godsall Estate Enabling Bill be referred for the consideration and report of a select committee.
2. That such committee have power to send for persons and papers, and leave to sit during any adjournment of the House, and that it consist of the following members, namely : — Messrs. Black, Chubb, William Brookes, Campbell, and the mover.

QUESTION.

Mr. MURPHY asked the Minister for Works—

1. If he has received a copy of certain resolutions passed at a public meeting held at Rockhampton on Thursday last, in the matter of the extension of the Central Railway?
2. Will he cause the plans and specifications of the further extension of that line to the Thomson River to be laid on the table of this House during this session?

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

1. Yes.
2. The Chief Engineer has been instructed to report on the best route which future extension of the Central Railway should take; and until such report has been received I am unable to give a definite reply to the hon. member.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

ANTI-CHINESE RIOTERS AT CROYDON.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said : Mr. Speaker,—I beg to ask the Chief Secretary a question without notice. The hon. gentleman told us last week that he had communicated with the police magistrate at Croydon to ascertain the particular crime of which the anti-Chinese rioters at Croydon are supposed to have been guilty, and obtain a report on the nature of the case. I would like to ask now if he has received that report, and, if he has, what steps he means to take in regard to the liberation of the rioters?

The PREMIER said : Mr. Speaker,—The hon. gentleman was good enough to give me verbal notice of the question, which I can answer now. A report has been received from Mr. Warden Samwell by telegraph, dated Croydon, the 19th instant. It reached here, I think, on Saturday. This is Mr. Samwell's report :—

“The men were not convicted for any connection with expulsion of Chinese, but for general disorderly conduct and larrikinism, blowing up closets with dynamite, breaking plate-glass windows, and with others keeping the town in a state of terror for some time past. The Chinese, consisting of some four or five cooks, had all left, but one in the employ of William Kelly, storekeeper. This man was preparing to leave, but James Enright, the elder prisoner, whose

credit had been stopped by Kelly, would not let the man leave in peace, and at night set fire to his tent behind Kelly's promises, destroying all his clothes, &c.; and if the wind had not been variable the large stores belonging to Kelly and Lorian, containing thousands of pounds' worth of goods and a large quantity of explosives, would have been all destroyed, besides placing the whole town in danger. It was proved the other prisoners pulled down the end of a building being erected by a Chinese British subject who had produced his naturalisation papers. Some day before they were cautioned to let him alone James Enright demanded from this man £10, blackmail, and promised if he gave it him he would let him alone. Chinaman refused to pay. The same night they proceeded to pull his building down; the police caught them in the act and identified the prisoners. The town has been most peaceable since the removal of these men. For several months midnight robberies with violence have been frequent. Several dangerous characters are still hanging about the place. So far as the Chinese are concerned, I had taken all possible steps to keep them off the field before any of the residents mentioned the matter. There are a few Chinese gardeners whom the miners at the first allowed to settle to produce vegetables, as scurvy was very bad—one man died from the effects of it. The whole fact of the matter is there are no crushing mills as yet at work; the water is very bad; a great deal of sickness and idleness with excessive drinking prevails."

In the face of that report, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel justified in asking the Government to recommend any remission of the sentences. It appears, if this report is correct, that the men were convicted of general disorderly conduct, and imprisonment for two months is not an excessive punishment for such offences as those of which they are reported to have been convicted.

THE RAILWAY ACCIDENT AT WOLSTON.

Mr. NORTON said: Mr. Speaker, — May I ask the Minister for Works if he has any objections to lay upon the table the Commissioner's report and the papers in connection with the late railway accident at Wolston?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I have no objection to do so.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMEND- MENT BILL.

CONSIDERATION IN COMMITTEE OF THE LEGIS- LATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into committee to consider the amendment of the Legislative Council in this Bill.

On clause 8, as follows:—

"All revenue derived by the council of a municipality from waterworks shall be placed to the credit of a separate account, and shall be applied in manner following and not otherwise:—

First—In payment of the actual working expenses of the waterworks;

Second—In payment of the annual instalments payable by the council under the Local Works Loans Act of 1880 in respect of the money borrowed for the construction and maintenance of the waterworks.

"And the balance, if any, may, at the discretion of the council, be applied in defraying the cost of the maintenance, repair, and extension of the waterworks, or in reduction of the principal loan."

—which the Legislative Council had amended by the addition of the words "and not otherwise" at the end of the clause.

The PREMIER said there was one amendment made by the Legislative Council in the Bill, and he confessed he could not understand why the amendment was made. The 8th clause of the Bill provided that—

"All revenue derived by the council of a municipality from waterworks shall be placed to the credit of a separate account, and shall be applied in the manner following, and not otherwise."

Those words governed the whole clause, which went on to say how the revenue was to be applied—first in the payment of the working expenses of the waterworks, and secondly in payment of the annual instalments of the loan borrowed for the construction and maintenance of the waterworks; and the clause further provided that the balance, if any, was to be applied at the discretion of the council in defraying the cost of maintenance, the repair and extension of the waterworks, or in reduction of the loan. The Legislative Council had added to that the words "and not otherwise," and it was really very difficult to know what the object of their amendment was. The most courteous supposition was that it was done by inadvertence. So far as he could see it had no meaning, and if it had any meaning, or was intended to have any meaning, it would apparently be a deliberate attempt to infringe the privileges of that House. He must take that opportunity of expressing his surprise that, after the events of last session, when both Houses agreed upon an Address to Her Majesty, asking that the question of the privileges of that House might be referred to the decision of the Privy Council, there should still apparently be a determination on the part of some members of the other Chamber to depart entirely from the honourable understanding then arrived at. He thought it was very much to be regretted. He, however, hoped and believed, as he had previously intimated, that that was the action of a small minority in the other Chamber, who, by accident, might have secured a majority in a division, and that it was not the deliberate action of the whole of the members of that Chamber. He proposed to move that the amendment be disagreed to, and to give the following reasons:—

Because the addition of the words proposed to be added is unnecessary, inasmuch as the first paragraph of the clause already provides that the purposes mentioned in the clause are the only purposes to which revenue derived from waterworks may be applied. The repetition of the words "and not otherwise" as proposed appears, therefore, not to add any distinctness to the exclusive definition of those purposes, but rather to obscure the meaning of the clause.

The Legislative Assembly have offered these reasons without waiving their right to insist upon the reason that the proposed amendment, if it had any effect upon the meaning of the clause, would be a manifest infringement of the privileges of the Legislative Assembly, as they have been always claimed by this House, and have lately been declared by the Privy Council in a case submitted at the joint request of both Houses.

He took that opportunity of saying that he thought it was extremely to be regretted that a Bill of that kind—the main principles of which were agreed to unanimously last year, and which were urgently demanded by a great number of municipalities in the colony, and, further, upon the passing of which depended the construction of works of great importance to the health of many of the most important centres of population in the colony—should be apparently obstructed merely for the purpose of asserting a right which it was universally admitted does not exist. If the Legislative Council desired to assert such rights it was very desirable that, at all events, they should not endeavour to obstruct the passage of a Bill of that kind, to the main principles of which no objection was taken in either House, and in which, moreover, the Assembly had gone out of its way to endeavour to meet the small criticisms which were directed to it last year. He moved that the amendment be disagreed to.

Mr. NORTON said that, for his part, he did not see the reason for the amendment, but he did not think the other Chamber intended to attempt to infringe the rights of the Assembly. The only object, so far as he could see, that they could have had in proposing the amendment was that they thought the words "and not otherwise" in the

first portion of the subsection applied only to the first part of the clause, and that they, supposing it was the intention of the Assembly to make the words apply to the whole clause, inserted them in the last portion of the clause. He could not conceive of any other reason for the amendment. He did not imagine for a moment that the construction placed on the amendment by the hon. gentleman was justified by the circumstances.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed, and the CHAIRMAN reported that the Committee had disagreed to the amendment of the Legislative Council.

The report was adopted, and the Bill was ordered to be returned to the Legislative Council, with a message intimating that the House disagreed with the amendment—

Because the addition of the words proposed to be added is unnecessary, inasmuch as the 1st paragraph of the clause already provides that the purposes mentioned in the clause are the only purposes to which revenue derived from waterworks may be applied. The repetition of the words "and not otherwise" as proposed appears, therefore, not to add any distinctness to the exclusive definition of those purposes, but rather to obscure the meaning of the clause.

The Legislative Assembly have offered these reasons without waiving their right to insist upon the reason that the proposed amendment, if it had any effect upon the meaning of the clause, would be a manifest infringement of the privileges of the Legislative Assembly, as they have been always claimed by this House, and have lately been declared by the Privy Council in a case submitted at the joint request of both Houses.

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 of the Whole further to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge) moved that there be granted, for the service of the year 1886-7, the sum of £6,640 for Law Officers of the Crown. There was a slight increase over last year. The salary of one of the clerks in the Crown Law Offices was proposed to be raised from £150 to £175. That officer was appointed some two years ago as successor to an officer who had been receiving £200 a year, so that since that time the country had been saving a considerable amount. He was a valuable officer in every respect, and there was no reason why he should not receive as much as his predecessor; though even this increase would not make his salary equal to that of his predecessor. The only other increase would be found under the head of "Fees to justices, surgeons' fees, burial charges, and incidental expenses under Inquests of Death Act of 1866." The vote last year had been found utterly inadequate, and as the money payable out of that vote was made payable by statute, it must be provided. An increase was therefore asked of £200.

Mr. NORTON said that before the question was put he would like to ask the Colonial Treasurer a question. Since the Estimates had been published it had been found that a very great mistake had been made in the estimate of revenue. No doubt at the time the Estimates were framed the hon. gentleman's expectations were much better than they could be now. In the Railway Department alone the decrease on the receipts for the year as compared with last year was somewhere about £60,000; and the decrease in the receipts from the Customs Department for the

last quarter, as compared with the same quarter in 1885, was, he thought, £36,000. Now, when they had decreases like that it placed the Government, and the Treasurer particularly, in a very serious position; and hon. members were quite justified in asking the hon. gentleman whether he was prepared to go on with the increases proposed in each department, or what action he proposed to take to meet the deficiency which was now discovered?

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the Estimates had been framed, as hon. members must observe, with the greatest desire to promote economy in the Public Service, and he did not think the paltry matter of £25 would affect the public revenue to such an extent that special attention should be called to it. If there were any large increases, and if the hon. member could point to them, they were not certainly within his knowledge. The present Estimates disclosed nothing of that sort of thing; and seeing that they had been framed with regard to the strictest possible economy, he did not see that any circumstances had transpired that would cause the hon. member to object to their passing in their original shape. It was perfectly true that the revenue up to the present time had not been so buoyant as he would desire to see it, but at the same time hon. members must remember that that was not altogether unexpected, and they would see that in his Financial Statement he expressed a serious apprehension that until the beginning of next year probably there would be no improvement perceptible. He was glad to be able to inform hon. gentlemen that during the last week there had been an improvement in the Customs revenue, and he hoped that was the precursor to a general improvement in the finances of the country.

Mr. BLACK said he was glad to hear the assurance of the Treasurer that the finances of the country were likely to improve, but they were discussing the Department of Justice, and he would point out that whereas the estimated expenditure for the whole year was £33,000, the expenditure for the first quarter had been at the rate of £38,000. Now, he did not think they could attribute any loss of revenue in the administration of justice to the drought, which had assisted the Government so often in warding off adverse criticisms. It was quite true that the number of insolvencies might have increased the expenditure, but the Attorney-General should give serious attention to the discrepancy between the estimated expenditure and the probable expenditure, as shown by the first quarter's disbursements.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said of course the question of increase on the whole estimate would be discussed as they came to the items which made up the increase. He had shown that the increase in that particular item was caused by an addition of £25 to a clerk's salary, and an amount of £200 for fees to justices, surgeons' fees, and burial charges which the department was compelled by statute to pay. It was absolutely necessary that the requirements of the Act should be complied with. There were some other increases, which came under the head of witnesses' expenses and payments to jurors, which also must be paid, and those were not matters for which the Department of Justice was responsible. The Department of Justice did not create crime; it did not create the necessity for witnesses or jurors, but they had to be paid; and if the amount of crime in the colony necessitated an increased expenditure, the department could not be held accountable for that. Under the head they were discussing there was only an increase of £25 which could be controlled by the department.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. gentleman had not made a very good case, because he had pointed out what the Opposition side of the House had always contended—that the expenditure would be larger than the amount allowed on the Estimates. The hon. gentleman pointed out certain items for which the department could not be held responsible, but someone ought to be responsible for the Estimates. The allowance made did not come up to the actual expenditure for last quarter, and if last quarter was to be taken as an indication of what the expenditure would be during the year, the estimate would be exceeded by about £6,000. Now, his side of the House had contended all along that in making out their Estimates the Government did not make sufficient allowance for liabilities which were likely to arise, and consequently the Estimates did not accurately represent what the expenditure was likely to be. Now, in regard to what fell from the Treasurer the hon. gentleman pointed out that the decrease in revenue was not altogether unexpected. Well, his (Mr. Norton's) side of the House always expected it, and the hon. gentleman was repeatedly put on his guard. He therefore thought that hon. members of the Opposition could not be blamed for neglecting to give any warning that might be necessary. He pointed that out to the Colonial Treasurer, because it was a fitting thing that the expenditure of the different departments should be regulated by the Government and not by the Opposition. The Government knew what their expenditure was likely to be, and he said it was not a fair thing for the Treasurer to ask hon. members to point out where reductions could be made. Of course, if the hon. gentleman thought the money was necessary then he supposed a majority of hon. members would vote it, but let the hon. gentleman take the whole responsibility for the increases.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the hon. gentleman complained that where an increase was necessitated the requirements of the present year were not met. As he had said, there was a considerable increase under the Inquests of Death Act. Last year the amount voted for that purpose was £1,000, and the requirements were £145 16s. more. £200 extra had been put down this year, which would give £55 over the extra expenditure of last year, and he thought that that ought to be sufficient. He did not think they ought to go beyond that in making provision for the expenditure of the current year.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the contention of the hon. the leader of the Opposition was that whereas the provision made on the Estimates to meet the expenditure of the department was £33,000, the expenditure for the first quarter of the year was £9,000, which being multiplied by 4 gave £36,000, or a larger sum than that demanded for the current year. The sum of £9,664 comprised not only the current expenditure for the quarter, but also £2,511 belonging to last year's service, which had been brought over. The actual expenditure for the quarter was only £7,150, or a little over £28,500 for the whole year, supposing the expenditure was continued at the same rate; and that was well within the estimate of his hon. colleague. That sum of £2,500, he might remark, paid on account of the service of the preceding year, was a considerably heavier disbursement than that paid during the corresponding quarter of the previous year; the amount paid on that occasion being only £1,400.

Mr. CHUBB said what he understood the hon. member for Mackay wanted to know was, what the expenditure for the first quarter of the

current year was so largely over its proportion of the estimate for the whole year. With regard to the item of "Fees to justices, surgeons' fees, and burial charges," he had never been able to understand why it should be charged to the Attorney-General's Department at all. It properly belonged to the Colonial Secretary's Department, and ought to be charged to that department. All that the Attorney-General had to do with that branch of the administration of justice was to receive the depositions. The item had somehow or other got into the Attorney-General's estimates, where it had no business to be.

Mr. PALMER said he wished to have some explanation with regard to the item of £300 for drafting Bills. To whom was the money paid? He had always been under the impression that the Premier drafted all the Bills, for which he made no charge.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was pretty well known that the Chief Secretary drafted nearly all the Bills brought before Parliament, and the country was indebted to him for that work in a way for which money would be no compensation. The only amount expended last year in drafting Bills was £42, and that was not paid to the Chief Secretary or to any member of the House. All the other draftsman's work was owing to the genius and industry of the Chief Secretary.

Mr. NORTON: And who was the genius whose industry was rewarded with this £42?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Alfred Pain. He gave some assistance in the drafting of a Bill.

Mr. ALAND asked why the Attorney-General asked for £300 this year for the purpose, when last year's expenditure was only £42? He presumed the Government were asking for the money for their own expenditure, and not on behalf of some future Government. If the money was not to be spent, the vote seemed unnecessary.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said there would be no harm done in voting the money, because if it was not spent it went back to the Treasury. The item had been on the Estimates from the very commencement, and it was absolutely necessary that some amount should be voted for the purpose. The present Government was the only Government that ever held office in the colony which had not spent the whole or nearly the whole of that vote.

Mr. CHUBB: There was not a penny of it spent for drafting during my tenure of office.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: Don't make rash assertions.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He said who had not spent the greater part, and very properly spent it. It would be very inconvenient if the vote were to be omitted. The present Government could not guarantee that they would have a perpetuity of tenure of office, and it was very difficult to restore an item to the Estimates after it had been once left off. Besides, the Chief Secretary might not choose to continue to do the work next year; his health might fail, or he might want to take a holiday; they would then have to pay for the work being done by others. Because the Chief Secretary had done so much work at no cost to the country, it did not follow that he was always to do it.

Mr. NORTON said he did not see why they should expect the Chief Secretary should do all the work. Why should not the Attorney-General share it with him?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Not unless you pay him. He has quite enough to do already.

Mr. NORTON said that in his opinion the time had arrived when neither the Chief Secretary nor the Attorney-General, whoever they might be, should be expected to do all the work of drafting Bills. It would soon be necessary to appoint an officer to do that special work.

Mr. DONALDSON asked whether the £260 saved from the vote last year for drafting Bills went towards paying the £2,500 by which last year's expenditure was exceeded?

The COLONIAL TREASURER replied that the unexpended balance of £260 lapsed into the Treasury, and formed no part of the £2,500.

Mr. DONALDSON said the item for drafting Bills was a very small one, and he would cheerfully vote that the Chief Secretary should be paid for his work of drafting. The country ought not to expect to obtain so large an amount of valuable work from the hon. gentleman for nothing. With regard to the larger question they were discussing, it seemed pretty certain that the Attorney-General was considerably out in his estimate last year.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was impossible to accurately forecast all the requirements of the department, especially with regard to fees to justices, burial charges, expenses of witnesses, and so on, where the actual requirements often exceeded anticipations. It was proposed to guard against that by increasing the vote for the present year.

Mr. BLACK said an argument used for retaining a clause in a Bill last night was because it was in a statute thirty-seven years of age. Now, the Attorney-General had pointed out that because the present vote had always been upon the Estimates it should be retained. It had been on the Estimates since the beginning, and therefore it should be retained, notwithstanding that it was not usually expended. It lapsed into what he might call "contingencies"—fuel, lighting, and so on. There were no "contingencies" in the vote. He would like an explanation with regard to the item "Fees to counsel, £300."

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the fees paid to counsel were as follows:—F. W. Dickson, £52 10s.; Virgil Power, £99 15s.; Patrick Real, £105 17s. 6d.; F. B. Sheridan, £63; W. K. Rose, £36 0s. 6d.; W. F. Wilson, £27 5s.; J. V. Barnett, £6 13s. Those were the amounts paid last year, the total being £391 1s., or £91 1s. in excess of the amount voted.

Mr. BLACK said there was a paper laid on the table of the House yesterday, but which was not circulated yet, showing two items making £500.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Not fees to counsel.

Mr. BLACK asked if the hon. gentleman would explain what vote that £500 was taken from?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said one part was taken from "Civil business," and the other out of a special vote not appearing in that department at all. The greater portion of the amount was paid out of funds provided by Parliament in connection with the return of Polynesian labourers who were improperly taken from their homes.

Mr. BLACK said it would be much more satisfactory if all those items were included in one vote. He noticed that £500 was paid to two members of the legal profession.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had explained that there was a difference between criminal and civil work, and there were two different items, one being "Fees to counsel," which was supposed to be given exclusively for the business done in the criminal branch of the Department of Justice on behalf of the Government, and the other being "Legal expenses, civil business account." Fees connected with actions by or against the Government were paid out of that vote. When there was something special, as in the case of last year—when it could not be foreseen that there was going to be a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the cases of those islanders, and a court established for the investigation of possible claims that might be made, and the payment of professional fees—it was paid out of a vote by Parliament for the whole business, all the particulars of which, he thought, had already been furnished to the Committee.

Mr. DONALDSON said he would like to know upon what principle the vote was generally spent, or the counsel were employed, because he noticed in the list read by the hon. gentleman that there were some large fees paid to counsel who did not get much private practice, and he thought better counsel might have been obtained.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it would be a bad look-out for the colony if only one or two barristers, who might be supposed to have the principal practices, should receive all of the Government business. All those young men whose names he had read out were fully competent to discharge the business entrusted to them.

Mr. DONALDSON: I did not say they were incompetent.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he never had, and never would, so long as he was in office, shovel all the business into the hands of one or two men, but would give them all a chance, and he had scattered the money pretty widely. Gentlemen who wanted legal business conducted in years to come would want leading counsel to take the place of the present leading counsel, and if those young men never got a chance how were they ever to be competent to take leading counsel's place?

Mr. NORTON said he did not think it was the business of the Government to rear a batch of young barristers. If they could not get on in their own way, they had better clear out altogether and leave room for those who had brains enough to make their own way. He did not wish to reflect upon any of them; certainly he had heard that some of them were not very good; but, beyond that, he knew nothing of them. Some, he believed, were very clever; but at the same time he did not think it was the business of the Government to rear them until they were able to stand on their own legs.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the hon. gentleman would see that there was a difference in the amounts given to junior barristers and those given to senior barristers. The senior barristers, who received fees from the Government out of that vote, received £105 and £99 respectively. As he had said before, the others were perfectly competent to conduct the work entrusted to them, and, in addition to that, they would do the work for less than the Government would pay to a leading barrister. The Government would have to pay a leading barrister his full fee whether the work was simple or difficult, and he could not see why the country should pay a large amount because a man had the name of being a leading barrister, when they could get it done equally well for half the money.

Mr. CHUBB said the Government paid smaller fees to counsel than private persons paid. In one case in which he had a brief for the Crown—the Polynesian compensation inquiry—the gentleman who appeared on the other side received 150 guineas more than the leading counsel for the Crown. He knew of several similar cases in which counsel were not over-anxious to be retained by the Crown, as that prevented them from holding briefs on the other side. Only the other day he was retained by the Crown when it would have paid him probably better to have accepted a brief from the other side; so that members of the legal profession who received briefs from the Crown were not excessively “spoon-fed” by it. He had heard the names of those gentlemen read who received fees out of the item “Fees to counsel,” and he certainly thought the greater number of them were well qualified to do the work for which they were employed. They were barristers of a considerable number of years’ standing, and they did their work quite as well as it would have been done by anybody else.

Mr. BLACK said it was not a question of competency. He believed barristers here were quite as competent as any from the other colonies. He complained of the way in which the estimate was put before them. There was “Fees to counsel, £300,” and then “Legal expenses, £350”; the latter was for civil business, they were told.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It says so.

Mr. BLACK said there was another vote in connection with the Pacific Islanders’ compensation, in which there were fees to counsel amounting to £500. Why not lump the whole and put them in one list, so that the Committee would know what they were voting for fees to counsel? There was no necessity to divide it in that way unless it was for the purpose of misleading, which was the effect it had.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Estimates were estimates for time to come, and how could he forecast that there should be anything causing a cost, for defraying of which a vote of the Committee might be necessary? How could he forecast that and make the item three times as large as it ordinarily was, merely to include some possibility they never heard of before?

Mr. NORTON: Like that £300 not spent.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes. It might happen next year that the Chief Secretary might break down, and he did not think there was any hon. member inclined to do his work for nothing.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You do not.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he would not do it. Those items had been framed in the present form year after year, and he was not responsible for it. How, then, could there be any intention to mislead hon. members? Those estimates had been in exactly the same shape year after year; and why should the hon. member come to the conclusion that there was a desire to mislead?

Mr. ADAMS said he did not complain that the hon. the Attorney-General said he would not do anything for nothing. There were not many persons who would do anything for nothing. He (Mr. Adams) was asked by some hon. friends beside him if he had ever done anything for nothing and he said, yes, many and many a time to his cost. But he was older now than he was then. There was one item, “Travelling expenses of Crown law officers, £550.” That was not a very large sum; in fact, it was a very small item. But when they were considering the travelling expenses of the Crown

law officers they ought to consider the travelling expenses of the litigants as well. They had been trying, in the district which he had the honour to represent, to have sittings of the Supreme Court there. So long as there was no court held there, if there was any litigation at all, the public had to travel a considerable distance, at great expense to themselves. It was desirable if they passed that estimate, which he hoped would be done, that the Attorney-General should be able to see his way clear to establish a Supreme Court at Bundaberg, as it would save great expense to the public. When the Crown law officers were considered, the public ought to be considered also. He trusted that before the session closed he would be able to get an answer from the Attorney-General as to his intentions in that matter.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the hon. member had spoken to him some time ago on that point, and he thought he had given him an answer that was satisfactory.

Mr. NORTON: It does not seem to have been.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to ask the Attorney-General a question in reference to surgeons’ fees. There were medical officers in nearly every town whom they had to pay to the tune of £4,285. Could not those health officers attend to the cases of inquest, and so save the country the fees that were charged on those occasions? They paid health officers £200, £400, and £500 a year, and he wished to know if those medical officers were paid inquest fees over and above the salary paid to them by the Colonial Secretary’s Department?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that when medical officers performed *post-mortem* examinations they were paid under statute a fee of two guineas. It was not congenial or very pleasant work, and medical officers who received certain amounts from the Colonial Secretary’s Department were not expected to do *post-mortem* examinations for nothing. The great majority of those health officers only received from £30 to £50 a year, and they could not be expected to travel considerable distances and perform *post-mortem* examinations, in addition to all their other work. They were entitled under the Act to receive two guineas whether they were health officers or not.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that doctors were like lawyers—they saw that they were well paid. He did not see why health officers, who had very little to do, and who were paid £30, £50, up to £200, for attending to health matters, should be paid over and above those sums for inquests. He could understand medical officers, not health officers, being paid if they were brought in to make inquests. Certainly two guineas was a very small sum; but when they were paid that over and above what they received as health officers it became a different question altogether.

Mr. DONALDSON said there was an item, “Interpreter for aborigines, £100.” What were his duties?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that his duties were to attend the courts not only in Brisbane but at Toowoomba and several other parts of the colony. He was capable of speaking many of the dialects of the blacks, and he interpreted between the aborigines and the court. The individual who performed that work was apparently the most competent interpreter in the colony, and had spent a number of years himself among the aborigines. For many years he had discharged the duties of that office although he was getting up in years now, and someone else would have to be thought of soon.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is his name?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Davis.

Mr. DONALDSON said the services of that gentleman were very well known. But it was also very well known that the dialects of the blacks changed in such a short distance that an interpreter who might be able to talk with the aborigines near Brisbane would be no good 150 miles away. It was astonishing how quickly the dialects changed. Any aborigines about Brisbane could give evidence in sufficiently good English without the services of an interpreter. If there was an interpreter up north or out west there would be some sense in it, because there the aborigines could not talk sufficient English to give evidence.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had it from Mr. Petrie—a gentleman well known to hon. members, and who had had very great experience among the aborigines—that it was possible to converse with aborigines who lived hundreds of miles apart and yet not be able to talk with those tribes whom they had to pass through. Mr. Petrie said that he could speak with the natives of Bundaberg district as well as with the natives about here, and so also with the natives round Toowoomba; but when he got to Roma he could not understand them at all. In all cases where that officer was capable of interpreting, he was employed.

Mr. DONALDSON asked if his services were ever necessary?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said they were very frequently necessary. Some of the judges would not allow interpretation to be carried on in "pigeon English," which the aborigines might or might not understand.

Mr. PALMER said that the best face to put on the matter was to say that it was a gratuity to a man who had spent many of the best years of his life among the aborigines; for all the services he rendered as interpreter might be put at *nil*, considering that of the tribe he lived among very few were now alive. It should hardly be expected that he could interpret the language of a tribe which he never heard of. He (Mr. Palmer) did not suppose that the vote could be placed on the Estimates many more years, and they should look upon it as a gratuity. He recollected asking for the information the first year he was a member, and the hon. member for Townsville gave him the information.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that if he believed the officer was not capable of doing the work for which the salary was set down he would say so. He frequently required that officer's services, and therefore did not feel justified in saying that his salary was a pension, though, as a matter of fact, it might be so. He did not know the motives that caused it to be placed on the Estimates in the first instance.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not think there was any serious intention on the part of the hon. member for Warrego to meddle with the item of £100; he simply asked for information.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Hear, hear! I have given it.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that as far as interpretation was concerned the office was all "moonshine." The officer had lived among the blacks in the Wide Bay district—the Maryborough blacks, as they were called—for a great many years, and could interpret their dialect; but it was well known that the language differed materially at places a few miles distant; and the statement that such a man was able

to interpret the language of the blacks at the Gulf of Carpentaria or Cape York—because there was a large district intervening where he could not interpret—was simply absurd. The same remark applied to the Chinese interpreter. There were a great many dialects of the Chinese language, and a man who could interpret two or three was a great linguist. No one could interpret them all. He had seen Chinamen well educated—both in English and in their own language—unable to interpret certain Chinese dialects in a court of justice. The amount set down was really a pension, with which he did not think anyone had a desire to interfere. With regard to the £300 set down for drafting Bills, he did not think that the money had been really expended in any one year, though a sum of money for the purpose had been on the Estimates every year since the colony was formed.

The PREMIER: It has—very often.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Premier devoted a great portion of his time to the drafting of Bills, and he might say that working seemed to agree with that hon. gentleman, just as not working agreed with the Attorney-General. There was a general feeling of regret among the admirers and friends of the Attorney-General that he was getting too corpulent; and he did not think that a little more work would do the hon. member any harm. Instead of informing the Committee in such an emphatic tone that he would not draft any Bills, he might have undertaken to do some of the work. Seeing that the Premier did a great deal of drafting, and a great deal of other work which was not his work—and did it for nothing—it would not be much out of place for the Attorney-General to assist him occasionally. He certainly was paid for some work outside his office, and there was no reason why he should not do a little for nothing outside his office. The Attorney-General might have a little more ambition and try to shine in other matters, as well as the Premier. He did not like to hear the emphatic disclaimer that he would not draft Bills, as if it was something *infra dig.* for a lawyer to do anything for nothing, when there was the leading lawyer in the colony doing three times the amount of work he was expected to do, out of the sheer love of doing it, and the ambition of serving his fellow-men.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he had known the interpreter very well for a great many years, and had frequently seen him interpreting in the Brisbane court-house. He believed that officer understood the language of the blacks from Brisbane to the Burnett, having lived among the blacks in the Wide Bay district for fourteen years. He could not agree with the hon. member for Burke that the blacks in the Wide Bay district were nearly all gone, as there were 500 or 600 of them in the district still, and if any of those unfortunates should be brought up for any offence no doubt Mr. Davis' services would be again required. He hoped that the gratuity or pension, or whatever it was, would be continued, as he believed it was thoroughly deserved.

Mr. W. BROOKES said that if the hon. member for Townsville carried his mind back to what might be called his own Attorneys-General he would see a very great contrast between them and the gentleman who now occupied the position. He did not refer to the hon. gentleman now sitting beside the hon. member.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BROOKES said he remembered Attorneys-General who did absolutely nothing, and it

was a matter of public notoriety that there had not been an Attorney-General for a long time who had done half the amount of work done by the present Attorney-General.

Mr. HAMILTON said it had been stated that the interpreter was very well acquainted with the language of all the blacks between the Burnett and Brisbane. Well, he thought that every blackfellow who resided in that part of the colony could speak just as good English as the Attorney-General himself. At the same time he should be sorry to deprive the poor old man who now acted as interpreter of his pension. If the services of an interpreter were required in the West there should be an additional interpreter, because the present interpreter could not understand the dialects spoken there. He (Mr. Hamilton) had knocked about among the blacks and studied their language, and he knew that there was a great difference indeed even in the space of eight or ten miles. The blacks on the mainland could not understand the dialect spoken on Stradbroke Island; and the Brisbane blacks could not understand that spoken on Frazer's Island; so that if the services of an interpreter were required in different parts of the colony, the old man for whom provision was made was not sufficient.

Mr. DONALDSON said that when he rose before he simply wanted information, because he knew that the dialects of the blacks were frequently different at short distances apart.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was never supposed that anyone would imagine that one interpreter could speak all the dialects spoken in Queensland. In many places special interpreters were employed, and it was very seldom that this interpreter went further north than the Burnett.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that in the country districts blackfellows as interpreters. The native police were often taken as interpreters.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: So they are now.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that was the way justice was administered at places some distance outside of Brisbane. The man Davis could only interpret around Brisbane, and though, if as the hon. member for Maryborough said, he had gone as far north as the Burnett, he might be able to speak a few words of the language of the blacks there, he was certain he could not really speak the language of those blacks.

Mr. GRIMES said the man had been for thirty years amongst the blacks, and as they knew the blacks did not remain in one place, but visited other tribes, a man who had lived so long with them might be perfectly conversant with the dialects of the blacks for miles and miles, and he could not therefore understand the statements made by hon. members opposite that he would not be likely to know the language of blacks within a few miles of Brisbane.

Mr. STEVENSON said that if it was the case that the blacks walked about the country in the way mentioned by the hon. member who had just sat down, there would be no necessity for a permanent interpreter at all. He could not see why there should be a permanent interpreter in Brisbane any more than anywhere else. The Attorney-General had himself stated that the services of a local interpreter were obtained in other places when required, and he could not see why they should have a permanent interpreter in Brisbane at £100 a year. It was the old story over again, that Brisbane must have more money than any other place. The vote should be struck out, as there were a number of other interpreters to be had besides that man, and many of the native police could be used as interpreters.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the hon. gentleman was quite right as to that, but, as he had pointed out to the hon. member for Townsville, the one under discussion was an exceptional case. That man had been a very great many years in the service of the Government, and they did not feel justified in discharging the old man after so many years' service, and he was afraid he was not likely to live much longer.

Mr. STEVENSON said he could not object if it was put as a pension to the man. There were very few blacks at all about Brisbane now, and very little necessity for an interpreter. If the vote was a pension, it should be stated as such in a straightforward manner, and should not be put down in the Estimates in the way it was.

Question put and passed.

SUPREME COURT.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that the sum of £7,783 be granted for salaries and contingencies in connection with the Supreme Court. That amount was also somewhat in advance of the amount of the vote for last year, and he would explain how the increases were made up. Hon. members would see that in the vote for clerks there was an increase of one clerk at £100 a year. It had been represented to him ever since he had been in office that the clerical staff of the office was utterly insufficient for the effective performance of the work to be done. The work was also increasing year by year, and it was proposed to appoint an additional clerk at £100 a year. There was an increase provided in the salary of one of the clerks of £25. That clerk had been in the service of the department for ten years, and was most efficient, and it was proposed to increase his salary from £125 to £150 a year. He might say that any hon. member who knew that clerk's qualifications would only be surprised that such a man stayed on at such a salary.

Mr. CHUBB: Is that Guy?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, Guy. He had been informed by members of the legal profession that that man's memory was of such a phenomenal character that he really saved the employment of another clerk, because he was able to carry and retain in his memory the numbers of writs and documents in the office for years past, and when documents were called for he was able, from memory, to recall their numbers, and go to the shelves and get them straight away without detaining members of the profession whose time was valuable.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: And that man gets £125 a year?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes.

Mr. BLACK: He ought to be better paid.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he ought to be better paid; and had the times allowed it the Government would have proposed a larger increase. The man was deserving of very much more than the paltry increase asked for. Then there was another clerk who had been appointed by the last Government at £100 a year. That man had a grown-up family, and the salary he received was wholly insufficient. It was proposed to increase his salary by £25. There was an increase in the amount of allowance for the attendance of witnesses attending the Supreme Court and circuit courts. The amount voted for last year was found to be wholly insufficient, and to meet the probable requirements in that respect for the ensuing year it was proposed to ask for an increase of £500. The witnesses must be paid, and if the requirements were anything like what they were during last year that amount would be required. There was an increase for incidental

expenses of £50. Hon. gentlemen would see there was a slight alteration in the manner of showing the amount for travelling expenses of the judges while on circuit. Instead of being put down as £800 for all the judges, the amount was divided into £400 for the judges of the Supreme Court and £400 for the judge of the Northern Supreme Court.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he desired to say a few words on the vote, and he would begin by complimenting the Attorney-General for giving the proposed instalment of justice to the clerk to whom he had referred, and in fact to the two clerks mentioned. He claimed to have special qualifications to speak upon that matter, as no hon. member in the Committee, not even excepting the Attorney-General, knew as much about it as he did. The clerk referred to was certainly very much underpaid, and that a clerk like him should have been ten years in the service of the department without reaching a salary exceeding £125 a year was one of those anomalies he could not for the life of him understand. That clerk was now to be paid £150 a year, but would not be reasonably paid until he got £200 a year. His memory was, as the Attorney-General had said, phenomenal, and his qualifications for his work exceptional. He (Mr. Brooks) spoke from an experience of six years, during which he had spent several hours every week in that office, and therefore knew what the work was. The increase of the work in that office was very great, taking, for instance, the matter of writs issued—which was not a very gratifying matter on which to report an increase—the increase had been 50 or 60 per cent. during the past year. Here they had a married man, standing six feet something high, in the service of the department for ten years, and he was just to get £150 a year! The other clerk got £100 a year, and was to get £125, and he was a plodding, respectable man, and deserved more. He liked fair play, and the Government had not dealt with those servants of theirs in anything like a spirit of fair play. They deserved more than they were getting now. He would like to remind hon. members that there was a set-off against that expenditure. The search fees alone in the Registrar's office amounted to something like £450 or £500 a year, leaving out altogether the fees paid for registration. His opinion was that the set-off against that expenditure of £5,013 left a very small debit.

Mr. CHUBB: It is more than paid.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said that with regard to the clerk, to whom special reference had been made, he thought the hon. member for Carnarvon would bear him out that the solicitors owed him a considerable amount of goodwill, because he was the general instructor of the lawyers' clerks. In all matters of precedent and procedure he was an authority, and he (Mr. Brooks) had heard hundreds of them take advice from him. He considered that the young man was not doing his duty to himself by remaining where he was at that figure, although he (Mr. Brooks), as a frequenter of the court, hoped he would not leave it. He had very great pleasure in thus bearing testimony to the excellence of the two clerks who had an increase put down for them, and he hoped the increases would be passed without demur.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he would like to mention, with reference to what the hon. member had said, that the income from that office for the half-year, from 1st January to 30th June, was £2,754, more than £500 a year above the cost of maintaining it.

Mr. BLACK said he was glad to hear that one Government department was paying; but it did

not say much for the generosity of the Attorney-General when he had a gentleman with such undoubted qualifications at a paltry salary of £150 a year. The House never objected to pay liberal salaries to gentlemen who were deserving of them, though they criticised very severely the unnecessary expenditure on those who were higher in the service. He had had no opportunity of knowing that gentleman, who, he saw, was in the Registrar-General's Office. He could only say that on the few occasions he had been to that office—

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: This is the Supreme Court Registrar's Office.

Mr. BLACK said he would finish what he was about to say—that the courtesy and expedition with which anyone attending the Registrar-General's Office was received was very creditable indeed to the department. If that was not in the Attorney-General's Department, perhaps he would take a lesson from it. With regard to the salary of the gentleman who had been mentioned, he was sure no hon. member would take exception to it; in fact, he thought the Attorney-General might have been a little more liberal. He might have cut down some of the fees to counsel, which would bear a little cutting down, and have paid in a more equitable manner a gentleman such as Mr. Guy had been described. He only hoped that that gentleman would not engage for too long a period with the Government; he thought the time was not far distant when they would be able to offer him something very much better than £150 a year, after ten years' service with the Government down here in the South.

Mr. PALMER said he thought Mr. Guy might thank the hon. member for Fortitude Valley for the very able way in which his case had been placed before the Committee, after which he was sure that no hon. member would demur to the increase. In fact, considering that the profits of the department were £500 a year, the Attorney-General had very properly placed a small amount on the Estimates to increase that officer's very small salary. He wished to ask the Attorney-General if it was intended to establish a branch of the Supreme Court at Normanton? A contract had just been taken for a commodious court-house, with the evident intention that it should at some time be an office of the Supreme Court. The contract was for the sum of nearly £2,000, and the building would be a very creditable one. He considered that a Supreme Court was very necessary, considering that Normanton was now the centre of very large outlying districts, extending to the table-lands, Burketown, Cloncurry, and right away to the South Australian border. Normanton was becoming a centre, as Townsville was the centre for Charters Towers and other places, and Brisbane for its outlying districts.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he thought it more than probable that the establishment of a Supreme Court at Normanton would not be very long delayed. The expense of bringing witnesses from the Gulf round to Cooktown was very great, and on the ground of economy it would be his duty before long to recommend the Government to establish a Supreme Court at Normanton.

Mr. BROWN said he would ask the Attorney-General if he could see his way to provide for the Supreme Court sitting at Townsville more frequently than twice a year? An interval of six months was very considerable.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had not had any representations made to him on the subject, and he would like to be supplied with the

material for forming an opinion. He knew the work was growing very much, and the importance of not having too long an interval between the sittings of the Supreme Court was not to be overlooked. Of course, Townsville was not the only place where the Supreme Court sat only twice a year; as a matter of fact, the Supreme Court sat only twice a year at any place out of Brisbane. He would be glad if the hon. gentleman could supply the department with any information which would assist in forming an opinion on the subject.

Mr. BROWN said he only wished now to draw the Attorney-General's attention to the matter. He proposed later on to furnish the hon. gentleman with information which he thought would induce him to give it favourable consideration.

Mr. DONALDSON asked if the Attorney-General could say anything about establishing a district court at Thargomindah?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the matter had been under consideration for some time, but it was quite out of the question during the time the drought prevailed, when it would have been almost impossible to get as far as Thargomindah. It would not have been desirable to establish the court in the midst of the drought, when it would be very costly to get there, and in fact impossible for the judges to get there. The tax on Judge Paul to get to Cunnamulla was already very great, and he would not like to tax him beyond his strength altogether. He could not say for certain that a district court would be established at Thargomindah this year, but he could undoubtedly promise the hon. gentleman that it would be established in due time.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said the Attorney-General, in reply to the member for Townsville (Mr. Brown), said that Townsville was not the only place in which there were only two sittings of the Supreme Court, but was there another place outside of Brisbane in which there was as much work to be done? He thought not. He thought there was sufficient work there for three courts in the year. He would ask the hon. gentleman if he did not think that the time had come when there should be a Supreme Court at Cairns? The only Supreme Court in that district was at Cooktown, and he thought on the plea of economy the Attorney-General should recommend the establishment of a Supreme Court at Cairns. There was considerable expense in bringing witnesses from Cairns by sea to the Supreme Court at Cooktown, and he thought the establishment of a court would be an economy, seeing that the judge passed Cairns on his way to Cooktown, and more especially as there were several inland towns from which business might be expected. He would say nothing at present about Port Douglas, because there was no railway there; but seeing they were making a railway from Cairns to Herberton and that it would be a convenience for witnesses coming in from the west of Cairns, he thought there should be a court established there.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said if there was no district court sitting at Cairns the necessity for a Supreme Court would be much greater. As far as he could ascertain, the great bulk of the cases that arose at Cairns were cases within the cognisance of the district court, and the proportion of cases beyond the jurisdiction of that court was very limited indeed. The few cases that were not cognisable by the district court came to Townsville, and he scarcely thought the balance of evidence was so favourable in the case of Cairns as it was in the case of

Normanton. He scarcely thought the time had arrived for the establishment of a Supreme Court at Cairns. There might be one case, or there might be none, and the judge would have to stop there a week. Besides, the judge would have to fix his court at Cooktown to follow Cairns. He could not fix the court at Cooktown and depend upon the chance of getting a steamer; he would have to fix a day so as to make sure of catching the regular weekly boat.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he would suggest that the judge might come straight on to Cooktown from Townsville, and take Cairns on the way back. There were two steamers a week leaving Cairns coming down.

Mr. STEVENSON said it would not be much out of the way when the judge had reached Clermont to go round by St. Lawrence and hold a court there.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he wished to ask when the court-house at Ipswich would be built? The building, which was an antiquated arrangement, was the oldest court-house in the colony he believed, and was not in keeping with the size or importance of the town. Complaints by the judges were very frequent, and he hoped something would be done.

Mr. MELLOR said he noticed that a sum of £400 was put down for the travelling expenses of all the Southern judges, and £400 for the one Northern judge. That sum seemed to him rather excessive, and, in fact, he thought it ought to be reduced. He knew on one occasion when the judge was travelling in the North he, through vindictiveness and nothing else, distinctly stated to his hotelkeeper that certain rooms that were always used for distinguished travellers were not to be used by any person until his return, although he knew at the time that the hon. the Premier was going up there.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: It is not true.

Mr. MELLOR said the judge did that to prevent the Premier having the use of the rooms. He thought hon. members should take care that the judge should not show his vindictiveness at the expense of the country, and he considered it would be well if the amount for travelling expenses were reduced by one-half.

Mr. CHUBB said the statement made by the hon. member for Wide Bay, that Mr. Justice Cooper directed that no person should occupy certain rooms, he had been told by the judge was not true. The circumstances connected with the case were these: The judge occupied the rooms when he was on circuit at Townsville. He had to go to Cooktown and he said that he should require the rooms when he came back; and when he did come back the hotelkeeper gave him a bill charging for the rooms for the whole time he had been away. Mr. Justice Cooper ascertained that the rooms had been occupied while he was away, and he objected to pay the charge, on the ground that if the rooms were kept for him they ought to have been kept exclusively for him. The hotelkeeper, although admitting that the rooms had been used, insisted upon being paid, and, he believed, reduced the account by the magnificent sum of 10s. 6d. The judge could not well dispute the bill in a court of law, so he paid it and left the hotel.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he hoped the Attorney-General was going to answer his question.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had informed the hon. gentleman before that the Ipswich court-house was hardly up to the requirements of such a place as Ipswich. He had no control of the funds out of which

buildings were erected, and he hardly felt justified, when the Government were declining to meet the necessities of many places, to ask for an expenditure which in these times would be comparatively a luxury. Ipswich, no doubt, ought to have a better court-house, but there would be no harm done if it waited a little time longer for it. With reference to what the hon. member for Wide Bay had said, it must be borne in mind that the Northern Judge presided over four circuit courts besides Bowen—namely, Mackay, Townsville, Charters Towers, and Cooktown; or only one less than were presided over by all the judges of the southern portion of the colony. Travelling was, of course, more expensive in the North than in the South; and if the Northern Judge confined his travelling expenses within £400 there would not be very much to complain of. He hoped, however, that that amount would not be exceeded.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. member for Bowen had omitted one small portion of the story. When the judge left Townsville for Cooktown, he asked the landlady of the hotel to keep rooms for him on his return. She promised to do so, saying she would charge for them if they were kept vacant. The judge did not want them to be kept vacant; he simply wanted to have them ready for him when he came back. That was the part of the story which the hon. member for Bowen omitted; all the rest was quite correct. With regard to travelling expenses, he agreed with the Attorney-General, that if the travelling expenses of the Northern Judge could be kept within £400 a year, there would be very little reason to complain. The Attorney-General knew, as well as anybody, how expensive travelling in the North was; and he (Mr. Macrossan) supposed that the time the Northern Judge was absent from Bowen amounted to about as much as that of all the three Southern judges when absent from Brisbane.

Mr. CHUBB said it was only fair to say that the travelling expenses of judges included also the travelling expenses of their associates and tipstaffs.

The PREMIER said he must say he had never before heard of a judge engaging rooms and paying for them for a fortnight while he was away in another town. It was certainly not a proper thing to do, and seemed to him to be an unreasonable expenditure of public money.

Mr. SALKELD asked whether the travelling expenses of the Northern Judge were limited by the vote of £400? Was there any control over them? Supposing the judge spent £600, was the country bound to pay it?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was a very unpleasant thing, and a serious thing to do without the very best of reasons, to dishonour cheques of a judge drawn in payment of his travelling expenses. Some very good grounds would be required before proceeding to discredit a judge in that way. As had been said before, the country trusted to the honour of the judges not to expend more than was requisite for the due discharge of their duties when travelling on circuit. In most years the cash credit provided for the Northern Judge's travelling expenses had been exceeded, and the question had been submitted to him whether he would recommend the payment of the cheques drawn in excess of the limit; but he had never felt at liberty to take any other course than to advise that the cheques be paid, trusting of course to the House to authorise the payment of the amount when placed on the Supplementary Estimates. It was quite competent for the House to fix a limit beyond

which a judge should not go; but when dealing with a judge they were dealing presumably with a man of the highest and most unimpeachable honour, who would do nothing that was not consistent with the rules of honour and the dignity that hedged a judge.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he did not see why hon. members should be so timid when they began to talk about judges. The question put by the hon. member, Mr. Salkeld, had a good deal of common sense in it; and it resolved itself into this: Was a judge to be allowed to spend as much of the public money as he liked? Were the judges to be the only officials in the colony who could spend as much as ever they pleased? It was very well known that up in the North there had been a great deal of unreasonable expenditure, and a great deal of foolish expenditure. There had been a good deal of nonsense about that Northern Judge—there had been a good deal of trouble with him—and there was a good deal of delicacy about taking him by the "scruff of the neck." He (Mr. Brookes) did not see why there should be. He did not see why a judge should be handled with kid gloves more than anybody else. It should be clearly understood that if a judge spent more than the House voted for him he should pay the difference out of his own pocket.

Mr. SALKELD said he was glad to hear the hon. member for North Brisbane speak as he did. He (Mr. Salkeld) did not object to the item of £400 for the Northern Judge's travelling expenses, as he believed in making sufficient provision for the travelling expenses of the judges. But beyond that they ought not to go. He had not the same kind of feeling with regard to judges that the Attorney-General evidently had. He did not look upon them as being of a different species from the rest of humanity. He believed in treating them and the position they occupied with proper respect, but he did not think they ought to be treated as something different from other persons. There were plenty of men in the Government service as honourable as the judges; but if any of them exceeded the amount voted for him he would be pulled up in a very rough-and-ready fashion. Why should the only exception be made in favour of the judges? If a judge exceeded the ample allowance voted by the House, he ought most decidedly to pay it out of his own pocket; and if the Attorney-General had not the backbone to put his foot down, he was neglecting his duty. It was about time that question was raised. There was a change coming over the minds of people, not in the colonies only, but in other parts of the civilised world, as to the way in which judges should be looked upon; and the judges themselves would have to conform to the requirements and views of modern society. They would be treated properly, but they would not be allowed to presume upon their position to do this, that, and the other. They would have to be held in, just the same as anybody else, and a step in that direction was recently made by the motion of the hon. member for Townsville with reference to punishment for contempt. The travelling expenses of judges was a matter in which the Attorney-General ought not to allow the amount voted by the House to be exceeded. Whether the sum was sufficient or not he could not say. He did not know what would be required for a Northern judge, but from his experience of travelling in the North, it required a great deal more to live on there than in the South. The travelling expenses were much heavier there, and no doubt the Northern Judge had a far larger circuit than the others. He did not object to the item as being too much, but what he wanted to express his opinion upon, and

what the Committee should express its opinion upon, was, that when a sum was put down on the Estimates, the judge had no more right to exceed that and incur unauthorised expenditure than anyone else.

Mr. FOXTON said he thought the Committee and the country should feel considerably indebted to the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Salkeld, and the hon. member for North Brisbane, Mr. Brookes, for having spoken so freely on the matter. There was no bias in it whatever, nor did he propose to enter into a discussion as to whether £400 a year was sufficient for the particular purpose for which it was set down or not. If not, a larger sum should be set down. They were the custodians of the public purse and should see, in the first place, that a sufficient sum was allowed, and, secondly, that that amount was not exceeded. He could not agree with the Attorney-General that it would be a disgrace to the country—he forgot the hon. gentleman's exact words, but he meant that it would be a discredit to the colony—if the cheques of judges for the payment of their expenses were dishonoured. He thought that the discredit would rest with the judge and not with the country, as he would have overdrawn his account the same as any other person. That was the view he took of it. If a limit was to be set, that limit should be adhered to.

Mr. SCOTT said it appeared to him that a set had been made at the Northern Judge. He could not remember rightly whether it was last session or the session before, that similar remarks had been made, and the result was that a return was called for which showed that a great many of the statements were not borne out by fact. He wished to know whether the judge on the Northern circuit exceeded his allowance last year? He did not think that gentleman had been spoken of justly or fairly, considering that he was absent. He had been accused of vindictiveness—that had been repeated once or twice—and it was a very strong term, and one which ought not to have been used concerning a man occupying the position that gentleman did, unless he had done something that was very bad indeed. All that he was accused of vindictiveness for was that he asked that a room should be kept for him—that it should be reserved for him on his return—not for all the time he was away. He (Mr. Scott) could not understand where the vindictiveness came in there.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said hon. members had asked for particulars concerning the expenditure of the vote last year. There was £800 voted last year, and the three judges who performed circuit in five places in the South spent £404 17s. 8d. The judge of the Northern Supreme Court, who performed circuit in four places, spent £581 10s., or, in other words, nearly £180 in excess of the others. He did not know why that amount should have been spent, considering the Northern Judge had one place less to visit than the Southern judges.

Mr. SCOTT said that when it was stated last session, or the session before, that the Northern Judge had exceeded the expenses allowed him by a considerable amount, it was shown that a portion of that expense did not belong to the judge. Were those the expenses for the twelve months, and for that period only?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that nobody regretted more than he did that there was an error in the particulars given two years ago. It arose from the fact that vouchers were sent to the Treasury, and the Treasury sent the totals to the Crown Law Offices. He had taken very great care since then that the Crown Law Office should certify itself as to the actual expenditure. The amounts he had stated were strictly

accurate. £581 10s. was expended by the Northern Judge for the circuits performed in one year. The months were—October, 1885; November, 1885; April, 1886; and June, 1886. The first lot of cheques were drawn in October last year, and the last lot in June of this year. That comprised the circuit work for twelve months and nothing beyond that.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said hon. members must bear this in mind in discussing the question: that the Northern Judge had to do all his travelling by steamer.

Mr. FOXTON: Not from Townsville to Charters Towers.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he went from Townsville to Charters Towers by rail; that was the only exception. He then went from Townsville to Cooktown, and then to Mackay. He was not able to control the movements of steamers; he had to wait for their convenience, as they did not wait for him. Three places visited by the Southern judges were visited by rail—Ipswich, Toowoomba, and Roma. A judge could go to Ipswich and return home in one day.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No, no!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said it might take two days, but the judge did not have to wait two days for a train. The same with regard to Toowoomba and to Roma. A judge could reach Roma in one day, although it was 300 miles away; he could reach Roma and return more readily than the Northern Judge could reach Mackay from Bowen and return, although the latter was less than half the distance off. He was certain it did not take a week for a Southern judge to go to Roma and back; but it took a Northern judge a week to go from Bowen to Mackay and back. Members should bear in mind that facilities for travelling were much greater here than in the North. The only place which the Northern Judge visited by rail was Charters Towers, and that place was the most expensive to live in in the whole of Queensland.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the court always opened on Tuesday at Toowoomba and Roma, and the practice of the judges was to leave Brisbane on the previous Friday or Saturday, in order to arrive there in time to get their work ready. The civil business was usually fixed for the following Thursday, and if there was any civil business it was impossible to get back, as a rule, to Brisbane before Sunday. It took nearly a week to do the Roma circuit, and the best part of a week to do the Toowoomba circuit—sometimes more. There was no doubt that what the hon. member for Townsville said was quite true—that the hotel charges were very much larger in the Northern districts.

Mr. STEVENSON said, although there had been a great deal of talk about the Northern Judge exceeding the amount of his expenses, he did not see that any particular amount for that gentleman's expenses had hitherto been put down in the Estimates. Had the Northern Judge been informed that he was only to get half of £800? If not, he (Mr. Stevenson) did not see where the excess would come in. Notwithstanding all that had been said by the Attorney-General and others about a specified amount being put down for expenses, he did not think it ought to be, for it would encourage the judge to spend up to that amount, whereas if left to himself he might spend far under the amount. If they were going to fix a sum they had better fix it at so much a day: make a liberal allowance for the time absolutely on circuit. It was very wrong indeed to put down an amount

and say that the judges must not go beyond that, when there might be no necessity for going to that amount, and when they did not know what amount of work they had to do. Were they going to have the judge's expenses defined simply because of a rumour about some paltry rooms which he never wished to be kept vacant for him, but only wanted to have the use of when he came back? If they were going to define the amount of expenses let them fix them at so much per day.

Mr. W. BROOKES said it was all very well for the hon. member for Normanby to talk about so much a day. The wish of the Committee was to treat the honourable judges as gentlemen.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. BROOKES: And in a manner consistent with their high office. But how were they to deal with such goings-on as they all knew had taken place with reference to the Northern Judge? He did not know how the case was to be met. They could not put him on so much a day. He did not like to say it, but it seemed that that judge of the Northern court did not appear to have the feelings which any gentleman was supposed to have. He seemed to have the idea that he had got the run of the exchequer. An English gentleman, as a judge, would in no way degrade his office by penuriousness, but most certainly he would maintain a high standard of honour in not spending a shilling more than he could help. That was the way in which a gentleman would act. He was very unwilling to talk about this; but the goings-on at Charters Towers were well known. The Northern Judge behaved there, as everybody knew, in a manner more befitting a Turkish pasha with his retinue than as an English gentleman anxious not to spend even his own money foolishly, and particularly careful in disbursing funds which he was in honour bound to handle prudently. It was fairly within the limits of that Committee to talk respectfully of dignitaries, and he maintained that in no other way should that question be dealt with than to leave it to the honour of the judges. But suppose they had not a very keen sense of propriety, how then? If they exceeded the sum that they knew was put down for them, how then? They ought to pay it out of their own pockets.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that the hon. gentleman talked about something which all the world knew had happened at Charters Towers. He had never heard anything about it. But, to come back to the expenses, there was a very important matter in relation to those expenses which he omitted to refer to. The Southern Supreme Court judges when travelling paid nothing for travelling expenses.

The PREMIER: Yes, they do.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said that when he was Minister for Works he had frequently placed a special train at their disposal, and they had never paid a farthing for it. When he was Minister for Works they had railway passes given to them, and he had also placed a special train at the disposal of a judge when going to Roma.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he thought he was quite right in doing so. The last time he visited Townsville he travelled in company with the hon. member for Bowen and the Northern Court Judge. The steamer was rather late in arriving at Townsville, and the judge had to be in Charters Towers early next morning to open the court, so as to save expenses to the public and jurors of a day. To do that he had

to hire in the evening a special train to Charters Towers, and pay for it himself. That belonged to the item of the Northern Supreme Court Judge's personal expenses.

The PREMIER: It had no right to be.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said of course the State would have to pay it eventually; it would be paid out of his travelling expenses.

The PREMIER: When was that?

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: In April.

The PREMIER: Then he ought to pay it out of his own pocket.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he ought not; and he (Mr. Macrossan) was aware of the whole circumstances. For the purpose of saving the time of the country and of the jurors, it was necessary for the judge to hire a special train and get up to Charters Towers that night. He (Mr. Macrossan) agreed with the judge, and told him that if anything was said in the House about it he would defend him. The judge paid the money in the interest of the country, and not in his own interest.

The PREMIER said that the reason why he had said that the judge ought to pay for the special train out of his own pocket was that if the facts were as the hon. member for Townsville stated, the action of the Northern Judge was in deliberate defiance of the Government. Last year, when reference was made to a special train, he (the Premier) communicated with him and asked him for information about it, and he made an explanation. He (the Premier) replied on the 26th November as follows:—

"I have the honour to inform you that, if at any future time it should become necessary in order to enable you to discharge your official duties without undue delay, a special train will be placed at your disposal, and the necessary arrangements will be made by the Railway Department at your request; and I trust that under such circumstances you will not hesitate to make the request, rather than allow it to be made by some other person not directly charged with the due administration of justice."

There was no necessity for the fuss about paying for a special train out of his own pocket; but, under those circumstances, when he (the Premier) had told him that at his request a special train would be placed at his disposal, if he declined to take advantage of those arrangements, and preferred to act as a private person, then he thought him guilty of very great discourtesy. He hoped there was some mistake about that also. He entirely agreed that judges should no more than anyone else be free to spend public money as they pleased. It was for Parliament to say what amount they should spend, and the judges were bound to keep within that amount. He thought the amount provided by the Committee ought to be liberal, so as to enable them to travel suitably, and to have the accommodation necessary for their position, and prevent them being unduly inconvenienced by mixing with other persons. It was for the Committee to say what a liberal allowance might be. He did not say £400 was liberal. But the amount having been fixed, it was for their Honours to confine themselves within the amount of the vote unless special circumstances arose, of which they ought to inform the Government.

Mr. CHUBB said he was a passenger on the steamer with the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Justice Cooper, and the officers of the court, and he knew the circumstances under which the special train was got. Instructions were given that a special train was to be placed at the disposal of His Honour if he applied to the authorities in Brisbane.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. CHUBB: At any rate, the steamer did not arrive at Townsville till 6 o'clock in the evening, when it would have been too late to communicate with Brisbane; and when the special train was ready to start it was 8 o'clock, and it was 2 o'clock in the morning when it reached Charters Towers. One of the passengers by the special train was Mr. O'Kane, who paid his fare. He did not know whether the judge paid for the train out of his own pocket or not. He knew the train was ordered, and that the judge preferred to pay for the train in Townsville rather than apply to the officers there, though no doubt if there had been time to communicate with the officers in Brisbane he would have done so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that he received a letter the other day from Mr. Justice Cooper in regard to a special train. In that letter he stated that on a previous occasion he had to take a special train, and that he paid for it himself. He did not state whether he had made a request for it at the time that he paid the money, but he asked that arrangements might be made for a special train for him in the event of his requiring it. Voluminous correspondence between Mr. Justice Cooper and the Chief Secretary had appeared in the *Courier*, but the fact had quite escaped him that the Chief Secretary had pledged himself that a special train should be provided for the judge if at any time it should be wanted. However, on receipt of the letter he communicated with the Minister for Works, who did not seem to see the necessity in that instance for a special train—his hon. colleague did not think a case had been made out—and therefore he was not able to make satisfactory arrangements for a special train from Townsville, though he did not think that interfered with Mr. Justice Cooper getting to Charters Towers in time to open the court. He thought the difficulty in regard to reaching Charters Towers soon enough to open the court at the appointed time might be obviated, if the judge were to make sufficient allowance, instead of fixing the time so soon after the arrival of the steamer in Townsville. The judges in the southern part of the colony paid their steamer fare the same as the Northern Judge; and the judge of the Northern court paid nothing for his train fare, the same as the judges of the Southern court. The judges in the South did not ask for special trains; and since he had been in office a special train had been provided for a Southern judge on only two occasions, once when Mr. Justice Harding was the only judge in the colony—the Chief Justice being away in England, and Mr. Justice Pring being ill in Sydney—and it was absolutely indispensable for the furtherance of public business that he should have a special train to get to Roma; and again when it was necessary that the Chief Justice should leave Roma in time to get to Brisbane early enough to open the court there on Monday morning. The judges in the South were always provided with special carriages, and the same courtesy was extended to the Northern Judge.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he did not know what arrangement had been made between the Chief Secretary and the Northern Judge as to special trains, nor did he know what arrangement might have been made since then by the Attorney-General, but he distinctly remembered making a calculation on the steamer with the Northern Judge, Mr. Justice Cooper, to see whether it would be more expensive to pay for a special train, even supposing the State paid afterwards, than to delay the court at Charters Towers for one day, and it was found that it would be more expensive to delay the opening of the court, independent of the disap-

pointment to suitors, jurors, and witnesses. The judge also told him that he did not think he would be justified in asking the authorities on shore to place a special train at his disposal, because the chances were that it would be refused; and it was too late to communicate with the authorities in Brisbane, as had been pointed out by the hon. member for Bowen. It was not right to place the judges, in the matter of special trains, in a position to be snubbed by subordinates. There were some who would be glad to have the chance of doing so; and some, knowing that there was no good feeling in regard to Mr. Justice Cooper, would prefer snubbing him to any other judge. He thought that if any application about a special train was to be made it should be to the Minister himself—the Attorney-General; so that arrangements could be made speedily and with dignity, and without any chance of the judge being snubbed.

Mr. HAMILTON said that, as the expenses of travelling on circuit and living in the North were greater than in the South, the allowance to the judge there should also be greater. As to the special train, he felt certain that the judge could justify his action in the matter as satisfactorily as he did in the other matter which caused such a lot of correspondence. With regard to the statement made by the hon. member for South Brisbane, that it would be derogatory to give the judges so much a day, he thought that was rather rough on hon. members, seeing that they were paid by the day.

Mr. BLACK said that no doubt there was a certain amount of friction between the Government and Mr. Justice Cooper, as evidenced by the correspondence between His Honour and the Chief Secretary, which took place in the *Courier*.

The PREMIER: It was never placed on the table.

Mr. BLACK: I said "the correspondence which took place in the *Courier*."

The PREMIER: It did not take place in the *Courier*; it was published in the *Courier*.

Mr. BLACK said he did not profess to be able to cope with the Chief Secretary's legal acumen; and he had no doubt that if he were in the witness-box the hon. gentleman would be able to turn him inside out. He thought it was to be regretted that, in discussing the expenses of the Northern Judge, the Government had not endeavoured to keep the matter that had been introduced into the debate as much as possible out of the question. He considered it only had the effect of bringing the administration of justice somewhat into contempt. Of course, hon. gentlemen had read the correspondence published in the *Courier* a few months ago between the Premier and His Honour Judge Cooper, by which it was quite evident that there was a considerable amount of friction between the Government and His Honour; and he thought it very apparent there would be a repetition of that friction from what they had heard during that debate. The Attorney-General entirely corroborated what the Premier had said in his correspondence with Judge Cooper—that, if at any time he should find it necessary for the administration of justice to have a special train, it would be provided. Well, it was clear that the Attorney-General did on one occasion consider it necessary that a special train should be provided for His Honour, as he applied for one to his colleague the Minister for Works, but the Minister for Works peremptorily refused to give it. He could quite understand that when His Honour got the information that a special train—notwithstanding what the Premier had said—was not to be forthcoming, it would go a great way towards intensifying any feeling of

irritation that he might have had against the Government. He (Mr. Black) thought that, if the Ministry had any quarrel or difference of opinion amongst themselves, they should if possible not let it get to the ears of the general public. Now, with regard to the expenses proposed to be voted to the Northern Judge, they were put down for the present year at £400, but they knew, from the statement the Attorney-General had read, that the expenses of last year were actually £580. The Attorney-General had not attempted to prove that those expenses were excessive—they had heard nothing to that effect. Why, then, after it had been proved that the expenses of the judge in the northern portion of the colony were very much heavier than they were in the South—travelling expenses of all descriptions were very much heavier in the North than in the South—there was very much more travelling to do, and to far greater distances—why, when that had been proved, and furthermore, when it was proved that last year the expenses amounted to £580, should the Attorney-General consider £400 would be sufficient for the current year? The mere fact of attempting to cut down what he assumed were the necessary expenses of the judge had the effect of casting a slur upon the character of the judge, and upon the administration of justice in the North. If it had been shown that the expenses for last year had been excessive, the Government would have had some justice on their side in attempting to reduce that amount; but that had not been proved. He would like the Attorney-General to state what would be the effect if His Honour the judge found it necessary to exceed the £400? He thought himself, especially since Normanton had been added to the circuit, that the expenses for the current year were more likely to exceed £600 than £400. He noticed that members of the legal profession always stuck together, and he remembered when that matter was under discussion before—for the present was the third time it had been before the Committee—and when the expenses of the Northern Judge were referred to as excessive, the Attorney-General was about the only member belonging to the bar who “stuck up,” he might say, for the judge of the Northern Supreme Court. They had this fact before them, that whereas the expenses for the last year were £580, they were now to be cut down to £400, and without any sufficient reason being given. He would like to know from the Attorney-General if that was all that would be paid, and what the effect would be if the judge declined to travel without his expenses being paid as was provided by Act of Parliament, and supposing they were not forthcoming? An hon. member had said that a private individual could not draw a cheque unless he had funds to meet it—though, unfortunately, they did sometimes—and that the judge was placed in a similar position. He differed entirely from that. A private individual had no right to draw a cheque unless he had funds to meet it; but a judge in administering justice was carrying out duties imposed upon him by an Act of Parliament which provided that his reasonable expenses would be paid, and the Committee would be acting derogatively to the very high position in which His Honour was placed if they said his expenses were to be £400 and no more. He would state this fact: that whatever differences might have occurred between the Government in power and His Honour the judge, he had never heard of a single case in which His Honour's administration of justice was called in question. He had met the judge in the North, and had travelled in the North, and he knew that the judge was held in the very highest esteem by those amongst whom he was called upon to administer justice.

The PREMIER said there was no reason why there should be any quarrel between any judge and the Government. Nothing could be more unfortunate than that there should be any such quarrel. There was no such quarrel at the present time, and he hoped hon. members would not be led to think there was. No one had attempted to throw any doubt upon the capacity of the Northern Judge, or upon the administration of justice as conducted by him. Some correspondence certainly had taken place about His Honour's expenses, and he (the Premier) had maintained, and as a member of the House and of the Government he was bound to maintain, that Parliament should say what expenses would be allowed every officer of the Government; and the judge was an officer of the Government. A judge should not be allowed to spend, say, £1,000, £2,000, or £3,000 for travelling expenses if he thought fit. The good sense of the judges had up to the present time prevented difficulties of that kind. Parliament, as he had said that afternoon, had made liberal allowances to the judges, and trusted to their honour not to make an improper use of the confidence reposed in them. He did not think he need say any more upon the subject. The amount of £400 would not be sufficient if the Northern circuit was extended to Normanton, as that would require a larger allowance; but the extension to Normanton was not anticipated in the Estimates. As to the expense of travelling in the North, he had travelled in the North under various circumstances and had not found that the expenses were much more than they were in the South. He did not think that under ordinary circumstances it was much more expensive to live in Townsville than in Rockhampton. That was merely a matter of detail. The £400 being placed on the Estimates was an indication that it was thought that under ordinary circumstances that amount would be sufficient for the travelling expenses of the judge. If a further allowance was asked for with a good reason there would be no difficulty in its being granted. At the same time it must be understood that Parliament was to judge what amount should be voted.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would like to explain the matter of the special train for the judge of the Northern Supreme Court. The hon. member for Mackay made some reference to the correspondence between the judge and the Premier that appeared in the *Courier*, in which it was said that when the judge wanted a special train he was to have one; but that was a case of emergency. In the case that occurred at Charters Towers the judge had to leave the court there and open a court in Townsville. He could not get to Townsville in time to do it by the ordinary train, and one of the clients in a case he was going to hear was charged with the cost of the special train. Hon. members would admit at once that that was not a proper thing. The money was refunded, and a promise was made by the Premier that should any case of that kind occur again the judge would be provided with a special train. On the occasion now referred to it was entirely different. The judge was leaving on circuit, and applied for a special train to carry him from one town to another; and he (the Minister for Works) did not see why the country should be put to the expense of providing a special train for Judge Cooper. The judge had the fixing of his own courts, and he had ample time; he was not killed with hard labour. It had nothing at all to do with the promise of the Premier; the Premier's promise was that in any case of emergency the judge would be provided with a special train, and so would any other judge on such an occasion. A special train had on one

occasion been provided for a district court judge, but it was under peculiar circumstances. He was at Charters Towers, and unless he had a special train he would not have been able to catch the coach so as to reach Hughenden in time to hold his court there, and that would have caused great inconvenience to the suitors and witnesses. The present was an entirely different case. The judge was starting on circuit; he might have gone at an earlier date, and there was no reason why the country should provide Judge Cooper with a special train when he had ample time at his command. The Premier certainly never meant that he would be provided with a special train on all occasions when he was on circuit.

Mr. CHUBB said he would like to ask to whom the judge would have to apply for a special train in such a case of urgency—to the Minister at Brisbane, or the chief officer at Townsville?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS said he would have to apply to Brisbane for it. There was no officer in the Railway Department who could grant a special train without instructions from headquarters. Under ordinary circumstances the judges ought to travel by the ordinary train, and if that did not suit them he was not disposed to provide them with special trains except in cases of emergency.

Mr. KATES said that the Northern Judge was a very expensive gentleman indeed, and he really believed that if it were one of the Southern judges who was being referred to, the Northern members would not take his part so much as they were doing. Out of £800 provided for travelling expenses, £400 had been sufficient for the Southern judges, while the Northern Judge monopolised £580. That was a little too much. If rumour was true, that gentleman had something like fifty bottles of champagne during his tour on circuit; he did not know if that was true or not. If it was true, then, on behalf of the general taxpayer, he protested against it. He blamed the Attorney-General very much for honouring the judge's cheques; he should certainly have allowed them to go back dishonoured when the £400 provided had been spent. He (Mr. Kates) could only say that if separation took place he hoped hon. gentlemen opposite would keep that Northern Judge to themselves.

Mr. STEVENSON said the statement made by the Minister for Works was entirely at variance with that made by the Premier. The Premier had distinctly given them to understand that by applying to the department at Townsville the judge could obtain a special train, but according to the statement of the Minister for Works he had to apply to Brisbane. If he applied to Brisbane it would be a long time before he would get a special train; it would take a great deal of explanation to induce the Minister for Works to grant it. The Committee ought to have some explanation as to whether the judge was to apply to the department at Townsville or to the Minister for Works himself.

The PREMIER said that under ordinary circumstances the judge requiring a special train should apply to Brisbane; but in cases of special urgency where that was not practicable, he would be quite justified in ordering a special train without reference to Brisbane, and upon the circumstances being explained the charge would be remitted. Hon. members must remember that these circumstances did not often arise. There were many things that were not provided for by rules. For instance, there was no rule to say which of the three judges in Brisbane should go to Rockhampton at the next assizes, or to Toowoomba—there was nothing to compel one judge to go more than another; but

no difficulty arose. In all such arrangements it was understood that they were dealing with reasonable beings; and, assuming that the judges were reasonable beings, those difficulties would not arise. It was not necessary or desirable to attempt to lay down rigid rules in advance to meet difficulties that did not arise between reasonable beings.

Mr. PALMER said a special case had been mentioned where the steamer arrived at Townsville at 6 o'clock in the evening, and the judge had to proceed to Charters Towers during the night. How was he to communicate with the Minister for Works then—after hours? There was a special case at once.

The PREMIER: In a case like that, of course, he would have to apply to an officer on the spot.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: We have just been told that the officer has no right to provide special trains.

The PREMIER: Not gratuitously.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN: He would have to pay it himself.

The PREMIER: He would be liable in the first instance.

The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN said he had mentioned a case where the steamer which should have arrived early in the morning did not arrive till late in the afternoon. It was too late to communicate with the Minister, and the judge knew it would be useless to apply to a subordinate for a special train; and after consultation with him (Mr. Macrossan) he determined to pay for it himself, so as to save the country unnecessary expense and the public unnecessary trouble. He (Mr. Macrossan) was under the impression that the Minister for Works had refused a special train for the same judge even at the request of the Attorney-General. He did not know whether that was true or not. The Minister for Works ought not to be quite so fussy.

Mr. BLACK said he would also point out that there was no similarity between that case and that of the three Southern judges referred to by the Premier. They were unanimous—at all events he supposed their unanimity was to be assumed—and they settled amongst themselves who should go to Rockhampton; but in the case of the Northern Judge, he appealed to three members of the Ministry, who were not unanimous. The Attorney-General considered it a case in which a special train should be granted. The Premier, in his comment upon it, said the Northern Judge was entitled to it, but the Minister for Works overrode the decision of his colleagues, and would not grant it. There was no similarity between that case and the case of the three judges in the Southern circuit.

Mr. CHUBB said he wanted to ask a question about the Registrar of the Supreme Court at Bowen. That officer had been in the Public Service for twenty-six years, beginning as associate to the late Chief Justice, and he was receiving now a salary less than the Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court in Brisbane, an officer who was appointed only two years ago. The Registrar at Bowen was certainly entitled to an increase, or to promotion if no increase could be granted for his particular work.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the officer referred to was no doubt deserving of consideration as a capable officer, although his duties were not very extensive. The Government were prepared to recognise any claims that might be advanced by him, and consideration would be given to any representations which might be made.

Question put and passed.

SHERIFF.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that a sum not exceeding £5,455 be granted for the Sheriff's Department. There was an increase of £25 only over the amount voted last year, which was required as a premium on a fidelity policy under the Sheriffs Act of 1875.

Question put and passed.

DISTRICT COURTS.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that a sum not exceeding £10,950 be granted for District Courts. That amount likewise contained an increase of £25 on the amount voted last year, which was required for the service of summonses.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said a few weeks ago, during a very important discussion that took place in the House, the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government pointed out, as a remedy for grievances which were stated to exist in the North, that he thought something should be done in the way of decentralising the system of government. Now, he thought that system should be begun with the district court judges. It had often been argued in the House that those gentlemen should reside in the districts in which they administered justice, and he thought that the time had come when they should be compelled to do so. Even in the small colony of Victoria, where there were railways running from one border of the colony to the other and crossing each other like a network, a demand had arisen that the judges should be compelled to reside in their own districts, and he thought that that should be done here. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government whether, pursuing the intention which he intimated during the separation debate, he would begin by carrying out what had been often suggested during the last seven years as to the district court judges residing in their own districts? Of course, that would also have to apply to the Crown law officers connected with the administration of justice in the district courts. They had a Supreme Court judge residing in the North, and he did not see why the district court judge should not reside there also, and the other district court judges reside in their respective districts.

The PREMIER said by an Act passed in 1878 the provisions of the law existing up to that time were repealed, and without another alteration in the law it was impossible to make any change. But after all, considering that a district court judge was travelling nearly all his time, he did not know that it would make much difference whether he resided in his district or not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Travelling all his time?

The PREMIER: Yes; with the exception of the Southern Judge, the district court judges were travelling nearly all their time. So that, so far as the people were concerned, it would not make any difference. He did not see what advantage would be gained, or that the matter was of much consequence. Suppose the Northern district court judge was required to live in his district, what would it matter whether he lived at Bowen, Mackay, Cooktown, Cairns, or Townsville? He would be away from the town where he was supposed to live nine months out of the year, and the only advantage a particular town would gain would be by having his house there. The matter was fully discussed in 1878; it had been discussed on more than one occasion, and until the law was altered nothing could be done. The matter was, perhaps, worthy of consideration; but it could not be dealt with by the Government without legislation.

1886—4 r

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said the hon. gentleman quoted the Northern district court. Now, one advantage in having the judge a resident of the North would be that he could hold courts more frequently than he did at present—and there was another advantage still greater than that. The Crown Prosecutor under the present system had only a few hours in which to master the details of the different cases.

The PREMIER: There is something in that.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN said if he lived in the North he would have the whole of his time in which to watch the details, and the administration of justice would not then be so often turned into a farce as at present. He thought those were two great advantages to be derived from the judge residing in his district. He did not urge a change for the sake of compelling the judge to live in a particular town in order that the town might get the benefit of his household expenses. That was rather a low way of looking at the question, and he hoped they would all look at it from a much higher standpoint. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government belonged to the legal profession, and he would know the advantages to be gained very well. He was certain there must be some advantages to be gained, otherwise the people of Victoria would not be crying out so strongly for decentralisation in the administration of justice; and he did not think the hon. gentleman could begin too soon with a decentralisation policy, even leaving out of the question the fact that separation might be accomplished at any moment. Decentralisation would be a good thing for the southern portion of the colony, and if it was begun now the system would be established when separation was granted.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he did not think that the administration of justice in the Northern or Central districts suffered by the judges living in Brisbane. The evil of centralisation was where work done in the North was governed from the South. As a matter of fact, there was no government from the South over the administration of justice in the district courts. The judges were appointed to do their work, and they did it, and the only real control exercised over their work was that the Attorney-General saw that the arrangements they made for holding their courts in the different towns allowed sufficient time for the proper administration of justice in those towns. When that was done, the practical supervision was really little or nothing. Hon. members did not seem to be aware of the amount of travelling done by some of the district court judges. The Northern district court judge, for instance, had to go twice a year to Normanton, and when he made that tour he was away nearly three months each time. Then he had to visit the coast towns, and to visit Herberton and Hughenden; so that he was most of his time travelling.

The HON. J. M. MACROSSAN: He also comes down to Brisbane.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the judge was a week or so in Brisbane now and again, but he was travelling the greater part of his time. He did not see that the administration of justice in the courts over which those judges presided suffered in any way because the judges did not reside in their respective districts. In Victoria the case was different. One could understand the desire there that the judges should remain in their districts. The districts were geographically very small, and it was a matter of comparatively little importance whether a judge resided at Melbourne or at Ballarat. One place

was as good a centre to work from as the other, and the actual time spent in travelling was very small compared with that occupied by the Queensland district court judges. A judge would therefore have a lot of time on his hands, during which he would be able to do any chamber work that was necessary to be done: whereas in a large territory like Queensland that was impossible, on account of the enormous time spent in getting from place to place. The time would no doubt come when some such arrangement would have to be made, but he scarcely thought it had arrived yet.

Mr. STEVENSON said the remarks of the Premier would lead hon. members to infer that the result of the discussion which took place on the subject in 1878 was in favour of allowing district court judges to reside in Brisbane. That was by no means the case. He remembered the discussion very well—the late Mr. Hely was then the Northern district court judge—and he could assure hon. members that the feeling at that time was that a judge ought to be compelled to reside in the district over whose court he presided. There was a large sum down for the travelling expenses of those judges. Why should a district court judge be allowed his travelling expenses to and from Brisbane?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He is not.

Mr. STEVENSON: How do we know that that is not included in the charge made for travelling expenses?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The judges send in vouchers for their travelling expenses, and they are allowed nothing until they get to the border of their own district.

Mr. STEVENSON said that at any rate he saw no reason why the judges should not reside in their districts, instead of making Brisbane the centre. Nothing seemed to be done unless the work was centred in Brisbane. The Northern judges especially ought to be made to live in their districts, and then they would have more time to attend to their business.

Mr. BLACK said it was even more important that the Crown prosecutors should reside in their respective districts. Cases often occurred of people being committed for trial and detained in custody, while the Crown prosecutor only arrived a few hours before the sitting of the court, hurriedly glanced through the depositions, and found no bill. Such an unwarrantably long detention in custody was a serious injustice, and it might to a great extent be done away with if the Crown prosecutor lived in the district, and had an opportunity of carefully inquiring into every case to be brought before the judge. That was an important matter for consideration in the interests of the public, although, no doubt, they would have to pay the Crown prosecutors a higher salary.

Mr. CHUBB said that, although he was not in the House at the time, he remembered that when the Bill to amend the District Courts Act was under discussion there was a strong feeling on the part of the majority of hon. members that the judges ought to live in their own districts. That was not carried into effect, but a clause was introduced providing that a judge should not be allowed travelling expenses when outside the borders of his jurisdiction. Another clause was also added, which had hitherto been of no practical effect, empowering a judge to sit in chambers within his district for the purpose of transacting emergent business. That part of the Act was inoperative, and could only be put into effect if the judges were to reside in their districts. With regard to Crown prosecutors, what had been said by hon. members had

really some force. The Crown prosecutors resided in Brisbane, and depositions were forwarded to them from all parts of the colony. Delays, sometimes without bail, occurred before deciding whether to file a bill or not, and in the meantime prisoners were kept in custody who ought perhaps to have been discharged at once. Difficulties arose also with regard to witnesses; it was not known whether they would be required or not. And another reason why Crown prosecutors should reside in their districts was that the Government would have there a responsible officer of legal ability, with whom they could communicate in cases of importance, when someone on the spot was required to look after the interests of the Crown. But there came in the question of cost. If a Crown prosecutor was compelled to live in his district, he would have to be paid more for it. They did not consider themselves too well paid at present, deeming that they honoured the office rather than that the office honoured them.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said something might be done to increase the utility of the district courts. At present the court sat only once in two months. In civil cases at least the sittings should be held monthly. The present interval was altogether too long. Criminal matters might continue as they were—once in two months; but the Supreme Court should be relieved to some extent. Many cases went to the Supreme Court, such as claims for debt, ranging from £30, and in many cases below that, although they did not necessarily carry costs. He thought the minimum amount to be entertained by the Supreme Court should be raised to £100, and all matters below that should be dealt with by the district court judges. That would lead to a reduction in the cost of law. At present nine guineas was the amount fixed in every matter in which judgment was given by the court. I am speaking of what are known as judgments by default. Taking a claim for £30 10s., which was just over the minimum, nine guineas, or 30 per cent., had to be paid; while last week there was a judgment signed for over £17,000, and the costs in the case were only nine guineas. That was a discrepancy which should not exist, and it would be a good thing if it could be possible to make an arrangement that civil sittings should be held every month, and a lower scale than the Supreme Court scale should be fixed. The mercantile community would be thankful for such a concession as that if it could be made with the present force of judges they had. He was in some doubt whether the Southern district court judge could compass that work.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Southern district court judge could not fulfil the requirements suggested, as in no case must there be an interval of less than five months between the sittings of one court and the sittings of the next at any place where the court sat twice a year. There must be an interval of not more than seven or less than five months, and the judge in making out his calendar had to arrange the sittings of his court at the different places, twice at some, three times at others, and in some four times. At Brisbane the court sat six times in the year, and the judge had to arrange that not more than the larger interval, or less than the smaller, should intervene between the sittings at the more distant places. Therefore, he could not sit monthly in Brisbane and go out to Roma, Charleville, Cunnamulla, and all those places. He did not think that the reason why more litigation did not go before the district court was that the sittings of that court were not more frequent. But he thought that solicitors, as a rule, preferred to go to the court in which the fees were higher than to go to that in which the scale of fees was lower. The hon. gentleman was in error in supposing that there was a minimum below

which the Supreme Court could not try cases. There was no minimum. What the hon. member referred to was perhaps this: that where a judgment was given for a sum less than £30, in the Supreme Court the costs would not follow as a matter of course, and the judge would have to certify that the cause for action was a proper one to be brought into the Supreme Court before costs would be allowed. A man might get judgment for £1 or 1s., and yet get costs, if the judge in his discretion thought it was a proper case in which to give costs. It was quite competent that a case brought into the Supreme Court might be remitted to the district court for trial. He was sure that the reason why more litigation did not take place in the district court was not because the intervals were too great.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said his experience did not agree with that of the Attorney-General. He knew of many cases that would have been taken to the district court if the interval had not been too long. If a cause for litigation arose just after the sittings of that court, a creditor when told that he could not apply to it for two months, resorted to the small debts court, which was in no way satisfactory. He thought there ought to be some provision made, even in spite of the solicitors, to deal with those smaller cases, ranging from £30 to £100, because a fee of nine guineas on a £30 claim seemed to him, who did not happen to be a solicitor, rather excessive, although he would admit it used to be more. The Supreme Court judges had shown a little bit of kindness to unfortunate debtors, and in some cases, to creditors too, in reducing the costs to nine guineas. Costs used to range from eleven to thirteen guineas. They used to have to make out three or four foolscap folios of costs, but now it was all done as a matter of course. It would be a great gain if some provision of the kind he had suggested could be made, by which, for a fee of three or four guineas, claims could be prosecuted in the district court.

Mr. CHUBB said the hon. member knew a great deal about the business although he was not one of the craft. He (Mr. Chubb) had expressed his opinion several times in that Committee, but it was not the general opinion of the profession. He thought that a man ought to be compelled to go into an inferior court if it had jurisdiction to try his case, and he believed that cases which could be taken to the district court should be taken there. All causes of action which the district court had jurisdiction in up to £200 should be sent to the district court and tried there; that was one of the objects of the establishment of the district courts. The time was not far distant when the Government would have to face the necessity for establishing a metropolitan district court judge. There were two in Sydney, and the number of cases that were tried there was something incredible. He was talking to District Court Judge Wilkinson some time ago, and that gentleman told him that he commenced his court with over 500 civil cases in Sydney. Of course that could not be done here with the present staff, and other arrangements would have to be made. It would be a great convenience to business people in Brisbane, who would be able to carry their small cases into court at once, and get a judgment without the great expenditure attendant upon taking cases into the Supreme Court.

Mr. BROWN said he agreed with a great deal that had fallen from hon. members, that the district court judge and the Crown prosecutor should live in the district in which the court had jurisdiction. The Northern district court judge was supposed to hold three sittings at Townsville, and visit other places in the North twice a year. He might sit on three occasions in

Townsville, and then he was at liberty to go to Brisbane or Sydney, or anywhere he liked; and he should not do that. He should live in his district, and, if the remuneration attached to the position was not sufficient to induce him to put up with the inconvenience of living in those outside places, the Government should give him more remuneration. He thought if the Supreme Court judge could reside in North Queensland, the district court judge could; but if as now they could only get a district court judge three times a year he was sure they did not get the conveniences that were anticipated at the time the District Courts Act was passed. There were many months when they could not get a judge at all, and the result was that persons having to use legal machinery must go to the Supreme Court at Bowen or at Brisbane. That was a state of things that ought not to exist; they should have a district court judge residing in Townsville, and a Crown prosecutor. He thought a resident Crown prosecutor was even more necessary, especially in the matter of criminal cases. It often happened in North Queensland that people did not know whether the Crown prosecutor was going to file a bill until the last minute. He had known cases where heavy expenses had been incurred in providing for a defence, and at the very last minute it was found there was no true bill to be filed; occasionally it happened that a Crown prosecutor scarcely went into a case at all until he came round on circuit. Then he investigated the cases, and sometimes filed no true bill, after all the inconvenience the parties had already incurred, and after they had gone to a certain expense which might have been avoided. He thought a Crown prosecutor should live in the district, and if the salary attached to the office was not sufficient to induce a man to do so, it should be raised. It was also indispensable that one of the district court judges should be a resident in the district.

Question put and passed.

INSOLVENCY.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that there be granted the sum of £1,462 for the Insolvency Department. There was an increase of £10 over last year due to an addition to the salary of junior clerk and messenger.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said there was here another of those anomalies to which he had previously referred. In that department there was a clerk at a salary of £150. He believed he was a very young man of seventeen or eighteen years. He might be a most admirable youth—he had nothing to say against him—but it seemed really an anomaly that a youth of seventeen or eighteen should receive a salary of £150 a year, whilst another clerk who had been in the service for ten years and was a most competent man, had only just had his salary raised from £125 to £150. The clerk whose salary was under consideration was a boy who looked as fit to be a clerk as he (Mr. Brooks) was to be an archbishop or something of that sort. He ought to be a farmer; he had no business to be in an office—he was a fine rosy-faced, rosy-cheeked lad!

Mr. BLACK said that if the young man performed his duties satisfactorily he did not see that his age should militate against his position. The hon. gentleman's simile was not a very happy one, for he thought that he would make a most admirable archbishop, and he had always thought that that was more in the hon. member's line.

Mr. FOOTE said that was not the only instance in the Government offices of mere youths receiving salaries of £150 a year, and doing very light

work. He thought it was time that that sort of thing was checked. There were plenty of men with families who were capable of performing the duties exceedingly well who would be glad to receive such a salary. He knew that large salaries had been paid to youths in Government offices on many occasions, where even their own friends would have been glad if the salaries had been smaller, because they led them to acts of dissipation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the hon. gentleman criticised him very severely for paying too high salaries, whilst just now he had been found fault with for not giving larger increases. The gentleman in question was a highly competent officer. He did not know his age—he supposed he was nineteen or twenty, and he admitted he had a particularly fresh, rosy complexion; but if anybody thought that that was an excessive salary for a competent young man to discharge the duties of his office efficiently, he had not got the enlarged ideas that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley had.

Mr. CHUBB said that this "Admirable Crichton" was appointed by the hon. gentleman, who evidently showed, by the salary he gave him, that he was much more liberal than his predecessors in office. He was very glad to see that the hon. gentleman did recognise that £150 a year was not too much to give to a clerk; and he hoped that next year he would remember the gentleman who had been ten years in the service and who had only now arrived at £150 a year.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said he had advanced that gentleman twice since he came into office.

Question put and passed.

INTESTACY.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL moved that there be granted the sum of £1,137 for the Intestacy Department. There was a small increase over last year of £25 additional to the salary of one clerk, and £10 to the junior clerk and messenger.

Mr. CHUBB said that that office was, to a certain extent, self-supporting—he did not know how far. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could say how much that branch of the department had brought in last year as a set-off against expenses?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the Government commission on fees on the gross receipts payable to the Treasury last year was £597 5s. 8d. He ought to say that that did not include the amount paid into the Treasury under the provisions of the Act where no one appeared for six years to claim it. The great bulk of those sums would always remain in the Treasury, though they were liable, under the provisions of the Act, to be paid out of the Treasury under certain conditions.

Mr. CHUBB said he believed the amount carried last year to the Treasury was about £2,000.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: £2,078 last year.

Mr. CHUBB asked what insolvency yielded to the Treasury, or did it yield anything at all?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said that the percentage under section 80, on payments to the Treasury, amounted last year to £446 3s. 8d.

SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. B. B. Moreton) moved that the sum of £4,355 be granted for salaries and contingencies. There was a reduction of £15 on the amount set down for last year, owing to some

transfers made in the office. A place at £100 was filled up by a lad getting £60; a clerk getting £120 received an increase of £5; one getting £100 received an increase of £10; and one getting £50 also received an increase of £10.

Mr. NORTON said that when a lad at £60 was doing work for which £100 was paid previously, the question suggested itself, whether too much was not paid before, or whether the new clerk was fit to do the work. He only hoped that in his desire to economise, the hon. gentleman was not sacrificing the efficiency of his department.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the lad of whom he spoke was in the office last year, but it was not certain then whether he would be kept on, or whether a more capable person would have to be obtained, and the sum of £100 was left on the Estimates. He was doing very well, however, and his exact position was now shown on the Estimates.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he was glad to observe a great improvement in the inspectors' reports. It was now easier to see the great progress made in the colony, but there was yet room for improvement, as they could see by comparing the average results.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member's remarks would come in better when they got to the vote for State schools.

Mr. BLACK asked whether the salaries under the vote were to be paid at the same rate as those for the quarter ending on the 30th September? His reason for asking the question was that the expenditure for the quarter was £773, or at the rate of £3,092 for the whole year, as against £3,505 now asked for, leaving out £850 set down for contingencies. That being so, it would appear that they were asked to vote a surplus of £400 over the amount actually required by the department.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not quite understand the hon. gentleman. His figures were not the same as those quoted by the hon. member.

Mr. BLACK said he would repeat his question. According to the returns published in the *Government Gazette* for the quarter ending 30th September the expenditure for the department was £773. That multiplied by 4 came to £3,092, which would be the expenditure for the year on the same basis, presuming that the officers whose salaries the Committee were now voting received those amounts. But they were now asked to vote £4,355, or, deducting £850 for contingencies and office requisites, which possibly had not yet been expended, they were asked to vote £3,505 for the four quarters, showing that the actual expenditure was about £400 less for the year than the amount they were asked to vote.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the amounts which were paid to the different officers of the department up to the 30th September were £3,478 for salaries, and £850 for contingencies.

Mr. BLACK said he was afraid the hon. gentleman did not entirely grasp the position. Perhaps if he handed him a *Government Gazette* it would give him a little information.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said probably the explanation lay in the fact that all the returns had not yet reached the Treasury.

Mr. BLACK said that if the hon. gentleman said that some officers of the department had not yet drawn their salaries he must accept that as a sufficient answer.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said there was an amount of £778 unexpended from last year in connection with the Education Department, and probably the discrepancy pointed out by the hon. member for Mackay was owing to the fact that the whole of the claims against the department might not have been rendered.

Mr. BLACK said he was dealing only with the salaries supposed to have been paid up to the end of last quarter. He had deducted the amounts set down for contingencies.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Some amounts have not yet been remitted to the Treasury.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. gentleman's explanation was not very satisfactory, and similar discrepancies would be found as they got further on with the Estimates. He was prepared to accept the explanation, unsatisfactory as it was, and he would advise the hon. gentleman to try and reconcile the accounts for each quarter with the Treasury accounts.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the difficulty arose from the manner of keeping the public accounts. The abstracts of expenditure were not made out in the Department of Public Instruction in the same way as in the Treasury, and it was quite possible that amounts accounted for there in September did not reach the Treasury for insertion in the Treasury returns until October.

Question put and passed.

STATE SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £5,750 be granted for inspection purposes. Hon. members would perceive that there was an increase in the item for the year. The work in the office had become very great, and the general inspector had to have some assistance while the examination papers were being prepared. Another inspector was required, as the general inspector had been unable to visit any of the schools himself. The amount of the increase just covered the salary of an additional inspector, £350, and there was £100 additional for travelling expenses.

Mr. ISAMBERT said the department deserved great credit for the way in which the work of inspection was carried on, but there was still room for great improvement. A great many teachers were afraid of the frequent change of inspectors, because different inspectors placed different values on various attainments. For instance, for history Mr. Kennedy gave 64 points, and Mr. Caine 34 points, showing a difference of 30 points. For mechanics Mr. Ross gave 62 points, and Mr. Shirley 33 points, showing a difference of 29 points. For composition Mr. Kennedy gave 72 points, and Mr. Caine 50 points; a difference of 22 points. For drill Mr. McGroarty gave 76 points, and Mr. Caine 55 points, showing a difference of 21 points. Taking the averages of all schools, Mr. Platt gave 59; Mr. Kilham, 63; Mr. Caine, 48; Mr. Shirley, 53; Mr. Ross, 58; Mr. Scott, 55; and Mr. Kennedy, 57 points. When an inspector was stationed for some time in a district the teachers got used to him, and they would know what he expected and work up to the expectations; but as soon as a change of inspectors took place their work seemed very much astray, and where as before they might have obtained good results, through having a different inspector, the results they obtained were not so satisfactory. That difficulty was recognised by at least one of the inspectors, Mr. Kilham, who said in his report—

"It is to be regretted that the inspectors have no opportunity of meeting in conference to adopt uniform plans of testing results, and to obtain in other ways the benefit of each other's experience in the work of inspection."

He would ask the Minister for Education to accept those hints, and not only propose a con-

ference of inspectors and superior officers, but also take advantage of the ripe experience of the best teachers in the department. He was sure such a conference would make many valuable suggestions to the Minister for Education. The department cost a large sum of money, and the country had the right to expect the best results. Several of the inspectors expressed themselves dissatisfied with the results in mechanics and in music. Mechanics was an obscure subject for children; and the music, he was told, was too theoretical. Singing after plain notation was mastered would occupy less time, and would supply about as much knowledge of music as the child's mind was capable of. He was glad to see that drill and discipline occupied a good place in the report. Inspector Platt, on page 49, said:—

"The discipline is generally satisfactory in character, and in most schools is sufficiently effective to secure favourable conditions for school work. This is eminently the case at Kelvin Grove Road School. In a few schools it goes deeper and establishes to some degree good school habits with some capacity for self-control and for sustained effort under a sense of duty. At the Central Boys' School I found the tone excellent; the boys were frank in bearing and full of life, but they responded promptly and fully to every call made on their attention or efforts. The order of the pupils in all school routine I found satisfactory in every school. Method and good taste in the disposition of school furniture and material are eminently characteristic of the Fortitude Valley Boys' School."

Now, those satisfactory results might be more generally attained if a training college were established. The pupil-teachers would have the advantage of instructors who had the art of teaching discipline with mildness, and on that subject Mr. Kilham made some interesting remarks—page 55:—

"As there is no training school in the colony in which the best methods might be acquired by young teachers under a qualified training master, several of them have much to learn when they take charge of schools. Those, however, who have had the advantages of four years' instruction in teaching and class management as pupil-teachers under a trained and certificated head teacher usually employ appropriate and approved methods, and are in other respects well qualified for their work."

Great stress was laid by the general inspector on the beneficial results of importing properly trained and well-qualified teachers from England, who had had the benefit of two years' training in a college. Now, if the benefit to the department was so great with twenty-two teachers, how much greater would be the benefit of having such a training college here, when he found that there were employed last year no less than 459 pupil-teachers? Only those who had the good fortune of being trained under good masters acquired the desired ability for teaching discipline with mildness, and more of them might have the benefit if there were a proper training school. All those improvements no doubt would be suggested by such a conference as Mr. Kilham proposed.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said that now they were on the vote for inspectors he might be allowed to express the hope that the inspector who prepared the examination questions for the grammar school scholarships would verify his quotations in future. He (Mr. Brooks) had almost a reverence for Alexander Pope; he was a writer who had said some of the best things in the best and fewest words; yet in the official report he was made to say—

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight;
He can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

Now, Alexander Pope was not arrant ass enough to write any such nonsense as that; what he wrote was "His can't be wrong." A late Attorney-General of New South Wales had made the same mistake, and so had many others. However, that

was by the way. He had a few words to say about the curriculum which he might as well say then as on any other part of the vote. The hon. member for Rosewood had made some slight indirect reference to music. Now, he (Mr. Brooks) would like to see something more done for drawing than was done. The vote for that was £200; of that he would say more when they came to it. He wanted to institute some comparison between music and drawing; he thought less time should be given to music and more to drawing; and he hoped some time would be taken off grammar and analysis and put on to arithmetic, writing, and reading. Let the three R's be taught more satisfactorily than at present. He had read the report through with fair carefulness, and concerning arithmetic the various inspectors reported as follows:—Platt, weak; Kilham, fair; Caine, only fair; McGroarty, not satisfied; Shirley, not satisfied; Ross, the three R's the least successful; Scott, weak. Mental arithmetic underrated—Kennedy, not satisfied. As to writing, taking them in that order, they were:—Well, generally well—the angular style disappearing—that would be satisfactory to hon. members; generally well, satisfactory, satisfactory, satisfactory, satisfactory, satisfactory. The reading was generally satisfactory. Some inspectors complained that sufficient attention was not paid to enunciation, the meanings of words, and the meanings of allusions in the books that were read. Now, it seemed to him that more time should be given to the three R's than was given, and a little time taken off grammar and analysis. He was not quite sure whether he could trust himself to speak on analysis, because he felt a little bit mad when he thought of the time that was wasted on it. Some of them who were not old men—he himself had not gained fifty yet—used to dabble in analysis, but the schools at that time were content with subject, predicate, and object—with adjuncts thrown in—they are called extensions now. He visited one of the schools in his electorate lately. The teacher was an excellent gentleman, thoroughly efficient; and one of the classes he went to look at was engaged in an analysis lesson. Well, really the matter was most painful. He looked at the children, and thought that in the future most of them would be laying bricks, chipping stones, or sawing wood, and yet there they were adding their brains with innumerable distinctions about extensions of time and place, and manner, and heaven only knew what else. Anything like a detailed account of a modern analysis lesson would drive the Committee mad. Take the subject of grammar. There they were teaching the lads who were going to do manual labour a lot of rubbish. Take a noun, for instance. Nouns were of three kinds—proper, common, and abstract. Proper nouns were of two classes—proper nouns strictly so-called, and proper nouns in transition state. Common nouns were divided into five classes—class name sensible, class name rational, collective name, name of material, name of measures. Abstract nouns were divided into three classes—name of qualities, name of actions, name of states. Now, there was all that nonsense taught to lads in the primary schools. Then the poor conjunction might be either copulative or disjunctive, and the copulative might be either connective or continuative, and the disjunctive either distributive or adversative. What the good of that was he did not know. There they were spending time in teaching lads who were not likely to want it that nonsense which some of them who could speak English fairly well never heard a word of.

The PREMIER: What are you quoting from?

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he had taken a note from a grammar used by his son. It was either Dalgleish's or Morell's Grammar. He was rather

of opinion that poor old Lennie, abused as he was, or the Irish National Society's Grammar, would be quite good enough for the ordinary schools. He thought an amendment might be managed in some way, and although it might be rather hazardous to criticise the curriculum of their public schools, yet there was room for improvement. A little less time might be given to analysis and a little more to reading, and writing, and history. In a democratic country like this, history seemed to him to be of vital importance, and he noticed that the inspectors did not seem satisfied with the results of history. There ought to be provision made for a systematic teaching of history—history of Australia, history of the British possessions, history of the British-speaking peoples, and then history of the world. In a community like this history ought to be taught so that the errors of the past might be avoided, and the example of our forefathers utilised. He did not mean by history the teaching of the names of kings and the dates when they began to reign. That seemed to be the very least part of history; they should teach the history of the progress of the people, the growth of our liberties, and such like. He hoped something more practical and useful would be imparted in the public schools. He thought such alteration as he had suggested should be made. They had reason to be proud of the work being done by the Education Department, but there was ample room for improvement. As he had said, he had gone fairly through the report of the Secretary for Education and the inspectors' reports, and he hoped hon. gentlemen would take in good part the suggestions he had made.

Mr. CHUBB said that when the Estimates were previously before the Committee the matter of neglected children had been referred to. Now, hon. members knew that they had in the Education Act the compulsory clauses, which might be enforced in such districts as the Governor in Council proclaimed to be under their operation. Before he went any further, he might say that it would not be a bad idea if the report in future was indexed; it would be a great convenience to hon. members to have an index instead of being compelled to wade through a hundred pages to find out what they wanted. He saw that on page 8 the subject of neglected children was referred to. The number given was 645, an increase of five on the number returned last year. He supposed that report was given in by the schoolmasters in the different districts, and was from their knowledge, but he did not suppose they took much pains to ascertain the exact number of children who were neglected. He was satisfied that the number must be much greater than that, and when they saw reports in the local newspapers about the great increase in the growth of larrikinism, he thought it was time that some decisive steps should be taken to bring into the educational fold all the neglected children running about without education, whose parents were too careless to see that they were educated, and who would grow up to be a very heavy burden on the State in future years. He should like to ask the Minister whether he had had the subject under his consideration at all since last year, and whether he intended to take any steps in the matter?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the question had been debated between himself and the Under Secretary since the Estimates were last discussed. The hon. member was quite right in saying that the number arrived at in the report was taken from returns supplied by the schoolmasters themselves, and he agreed with the hon. member that that did not represent the actual number of children who did not attend school. Still, at the same time he thought the number of children who

did not attend school was not so great as a great many people thought. In looking over the reports of the other colonies for last year, and even for the present year, he found that the attendance here, without the compulsory clauses being in force, was almost equal to the attendance in the other colonies where the compulsory clauses were in force. He therefore concluded from that that there were not many children who did not attend school. However, when the census papers were all furnished, he would be able to ascertain from them the number of children now in the colony of school age; he had requested the Registrar-General to prepare a table so that he would be able to ascertain the actual number of children in the different districts of the colony of school age. He should also be able to ascertain where the bulk of the children really were, and putting that together with the number of the estimated annual enrolment, he should be able to ascertain what number of children were really not attending school. The enforcement of the compulsory clauses raised a very serious question, and he should not be inclined to enforce them unless some very strong and substantial reasons were given for so doing. It would create great inconvenience in the country districts, and would involve an additional expenditure of £2,000 or £3,000. Some hon. members seemed to think that the clauses should be enforced, but in his opinion the number of neglected children in the colony was not nearly so large as hon. members imagined. Still he did not deny that, however few they were, something ought to be done to bring them into the schools.

Mr. NORTON said the speech of the hon. member, Mr. Brooks, deserved to be seriously considered by the Minister for Instruction. With regard to analysis and subdivided grammar, there was a great deal of wretched hair-splitting carried on that was utterly out of place in public schools. It was worse than a waste of time. Some time ago a friend of his in New South Wales was asked to correct the examination papers of a private school. Upon that very question of analysis some question arose, and it was decided to refer it to two gentlemen in Sydney, who were supposed to be the leading specialists in that class of work—there was no occasion to name them—and they each gave a different opinion upon it. What was the use of teaching State school children analysis? It ended in nothing. If they taught them the old-fashioned grammar it would fulfil all requirements. Instead of that the children were taught miserable pettifogging distinctions that would be of no value to them whatever. He hoped the Minister for Instruction, having had the matter so forcibly brought before him, would take it into his own hands, and decide that the children should be taught something which would be of permanent value to them when they grew up. He thoroughly endorsed everything that fell from the hon. member, Mr. Brooks, and was very glad to hear him speak as he did. With regard to the question of neglected children, he did not pretend to know how many there were in the neighbourhood of Brisbane, but that a state of wretched neglect did exist was evident from a case that was brought before the police court a few days ago. He need not particularise the case; hon. members knew to what he referred. Could anything more disgusting or more horrible be imagined than the facts that were brought to light in that case? Was it not a disgrace to any civilised country, having such an educational system as theirs, on which they spent tens of thousands of pounds every year, that while such a state of things existed in their midst, they should devote so much time to teaching the children analysis and subdivided grammar? It should be impossible, in a colony like Queensland, to find

children so utterly neglected as those unfortunate girls to whom public attention was directed only the other day. He hoped that in Brisbane and its suburbs, and wherever population was dense, the Government would take the matter in hand, and try to put a stop to the wretched neglect which was known in some cases, however few, to exist. It was a crying shame that they should go on spending tens of thousands of pounds on public education every year, while neglect of that kind was suffered to exist in the very midst of a populous city like Brisbane.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he was very glad the subject of neglected children had been brought up. The leader of the Opposition had just referred to a very melancholy case of neglected children which was brought to light at the police court a short time ago. Such things ought to compel the Assembly to devise some means whereby neglected children could be brought within the reach of education. Neither of those girls had heard the name of God, nor had they any idea of the Saviour. And that brought up a point in reference to their system of national education on which he should like to say a word or two—that was, teaching the Bible in State schools. For many years—indeed up to about three years ago—he was utterly opposed to teaching the Bible in State schools, believing that the education imparted there should be thoroughly unsectarian. But his opinion on that question had very much altered lately, on viewing the deplorable state of vice, ignorance, and larrikinism that existed amongst some portions of the young and rising generation, both male and female, in the colonies. They seemed to know nothing about the Bible and other matters which were taught to boys and girls when he and other hon. members were young. The time had come when the question would have to be raised and tackled—the question of teaching the Bible without comment in State schools. It would never do any harm, and might do a great deal of good. He saw no reason why it should be objected to, if the teachers simply took portions of Scripture and taught moral lessons therefrom which every boy and girl ought to know. The relationship in which they stood to the great Creator ought to be taught in all the public schools. He raised the question in order to elicit the views of hon. members—although there was only a small Committee—upon it. The feeling outside the House was gaining strength in favour of teaching the Bible in State schools; and as it grew it would compel the House to take notice of it and discuss it, and possibly to put it into action. The hon. member, Mr. Brooks, very properly drew attention to the waste of time at some of the State schools with reference to the kind of education imparted—a kind of education which would do the scholars very little good in after life. If they were taught something concerning themselves—if they were given lessons in physiology, for instance, and taught what to eat, drink, and avoid—it would do them a great deal more good.

Mr. NORTON: Also, what not to drink.

Mr. MACFARLANE said that tuition of that kind would make the children both morally and physically better human beings and better members of society than many things they were now taught at the State schools. He had merely raised the question to see how it was received by the Committee.

Mr. CHUBB said the hon. gentleman had raised a question upon which there might be great difference of opinion. The question raised by the hon. member for the Valley was also of very great importance. A clever schoolmaster had said the other day that if Euclid himself were alive now he would find it very difficult to pass in the mental gymnastics which were prescribed

for teachers of the second class, and which would be found in the report. To return to the subject he had referred to—the question of neglected children—he would point to the admirable system which was being carried out in New South Wales. He was in that colony some time ago, and took the opportunity of visiting the ship “Vernon,” which was used as a training ship for children who came under the category of criminals, and he had a long discussion with the very excellent man who was in charge of the ship, Captain Neitenstein, and he was of opinion that children of the criminal class should be separated from those of the neglected class. Lately the Government of New South Wales had taken the “Wolverine” into the service, and had applied her to the purpose of a training ship for neglected children. He thought they might advance in the same direction in this colony. The reformatory at Lytton was very good in its way; but not only neglected children but criminal children were received there and were associated together, and many of the latter, although young, were inured to criminal habits. It was not a good thing that children of vicious habits should be associated with simply neglected children; but, of course, separating them was a matter of expense. If the compulsory clauses of the Education Act were not put into force, the children could be brought under the Industrial Schools Act, and taken up as neglected children and sent to places of this kind where they might be trained to be useful members of society, and when they grew up they would save the country an immense expense, which would have to be incurred in repressing crime. He read only the other day that Captain Neitenstein had received applications for 500 apprentices, which were for three times as many as he could supply. The boys remained with him for about two years, and were then spread all over the colony; but always under the eye of the Education Department, Captain Neitenstein himself visiting them at different times. They were while in service sent to school, if possible, and the scheme was found to work admirably, and would prove in future years a blessing to New South Wales, and he did not see why they should not try one of the same kind here.

Mr. NORTON said the subject raised by the hon. member for Ipswich was one which it would be hardly fair to discuss on an occasion like the present—that was, the question of religious instruction in State schools. If the hon. gentleman wished to get up a discussion upon that subject with the view of eliciting the opinions of hon. members, it would be better to pick out some day for it when the Government business would not be interfered with. If they entered into a discussion on that subject at once, a great many different opinions would be expressed, and they would be no further advanced at the end of it than they were at the beginning. He was not prepared to enter into it that night, and should be sorry to see it take place except upon some occasion of which due notice had been given, so that hon. gentlemen would have time for preparation, and not only make up their minds as to what they would say, but also as to what they would not say. It was too large a question to be discussed upon an occasion like the present.

Mr. PALMER said the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. S. W. Brooks, had referred just now to some matters in connection with the curriculum of schools which must strike anyone as being quite out of proportion to the understanding of young children. He believed the language used in grammar lessons would be foreign to members of that Committee. He was quite sure they would not understand

the extraordinary distinctions given as examples in lessons on grammar. He recollected himself to that day the difficulty there was in distinguishing the wonderful difference between copulative conjunctions and others which he had never mastered—indeed he could not find the sense or reason of the distinctions now. It seemed they persisted in the same barbarous manner of educating children up to the present. There were two or three subjects which might be introduced in a practical manner to enable scholars in this country to earn their living in connection with the physical aspects of the colony, and in which a fresh departure might be made. For instance there was the subject of agriculture which the hon. member for Darling Downs was anxious to promote. The elements of agriculture might very well be added to the list of subjects for instruction to be taught in the public schools to make the taste a little more popular than it was. He supposed there was nothing that the children of this colony had such an aversion to as agriculture or tilling the soil. They would ride horses, drive bullocks, or become larrikins, but they would not cultivate the land. They were not taught to cultivate flowers, or fruit-trees, or vegetables of any kind; and if a little elementary instruction in agriculture were taken in hand in schools, it would be a matter of some importance. He saw in the report with regard to technical classes in the School of Arts that it was stated that an agricultural instructor had been appointed in New South Wales with a salary of £800 a year, and under him were six other lecturers. Those gentlemen visited the agricultural districts of the colony, and delivered lectures to the farmers. The syllabus of subjects was large and exhaustive; and the necessity for attempting something in that direction had been felt here for some time. At the same time, the report stated, such instruction as could be provided should be made available to all in need of it, which led to the opinion that good work might be done by extending the operation by means of branch or off-shoot classes in South Brisbane and Fortitude Valley. That meant that they must begin at the beginning, and in the schools make the lessons a little instructive to the youthful mind. There was nothing like beginning while they were young; and he was quite certain that cultivating a taste for agriculture—if only for flowers or fruit-trees—would be of considerable advantage in leading the ideas to agricultural subjects. There were other subjects in which the youth of the colony could be very well trained—namely, in mineralogy and experimental chemistry. One of the principal productions of this colony for all time to come being minerals, they could not begin too early to teach their youth the elements of geology, and of experimental chemistry in connection with mineralogy. Those were two subjects which appertained to the future prosperity of the colony for all time to come. He did not think that to make that popular with their youths as they grew up could be at all foreign to the spirit of the Education Act which they were at such pains and such tremendous expense to try and carry out efficiently. He thought they could not devote too much attention to endeavouring to perfect their educational system. With respect to children who did not attend schools, he was sure that the subject alluded to by the hon. member for Bowen was one that would meet with approval. That was taking those young incorrigibles, who perhaps might turn out first-class men if properly trained, and bringing them up under naval instruction. It had been a great success in Sydney, and considering that our future principal arm of defence would be a naval one, he thought it would be a very good plan to teach those boys a little of the art or system of naval warfare by training them

in ships of some kind where they might cultivate a taste for such work, and be of service to the country not only in that way, but also by being saved from becoming disreputable larrikins.

The PREMIER said arrangements were being made for the teaching of elementary agriculture in the State schools of the colony, as the hon. member would see on reference to last year's report on public instruction. The hon. member also suggested the teaching of mineralogy, but he (the Premier) thought hon. members sometimes forgot the real capacity of a child's mind during the period of attendance at a State school. They also appeared to forget sometimes that the object of a child attending school was not so much to learn things as to be taught how to learn—how to use his mind. That was nearly all they could teach. They could not teach a child much before twelve or thirteen years of age. With regard to the question of analysis, he had always had a dislike to that system. He had never learnt it himself, and he did not think his knowledge of the English language had suffered very much from not having learnt it. That again was taught, not for the purpose of making a child learn twelve or fifteen different kinds of nouns, but to teach it how to think. They must have some materials for teaching children to think, and analysis was a system that had been devised by very experienced teachers, and was a method which had been found to be successful in that direction when used in moderation.

Mr. NORTON: Great moderation.

The PREMIER said he thought it should be used with moderation. He would point out that all the distinctive definitions, subdivisions, and refinements to which reference had been made were not taught in the State schools. He remembered addressing his attention to the matter when he was Minister for Education. Time was not wasted in teaching those things to young children, but they were taught to a certain extent when children were old enough to understand them; and it was useful for them as a mental exercise to be taught to distinguish between different parts of a sentence. It was a mistake to say that those things were of no use. With respect to the question of neglected children, it had been suggested by the hon. and learned member for Bowen that the same system which was in force in New South Wales should be introduced here—that was to have a training ship. They had a training ship here once, but now they put the boys ashore in the reformatory at Lytton, where they were taught just as well as they were taught in the training ships in Sydney, and they turned out just as well. They had no more successful institution in the colony than the reformatory at Lytton. Nearly all the boys looked back to it as a home; if they were ill-treated they looked to it as a place to which they could go back, with the certainty of being well taken care of and getting another good place. It had done an immense deal of good, and he did not believe it was so overcrowded as that it was necessary to start another rival institution afloat. Up to the present time the institution had done extremely well.

Mr. NORTON said he was very glad to hear that analysis as referred to was not taught in the State schools. He had no doubt the hon. member who made the statement believed he was correct, and it was, therefore, rather a relief to know that such was not the case, and that things were not so bad as they supposed them to be. He had seen a good deal of analysis, not in the public schools, but in other schools, and he could not help regarding it as pure waste of time. The good old parsing

they used to do in the old days was, he thought, quite sufficient for all ordinary purposes. It was a very good way of getting a knowledge of composition in English and in other languages.

Mr. GROOM said he was glad to hear what had fallen from the hon. the Premier—that the teaching of something like elementary agriculture was to be introduced into the public schools of the colony.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is!

Mr. GROOM said he had not seen anything of it yet. He believed that something of the kind was absolutely necessary. In fact, he thought there was no subject in connection with the discussion of the Estimates to which they could devote attention with more likelihood of good results from it than in that direction. At present absolutely nothing was done in Queensland as far as imparting to agriculturists any knowledge in connection with the cultivation of the soil. They knew nothing whatever of the constituent parts of soil, nothing whatever of the climatic conditions of the different parts of the colony, nothing whatever of the rainfall, nor was very much effort made to ascertain the rainfall correctly in different portions of the colony. He believed that a great many of the failures of selectors in agriculture had arisen entirely from that defect, and unless attention was directed to something of that kind he was perfectly certain that agriculture would not be the success in Queensland that they all desired it to be. In 1884, as hon. members would perhaps remember, there was a health exhibition in London, at which there was a conference held with regard to agricultural teaching in schools. The gentlemen who took part in that conference comprised some of the most learned professors in America, England, and the continent of Europe, who had charge of agricultural schools, and the information which was contained in the discussion, which would be found in the Library, was something wonderful as to the good results which had followed in the different parts of England—in the United States particularly—and on the continent of Europe, upon the establishment of agricultural schools, where children of farmers in poor condition could go and receive a thorough agricultural education before going out and taking farms for themselves. The amount of good which had resulted from the establishment of those schools was hardly to be estimated. Nothing whatever had been done in Queensland in that direction up to the present time. Another fact in connection with the matter, which was well worth considering, was that while they were told that 11,000,000 acres of land had been alienated, they had the melancholy fact staring them in the face that up to the present time only 200,000 acres were under cultivation, and they were absolutely sending away over half-a-million of money every year for breadstuffs and other agricultural produce that could be grown in this colony if the farmers only knew how to do it. He was one of those who were strongly of opinion that an effort should be made in that direction. If they had only one agricultural college where the sons of farmers could obtain a thorough knowledge of the principles of agriculture, he was sure that great good would result from it. Establishments of that kind in the United States had done an immense amount of good in this way. When a young man entered one of those colleges, he need not go there with white kid gloves on. All fanciful ideas of that sort were knocked out of his head immediately he went there, because not only was he instructed theoretically in the college, but he had to do the practical part of the work as well. The students were taken out into the field—an

orchard for example—by one of the professors of the college and instructed in the grafting of trees. Then when the fruit was ripe they were taught how to gather it, how to separate the fruit that should go to market from that which was fit to be preserved, and how to pack the fruit for market. They were instructed how to make the cases, and had to pack the fruit themselves and send it to market; and they were also taught how to convert the inferior fruit into jam. They were further instructed in the different manures, and were taught how to mix manures, and what were their chemical properties. In short, they were not only taught theoretically, but had to turn up their shirt sleeves and go into the fields; and in that way a thorough agricultural education was imparted to young men. A great number of men who had gone into the Western States and opened up the prairies, and there successfully engaged in farming, were men who had got their education in the agricultural colleges to which he referred. The plan was a great success, and he hoped something of the kind would soon be established in this colony. New South Wales had already made a start in that direction. As the hon. member for Burke had stated, the Government of that colony had recently appointed an agricultural instructor, and under him there were seven lecturers who were at this particular time going through the agricultural districts and delivering a course of highly instructive lectures with a view to informing the farmers and imparting to them such knowledge as would enable them to make the soil more productive than it was at present. What the Premier had said with reference to that question was perfectly true. A great many of the young people attending the primary schools of this colony could not be instructed in that way just now, but at the same time there were many farmers' sons who should be fitted by a practical course of agricultural instruction to take up and cultivate the public lands, and so become useful colonists. He was sure hon. members must be struck with the number of young men who applied for Government billets. What a large proportion of their young men there was who thought almost anything better than farming! They were simply ashamed, for some cause or other, to go into farming; they would sooner become pupil-teachers in the primary schools, or go behind a counter, or enter a bank as clerks—anything rather than till the soil—and the result was as he had said, that out of 11,000,000 acres of land alienated there were only 200,000 acres under cultivation. And that kind of thing would go on until they provided the means for imparting to the sons of farmers a thorough practical agricultural education. When they read of the great success of schools of that kind on the continent of Europe, particularly in Germany, but also in Belgium, Switzerland, and a large portion of Italy, and also in the United States, they could not but hope that something in that direction would soon be initiated in Queensland. If hon. members would read the report of the Health Conference held in London last year, which could be found in the Parliamentary Library, they would see that the amount of information imparted there was something wonderful. The Minister for Public Instruction first drew his attention to the volumes, and he became so interested in them that he did not cease reading them until he had read them all through. He collected a large amount of information from the volumes, showing the value of both the higher class and lower class of agricultural education. He might state that there were various grades in those schools. A farmer might be in a position to pay a sum of £50 a-year for the education of

his son in one of the agricultural colleges; and if he did the lad received an exceedingly high-class education, and could become—not what the hon. member for Barcoo referred to the other night as a scientific squatter, but a scientific farmer, able to go out and instruct others. On the other hand, if a farmer could not afford to send his son to a school of that class, he could send him to another for £10 a year, or even as low as £5, and for that sum the boy would receive a considerable initiation into agriculture, both in the school and in the field. There were many places in the colony where small agricultural schools might be established with advantage, and he believed that farmers would not begrudge paying a moderate sum of money to have their boys taught some practical knowledge of agriculture. He therefore hoped the Premier would see his way before long to establish one or more of those agricultural schools in the colony, where farmers' sons might receive something like training in the science and art of agriculture.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he would not express any opinion as to the various subjects that were taught under their system of education, but would chiefly deal with the matter of holding a conference of inspectors and school teachers, who, he believed, would be best able to make suggestions to remedy those minor difficulties. With regard to agricultural training, he thought much more might be accomplished than was now effected in New South Wales by a professor and seven lecturers, if they established both a teachers' college and an agricultural college, where the teachers could be instructed for some time. The amount of knowledge that would be obtained in that way and carried over the length and breadth of the land would be immense, and then, as they could afford them, they could establish proper agricultural schools, where farmers' sons could be regularly taught. He would like to have the opinion from the Minister for Public Instruction in regard to establishing teachers' colleges and agricultural colleges, and also as to the holding of a conference of teachers and inspectors.

Question put.

Mr. ISAMBERT said before the question was put he would like to have an opinion from the Minister for Public Instruction.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he quite agreed with the hon. member, and with the hon. member for Toowoomba, who spoke just before him, as to the desirability of doing something towards teaching agriculture. He himself had attended a college at home, and was there for two or three years, and learnt agriculture. He knew it did him a great deal of good, and he believed that good would result if they could establish such institutions in this colony. He hoped to see it done some day. He would draw the attention of the hon. member for Toowoomba to page 5 of the annual report, where he would find that a small book on agriculture had been placed in the hands of teachers to be used as an object lesson book; he hoped that would do some good.

Mr. BLACK said they were now paying salaries to ten inspectors. The amount paid to them for inspection for the last quarter, according to the Treasury returns, was £1,080 11s. 10d., or at the rate of £4,320 a year. The amount set down in the estimate for the year was £5,750. It was quite possible that some vouchers for the quarter might not have been presented to the Treasury when the return was made up. He believed that was probably the explanation the Minister for Public Instruction would give, if he made further inquiries into the matter. No doubt there were arrears at the

beginning of the present quarter belonging to the last quarter. His reason for referring to the matter was that the expenditure on public instruction for the past quarter was £35,510 14s. 1d., which, multiplied by 4, gave about £53,000 below the estimated expenditure for the whole year; and, even assuming that there were some accounts in arrears, the difference was very large. If the estimated expenditure for the other departments was on the same scale, the difference between the estimated and the actual expenditure would be enormous. As he had pointed out, in the Education Department alone the expenditure would be about £53,000 less than the Government anticipated.

The PREMIER said surely anybody who knew anything at all about figures knew that they could not draw an inference like that from one quarter's expenditure. At the present time there were eight inspectors, and they all drew fixed salaries. One fourth of the whole salary was the amount for the quarter, and that was due, whether the money was paid during the three months or not. Some of the inspectors were probably far away. They knew perfectly well what the expenditure for salaries was, but as to travelling expenses they were more in one quarter than in another. There was one quarter in which there was very little. As for the total expenditure of the year, it was perfectly well known that the department spent large sums of money in buildings, and those could not be spread evenly over the four quarters.

Mr. BLACK said the salaries were known.

The PREMIER said those had all to be paid during the twelve months. They were paid fortnightly, but it might happen that the fortnightly payment fell after the 1st October, or that some of the expenditure of the preceding quarter fell into that quarter.

Question put and passed.

DRAWING INSTRUCTORS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that there be granted the sum of £200 for drawing instructors.

Mr. PALMER said that was a very important item. £200 would not go a long way for drawing instructors. How many drawing instructors were there?

The PREMIER: Two.

Mr. PALMER asked if there was one for the North, and one for the South. Were the drawing instructors confined to one school, or did they travel?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was one at Brisbane, and one at Rockhampton, and one of the teachers at Maryborough had undertaken to teach drawing there.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said that now was the time to put in his plea in the matter of drawing. He would quote the words of the general inspector, Mr. Ewart, who said:—

"Music seems to be advancing a little; but I am convinced that in many schools the time devoted to the subject is almost wasted, and would be more beneficially employed in teaching other subjects. The art appeals to the finer sensibilities that are reached by the ear. Few teachers possess sufficient proficiency or skill in the art to reach these, and it does not appear practicable, with the money placed at the disposal of the department, to institute means whereby music may be more highly cultivated. Comparing music with drawing, and considering the value of the latter as an educative and refining art, and as a step to technical education, I think it is to be regretted that our system stands alone among national systems of education in its exclusion of drawing from the programme of subjects to be ordinarily taught. Were drawing taught so

as to yield fair results without much trouble. Most teachers could readily acquire, if they do not already possess, sufficient proficiency in that art to teach its elements satisfactorily."

Another inspector, Mr. Platt, said:—

"It is a national loss that elementary drawing is excluded from our schools. There are now but few teachers in State schools who have not sufficient skill to undertake this branch, so that the State would incur little or no expense in introducing it."

He did not think hon. members required that he should institute a comparison between drawing and music in their relative bearing on actual practical life. It was coming to be felt more and more every day that drawing, in the ordinary arts of life, must assume a very prominent position, and if they would give their system of national education fair play they must give drawing wider scope, and teach it to pupils as well as to pupil-teachers. They should try and do more in that direction, even at the sacrifice of some music. They had sometimes too much music, but it would be a long time before they could cry out "Stop our drawing."

Question put and passed.

TEACHERS' SALARIES AND CONTINGENCIES.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that there be granted the sum of £120,350 for salaries of teachers and contingencies. The increase in the vote was made up by the increase in the number of teachers.

Question put and passed.

BUILDINGS AND SUPERVISION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that there be granted the sum of £27,655 for buildings and supervision. There was a decrease in the vote from last year of £10,000; but the amount in the vote was sufficient for the work that was likely to be done during the present year. The amount for buildings last year was £35,000, but the whole of that sum was not expended until 30th September. In addition to the £25,000 asked for buildings for the present year, there would be the amount of local subscriptions also to work upon. Previously the local subscriptions went into the consolidated revenue, and the total vote was made by the Committee out of the consolidated revenue. Now the local subscriptions were placed to a trust fund and the department worked on that trust fund according to local subscriptions and requirements. In addition to the £25,000 they would have £2,000 to £3,000 local subscriptions, which would bring up the building fund to £27,500 which they could work upon. Considering that a large sum had been expended on buildings during the last two or three years, and that the accommodation had been considerably increased in some of the main towns, such as Maryborough and Rockhampton, he expected to be able to get through the present year with a somewhat smaller amount. With the exception of one or two schools in the town of Brisbane, he did not think there would be any very great demand on account of buildings.

Mr. BLACK said he understood that the Minister proposed establishing a trust fund for schools.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Not a new fund.

Mr. BLACK said it was not in existence at present; at any rate, it was not included in the trust funds indicated on page 85. Was it intended to anticipate the expenditure, or to place it on the Supplementary Estimates? Was the fund in existence yet, or was it to be only in the future? The hon. gentleman said that in addition to the £25,500 there would be £2,000 or £3,000 as a trust fund for the erection of schools.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that a local subscription was always required for new buildings, amounting to one-fifth of the total cost. Previously to the present year it had been the custom for the whole of the local subscriptions to be placed in the consolidated revenue, and the department had only acted on the amount voted on the Estimates. Since then a system had been inaugurated by which each local subscription was placed to an account by itself in the Treasury, and the department was allowed to operate on that account previously to operating on the other four-fifths, which had to be paid out of the consolidated revenue. That meant that, in addition to the £25,500, the department would be able to operate on the local subscriptions coming into their hands.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. member's remarks showed that it was a new trust fund.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he used the expression "trust fund" because it was the term used in the Treasury.

Mr. NORTON said it was very desirable that a trust fund of the kind should be kept; but he had a question to ask with regard to that, because of the local subscriptions in certain cases. Supposing the residents of a particular locality subscribed £100, and the amount was increased by £400 by the department, so that the school committee were in a position to call for tenders for a school estimated to cost £500—if the school did not cost that amount, what became of the balance? Was one-fifth of it returned to those who subscribed one-fifth of the cost of the school?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that if there was a balance it was held in suspense and used in paying for any improvements that might be made with the sanction of the department.

Mr. NORTON said that under the old system the residents had to contribute one-fifth of the cost of additions or repairs, but under the present arrangements the whole of the cost was borne by the department, so that he did not see any object in retaining the money to the credit of the school, because the money subscribed by the residents would not be required for paying for additions or repairs, and one-fifth of any balance that might be left might just as well be returned to the people by whom it was subscribed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the one-fifth subscribed by the residents was placed in the Government Savings Bank, and the deposit slip sent to the department, and interest accrued on that deposit. There had been cases in which one-fifth had been collected and the school was almost on the point of being approved, when the inhabitants disagreed as to where it should be erected, and the money had been returned.

Mr. NORTON said he was speaking of the balance left after the work was completed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that any balance would be used on that school for improvements.

Mr. MURPHY asked how the hon. gentleman arrived at the sum of £25,500? The sum of £36,675 was voted last year, and it was questionable whether £25,500 would be sufficient for the new schools required.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the total amount spent up to September last was £34,453—that was for fifteen months. He had made a calculation of what would be required, and as he kept within the amount voted last year, he thought he should be able to do the same again.

Mr. PALMER said that while they were on the vote for buildings he would like to put a question to the Minister for Public Instruction about the school at Cloncurry. Through some unfortunate mistake of the surveyor it had been put on land that did not belong to the department. The department had refused to do anything for it on the ground that it was not on their land. The Premier would know the position of the school, as he had lately visited the place. They were really in want of help to put up sheds for the children, and if the department would undertake to do something for them he would undertake to see that the school was shifted to land that did belong to the department.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not at that moment know very much about that school beyond the fact that there was some difficulty about the ground. If the hon. member would come to his office in the morning he would see what could be done.

Mr. DONALDSON said as he noticed a large amount set down for advertisements, he would like to know how the advertising was done. Would the money be spent in the districts in which the schools were erected, or would the advertisements to be inserted in papers all over the colony? They were getting very extravagant in the advertising vote.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the custom was to put the advertisements in the local papers where the schools were to be built, and his instructions were that that practice should be carried out as strictly as possible. Advertisements were often inserted in the Brisbane papers for schools in other places, but not for schools in districts far away—except in the case of such places as Normanton—because most of the schools in towns along the coast are built by contractors in Brisbane, Maryborough, Bundaberg, and Rockhampton.

Mr. DONALDSON said that advertisements were often inserted in papers that did not circulate in the district in which the school was to be erected. For instance, if a school was to be erected in Toowoomba the advertisements might appear in Brisbane, Ipswich, or other places besides Toowoomba.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Probably.

Mr. DONALDSON said he hardly thought that that was necessary. If they gave the local contractors notice through the local papers and the *Government Gazette*, that ought to be sufficient. Though he did not complain particularly of the item under that vote, he did complain that the advertising vote under some of the other departments was extravagant. He noticed the Minister for Lands was smiling. Under that hon. gentleman's department a small advertisement might appear in some local paper about certain lands to be sold in a particular district, and yet they found long advertisements in the Brisbane papers on the subject which might never reach the district at all. Only yesterday he had seen long lists of electoral rolls published as advertisements in a very unimportant paper—advertisements which would cost a very large sum. He would take another opportunity of dealing with that question.

Mr. MURPHY said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Warrego that the expenses for advertising were too much. If they wished to build a school in a far-away country district, he could not see the use of advertising for tenders for it in the Brisbane newspapers. It would be very easy to find out those papers

circulating most in the particular districts in which the work was to be constructed, and it would be sufficient to advertise in those papers. It was only a waste of money to advertise in Brisbane papers that were not circulating in the outside districts at all.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that from the tone of the hon. member's remarks he would come to the conclusion that no advertisements were being inserted in the local papers; but that was not so—they were inserted in local papers, and very freely. There was no reason why they should call for tenders from only two or three local men, when they might be able to get the work done cheaper by people in other districts who would not see the advertisements in the local papers. He could assure the hon. members for Barcoo and Warrego that local papers received advertisements for local works.

Mr. DONALDSON said that what he wished particularly to draw the attention of the Committee to was that frequently advertisements were inserted in papers that did not circulate in the districts in which the work for which the tenders were called was to be done. Again, if a school was wanted around Brisbane, it was unnecessary that the advertisement should be inserted in every paper in Brisbane. If a school were to be erected at Thargomindah or Blackall, he thought it would be quite sufficient to advertise in one of the papers there and in the *Government Gazette*.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he held in his hand the Government bill for advertising, and a nice little bill it was. He noticed that the Secretary for Public Instruction figured for a very small sum in it—£568 5s. 10d., and he congratulated him upon that. They were spending a total sum of £12,494 16s. 5d. in the year for advertising, and when the amounts for advertising the electoral rolls were counted up, it would come to very much more. The advertising account was one in which the Government could very well make a reduction. He saw the triple organs, represented by the *Courier, Observer*, and *Queenslander*, went in for about £1,500 a year of Government advertisements. The *Telegraph*, the Government organ—

Mr. BLACK: Is it the Government organ?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was supposed to be the Government paper, and it got over £700. The *Week* got £285 6s. 6d. Considering how good they were to their enemies, the Government, he thought, should be a little better to their friends. £12,494 was a little too much to spend for advertisements, especially when they considered that the newspapers were further subsidised by being carried over all the mail routes in the colony free. As the Government did that much for them, the least the papers could do would be to insert Government advertisements free, because he did not see why they should receive double-barrelled protection of that kind, especially as the *Government Gazette* was printed and circulated about pretty freely, and contractors, wishing to tender for works under any of the departments, could always get an opportunity of going to the court-house to see the *Government Gazette*.

The CHAIRMAN: I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that we are dealing with the Education vote.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said they were dealing with advertising, and he maintained he was going right on the general subject.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee is not dealing with the general subject of advertising. If the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the

item for advertising in connection with the Department of Public Instruction, I can make no objection to his continuing.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he considered that, to illustrate the whole question of the Education vote for advertisements, one must touch upon the other point; and of course what would be a remedy for one department would apply equally to all the others. The vote of £568 was a mere bagatelle, but when it came to be added to all the others it was a matter of thousands. He thought that when they were debating supply, they should look all round and see where expenditure could be reduced. He was pointing out to the Treasurer where a substantial saving could be effected, and he hoped the Government would take it into serious consideration. It would be better to distribute the *Government Gazette* to every elector in the colony than go to that expense for advertising. It could be done for less money.

Mr. NORTON said he thought there was some misapprehension in connection with the vote for building. Looking at the accounts, as far as he could understand, that £38,000 odd was money expended for the financial year proper. Now that the Government had undertaken the whole of the repairs, of course the amount would increase every year with the increasing number of schools; and he was afraid the expenditure was almost certain to exceed the amount provided for.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the amount included the local subscriptions that had been paid up.

Mr. NORTON said he had understood from the Colonial Treasurer that it did not include them. If it did not it made all the difference. He was taking the expenditure for the financial year—not during the year, but for the year.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said the change in the system was inaugurated on the 1st of October, 1885; so that virtually during three-fourths of the year no contributions had been paid to the Treasury. He was correct and not correct in what he had said. No subscriptions were actually received after the 1st October, still the disbursements included what amounts then remained in the Treasury.

Question put and passed.

PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £14,650 be granted for provisional schools.

Question put and passed.

GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £3,169 be granted for grammar schools—scholarships, exhibitions to universities, travelling expenses, and contingencies.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that was rather a luxurious vote these hard times. He did not think the State was called upon to contribute to that extent to such a very high-class examination. He thought the tendency of State schools was to make the children learn too much altogether, and to be a cut above work. They all wanted to be clerks or Civil servants or bankers, or anything rather than turn their hands to manual labour. They were ashamed even of being tradesmen.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not suppose the hon. member was in earnest. He was certain no hon. member in the Committee would support him in any reduction.

Mr. BLACK said he would support the hon. member. There were several hon. members who held the same views as he did—that though the State was bound to provide the elements of education, it should not be called upon to pay for the education of a class of people well able to pay for themselves. Ornamental education, he considered it. He would like to ask the Minister for Education whether there was any Act rendering it compulsory upon the Government to give those annual scholarships, or whether it depended upon a vote of the House?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: A vote of the House.

Mr. GROOM said he was sorry he could not agree with the hon. member for Cook with regard to the vote. He looked upon it as one of the best votes on the Estimates, and anyone who had watched the progress of the boys in connection with it would say that they were an honour to Queensland. Three university exhibitions were offered every year, open to every deserving boy in Queensland, whether he attended a State school, or grammar school, or private school; and it was a remarkable fact, which the records of the Education Department showed, that the boys who had achieved distinction were boys who had started from the very lowest rung of the ladder in the State schools. They had shot ahead of all the other boys. Without mentioning names, they had a gentleman in the legal profession in the city, who was an honour to Queensland and an honour to the bar, who commenced on the lowest rung of the ladder at a State school, won a scholarship, then won a university exhibition and achieved success at the Melbourne University, and was now a distinguished member of the bar of this colony. His parents were not in a position to give the boy that education. There was no ornamental education so far as that lad was concerned; he honestly worked for and achieved success, but he would not have been able to achieve success had it not been for the establishment of those exhibitions. Even if they had only done good in that one case he believed the system was an exceedingly grand one for the country. In any of the country towns or villages of the colony there might be

"Some mute, inglorious Milton,"

whose parents might not be in a position to give him the education he desired, and by means of that vote he was given an education which his intelligence qualified him to receive. He was perfectly sure, from his own knowledge, that the scholarships had been incentives to many a boy to work most laboriously and hard to achieve success. Many of them had achieved success, and he believed the system would still continue to be the means of stimulating the boys at the State and grammar schools, urging them on to obtain an education by means of which they could fight their own way in the world. After all, the amount paid was not sufficient to provide all the expenses of a university education, and he could mention the case of a young grammar school boy who, having won a scholarship, was now attending the Melbourne University, and was not ashamed to do manual work to earn the necessary funds to enable him to go through his course of lectures. He said again, that the vote was doing an immense amount of good, it was stimulating young men to achieve success in the world, and they should by no means reduce or do away with it. He hoped he had satisfied the hon. member for Cook, and he was sure if the hon. gentleman looked closely into the subject he would see that nothing but good could result from such a vote.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said, notwithstanding the hon. member for Toowoomba's eloquent

explanation, he was not convinced. He believed the system did excite and stimulate the boys, and brought out one or two brilliant successes, but he thought the stimulation was of a very unhealthy kind, and spoilt the boys for a career of usefulness as colonists. He believed such prodigies as the member for Toowoomba talked about would come to the front without the aid of that vote. Their own force of character would bring them to the front. It was not always the best educated or the most wealthy men who came to the front. The men who had come to the front in this colony were those who were not afraid to put their shoulders to the wheel and educate themselves as well. Those were the men—men of self-reliance and determination, and they were the most useful class of colonists. The money which it was proposed to vote came out of the pockets of the ratepayers of the colony; it came out of the pockets of the poor as well as the rich, and was applied by the State to an object which was not legitimate. He admitted that it was the duty of the State to give a primary education to the people, but he did not consider the State was called upon to give a high-class education to any particular class, be they rich or be they poor.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Cook had himself enjoyed the benefits of a university education, but he appeared to think now that grammar schools and universities ought to be abolished. How were they established in the old countries? Were they established for the poor, or were they entirely for the benefit of the rich? Did the hon. member think there ought to be no educated people in the colony or no people who should have the benefits of a higher education? There was a higher education to be obtained. Were they to limit all the people of the colony to a primary education, and were they to import all highly educated people from abroad? What were the boys of the colony to do? Were they to have no opportunity of obtaining a higher education? Was Queensland to be distinguished as the only country in the whole of the civilised world where the benefits of a higher education could only be attained by men of wealth? He hoped they should not be distinguished by any such means. He thought even that they were late and behindhand in the establishment of a university. Only that day he had turned up the draft of a Bill which he introduced into the House in 1877 for the purpose of establishing a university. That was nine years ago; but nothing had been done up to the present time. Shortly afterwards he brought before the House a resolution which was passed, and which had been acted upon ever since, providing for the establishment of three exhibitions every year to be awarded to Queensland students, to enable them to attend universities. Every year since the money had been cheerfully voted by Parliament, and the system had proved of the very greatest advantage. Every one of the students had done well, every one of them had distinguished himself, at the university; and scarcely one of them could have obtained a university education, or attained to the position he had attained, had it not been for the establishment of those exhibitions. In previous years, when the vote had been objected to, he had prepared himself with the details to show the work that had been done, and he had no hesitation in saying that no money could be better expended by the State if it was admitted that it was desirable to have men of superior education in the colony at all. If they wanted to abolish all doctors and lawyers, by all means abolish the vote; abolish grammar schools; abolish universities; do not have any doctors, or any lawyers, or any professional men of any

kind, and get on the best way they could without them. As to getting higher education, except with the assistance of the State, they knew it was impossible, except for the wealthy few, and he, for one, objected to legislate entirely for the benefit of the wealthy few.

Mr. NORTON said the hon. gentleman must regret that the surplus left by the late Government was exhausted without any attempt to establish a university. For now that they were involved in taxation and in the expenditure of more than their income, there was no possibility of starting one and they would have to wait until a more favourable opportunity—until the next Government created another surplus.

The PREMIER: By the sale of land.

Mr. NORTON said he was one of those who always opposed the vote, and he had opposed it on a fixed principle, but he was bound now to withdraw to a certain extent the arguments that he had sometimes used against the vote. For a long time he was under the impression that the effect of the vote was to provide for people who could provide for their own children the means of a higher education, but from inquiries he had made he had reason to believe that in most cases those scholarships had been won by the children of men who were not in a position to give them a high-class education even if they had desired to do so. So far, he was willing to withdraw anything he had ever said against the vote. But apart from that, he had often found that men who possessed the largest amount of information were the most useless creatures under the sun. A man's getting on in the world did not depend upon his possession of information, but upon his ability to turn that information to his own advantage. Most hon. members must have come across people who were very well informed indeed, but who were utterly helpless and had to depend upon others, even for their means of subsistence. He had always opposed the vote for the reason that in a country like Queensland there must necessarily be a large number of people who could not possibly take advantage of the educational system provided by the State. In his own district and in others, cases had come within his knowledge of men who tried their hardest to avail themselves, for their children, of the education provided by the State; but it was beyond their reach. They could neither send their children to a primary school nor a provisional school, nor obtain the services of a travelling teacher. They were left to rely upon themselves, paying entirely out of their own pockets for someone to undertake the work of tuition. It was hard that those people—poor, for the most part—who had had to find the money to teach their own children, should be compelled to contribute towards that enormous sum of over £200,000, which the colony was now expending on its public school system. Every one knew that there were numerous children in the colony whose parents gained no advantage whatever from that large expenditure, and yet they had to contribute as much as those who derived the fullest benefit from it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was quite true, as the Premier had said, that he himself had enjoyed the exceptional advantage of having been at a university, but when he came out to the colony he found that everything he had learned there was utterly useless to him. He had to learn bullock-driving and shearing, and to put classics and logic and all that sort of thing on one side. Certainly he did not work very hard at the university, nor lay himself out for very high honours, but what he did learn there he did not find of much benefit in practical life in the bush. Amongst the many youths who strove for those scholarships one or two turned out

wonderful birds—regular phoenixes—while the great majority who did not succeed added their brains and were worthless for all practical purposes in after life, and were of no use to the colony.

Mr. GROOM said he could assure the hon. member that every one of the young men who had won those scholarships and exhibitions to universities had distinguished themselves; there had not been a single failure. Without mentioning names, he would take the very first from Table O of the appendix to the Education Report for 1886. That exhibitor's record was as follows:—

“Stood first among competitors from primary schools for scholarships to grammar schools, December, 1873. Gained the open exhibition for English and history, and the classical exhibition of £50 for candidates of the first year at Melbourne University, 1879. First class classical honours in B.A. degree, and university law scholarship at Melbourne University, 1883.”

Mr. NORTON: What is he now?

Mr. GROOM said he was now an eminent barrister in Brisbane, and he commenced as a State school boy. He would not trouble the Committee with referring to other cases, as they were all fully set out in the table from which he had quoted. Many of those boys had distinguished themselves by winning two £50 scholarships in two succeeding years, and one had even won three.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: He is a cormorant.

Mr. GROOM: So far there had been no failures; and it was an honour to Queensland that it granted an annual vote of that kind which had effected such an enormous amount of good. On many occasions he had heard the hon. member for Port Curtis oppose the vote, and nothing had given him greater pleasure than to hear his recantation that night, and he was sure that if the hon. member continued in the House he would support the vote enthusiastically, and so help to give to many a deserving boy in the colony a chance of obtaining that higher education which otherwise would be placed far beyond his reach.

Mr. BLACK said there was no intention to question the ability of those who had taken the scholarships, but it would be interesting to know whether the parents of those youths were in a position to pay for their higher education. If they were, the State had no right to be asked to contribute. The Colonial Secretary had asked the Committee to contemplate the lamentable state of the colony if it had neither lawyers nor doctors. Why did the hon. gentleman mix up the two professions? He was not at all certain that a country in which there were no lawyers would not be as near an approach to Arcadia as they were likely to see. As for the two professions—the doctors relieved suffering humanity, while the lawyers relieved suffering humanity's purses.

Mr. ISAMBERT said that although a large amount of money was expended on the higher education, the Government had practically no supervision over the grammar schools. Did the Government intend to bring them under the control of the Education Department? It might be right to spend money on higher education for the purpose of producing doctors and lawyers; but was it not time that similar efforts were made in the direction of technical education, for the purpose of producing a supply of more useful colonists?

Question put and passed.

BRISBANE SCHOOL OF ARTS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £600 be granted in aid of technical education.

Mr. PALMER said he would take advantage of the vote going through to ask the Minister for Education or the Colonial Treasurer at what time he thought he would be able to inaugurate the much-needed public library for Brisbane? He thought it was a disgrace to Queensland that the city of Brisbane had not a public library. Even in a country like Japan, a so-called half-civilised place, they not only had public libraries in every city, but they had branch libraries in all the smaller towns. The Committee had just concluded a discussion upon higher education, with regard to exhibitions to universities, and he was quite certain that no better education could be given than could be found in a public library. It was a disgrace that the matter had not been started before. It was no use referring to the Brisbane School of Arts library, which was a twopenny-halfpenny concern altogether—a collection of yellow-backs, and which did not come up at all to the requirements of a public library where people could go and spend those hours reading that they spent outside in far worse amusements. It would be much better to spend the money on a public library that they had voted for non-paying railways.

The PREMIER said the matter had for some time received the attention of the Government. The great difficulty in the matter had been to select a suitable site for the expenditure of the money available. There was a site close to Parliament House. Just inside the adjoining garden fence there was a very nice piece of land—a fine lawn looking over the gardens—perfectly quiet, and of sufficient area. That had been recommended by the trustees of the museum as a site for a new museum, and he was disposed to think it was the best place available. There had been a great many sites under consideration, and various pieces of land had been under offer to the Government during the last two years. So far as he could see, the piece of land he had suggested was the best, unless they were prepared to pay a high price for land somewhere else.

Mr. MURPHY said the Government ought to take steps to secure a piece of land somewhere in the neighbourhood more suitable for a Government House than the present one.

The PREMIER: We have a splendid site.

Mr. MURPHY said the Government could turn the present Government House into a public library and picture gallery, and associate the museum with it, and build a suitable Government House further out of town.

Mr. NORTON: What will you do with the museum?

Mr. MURPHY: Sell it, and it would help to build the new Government House. It would be better if the museum, the picture gallery, and the public library were all under the same roof, the same as they were in other places. He hoped that as a means to higher education the Government would take the matter into their serious consideration. The question of cost was one that should not be considered at all. As the hon. member for Burke had said, it was a scandal to the colony of Queensland that Brisbane should not have a picture gallery or public library.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he sincerely hoped that not one yard of the Botanic Gardens would be used for any purpose other than that for which it was used now, and he trusted that the people of Brisbane would resist any encroachment. There were many sites around Brisbane suitable for a library or museum; and there was one, particularly, near the Parliamentary Buildings that would answer the purpose remarkably well—between there and Government House. It was at present a useless piece of land so far as the public were con-

cerned, and was used merely for grazing the Governor's cattle. It could be turned to much better account by being used for a public library, or a museum, or any public building of that refining character, without destroying the Botanic Gardens—that beautiful spot which was the only place for recreation that the people of Brisbane had. He hoped, when the question was raised, every man, woman, and child would raise their voice against it.

The PREMIER said the hon. member misunderstood him. The place he mentioned was distant not more than thirty feet from the place referred to by the hon. member—only on the other side of the road.

Mr. NORTON said he agreed with the hon. member for Maryborough that it would be a pity to take even thirty feet from the Botanic Gardens. He thought he must apologise for calling them the Botanic Gardens. There was an idea at one time to make them, and keep them, botanic gardens; but now they were merely ornamental gardens, and he did not see why they should retain the name. He did not know that he could congratulate the trustees upon the change in that respect. There was not the botanical knowledge to be obtained from them which one would expect from the name. With regard to the public library, there was a large sum of money voted for the purpose, and it occurred to him that the present museum would be a suitable place for it.

The PREMIER: We must put the museum somewhere else.

Mr. NORTON said there was a vote for a new museum, and something would have to be done with the present museum.

The PREMIER: Make that the library.

Mr. NORTON said it appeared to him that the museum would be a good position for the library. There were no means of adding to the present museum, which was already too small for the purpose; but it would suit admirably for a public library. It was in a quiet place and easily accessible from all parts of the town.

The PREMIER said the difficulty was to get a large enough site for the museum which would be accessible, and the Government had given the matter a great deal of thought. It would be an advantage to occupy the piece of land he had proposed.

Mr. NORTON said there was a place upon the reserve at Wickham terrace.

The PREMIER: That will be wanted for railway purposes.

Mr. NORTON said the piece he referred to was above any piece which could be required for railway purposes.

The PREMIER: It is not a convenient place.

Mr. NORTON said he did not think it was an inconvenient place.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he believed the vote before the House was for technical education, and he did not know what earthly or other connection a public library had with the vote for technical education. He hoped hon. gentlemen had read the report of the School of Arts on the subject, as they would be able to gather from it that something good was being done in the matter. He rose merely to suggest to hon. members that they need not be surprised if the committee of the Technical College came next year and asked for something more than £600.

Mr. BLACK: They won't get it.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said it was not a capital offence to ask for it. The committee hoped to do something in the direction of instruction in agriculture, and they could not do that with the £600 at their command. He might say that branch classes had been established at Woollongabba and Fortitude Valley, and they had promised to turn out successfully. The committee hoped during the year to make some arrangements for, at any rate, a small effort in the direction of instruction in agriculture. If that was successful they would probably have to ask for a little larger sum than £600 next year.

Mr. NORTON said with regard to the Technical College he could speak for one department of teaching in it—that was the carpentry class. He had had his boy attending that class for about twelve months, and it was certainly a very cheap way of getting boys taught. He did not know whether it was quite right to expect the State to provide for such education; at any rate it did so, and they taught cheaply and exceedingly well. He could only say that if the other classes were as well taught as the carpentry class, they deserved every possible assistance. For his part he recommended the class to anyone who had a boy who wished to know anything about the use of tools.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS said he might state that on the notice paper for a committee meeting that day, was the item "Use of lecture-hall for drawing class." The drawing class had increased so largely in numbers that the committee would have to take the lecture hall as a class-room for drawing purposes.

Mr. NORTON : They do very good drawing.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he had every reason to suppose that the technical college in connection with the School of Arts was giving great satisfaction, and was of great benefit to the inhabitants of the city. So satisfied was he of that from inquiries he had made, that he certainly hoped the system would be extended to other large towns such as Rockhampton, Maryborough, and Townsville. They had just as good a right to have a vote of money for technical education as Brisbane. They ought not to concentrate everything in Brisbane. Brisbane was not all the world. He was a Brisbane man, and he was as anxious for its success as anyone in the colony, but at the same time he was not going to sit silently there and see everything expended in Brisbane, while other large centres of population were neglected in those matters.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said it was all very well for Brisbane members to get £600 this year for the purpose proposed and say that they would require a little more next year. But a school of mines was very badly wanted in the district he represented, and he would like to see a little money on the Estimates for that. It would be very usefully expended in teaching the fundamental principles of mining. Even grown-up people would be glad to go there and learn the value of different ores—especially the refractory ores they had to deal with now. For his part that was a line of education he did believe in—practical technical education. It had his full sympathy, and he would be glad to see a great deal more money spent in that and a great deal less in the fancy part of their present educational system. At present they were spending so much on general education that he did not see how the Government could be expected to devote anything like a proper amount to the general distribution of technical education throughout the colony. He did not see where the money was to come from. That was why he would be willing to curtail some of the extra-

1886—4 v

gant branches of education with the view of fostering and encouraging what he believed to be thoroughly useful practical education.

Mr. MURPHY said he thought that in order to give the Land Act of 1884 a thoroughly good show, technical colleges, for the purpose of teaching scientific squatting, should be established. He thought Blackall would be a very good place to establish a college of that sort.

The PREMIER : Will you take charge of it?

Mr. MURPHY : Yes.

Mr. BLACK said he was very glad to see that the technical college in Brisbane was making satisfactory progress. He judged that such was the case from the amount of fees paid and donations received, which considerably exceeded the amount collected by the institution last year. He noticed that the fees for the present year amounted to £491 and donations to £42, which were within about £60 of the amount of Government endowment. So long as the endowment was at the rate of £1 for £1 upon contributions to such institutions, the same as to schools of arts, he had no objection to it; but when the hon. member for Fortitude Valley said that that institution proposed to ask the Government for a larger sum next year, he (Mr. Black) interjected that he would not get it. What he meant by that was that the Government would not be justified in contributing more than £1 for £1. When those institutions were self-supporting they deserved every support from members of that Committee. When, in order to popularise them, they adopted the system that the hon. member for Port Curtis had pointed out—by teaching the young men in towns technical education in the shape of carpentry, and such like mechanical pursuits—he did not think anyone could possibly raise any objection to them, and he should like to see the principle extended. He saw no reason why it should apply to Brisbane and not be made applicable to other large towns in the colony, such as Maryborough, Rockhampton, and, in fact, any place in which the liberality of the people induced them to subscribe £1 for £1 for technical education, receiving like endowment from the Government. He hoped that the hon. member for Fortitude Valley would not suppose from his interjection that he disapproved of the principle of grants to such institutions. He did approve of it, but he wanted to see it of much more general application than it was at present, being confined entirely to Brisbane.

Question put and passed.

ORPHANAGES.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £15,556 be granted for Orphanages. He said the principal items of decrease would be found in the omission of the items buildings, fencing, and furniture at Townsville, and buildings at Mackay.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS asked what was the meaning of the increase of £1,000 for St. Vincent's Orphanage?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the increase was in consequence of an increased number of children there.

Mr. S. W. BROOKS : Has it anything to do with buildings?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : No ; it is a capitation allowance.

Question put and passed.

DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND INSTITUTION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that £480 be granted in aid of the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institution,

Mr. NORTON asked what was the reason of the reduction in the amount of last year?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it was on account of the reduction in the number of children attending the institution.

Mr. BLACK asked the Minister for Public Instruction whether that amount was the amount contributed to the New South Wales institution?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes.

Mr. BLACK said he believed they had a gentleman in their midst who was doing an immense amount of good amongst the blind in this colony. He would ask the Minister for Public Instruction whether the sum of £80 in that vote was for that gentleman?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes, that is his salary.

Mr. BLACK said he thought that was a very insufficient salary. He had met the gentleman to whom he had referred—Mr. Tighe, he believed, was his name—travelling in different parts of the colony, especially in the North. He thought it was to be regretted that, notwithstanding the depressed state of their financial affairs, that gentleman should not be paid a little more handsomely than £80 a year. It was really a matter in which the Government might exercise a little more liberality. The vote was cut down from £630 last year to £480 for the present year. He hoped the Minister was satisfied that that amount was sufficient, otherwise he was perfectly satisfied that the Committee would consent to a little more liberality being displayed with regard to that particular item.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said one reason why no change was made this year was that there was now the beginning of a colonial institution in Brisbane. He hoped that within a short time the vote would be given to that institution, £1 for £1, in the same way as it was now given to New South Wales.

Question put and passed.

MUSEUM.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £2,298 be granted for the Museum and contingencies.

Mr. NORTON said he was sorry to see the reductions in the last part of that vote. The amount voted last year for fittings and maintenance of building was £300, and this year the amount was £200. He would point out to the hon. gentleman that some improvement was very much needed in the outbuildings which were a disgrace to the establishment, and he hoped something would be done in that respect as early as possible. With regard to the library, he thought it was a misfortune that the vote should be reduced from £500 to £250. Where a museum was carried on, the library was one of the most important things in connection with it, and he believed the money spent in the library had always been well expended. There was, at the present time, a considerable collection of books of very great value in the Museum, but they still required books in connection with certain branches of natural history, which could hardly be done without. He only hoped that if a larger sum was required during the year than that placed on the Estimates the Minister would find some means of providing it.

Mr. SHERIDAN said he was sorry to see that two items under the heading of "Contingencies" were reduced in that vote. He would have been very much better pleased if a sum of £700 had been voted for the purchase of specimens, and if the sum of £500 instead of £250 had been

put down for the library. That economy was a very small one, and the subject was very important to the colony as a whole. He considered that money expended for scientific purposes, particularly for a purpose so exceedingly educating as the museum, which afforded to persons in all parts of the colony an opportunity to amuse or instruct themselves, was well spent. He repeated again that it was very poor and small economy to reduce the vote, and he could only say with the hon. member for Port Curtis that he hoped, if more money were required, it would be granted by the Government. He was quite certain that if that was done, when the vote came on next year, it would be agreed to without any demur on the part of the Committee.

The COLONIAL TREASURER said he might mention that there was a sum of £52 carried forward from last year—unexpended balance from the amount voted for the purchase of specimens.

Mr. NORTON said he did not think the purchase of specimens was so important as the matter to which he had referred.

The PREMIER: The amount being in a subdivision of "Contingencies" can be transferred.

Mr. NORTON said he regarded the museum as an educational institution, not only for the benefit of Brisbane, but for all parts of the colony. Numbers of people at different places sent down specimens to have them named and examined; and from the information thus obtained very valuable discoveries were sometimes made.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER, the CHAIRMAN left the chair, reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again tomorrow.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

OYSTER BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, intimating that they had agreed to the Bill for the protection of oysters and the encouragement of oyster fisheries, without amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received the following message from the Legislative Council:—

"Legislative Council Chambers,
Brisbane, 27th October, 1886.

"MR. SPEAKER,

"The Legislative Council, having had under consideration the message of the Legislative Assembly relative to the amendment made by the Legislative Council in the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, beg now to intimate that they insist on the said amendment, because the amendment is necessary to make the clause complete, and prevent the undue diversion of funds derived from water rates to purposes unconnected with water supply.

"JNO. F. McDOUGALL,

"Presiding Chairman."

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I cannot help thinking that there is some misunderstanding about this message. I move that it be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

SEPARATION OF NORTHERN QUEENSLAND.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to lay on the table of the House further correspondence with reference to the separation of the northern portion of the colony, and move that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said : Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. With regard to the Government business for to-morrow, Supply stands first, and I hope we shall have some time to spare after going through the Treasurer's estimates. If so, it is proposed to proceed with the two Bills which now stand first in order on the business-paper.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock.