

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 1887**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.**

*Wednesday, 14 September, 1887.*

Petitions.—The Immigration Act of 1882 Amendment Bill—first reading.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Gaols Commission Report.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

**PETITIONS.**

Mr. FOOTE presented a petition from Francis Porter, timber-getter, of Ipswich, setting forth grievances in respect to the purchase of certain land; and moved that it be read.

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

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

Mr. KATES presented a petition signed by 300 farmers and producers in the Darling Downs district, praying for the protection of agricultural produce; and moved that it be read.

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

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

#### THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1882 AMENDMENT BILL.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the desirableness of introducing a Bill to further amend the Immigration Act of 1882.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER said he would say a word or two, by way of explanation of the Bill, before moving that it was desirable that it should be introduced. The other day, when mentioning the measures which the Government proposed to proceed with during the session, he stated that there would probably be a Bill introduced to amend the Immigration Act of 1882 in some particulars. The particulars in which it was proposed to amend it had reference to the raising of the amount required to be paid for the passage of persons nominated from Europe, and also to raising the rates to be paid for assisted passages from Europe. The present rates were very small, and under existing circumstances the result of raising the rates, while it would not diminish the flow of desirable immigrants, would to a very appreciable extent diminish the cost to the Treasury of immigration. It was also intended to amend the Act by providing for the punishment of persons who had been here before and fraudulently procured themselves to be nominated to be brought out again. He had lately had instances before him of persons making their second or third trip to the colony at the expense of the Government. They went home for a trip, and got nominated to come out again for a second or a third time. He moved that it was desirable to introduce a Bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1882.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER, in moving that the Chairman leave the chair and report the resolution to the House, stated that the Government proposed to make the Bill take effect from that day, as in other cases in which rates were raised by an amending Bill.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, and, on the motion of the PREMIER, the resolution was adopted.

#### FIRST READING.

The PREMIER presented the Bill, and moved that it be read a first time.

Question put and passed; and, on the motion of the PREMIER, the second reading of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### SUPPLY.

##### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I beg to move that you do now leave the chair, and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to further consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

#### GAOLS COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. JESSOP said: Mr. Speaker,—I have made it my duty to bring before the House the report of the Commissioners upon the gaols of the colony. Some three years ago I had several

complaints made to me about the working of these institutions, and the session before last I tabled a motion for an inquiry to be held into the working of the gaols of the colony. It was then very near the close of the session, and before the time came to move the motion I was taken ill, and remained unwell until the session closed, and therefore the matter was held over. Last session I tabled a motion, after consideration, for the appointment of a Royal Commission. During the recess I had been inundated with all kinds of complaints, and I came to the conclusion, with advice, that it would be much better to have a Royal Commission appointed than a select committee. When I moved for the appointment of a Royal Commission the Premier seemed to be in accord with the idea, and promised to have an inquiry held, but not by a Royal Commission, to which he objected on the grounds of the expense. That inquiry has been held, and I take this opportunity of thanking the Premier for his action in appointing the Commissioners to make the inquiry, and I also thank the Commissioners appointed for having taken every possible pains, and fossicked in corners, and for having brought out grievances I had no idea of. I think the Commissioners' report will do a great deal of good in exposing the grievances, and will have the effect, I think, of correcting many of them. I have been twitted in this House and outside of it in connection with this matter, and I have been asked why I took up the championship of wrongdoers. I do not admit the statement that I have taken up the championship of wrongdoers. I have not done so, but I have come forward and asked for an inquiry, so that even the wrongdoers might get fair play, and that people might not be accused of doing things they were not guilty of. The turnkeys of the gaols have been accused of levying blackmail upon the prisoners, of robbing them of their food, and of doing a great many things which, if true, would be very awkward to society, and especially to people who had relations and friends concerned. That is why I insisted on an inquiry. No doubt it has been proved that there was a great deal of truth in these statements. The levying of blackmail has been proved, though not to the extent it was originally supposed to exist. That business is easily accounted for. A great many people came to me, in the first place, and made statements and volunteered to give evidence, but the moment the Commission was granted they closed their mouths, as bankers in hard times fasten their pockets, and it was very hard to elicit any information from them, and a great many people gave evidence very reluctantly. I do not blame this Government any more than I blame previous Governments for a great many things which will be found stated in the Commissioners' report, as the Colonial Secretary cannot be in every place; but I think it necessary, and I believe the House will agree with me, after reading the evidence and report of the Commissioners, that a general inspector should be appointed for all the gaols of the colony. The report is a very good one, and I am told that it is the largest yet laid before the House. It contains a great deal of useful information, and is a credit to the gentlemen who conducted the inquiry, Messrs Rose, Cribb, and Okeden. I must crave the indulgence of the House on account of an affection in my throat, which prevents me from speaking as loud as I should like. The Commission has done a great deal. It has proved the statements I made by facts and figures, and has given to this House and the public a great deal of information that could not have been obtained in any other way. The statistics, which include among other things the number of gaols, number of inmates

in each, and the number and sizes of the cells, are most valuable, and will enable hon. members to compare notes, and see whether our gaols are properly managed or not. I think the latter will be found to be the case. It will be found on reference to the evidence, to which I shall have occasion to refer later on, that the evils which exist, the crimes which have been committed, and a great many other things brought to light, show decidedly the necessity for some change in the administration of our gaols, lockups, and penal establishments. The sanitary condition of the gaols is, in many instances, in a very bad state, calculated to create fevers and other diseases. The cells are not nearly sufficient in number to accommodate the prisoners, and they are generally too small. In many instances a cell intended for one prisoner has to accommodate two, three, or four; and in all the large gaols the associated cells and wards are proved to be a downright curse to the country. There is no classification, and prisoners of various classes committed for various crimes—short-sentenced men and long-sentenced men—are very often all mixed up together and sleep together. There are sometimes twenty, thirty, and as many as forty prisoners at a time in these associated cells, where they can talk together; and at St. Helena they can talk to each other across the corridor from their cells. All this must be very injurious, especially where young lads convicted for the first time and sentenced to six months for a petty theft have to associate with men convicted five or six times, men who have committed some of the most heinous crimes imaginable, and men who have been in gaol half their lifetime. It is also shown that the associated system causes a great deal of insubordination, because the prisoners invent tales and cause a lot of pettifogging annoyances to the officers, which sometimes lead to disturbances and trouble. And, as may be well imagined, it is shown that in a great many instances young offenders are a great deal worse when they go out than when they went into gaol; they go in novices, perhaps, and go out with all the knowledge of crime they can possibly swallow, instilled into them by old offenders. Classification is one of the first things that should be attended to in order to prevent that evil. Men committed for trial are sent to gaol, if they cannot get bail, and have to herd with criminals; and I think it is very unfair that a man who is innocent, according to English law, until he is proved to be guilty, should have to herd with men steeped in crime, long-sentenced men and short-sentenced men, and men of all nationalities—Chinese, Australian aboriginals, Malays, South Sea Islanders, and others. That is the sort of community among which many people have to live while waiting to be tried; and they have to stay there sometimes as long as two or three months before trial. The evidence shows that there is a great deal of disease in the gaols, and that some of the prisoners, when admitted, are in a most filthy state, covered with vermin in many instances, and that when they leave, their blankets are handed over unwashed to be used by other prisoners. That is a most important matter in connection with the sanitary condition of the gaols. In some cases lunatics are placed in cells with other prisoners, and the evidence shows that in Townsville Gaol, a man named Evans, while under committal for sodomy from Cooktown to Brisbane Gaol, was placed in a cell with a man named Pickford—recently hanged—and a lunatic, and that he committed an unnatural offence on this unfortunate lunatic. Fancy putting a man committed for that crime into a cell with a lunatic? It shows that there is some very bad management somewhere. It is proved in another place that prisoners are allowed to leave gaol sometimes without escort; it is shown that in Too-

woomba Gaol female prisoners become servants to the gaoler; it is shown that in Townsville Gaol the same practice prevails, and that the gaoler takes out prisoners in the morning to fetch in the cows. Sometimes they have to go into the bush and across other people's paddocks, and it is evident that prisoners should not be employed for the purpose. It is further proved that the female prisoners are taken from the gaol into the gaoler's house and employed as servants. One woman, Mrs. Thompson, had not been there many days before she was in the gaoler's house as a general servant, allowed to go about as she liked almost, and to come in when all the other prisoners were locked up. The evidence also showed that she had spent an hour, an hour and a-half, or two hours, nearly every evening in the ward with the gaoler alone. This was the woman who was hanged the other day for assisting a paramour of hers to kill her husband—one of the most cruel things you could imagine. There was another prisoner, a Miss Smith, a most notorious brothel-keeper in Townsville, who was committed for trial for robbery. She had only been in three days or so when she was walking up and down with the children and a perambulator outside the gaol wall in the gaol paddock. The turnkeys grumbled that they could not get to sleep at night because of her singing and playing the piano. Then it is shown that the prisoners were intimidated from making complaints to the proper authorities. This applies not only to the prisoners, but also to the turnkeys. There is the evidence of a turnkey named Burke, on p. 211. I shall read from question 5347:—

"When Nos. 2 and 3 are absent the gaol might be taken possession of? There is no one inside.

"Does that happen very often? Very often.

"Once a day? Twice or three times, or four times a day.

"Does it occur every day? Yes.

"Is the staff of the gaol sufficient for all the proper duties if the men were properly employed? There are four men every day, and if they were at their posts they would be enough. The others being absent, No. 1 has to do their work.

"Have you, since you joined service here, seen turnkeys incompetent for their duty through over-indulgence? Not as a rule. I am a teetotaler myself, and would have noticed.

"How often? Perhaps they might be a little flush in the morning, but not very often. I do not care to say anything about the gaoler, because I might as well pack up.

"You do not care to go any further? I shall answer any question; but if he were aware that I said anything against him as to his breaches of the rules, I would have to go. Some twenty-five or thirty men have been run out since I have been here."

The evidence shows that they are ruled with a rod of iron, and are frightened almost to say their lives are their own; that is brought out a good many times. Now, all these things want remedying, and a good deal more that I have not time to go into this evening. I think that to thoroughly analyse and comment upon this report would occupy Sir Samuel Griffith for three months, and it is a great deal more than I am competent to do. I forgot to mention that one woman suffered very much from rheumatism, and the doctor, it appears, got a red-hot iron and burnt the shoulder. How far this is true I do not know, but it is taken down in evidence. Then there was an attempt made to break out one night, but it was found out. The evidence is given by the turnkey, the prisoners, and the gaoler himself. Notice was given by the man Pickford. There was no inquiry made into that. Now, is it not the duty of the officials of the gaol to make an inquiry into an important matter like that? Had it not been for the man Pickford the prisoners would have got out of gaol. They had come

to an understanding that they would make a rush when the gates were opened to let the gaoler's buggy out. The gaoler himself said that if he had three minutes' time and eighteen feet of rope he could break out of the gaol. The other side of the question is where the prisoners are treated too leniently. Some of them use the gaol for their homes, and live on the Government free of expense. Hard labour, according to the evidence, is not hard labour at all; it is simply pastime. A great many of the prisoners want to go to St. Helena, because the time is very much easier there. By the way, I want to know why the "Hopeful" prisoners are not sent down there?

The PREMIER: We cannot send men in irons to St. Helena.

Mr. JESSOP: However, all the prisoners here want to go to St. Helena; they know what a nice comfortable place it is. I was there the other day, and with the exception of the small cells I thought it would be a very nice pleasant place to live in. I do not mean inside the walls of the gaol, but on the island, though even the gaol would be preferable to many places I have seen. The men are taught trades and pursue various industries. No doubt a great deal of good is done in that way, together with a large saving of expenditure. But I think a great deal more might be done. If the sugar-cane land was ploughed up and used for other purposes it would bring in quite a large revenue. It is as fine a piece of land, for many purposes, as any in the colony. Indeed, if the island were in the hands of a private individual he could rear enough poultry and vegetables to supply the whole of Brisbane. No better soil can be found anywhere. Anything would be better than sugar-cane growing. I think also that the hard-labour prisoners should be made to work harder. They might be utilised, for instance, for the construction of buildings, wharves, breakwaters, and so on. On this subject I will read a short extract from the evidence given by Mr. Alfred Henry, the police magistrate of Townsville:—

"5657. You said that hard labour in Townsville Gaol is no hard labour? None whatever. I know that men have complained of the utter weariness of having nothing to do in gaol. I have seen them at it myself. There is no hard labour in sawing those logs. I know of one case where a gentleman told me a prisoner informed him that—in three months, I think he said—he played over 700 games of chess in the Townsville Gaol. He went in a perfect novice, and came out an accomplished chess-player. I may explain that the chess-boards are marked upon the floor of the yard, and they manufacture their chessmen and draughtsmen. They have nothing else to do."

I do not call that hard labour. I think better and more profitable employment might be found for a prisoner, whom the country has to keep, than playing 700 games of chess in three months. The witness continues:—

"5658. It is better that they should play chess than that they should indulge in some of the conversation that goes on? It would be better to do hard work."

"5659. Is there any species of labour you could suggest that men might be employed in in Townsville? Yes; a suggestion was thrown out some time ago in the Press which I thought admirable—that was, that they should be employed on the fortifications of Townsville."

"5660. The Government design to erect forts for the protection of the town? Yes. Colonel French spoke to me about it two years ago. At all events, I am sure there could be no objection to putting them on such works as the Government would not be in a position to undertake by free labour. If any objection is urged it has always struck me that every man in the colony is a loser by men passing their lives in gaol, and every man in the colony would be a gainer if they were made to earn their living."

"5661. On that principle they may even be employed on such public works as the new breakwater? Certainly."

"5662. The excavation of docks? Any public works."

"5663. In addition to the fortifications? Yes."

1887—2 N

"5664. You think there is plenty of work for the employment of all prisoners in Northern Queensland here? Yes, certainly."

"5665. And that a saving might be effected, if once prison accommodation were provided, in the transit of prisoners from Northern Queensland down to Brisbane or St. Helena; that is to say, you would employ all Northern Queensland prisoners on Northern Queensland works?"

That is separation. The answer is—

"Yes; of course there is an objection, which appears to be a sentimental one—that it is competing with free labour; but I think the free labourer is as much defrauded by these rascals spending their lives in gaol as anyone else, and would be an equal gainer if they were compelled to keep themselves by their work."

Those are exactly my sentiments. There is another most important item that appears to me to want regulating, and that is laxity of discipline. The discipline is certainly very lax indeed. Doctors are allowed to go in and out whenever they like—in some instances not more than once in seven or nine days, the average being once in four days—while the gaol regulations say that they are supposed to be there every day. But they do not go there every day, the average attendance being, as I said, once in four days. Sometimes a doctor will call at the gate in his buggy, ask if anyone is sick, and if the answer is "No," he drives off, saying he will call again to-morrow. The regulations should be carried out, even if the doctors have to be better paid for their services. Another important matter is that of dispensing. At Toowoomba the evidence showed that the doctor sent a young lad who was learning to be a chemist, and who was not a qualified chemist, to the gaol, where he prescribed and made up medicines of various kinds for the prisoners. The evidence shows the existence of a peculiar disease there with a long name, and this lad mixes the medicine for it and serves them with it out of a large bottle. It is further shown that at Townsville the dispenser applies morphia and other dangerous medicines to those who are sick in the cells. At Brisbane the dispenser is a prisoner, who had not been there more than three weeks when he was put to the work. He says in his evidence that all he knows about chemistry is what he has learned there. Still he takes possession of the gaol and of the doctor too; he takes the whole thing in hand, and both prescribes and serves out medicine. It is shown in the evidence that the place where the medicines and poisons are kept is left open, and that prisoners can get in at any time and take poison or whatever else they may want. Discipline of that sort is not to be tolerated. At St. Helena, Mr. Hamilton, the chief turnkey, has had considerable practice, and dispenses medicines very fairly. The evidence shows that the medical officer goes there once a week, and that if anything happens he is telegraphed for, and that he can get there in from half-an-hour to three hours. I cannot make out where the half-hour comes in. I do not know of any place where a doctor is likely to be which is only half-an-hour from St. Helena. Then as to the laxity of discipline again, sir, the report at page xxxviii. says:—

"Immediately previous to entering upon our inquiry the hon. Colonial Secretary handed to us a statement of grievances from which the prisoners in St. Helena alleged they suffered, and asked us to make a special investigation into these complaints. This we did. A number of prisoners, claiming the character of delegates from the various yards and assuming the right to speak for their fellow-prisoners, appeared before us; but we thought it well to give every prisoner an opportunity of personally stating that of which he was aggrieved in the administration of the penal establishment. The 'statement' with a report by Captain Townley, the superintendent, upon it, will be found in the Appendix—Part I. It may be well to state in the outset that the mere possibility of such a statement being prepared and forwarded to the Colonial Secretary

without the knowledge of the superintendent shows the impossibility of maintaining in the present buildings, crowded yards, and associated cells, anything like the discipline which should exist in a well-organised penal establishment."

Now, sir, we are told by the evidence that Captain Townley never saw that petition until it was shown to him by the Commissioners. How such a petition could have been got up in an establishment like that, supposed to be under the supervision of turnkeys and gaolers, passed from yard to yard, and signed by nearly all the prisoners in the place, and how it could then have been allowed to leave the establishment and come into the hands of the Colonial Secretary without the officials knowing anything about it, beats me. I cannot conceive the possibility of such a thing. It shows that there must be somebody inside the gaol who assisted the prisoners; and that ought to be found out. The prisoners could not do it themselves; they must have been assisted by somebody else. It is a very strange thing that the first time Captain Townley saw that petition or knew anything about it was when it was produced to him by the Commissioners. The report goes on:—

"There was evidence in a bundle of loose papers accidentally dropped by a prisoner and found in the tinsmiths' shop that the idea of the statement had emanated from one or two prisoners; that they had set to work systematically in taking secret depositions, and had given instructions to other prisoners what to say should an investigation be made. The statement was signed by almost all the prisoners on the island, with the exception of the kanakas and aboriginals; but we had evidence of several prisoners that, while not concurring in the statements made in the paper, they had been coerced into signing it. One declared that he had been mobbed and assaulted because he would not sign it; and it was clear that if any man opposed the orders or wishes of the 'clique' or 'league' he ran considerable personal danger. Coercion had become an habitude with the leaders in the 'grievance movement,' for they closed their statement by the threat that if the Colonial Secretary delayed action it might 'lead to unpleasant consequences.'"

Briefly stated, the alleged grievances were—

"1. That a previous investigation of complaints had not been satisfactory to the prisoners."

I can quite understand that.

"2. That the printed rules hung up in the yard were incorrect, were violated, and that written rules inconsistent with the printed ones were issued by the superintendent."

"3. That the visiting justice when appealed to sided with the superintendent."

I can quite understand that also.

"4. That the doctor was neglectful, refused change of diet, and deprived prisoners of their indulgences as a punishment for being sick."

"5. That owing to neglects and threats one prisoner had cut his throat."

"6. That the chief warder neglected sick prisoners."

"7. That the punishments inflicted by the superintendent were vindictive and tyrannical."

"8. That verbal rules—erratic and uncertain—were issued by the superintendent."

"9. That petitions had been 'holed-and-cornered' and not forwarded to the proper quarter."

"10. That prisoners were prevented seeing Ministers of the Crown when they visited St. Helena."

That shows, sir, that the management of our gaols and penal establishments is something very strange, and, I should say, very much out of order. I have now to call attention to another fact. I went round to visit the Brisbane Gaol the other day in company with a member of this House, and walking round the yards we saw some divisional board men on duty in the turrets.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What!

Mr. JESSOP: I will say we saw some strange men there, out of uniform, on guard, marching about with rifles in their arms in the turrets overlooking the yards. We asked who they were,

and were told, "Oh, they're divisional board men." I said, "What do you mean?" The answer was, "They are divisional board men." Of course we wanted an explanation, and it was this: that some of the prisoners were consigned to the divisional board every day to work, and some of the turnkeys had to be told off to look after them; and to make up for those officers the divisional board sent men to take their places. Can you imagine such a thing as that in gaol administration? We wanted to know how it was done, and the reply we got was, "Oh, the board pay the men; we do not pay them." There were those men in charge of the prisoners; there was nothing to prevent them from throwing down tobacco, knives, or anything else. But we were told, "Oh, they must get a recommendation. The sheriff passes them; but they are recommended by the board." These men are there going about with guns in their hands; men who possibly may have been there themselves, or who may have some friends there. That is a strange state of things, sir. They are not sworn in as special constables or anything of that kind. They are simply put on guard at the instance of the divisional board. It is well known that in many cases tobacco has been smuggled in to the prisoners. I was speaking to a gentleman about this matter this forenoon, and he told me that he had heard the following story from a clergyman:—Some time ago a business man thought he would give a man who had served his time a chance of earning an honest living, and engaged him. The man rendered him faithful service, was steady and industrious, and the result was that he saved money and took up a selection. The other day when he was going away he asked his employer, "Can I have that case?" His employer asked him what he wanted it for, and he replied, "I want to send a few things to a friend of mine at St. Helena." The result was that he packed up a lot of tobacco, two or four bottles of brandy—I forget which—several packs of cards, and several other things, and that parcel went away by steamer to St. Helena. That came out in a very funny way. I cannot relate one-hundredth part of the instances in the evidence to which I might refer; but I find my throat is failing me. I will, however, refer briefly to Toowoomba Gaol, which is kept for female prisoners. I think, sir, that that institution ought to be abolished at once; I do not think it ought to be there at all. Its position is peculiar, and the accommodation is decidedly wrong. There are a large number of prisoners herded together in the wards. When I went into one of the dormitories and had a look round the other day, I saw over thirty women all sleeping in one apartment in the associated cells. I asked why it was so, and was told that it was because they had not sufficient accommodation. I asked the prisoners a good many questions, and, of course, they were all satisfied, with one exception. Mr. Murray, the police magistrate, had them arranged in front of us and called to attention, and they were asked if they had any complaints. They were all silent for a while. At last one woman said she had a complaint, which she stated. When asked why she did not make her complaint to the turnkey she said, "It is no use making complaints to them; you get into the cells if you do." Possibly that may be so, or it may not. However, I wish to refer more particularly to the evils of the associated cells. There are women there who have been almost all their lives in gaol—women who have been forty or fifty times convicted—and there are also mixed up with them young girls who are suffering their first conviction; and anyone reading the evidence given can come to no other conclusion than that this gaol is a very bad place indeed for

young girls to be put into. It is stated that the elder prisoners indulge in very bad behaviour—beastly behaviour. They take up their clothes over their heads and chase each other round the wards, and use language which is much too beastly to mention. Well, I think that is a sad state of affairs, and I think if the Government cannot manage their own gaols better than this, it would be almost better to let the prisoners loose among society, because when young girls go in there they come out a great deal worse than when they went in. There is one female prisoner who gave evidence, which I will read, and I think it will convince a good many hon. members that what I have said with reference to the evils of the associated cells system is quite true. On page 244 this evidence is given:—

"6188. I have been ill-used since I have been here. I had a child in the cell the first time I came here, through a beating I received from the old hands. I told the matron, Mrs. Joseph, that I felt bad after I had been kicked, and she said, 'I want none of your capers,' and she put me in a dark place—hospital they call it. They would not send for a doctor. I was in the dormitory, and was kicked by some of the old hands, and the kicking brought on pains. I called out, but they had no more compassion on me than if I had been a dog. Mr. Dunn, the chief turnkey, asked me what was the matter, and I told him I felt bad. He went and told Mrs. Blaney, but he did not send for the doctor. Mrs. Blaney did not come during the night when I was calling out. There was another woman in the cell, but she was no good to me, because she was sick. It was about half-past 6 in the morning when Mr. Dunn went for Mrs. Blaney. I had been calling out all night. Mrs. Blaney came to see me about 11 o'clock next morning. The doctor did not come for about five days afterwards. The baby was born at about 5 o'clock, before Dunn came. I think a little girl was present as well as the sick woman; she was doing six months, and was about sixteen years old. She helped me as much as she could. Dunn sent for Miss Nixon, who was very kind. The matron did not require to come if Miss Nixon was there. The doctor only just came to the door of my cell. I had only eight days more to serve, and I asked the gaoler at the end of that time to give me a few shillings to go to Rockhampton, but he would not. I had to sleep out the night I went down to Brisbane. The baby was born dead. I did not hear it cry. I was kept in the hospital for the remainder of my sentence. Mr. Blaney refused to give me a pass to Rockhampton. I had to sit down three times on my way to the railway station—I was so weak. I was a stranger in Brisbane. I slept out that night, and next day was put into gaol. I met a party I knew and he gave me some drink. I prostituted myself to get money."

That was eight days after her confinement.

"I got another three months here and was sick all the time. Mr. Blaney always treated me badly. I have been backwards and forwards here ten times. The old hands said that the baby was made here. Mr. Blaney had a suspicion that I had got into the men's place. The way the old hands behaved in the dormitory was disgraceful. They were always fighting and swearing, and pulling each other about. I was searched carefully when I came here. All new chums are; the old hands are not, because they are able to tell Mr. Murray, the visiting justice, they smoke in the dormitory. A prisoner can go into Mr. Blaney's and sleep there all night, and not be seen in the yard for a week. I have seen Miss Nixon here at 11 o'clock at night; she speaks to us as if we were dogs. I have seen gentlemen in her room with her. I have been three months in the Rockhampton Gaol. Mr. Blaney could have twenty servants out of the gaol. The old hands are fed up, and can fight with the new chums. Mrs. Blaney had a son about a week ago. One of the prisoners has just come out of the house. Her name is Kate Mullins, and she has been in the gaoler's house for a week. I expect she brought back tobacco, and will divide it amongst the old hands. I have seen prisoners away for a week. There is one prisoner in the yard who is taken down town to scrub out a place belonging to the gaoler. A quiet girl, named Sarah Mattie, came here, and one of the old hands spat in her face. Sarah Mattie then hit her, and I went to pull her away, and told her not to get fighting."

It goes on like that, and finishes up with this:—

"The old hands expose themselves at night, and behave indecently. A young girl might just as well go

to a brothel at once. The old hands will pull up their clothes and race round the yard. If an old hand is sick here, she is well attended to; but a new hand could die in the yard before she would see the doctor. I have several times seen old hands throw their clothes over their heads. I have seen newspapers come from the gaoler's house; Emily Hansen used to bring them; she was turned out of the gaoler's house for being drunk. Some women were smoking down in the closet when I came in here; some of the old hands seemed as if they had grog with them when I first came here, but not lately."

Now, that proves that there is something materially wrong. Of course, the evidence is denied to a certain extent; but a large amount of the evidence given confirms those statements. The gaoler himself admits that he has used the prisoners; but he says that he does it under an order from the sheriff, and, of course, he cannot be blamed if that is so. Now, I think the evidence in regard to the gaol for female prisoners at Toowoomba is something like a disgrace to any community, and it is high time that some steps were taken to remedy the evils that exist there. I have no doubt that a great deal of this is brought about by the associated system, and I say that the prison at Toowoomba ought to be abolished. I may refer to one prisoner, Annie McCormack, who has forty-nine convictions recorded against her. She was let out from the gaol, and preferred to get out of the train at Helidon, stating that she did not want to come to Brisbane. She camped a night on the road without covering over her and got back to Toowoomba Gaol in a few days, as she said she would rather stop there. Her statements are corroborated by other prisoners who have given evidence upon the management, and with reference to the associated system, the misbehaviour of the women, and the foul language used. Now, sir, I visited the reformatory at Toowoomba. I think it is in a good condition. I saw the girls at work there, and they washed and ironed and did their work as well as I have ever seen laundry work done. They all seemed to be tidy and clean, and I do not see that there is any possible chance of their mixing with the other women, or having any communication with them. Whether they do so or not I do not know, but I should hardly think it likely. I think that Mr. Blaney takes too much pride in the reformatory to allow any communication to exist between the reformatory girls and the grown prisoners in the gaol. I think the best way to deal with this Toowoomba Gaol is to abolish it altogether. The women, of course, must be taken care of. They are the sweepings of Brisbane streets and the streets of London and other cities. They are the vilest of the vile, and there are many among them who have been convicted twenty times, and others who have forty or fifty convictions recorded against them. I think, therefore, that those women should be isolated; that girls should not be put amongst them; that they should be kept in single cells, and should not be allowed to go on in the way they do by using foul and obscene language in the presence of the young people. I think we ought to secure one of the islands in the Bay, and put them there, under good guard. That is an idea well worth considering. Now, sir, I wish to refer to another matter, but I shall not be able to deal with all the points I should wish to, as I find that my voice is giving way; but before I go into that, I wish to say that a great deal of good work has been done by ladies in Toowoomba and Brisbane visiting the reformatory. I believe there has been a split amongst them, but that has been set right now. The Townsville Gaol, so far as I can see, is about the worst managed of any of them, and appears to be one mass of complaints and wrong-doings. I have received a statement which I propose to read to the House in reference to it, and, strange

to say, this statement came to me on the 23rd August, showing that it was written before the report was known, or anything at all about it came out. It was written by a man named Hagerty, who was a turnkey in the gaol. This man was discharged, though whether rightly or wrongly I do not know; but the evidence goes to prove, I think, that he was very badly treated. He came to me and spoke to me about his grievances, and I told him I could not remember half of what he told me, but if he would put his complaints in writing I would see if it was worth while to take any steps in the matter, and at any rate it might be useful to me when the matter came before the House. This is the statement this man makes :—

"SIR,—Enclosed please find, so far as my memory serves me, the promised information *re* Townsville Gaol and its gaoler. The facts set forth can all be proved, and if the Gaol Commissioners' report contains all the evidence it will nearly all be found therein. *'Fait ce que deuras, adieu ce que pourra.'*

"Yours obediently,

"A. M. HAGERTY."

This is the statement he makes. It is borne out by the evidence, not only of himself, but of others examined :—

"*The Turnkeys.*—The gaoler has a herd of milk cows, two horses, a flock of goats, and a very numerous poultry yard, and they all required to be very strictly attended to, several prisoners being told off who, in charge of a turnkey, do very little else. The gaoler's servants are let out of their cell before the usual hour, so that they may be ready immediately the early morning parade is over. The turnkey on No. 3 takes them, gathers any spare food from the previous evening meal, and goes and feeds the poultry; after that the goats are milked, then the milking herd are looked for, and as they are at night turned out of the gaol paddock, they have to be searched for in the neighbourhood, and it is quite a usual thing to have to go into the park, or garden, or hospital paddock; this, during the last season, meant being regularly wet to the skin (as the grass was waist deep), and no matter what the weather was this had to be done. Well, being found, part of the cows were milked, and after breakfast they were finished. No matter in what condition a turnkey returned off this duty no time was allowed him to change—indeed it would scarcely have been worth while, as after breakfast he was out again, and so on during the day until he finished at night, after having gathered the goats into their yard, penned up the calves, and turned the cows out to graze. It might be considered, that considering the work done by the turnkeys for the gaoler's private profit, that they would be treated with civility, but that is not so. I never heard the gaoler speak a civil word to a turnkey. He is a man irredeemably selfish, and no man under him will remain for any length of time, unless he is a good tale-bearer and a good cow-boy. He must be— to use an expressive but not very polite word—a "crawler." Many a time I have heard the state of the gaol spoken of when he was away on leave—how quietly and regularly the work went on, no trouble, men knew what duty to do, and they did it. Many regrets have I heard expressed (since his return) that he did not get made a keeper of the Irish dynamite magazine and blow himself up. He is most thoroughly hated by every man in the gaol, without exception. He is coarse and brutal in his language, and called Turnkey Storey 'a stupid pig; and that before prisoners. He has on several occasions threatened to kick turnkeys out of the gaol. When I heard and saw what was going on, I said to several of the turnkeys, 'Well, why don't you report?' The answer was, 'Oh, oh! When you begin to report the governor of Townsville Gaol you may at the same time begin to pack up,' and well I have found that out. I do not say that it is well to encourage subordinate officials to report their superior officers, but the protection of the latter may be carried too far. When I joined the gaol service on January last the firearms were in a dangerous state from neglect, being rusted; in fact, the revolver given to me, when examined on parade, it was found that a small hornet had formed a nest in the barrel; after I complained they were kept in better order."

Those are the firearms given to the turnkeys to protect the country, and it must be remembered this is all borne out in the evidence,

"No instruction books are given to new turnkeys, nor is any instruction regularly given; in fact I never got any, and when I applied to the principal turnkey to borrow a Gaol Regulation-book that was in the office, it was refused me."

Then follows a matter which I think is worthy of some notice. He says :—

"I was reported on the 28th February for allowing a prisoner to escape from one yard to another. I was at the time on duty in the tower, and the prisoner, an aboriginal, got over the fence at a place where I could not see him, the roof of a shed being between us. I was reported again on the 7th and 10th March. My explanations, accompanied by medical certificate, showing I was ill from intermittent fever, was sent to the sheriff. About six weeks after Mr. Henry, the P.M., Townsville, held an investigation. By the evidence of two turnkeys I disproved the reports; nevertheless, I was suspended on the 3rd May. I was kept suspended until the 1st July, and then verbally told by the sheriff that I was discharged long before. That information had never been communicated to me."

Surely a man, whether he is suspended or not, should have fair play. He goes on to say :—

"One of the turnkeys who gave evidence on my behalf was taken into the gaoler's office and roundly abused for going to give evidence in my favour, and in one week that turnkey was twice reported, and he also was discharged. His name is McCarthy."

That is all confirmed by the evidence, and it is strange that this man should have written this as if he knew what evidence would be given.

"The other turnkey (Morris) had been reported for being asleep (he was suffering from the effects of the wettings he had got from time to time, looking after the gaoler's cattle, and had been upwards of seventeen hours on duty). That was the complaint against him. He also was discharged. The gaoler seemed to take a dislike to me from the first; his manner to me always seemed intended to irritate, so that I might say or do something which would enable him to report me for insubordination. He kept me on duty on the tower, and ordered me, at a time when the sun was blazing down upon me, to stand out in the sun and not to offer to go into the tower—to stand there all day. Is it any wonder that I lost 15 lbs. in the first two months' service, and that I had an attack of fever? I had a second attack after I was suspended. I believe that more turnkeys have been dismissed, resigned, and transferred from Townsville Gaol since it was opened than all the other gaols of the colony.

"The reports, explanations, and Mr. Henry's investigations are voluminous; the latter I never saw. I endeavoured to obtain a 'Gaol Regulation-book' when making out my explanations, but it would not be allowed me.

"The reports against myself, turnkeys McCarthy and Morris, together with the telegrams sent, are in the sheriff's office. They would be most instructive reading, and might assist to unravel the mystery of why the Townsville gaoler has such despotic power.

"When the Gaol Commissioners were at Townsville the gaoler told them a *lie* about turnkeys McCarthy, Morris, and myself. I quote Mr. Rose's words, 'The gaoler told us you were dismissed and gone away.' I saw the gaoler after that, and he had heard nothing—at least he said so."

Here is a note on that point made by me :—

"Writer was living close to the gaol at Townsville at the time the evidence was taken by the Gaols Commission."

The letter goes on to say :—

"Amy Smyth, or Smith, the keeper of a notorious brothel at West End, Townsville, convicted at the Autumn District Court, Townsville, this year, and sentenced to six months' hard labour, for having robbed a man at the brothel. She was only a few days in gaol when admitted to the gaoler's residence and allowed to practise on his piano, also allowed to parade the garden and paddock without escort; in fact, she could have walked away had she so desired it; but where was the necessity of leaving such comfortable quarters? She is the pet and companion of the gaoler's wife, teaches his children (for Amy's an accomplished musician). She is remarkably like the gaoler, and bears the same name. The paddock is bounded by two public streets. The executed woman, Mrs. Thompson, was for a considerable time the gaoler's cook. She was allowed to remain alone with the male turnkey on night duty up to as late as the gaoler's supper-time; and she, a desperate woman, committed for trial for having



induced a paramour to murder her husband, had around her the gaoler's cutlery, whilst hanging outside against the kitchen wall were a scythe and two reaping hooks. The gaoler's kitchen is inside the circle, and his cook—who is almost invariably selected from the numerous women of ill-fame that abound in Townsville, and who pay regular visits to the gaol—is, or was, nightly left with the male turnkey on night duty after the female turnkey had gone home, and the gaoler's wife in her residence. Female prisoners who are servants to the gaoler are regularly passed in and out to the gaoler's residence; they, his servants, are also permitted to perambulate the paddock. I have seen them as far as the reception ward. Lunatics were confined in the gaol in the No. 3 yard; they were herded (that is in May last, when I left) with criminals of all nations—aboriginals, Chinese, kanakas, Malays, &c.; many of whom were foul with venereal disease, and four Malays were more than suspected of being lepers. They had to use the same bath (there being only one) and squat on the ground among them to take their food, and their treatment was the same. Worse than that, they occupy the same cells at night, and are regularly given into the care of prisoners committed for capital crimes. Cells built to accommodate one prisoner have three and occasionally four for the night. Many of the insane after admission become notably worse. One case—a Dr. Horn, from Charters Towers—raved for weeks about being shut up in the company of murderers and thieves. He had ultimately to be sent to Woogaroo. Another named Askew was given into the care of a man committed for sodomy (Evans, of Cooktown, now undergoing ten years' penal servitude for that offence), and the man since executed for the Ravenswood murder. They all occupied the same cell. In the middle of the night Evans was seen to be going on with his sodomite game with the lunatic. It was reported to the gaoler next morning by Pickford—since executed—after which Evans was confined in a cell by himself."

There was no inquiry in this case. When the matter was reported to the gaoler nothing was said, and we should never have known it but for this Commission.

"The matter was hushed up; but is it any wonder that Askew had also to be sent to Woogaroo? It always seemed to me in Townsville Gaol that the more grave the charge against a prisoner the more he was trusted. Now, sir, were it reported to us that Russia sent those whom God has permitted to be afflicted by mental derangement into the company and care of her vilest criminals, what columns would be written on the subject to prove that she was receding in civilisation! Where is our boasted Christianity when this has been done during the current year in a public institution, provided with a visiting justice, a doctor, and occasionally by ministers? There is no such thing as hard labour. The bell rings at 8 a.m. for work, which is commenced at from ten to fifteen minutes after, firewood cutting being what they play at. 'Smoke oh!' is called at 10 a.m.; stop at 11:15 for dinner; at 1 p.m. work is resumed; 'Smoke, oh!' again at 2:30; work stopped at 3:45 p.m.; and that is called hard labour. I call it killing time. Of course there are in the kitchen four or five men doing the work of two, spending most of their time in gossiping and smoking. The gaoler has two horses, and they are allowed to run regularly in the yards. On one occasion they destroyed the female prisoners' hats and on another ate up some of the male prisoners' bread; in fact, the kitchen has to be kept shut against them or they would help themselves. Chubb's expensive patent locks are used on the gaoler's poultry and buggy houses, and galvanised tubs and tins are lying about the gaoler's fowl and goat yard corroding when, at the same time, sufficient can scarcely be got for inside. When prisoners leave the gaol no record is kept of the work they are sent to do.

"During March an organised attempt to escape was discovered (the sodomite Evans gave the information out of revenge); the attempt was to be made when one of the large gates was opened to allow of the gaoler's buggy being passed out or in. The buggy very frequently remained in the wood-yard or outer circle, and could have been easily reared against the outer wall; but the intention was to rush the gate, and, as the prisoners had removed a rail from the yard fence, it offered a fair chance of success, especially as a considerable portion of the circle could not be seen from the watchtower. Notwithstanding this no extra precautions were taken, and it was only by good luck that there was not an *émeute*.

"When the buggy required lubricating, the castor oil provided for the prisoners was used, and I believe it is also on record that the cosmetics required by the gaoler's wife are charged on a medicine voucher.

"Previous to the gaoler and family visiting Ireland, he had as many as twenty-nine suits of clothing made by prisoners; in fact, all is done for himself and family, and any prisoner by whose work he can profit is used by him; when, on the other hand, a turnkey could not get his hair cut nor button sewn on without running the risk (if discovered) of being reported and censured."

I did not read this until I had analysed the evidence, and it so coincided with the evidence of the prisoners, the discharged turnkeys, the gaoler himself, and the present turnkeys, that I think it was the best analysis of the goings-on at the Townsville Gaol that I have met. It was far better than I could have done myself, and that is the reason I have occupied the time of the House in reading it. It goes to show that that the whole management is wrong. I meant to go a good deal further, and speak about the Brisbane Gaol, the St. Helena Gaol, the Roma Gaol—in fact, to analyse the whole of it; but I find I cannot to-night. I intend at some future time to revert to some of those subjects. Of course, I do not believe all that is said; the prisoners are naturally anxious to "paint the devil blacker than he is"; but when the statements made by the prisoners are corroborated to such an extent, it is quite evident to me that there are grievances which ought to be removed. I have to thank hon. members for the patient hearing they have given me.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. B. Moreton) said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to take up the time of the House very long in saying what I have to say in reply to the hon. member's remarks. I entirely agree with some of the recommendations made by the Commissioners in their report; they are exactly what I thought necessary before that report came out. I believe myself that it is essential that the general management of the prisons should be under one head. I may say that I disbelieve altogether a good deal of the evidence that has been brought forward by the prisoners; what has been gathered from their evidence must be taken with a grain of salt. I think the Commissioners based a great portion of their recommendations on the evidence of prisoners only. I do not deny that many things have occurred which ought not to have occurred; there are things going on in our gaols of which I never knew until I read this report and the evidence. In the case that the hon. member mentioned, at Townsville, which he said would never have been made public but for this report, the sheriff did make an inquiry, and laid the papers before me. Of course, our system at the present time is not all that it would be if we were an older community, and had more money to spend on buildings. There is no doubt that the classification at St. Helena is not what it ought to be if a proper amount of money could be spent on it. The question of building another penal establishment has been before the present Government, but it was not quite decided whether it should be built on the island of St. Helena or on the mainland, and the matter was left until we had this report sent in. Hon. members know that a sum of money has been voted for that purpose. In one aspect of the case, it may be more convenient to have it built on the mainland, but it would be more economical to have it built at St. Helena. If it were on the mainland there would probably be the advantage that it would be accessible at any time, and could be reached more quickly by train, but there is greater security in having it on an island, while it also cheapens the management as far as the number of warders is concerned. Those scenes in the Toowoomba yard which the hon. member so graphically described may have occurred or they may not. I myself do not credit that they did occur; I hardly think they could have occurred without the

visiting justice hearing something about it. I quite agree with the suggestion that the female gaol at Toowoomba is not the place it should be. I think there should be a new gaol built especially for females, and it would be much more advantageous to have it nearer to Brisbane, although the climate of Toowoomba, which is a factor in the question, may have something to do with the settlement of the question. With regard to the classification of prisoners, we have, as I said, none. The only classification that is attempted at St. Helena is that those who are working in the sheds are kept in one yard, those doing outdoor labour are kept in another yard, and those who are doing punishment are kept in a third. That an improvement is required at St. Helena, as far as classification is concerned, is manifest. I am also of opinion that no prisoners should be sent to St. Helena for a shorter sentence than one year. It makes long-sentence prisoners dissatisfied with their condition to see short-sentence prisoners going in and leaving every month or so. But at present the accommodation in the Brisbane Gaol is insufficient to keep all the short-sentence prisoners there. But it is extremely advisable that they should not mix with the long-sentence prisoners at St. Helena, and I have requested the sheriff to send in a report upon this point, and also to add any remarks he may have to make on the report respecting those gaols which are under his management. I have also asked Captain Townley to make any remarks he would like to make on the report as far as it affects St. Helena. I have here a report from the Brisbane gaoler, and although he finds fault with the evidence of the prisoners, I do not see anything very material in it, excepting, perhaps, with regard to the cleanliness of the blankets. It was stated in the evidence that the blankets at the gaol were not properly washed. The gaoler denies that very distinctly, and states that they are washed every three months or oftener.

Mr. MURPHY: Since the inquiry was held, no doubt.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, before it. But I will read what he says on the subject:—

*Blankets.*—I contend that here again is a flagrant case of unfairness.

“The blankets are not washed regularly. The evidence upon this point is conflicting. Some prisoners declare they had not been washed for nine months, but this was denied by the officials, who, however, admitted that they might not have been cleansed for four months.”

“The Board deduce from this that the prisoners who fixed the period at nine months spoke truly, while those who fixed it at three months spoke untruly. Surely it was the duty of the Commissioners to examine the washman in such a case as this; but they appear to have omitted to do so. They at least would, if their minds had been unbiased, have regarded with suspicion the evidence of prisoners whom I had distinctly referred to as likely to entertain hostile feelings against the administration. It will be found on page 87, paragraph 1749, that the wardman who has the handling of the blankets says, ‘I know that the blankets are washed every three months.’ Again, page 97, paragraph 2126, Turnkey Joseph Sneyd explains why four months instead of three had elapsed since the last washing. He says: ‘We are rather overcrowded, and the weather being wet we could not wash them. We have not that number of blankets that if those in use get wet we can serve out dry ones.’ Again, Captain Jekyll, page 167, paragraph 2438, says: ‘They are washed every three months. If a man said they had not been washed for nine months it would be absolutely untrue.’ Again, Mr. Woodward, page 111, paragraph 2576, says: ‘They were continually being washed—every two or three months. We always had a stock of clean blankets replenishing the others. Clean blankets were always in circulation. When a dirty man came in he got dirty blankets, and those staying in a long time kept the same blankets all the time.’”

I presume that “dirty blankets” means blankets that have been in use—that he did not give them fresh blankets. I do not think there is anything else I need say in reply to the hon. member, excepting that the evidence of prisoners was one of the chief foundations on which the Commissioners based their report. No doubt there are hardships in the smaller gaols in the country; that must necessarily be the case, considering the distance they are apart from each other, and the not very easy access to some of them. There has been some complaint in reference to the moving of prisoners from one gaol to another. No doubt hardships have occurred in transit, and must naturally occur. The main recommendations of the Commissioners are such that everybody, I think, will agree to. There are six of them, as far as the buildings and the classification of prisoners are concerned, and they are all, I think, worthy of being carried out as soon as we are able to do so. But I believe the main thing is to have an inspector of prisons, who will take the entire management of them into his own hands. At present the sheriff has the management of the Brisbane Gaol and the country gaols, while the penal establishment at St. Helena is under the management of the superintendent, who deals directly with the Colonial Secretary's Office. Those are points in the report which I think everybody would be willing to agree to, and I for one will do the best I can to see them carried out.

Mr. BAILEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I regret very much that the Colonial Secretary seems to have utterly failed to grasp the main questions that have been raised by the hon. member for Dalby. I give great credit to that hon. member for his persistent efforts in trying to insert the thin end of the wedge into the system on which we conduct our penal establishments, and indeed into the whole system of justice in this colony. There are other members of the House who have tried to do the same thing, and who have failed to do even what he has succeeded in doing—and he has done very little yet. We have got a report—a bulky volume of evidence, imperfect, very imperfect, badly arranged; so badly arranged and imperfect is it that I do not believe there are six members of this House at this moment who have been able to analyse that report and the evidence properly. I hope, sir, that the hon. member for Dalby will consent that we shall take a proper debate upon this question when we are in Committee of Supply. It is quite impossible to do it now. Members are not prepared to discuss the question in connection with the evidence they have before them, and until they have an opportunity of studying it fully it cannot be properly discussed. I can fairly state that not one member out of six in this House has been able or has had an opportunity of doing so. Why, it would take three or four days' close study to go through and analyse the report and evidence as it has been placed before us. There are no marginal notes; the whole thing is jumbled up together. The report may be a good one, the evidence may be good; but we are not in a position to analyse them without a great deal of time and trouble. Sir, it is a very great social question we have to consider, not mere little petty details about the treatment of one prisoner or another, or the condition of one gaol or another. We are opening up a great social problem. We began to open it up before, sir; we are carrying it on now, and I hope that we shall be able to carry it a great deal further than we have been doing. Why, sir, the Offenders Probation Act is one of the grandest strokes of jurisprudence ever passed by any parliament in the world. I hope, sir, that we shall be able to recognise the fact that there are criminals and criminals; that there are innocent

persons who are treated as criminals; that there are criminals by accident, and criminals belonging to what we call "the criminal classes." To treat all those three classes alike is barbarity and cruelty. But, sir, officialdom knows no distinction. A man who is perfectly innocent of any crime whatever is taken into custody to-day by a policeman, and is treated worse than the worst of criminals; and officialdom looks on contentedly, with "We can't help it." Bread and water for him, and a loathsome cell. A man may become criminal by a mere accident, by some temptation that he could not withstand, or something of that kind, and he is treated just as badly as the worst of the criminal class. Officialdom makes no distinction; but I hope, sir, that when this question is debated this distinction shall be insisted upon, and that such a system shall be carried out in this colony that instead of creating criminals, as has been done in some of the older countries, we shall reform those who have been convicted, and protect the innocent from being thrust in with the most guilty and depraved. I do trust, sir, that this debate will be continued. I think great credit is due to the hon. member for Dalby for bringing it under the notice of Parliament. We have men here who have taken great interest in this question for years—not many, but yet there are some who have endeavoured to improve the present condition of things, but who have been blocked in every attempt by the red tape and officialdom of which I have spoken. Therefore, I say, great honour is due to the hon. member for Dalby that at last he has persuaded the Government to give us this Commission to bring up this report and this evidence. Faulty though it may be, and imperfect as it may be, yet I am confident that it will do a great deal of good; and it will lead to good results, I am sure, if, when we debate the question, it will be fully and completely debated by us.

Mr. ALAND said: Mr. Speaker,—I should like to say a few words before the House goes into Committee of Supply. I do not know whether we shall have another opportunity of dealing with the report that has been brought up, or whether it is intended to say what has to be said about it now and let that be the end of it. I think, sir, with the hon. member for Wide Bay, that this is a very important question indeed, and one that requires a vast amount of consideration, not only at the hands of hon. members, but also at the hands of the Government. There is no doubt it is a difficult question to deal with—while on the one hand not to treat criminals with undue harshness, yet on the other not to treat them with undue laxity. And it must also be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that in order to carry out what some of us think are necessary reforms in this matter we require a very large outlay of public money. We are bound always, I think, to take the question of expense into consideration. We have, perhaps, in some things been too apt to carry on matters regardless of expense, but I am in hopes that that day is fast going by, and that before we commit ourselves to anything we shall, as the Premier has put it, have the money in hand that is necessary, or know where to lay our hands upon it. Now, sir, I have not had time, and I daresay few members have had time, to go right through the voluminous report. If I mistake not, it has been called the largest document that has been issued from the Government Printing Office. It has only been in our possession some few days, and, with our multifarious engagements, we have not been able to give our undivided attention to it. I do not suppose any hon. member has been able to do more than read the report itself; and those of us who live in the vicinity of gaols have,

perhaps, read the portions of the evidence concerning our own gaols. I think, sir, no one looking through that evidence can be otherwise than struck with this fact: that our gaols are sadly mismanaged. Whoever it is, the sheriff, I presume, is the man chiefly responsible for their management, and I do think that as far as that gentleman, or these gentlemen—I believe there are two of them—

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. ALAND: Well, as far as that gentleman is concerned, he has been very lax in the discharge of his duties. I have been to the Toowoomba Gaol on more than one occasion, and I must say that I think the duties connected with the visiting justice are carried out in a very perfunctory sort of manner. As the hon. member for Dalby has stated, when the visiting justice goes to the prison he is accompanied in his rounds by the gaoler, the prisoners are marshalled out in front of him, he looks up and down—and I can assure you, sir, that the female prisoners in Toowoomba Gaol look you up and down—however, he looks them up and down, and simply asks if there are any complaints. There, sir, is the gaoler standing beside him, and these prisoners know very well that it will be made hot for them, as the saying goes, if they do make complaints to the visiting justice in the presence of their gaoler. I regret very much, sir, that such a report should have to be written as has been written in reference to Toowoomba Gaol. It certainly does not speak well for the civilisation of this century that such a state of things is allowed to exist, as does exist in that establishment. To think that the class of women who are sent there from time to time are herded together and allowed to associate together in the way they are, is really monstrous. It must be borne in mind, sir, that that gaol was not intended originally for the purpose to which it is now applied. It was built as a gaol for male offenders: but some years ago Sir Arthur Palmer, or the Executive, determined that it should be set apart for female prisoners, and that no male prisoners should be kept there except two or three—sufficient to do the inside work of the gaol. So that there is this to be said: that the gaol was never built for the purpose for which it is now used, and that it is not adapted to requirements. However, I am pleased to hear that the Colonial Secretary is going to see if some improvement cannot be made in that respect. I very much favour the suggestion that a new gaol should be built away from the mainland, and in which female prisoners can be kept; because it is well known that when females go to the bad they are certainly worse than the men. Now, there is the matter of employing the female prisoners by the gaoler. I think that that is a matter which ought not to be allowed, and I go further and say that it is much worse that young children should be taken from the reformatory in Toowoomba into the gaoler's house, where they must mix with these female prisoners who come out of the gaol. I know that it has been denied that such is the case, but we have it in evidence from several ministers in Toowoomba that such has taken place, and I am quite sure that those gentlemen would not have committed themselves to paper if such had not been the case. But I have it from a very good source myself that that thing is done—that the young children from the reformatory are taken into the gaoler's house to look after his children, and they therefore must come in contact with abandoned women, who are taken out of this gaol to do the work in the gaoler's house. There is another thing I noticed when visiting the reformatory, that the children there range from ages of three or four years up to sixteen or eighteen. Now,

why should those young children, who are perfectly innocent, and who, through no fault of their own, have been taken out of the care of those who ought to care for them, and placed there by the Government—why should these little children be allowed to associate with the young girls of fourteen or sixteen, who have been sent to the reformatory because they have committed some crime? I think that that is a matter which ought to be looked into, because the children are sent there through no fault of their own, and they ought not to come in contact with the criminal class. I very much regret, too, to notice the laxity with which the visiting surgeon of the Toowoomba Gaol appears to have attended to his work. There is, perhaps, this to be said: that the emolument which the Government gives to its medical officers is not nearly enough; but then I think, on the other hand, that gentlemen ought not to accept the position at that emolument unless they are prepared to do their duties honestly and faithfully.

Mr. NORTON: They hunt after it.

Mr. ALAND: The hon. member for Port Curtis says they hunt after it. Well, I do not know whether that is the case, but I am quite sure that the gentleman who holds the position in Toowoomba does not need it, and would be a very great deal better without it. I believe that in the new towns medical men who are just starting in the profession search for the appointments, as it gives them a sort of status to be able to call themselves Government doctors. I think the hon. member for Dalby is to be congratulated in having brought this question before us, and I trust that the report of the Commission will not be allowed simply to be read by the Executive, and then passed over for further consideration when they have nothing else to attend to.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I was quite surprised when the discussion came on on the report of the Commissioners, as I see no notice of it on the paper before the House.

The PREMIER: If you had read *Hansard* you would have seen it.

Mr. PALMER: I may not have been in the House when it was spoken of, and I had not the slightest idea that it was coming on until I heard the member for Dalby bring it forward. The question is of so much importance that I think it would be advisable that a certain day should be given on which to discuss it.

The PREMIER: I gave it. I fixed the day last week.

Mr. PALMER: Well, it is not on the paper. A verbal statement a week ago might easily be forgotten by members. I never heard of it, and I have taken a very great interest in the Gaols Inquiry. I visited the gaols of Adelaide, Melbourne, and Sydney, when down south, to obtain information, and I know there is a very great discrepancy between the management of gaols in the southern colonies and in Queensland. I have not half looked through the report, and shall be very much disappointed if this is all the discussion we are likely to have. I move the adjournment of the debate.

The PREMIER said: The question is to go into Committee of Supply, and the adjournment of this debate cannot be ordered. The hon. member is mistaken in saying that no day was fixed. The hon. member for Dalby last week asked if the Government would give a day for the discussion of this subject, and I then suggested that it should be taken on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, and undertook to put Supply at the head of the paper for one day this week for the purpose. I promised yester-

day to put it at the head of the paper to-day. Accordingly it was put at the head of the paper. Of course, the hon. member for Dalby might have given notice that he would call attention to the report on a certain day, on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, but I think every member of the House perfectly understood that the question was going to be introduced to-day, and I am sure the hon. member for Dalby understood so. I should be glad that there should be further discussion on this subject, because it is a matter that requires very full ventilation. I extremely regret to have read the disclosures made in the report of the Commission, and one thing I am satisfied about is, that in the administration of our gaols there is certainly room for very great improvement. It is also very clear that the construction of our gaols is defective.

Mr. CHUBB: That is a question of money.

The PREMIER: As the hon. gentleman says, that is a question of money, but there is no doubt that the construction is radically defective. The associated system is undoubtedly a very bad one, and we must, as far as we possibly can afford to do it, substitute the separate system for the associated system. It is becoming a very serious question. Of course, it is a question that increases in magnitude as the population of the colony increases. In the early days of the colony it did not make so much difference. The gaols were good enough then as they were built, but we have now arrived at a condition of things when we are bound to make better provision both for the punishment of offenders and for the prevention of their further deterioration. There is no doubt that a very radical change is necessary. The Government have not had an opportunity to go into the matter fully, but as has been suggested by an hon. member, the question of money is involved to a great extent. We certainly cannot put the gaols on a better footing in point of construction without the expenditure of £100,000 or £150,000 for the number of criminals now to be provided for, and that is a very serious matter, and requires a great deal of consideration. We cannot do it all at once either, and it will be necessary to consider how a re-arrangement can be made until we build new gaols or improve the construction of the gaols we have. When hon. members desire to discuss the matter again, the Government will have no objection to appoint a time in the same way as has been done to-day—that is, name a day upon which the question may be raised on the motion for going into Committee of Supply; or perhaps it might be more convenient to postpone discussion until we come to the vote for gaols in the Estimates. A great deal may be said on that occasion. We are not likely to reach that stage of the Estimates this week, and by the time we get there hon. members will be able to discuss the question more in detail.

Question put and passed.

#### SUPPLY.

##### COLONIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the sum of £5,635 be granted for the Colonial Secretary's Office—salaries and contingencies. There was a decrease in the vote of £150, accounted for by the disappearance of the item "Allowance to Chief Clerk while acting as Under Colonial Secretary," which had to be provided for last year.

Mr. NORTON asked whether the whole amounts—£1,500 and £799—voted for last year for advertising and contingencies had been expended, or whether there was any balance left?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The whole of it has been expended.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Has it been over-expended?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes, it has been over-expended.

Mr. NORTON: To what extent, might I ask?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Very nearly £3,500.

Mr. NORTON said if the amount had been over-expended to that extent, would the hon. gentleman tell the Committee how the over-expenditure took place? Was it all in connection with the publication of the electoral rolls?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said it was mostly expended in connection with the electoral rolls, and some in getting the new claims under the Act.

Mr. NORTON said he would like to know whether all the charges made for the printing of the electoral rolls had been paid. It was shown last year that a very large number of newspapers had printed the electoral rolls, and some without being asked to do so, and as he supposed all sent in their accounts he would like to know if all were paid, or to what extent they were paid. He remembered last year that it was stated the cost would be about £3,000, though Ministers insisted it would not be so large.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that so far as his memory served him some of them were not paid, and all of them were very considerably reduced from the amount of the account originally sent in.

Mr. NORTON: Who were the advertisements ordered by?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he had mentioned last year that almost all were ordered by the clerks of petty sessions.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought they had listened to one of the most astounding statements he had ever heard made in that Committee. Here was a vote of £1,500 for advertising, and that amount was absolutely exceeded by 150 per cent., and not a word was said about it by the Colonial Secretary. Had it not been that the hon. member for Port Curtis had extracted some replies from the hon. gentleman, he would have given no information on the subject. They knew the extraordinary way in which it was given. He was asked if the vote of £1,500 had been expended, and one would have thought his memory would have served him to remember that £1,500 had been expended when something like £5,800 was expended; but after consultation with his Under Secretary the hon. gentleman returned and stated that that sum had been expended. They next extracted from him the information that the vote had been over-expended, and then when he was asked "By how much?" they got the startling information that the amount had been exceeded by £3,500. He did hope, while going through the Estimates, whatever Minister was in charge of them, he would let the Committee know when the amount was over-expended. He was perfectly certain, with the exception of the hon. member for Port Curtis, who seemed to know something of the matter, no hon. member knew that that vote was exceeded by that extraordinary amount.

The PREMIER: It was all explained last session.

Mr. MOREHEAD said it had not been explained last session.

The PREMIER: You were not here, but we spent a whole day at it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the matter should be explained this session, and had it not been for the hon. member for Port Curtis the Committee would have got no information from the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. BLACK said the question was one in which he took some little interest, and he had made some inquiries in respect to the vote last session, when the Colonial Secretary was unable to give a satisfactory reply. The hon. gentleman promised, as soon as the accounts came in, to let hon. members know what the extravagant expenditure in regard to electoral rolls consisted of. They had not yet received any information as to the actual amount, and he wished to ask the Colonial Secretary—now that he had had ample time to make inquiries, and must have the information at his command if he chose to obtain it—the actual cost of advertising the electoral rolls last October and November.

The Hon. G. THORN said that hon. members on both sides of the Committee seemed to be under a delusion. He always understood that the electoral rolls were printed at the Government Printing Office. That being so, he could not understand what all the money was wanted for unless the Government were going in for subsidising newspapers wholesale.

Mr. ALAND said the hon. member, as usual, spoke in too great a hurry. If he had waited he would have found, from the answer given by the Colonial Secretary, that the money was for advertising, not for printing.

The Hon. G. THORN said he knew all about that; but not a word had been said about advertising till the hon. member for Toowoomba spoke. He was not so green as not to know that the money was for advertising, but he wished to point out that hon. members who spoke of the expense of printing the rolls were under a wrong impression.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the amount was from £2,500 to £3,000.

Mr. BLACK said it appeared from the reply of the hon. gentleman that a matter of £500 was of no consideration to the country. He would now ask the cost of advertising the electoral rolls last year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not possess the information at present. It was stated last year.

Mr. BLACK said the hon. gentleman stated last year what the expenditure was likely to be. He would read his words as they appeared in *Hansard* of the 2nd November:—

"The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. B. B. Moreton) said: Mr. Speaker,—Since I addressed the House on this subject last week I have received a report from the Government Printer as to the probable cost of advertising the quarterly rolls for this year, but I have not yet been able to ascertain the authorities upon which the advertisements were inserted in the different papers. That can only be obtained when the vouchers are sent in, and that will be very shortly, I believe. The total cost of advertising in the whole colony, the Government Printer has told me, will be something under £3,000."

He assumed that the vouchers were in by this time, and he wanted a specific answer as to the expenditure connected with advertising the Enoggera roll and the other electoral rolls, stating the amounts paid to the different papers throughout the colony.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that if the hon. member really wanted the information he would get it for him.

Mr. BLACK said he wanted it very much, and he thought it would rather astonish hon. members. Would the hon. gentleman promise to lay on the table a return containing the information for which he had asked?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he would promise to lay it on the table as soon as he got the information.

Mr. PATTISON said that surely there had been sufficient time since last session for the hon. gentleman to get the necessary information and to let hon. members know those journals which had been subsidised by the Government—for that was the view taken by many hon. members. One of the journals referred to last year was a journal in which an hon. member of that Chamber had a substantial interest. It was a journal not read by the English-speaking community. He thought that slight reference was sufficient to make the cap fit, but if the hon. member wished him to be plainer he would certainly be so. The country should know the papers that had received those bribes. Some of them had been subsidised to the extent of £600 or £700, though they were not read except by the people about Brisbane. He for one was prepared, until some assurance was given that the return asked for would be furnished, to block the vote.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have given the assurance.

Mr. PATTISON said the return might be laid on the table after tea-time.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that, notwithstanding the explanation given by the Colonial Secretary, there still remained £1,000 to be accounted for.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that was for necessary advertising which went through the Colonial Secretary's Office. A large amount of advertising went through that office.

Mr. NORTON said he understood from the Colonial Secretary that a large number of advertisements in connection with the electoral rolls had been inserted in the papers without any authority.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Some of them.

Mr. NORTON said he understood most of them had been, and he should like to know what would be the consequence to the clerks of petty sessions. Would they have to pay the accounts, or would the Government quietly settle the matter and let the clerks of petty sessions out of it without any result as far as their pockets were concerned?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that under the Elections Act it was the duty of the clerks of petty sessions to advertise the electoral lists. Some of them had to collect applications for portions of two electoral districts, and they might advertise in four papers—advertising the lists for the one district in two papers and those for the other district in two other papers. There were some clerks who had done more than they had a right to do, and they had been reprimanded for it.

Mr. NORTON said that a similar matter had taken place during the time the late Government were in office, and the clerks of petty sessions had been left to settle the accounts themselves. He could tell the hon. gentleman the name of a clerk of petty sessions who had let the Government in for something like £40 for advertising in that way, and that gentleman had been told he had better settle the account himself, and he had to do it. He (Mr. Norton) could not believe there was anything in the Act which justified any clerk in inserting those lists of applicants in newspapers, and he did not believe that they were responsible in all cases. Possibly in many cases the proprietors of newspapers took it upon themselves to reprint the lists, and then charged the Government, although they had never been instructed to publish them by anybody; and he hoped that in all such

cases they would not be paid. He could not believe that any clerk of petty sessions would scatter advertisements broadcast over the country as had been done in some of the cases referred to by the hon. member for Mackay.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was certain that no clerk of petty sessions would order the advertisements in nine different papers, and if he did he ought to pay for them. The electoral roll of Enoggera appeared in the *Evangelical Standard*, *Zeitung*, *Southern World*, *Courier*, *Telegraph*, *Observer*, *Moreton Bay Mail*, *Sandgate Directory*, and *The Planter and Farmer*; and the same with the Oxley roll. Several others came in five or six newspapers. He would like to know whether the Colonial Secretary revised the advertisements, or whether the Under Secretary issued the orders broadcast. He believed that the bill of *The Planter and Farmer*, a small paper having an existence in South Brisbane, amounted on their scale to over £1,000, more than the whole wretched thing was worth itself—it could be bought out for less than that money. It was really time that they came to some understanding with these newspaper gentlemen. If they were to be allowed to blackmail in that way, and get their papers carried for nothing, and abuse members of the House in the way they did—

Mr. PATTISON: Very fairly, too, in your case.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: That might be the hon. gentleman's opinion. If the papers were carried for nothing, they should be obliged to insert free of charge all the Government advertisements that needed circulating. Then there would be an end to members coming to the House pulling a long face on account of their Press organs, and saying that such-and-such a land sale was a failure for want of sufficient advertising. The papers ought to be too glad to advertise without charging, anything that was of interest to the State and the community they were living in; and, if their wares were carried for nothing, it was small justice that they should do it. He hoped a return would be laid on the table to show what money was spent on reckless advertising last October, and he hoped it would be clearly shown who authorised the expenditure. The Colonial Secretary spoke of clerks of petty sessions authorising advertisements in three or four papers, but there must have been somebody behind them to authorise the insertion of the Enoggera roll and the Logan roll in nine papers—some of them leading papers with a good deal of circulation, and others most obscure papers. Whoever authorised them—if it was the Colonial Secretary himself or the Under Secretary—ought to pay some of the damage that was incurred. If a clerk of petty sessions ordered them, he ought to suffer in the same way. He hoped they would find that in some cases the bills were not paid, because some of the papers inserted the advertisements without any authority and sent in the bill afterwards. In cases of that kind he hoped the Colonial Secretary had sufficient strength of mind to refuse to pay.

Mr. PALMER said he would like to hear the Colonial Treasurer on this matter of payment of money, because he rather sympathised with him in having continually to find money for payments over which he had no control whatever, and over which the Minister apparently had no control. Whoever authorised the advertisements the Minister at all events should have to say whether they should be inserted or not, and for what purpose, and to what extent. There must have been an unnecessary expenditure in publishing the Bundaberg electoral roll in the *Zeitung* in Brisbane. What purpose could be served by that? There had been

very justifiable complaints about the advertisements from the Lands Department; there was no doubt that that department had lost considerable sums of money through not advertising in a proper and sufficient manner in the same way as private firms; so that the country was losing in one way and not gaining in another. He knew as much on the subject as the late Minister for Lands, though that hon. gentleman had been four years in the department. He knew there had been sales of very important allotments in Normanton when the people did not know they were coming off, because they were only advertised in the *Gazette*. When that was taken in conjunction with the advertising of the electoral rolls in eight or nine papers, the Colonial Treasurer was certainly entitled to a little sympathy for the needless expenditure over which he had no control.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said the hon. member for Cook appeared to have forgotten what was said last session when he (the Colonial Secretary) explained that the authority for some of the advertisements was given at the Colonial Secretary's office, and he had mentioned the names of those papers in the case of which he had authorised the insertion. In the case of others authority was given by the clerks of petty sessions in accordance with the Act. The sum he had mentioned in excess of the £1,500 was necessitated by the Act of 1885, whereby in August everybody wishing to have his name on the roll was to send in his claim; and all these names were to be advertised. Every elector on the roll had had his name advertised, and hon. members could not suppose that that would be done for nothing. The amount was certainly very large, but it would not occur again, as all that had to be advertised in future were the new names on the quarterly rolls.

Mr. BLACK said the Act simply provided that each electoral roll should be published in one of the papers circulating in the district. No objection could be possibly raised to that. The contention was that the Colonial Secretary had neglected the duties of his department, and allowed clerks of petty sessions and others to take his duties out of his hands, and to advertise the rolls not only in one paper circulating in each district, but in a whole host of papers which did not circulate in that district. The Stanley roll was advertised in three papers published in Brisbane, besides, very likely, in the local papers published at Ipswich, of which he was not aware. It was advertised in the *Zeitung*, the *Evangelical Standard*, and the *Leader*. Where was the necessity for advertising the Stanley roll in those three papers? The Darling Downs roll was advertised in the *Zeitung* and the *Evangelical Standard*, besides probably the local papers on the Darling Downs. The Bundamba roll was advertised in the *Zeitung*, the *Evangelical Standard*, and the *Leader*. The Enoggera roll, as stated by the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hill, was advertised in no less than nine papers—the *Zeitung*, the *Evangelical Standard*,—that seemed to have been the pet paper of the hon. gentleman—it got all the advertisements,—the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, the *Observer*, the *Moreton Mail*, the *Sandgate Directory*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. Was that carrying out the intention of the Act—that the roll was to be advertised in one paper circulating in the district? He was informed last session that according to the newspaper schedule of prices the cost of one advertisement of the Enoggera roll was £110. And it was advertised in nine different papers; £990 for advertising one electoral roll! The Moreton electoral roll was advertised in eight papers—the *Evangelical Standard*, the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, the *Observer*, the *Moreton*

*Mail*, the *Sandgate Directory*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. If the Government made ducks and drakes of their money in that way, no wonder they did not know where it had gone to! The Fassifern roll was advertised in the *Leader*, the *Southern World*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. The Bulimba roll was advertised in the *Evangelical Standard*, the *Zeitung*, the *Leader*, the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, the *Observer*, the *Sandgate Directory*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. Could any sound reason be advanced for that reckless expenditure? The Mulgrave—that was, Bundaberg—roll was actually advertised in the *Zeitung*, down in Brisbane. The Logan roll was advertised in five papers—the *Zeitung*, the *Evangelical Standard*, the *Leader*, the *Southern World*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. The Oxley roll was advertised in nine papers that he knew of, besides others of which he was not aware—the *Zeitung*, the *Evangelical Standard*, the *Leader*, the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, the *Observer*, the *Sandgate Directory*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. It was the same story all through; those papers had been specially favoured. The Aubigny roll, which ought to have been left solely to the papers on the Darling Downs, was advertised in the *Evangelical Standard*. The Ipswich roll was advertised in the *Leader*. The South Brisbane roll was advertised in the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, and *The Planter and Farmer*. The Valley roll was advertised in the *Southern World*, the *Courier*, the *Telegraph*, and the *Valley Vindicator*—a paper which, notwithstanding the enormous endowment it had got from the Government, had ceased to exist—and *The Planter and Farmer*. It was stated last session that the advertising account sent in by *The Planter and Farmer* alone amounted to £1,050, and the Colonial Secretary then assured the House that the account should be closely scrutinised. He would now ask that hon. gentleman whether he did closely scrutinise it, and what was the amount actually paid to *The Planter and Farmer*? He felt very strongly on that subject because the Government, notwithstanding the evident incapacity they had shown in keeping the accounts of the colony, wanted to force their system of book-keeping on the more northern parts of the colony. In connection with the Colonial Secretary's department, he would point out to the Committee and the country that it exceeded the amount voted for it last year by £33,000. Now was the time for the Committee to get some information as to where that money went. If that reckless expenditure on advertising was a specimen of the way in which the money was spent, the sooner the Government resigned a position which they certainly had not filled with credit, and let someone else attend to the business of the country, the better. He would repeat his question to the Colonial Secretary, as to whether he did closely scrutinise that account of £1,050 from *The Planter and Farmer*, and to what amount it was eventually reduced?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said that he certainly did scrutinise the amount very closely indeed, and he knew that a very large reduction was made in it, but what it was he could not at the present moment state.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was sorry to inform the hon. member for Mackay that, notwithstanding the valuable patronage accorded to it by the present Government, the *Evangelical Standard* was dead.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: No, no!

Mr. MOREHEAD said it was supposed to be dead, and it must be suffering from a resurrection. It had, perhaps, got a further supply of food from the Government in the shape of advertising electoral rolls.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: *De mortuis nil nisi bonum.*

Mr. W. BROOKES said that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side were thrashing a dead horse.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Are you speaking personally?

Mr. W. BROOKES said he would admit that the hon. member for Mackay had got a good case, and that he was a very bitter pill. Still, what in the world was the use of badgering the Colonial Secretary about a matter which was so fully explained last year?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: We have never had an explanation.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he begged the hon. member for Cook's pardon, but it was fully explained in the House last session that the action of the clerks of petty sessions came upon the Government like an avalanche; they had not the least idea that any clerk of petty sessions could do anything so absurd.

Mr. MOREHEAD: What about the Colonial Secretary?

Mr. W. BROOKES said the Colonial Secretary was only human. He was not an "Encyclopædia Britannica," nor a gazetteer, nor a dictionary. That hon. gentleman could not answer everything, and some of the questions put to him by the hon. member for Mackay had been simply prods and digs. The hon. member for Mackay did not care a bit whether he got an answer to his questions or not. What he did was out of pure devilment.

Mr. BLACK: I will ask your ruling, Mr. Fraser, as to whether the hon. member's remark, that I put my question out of pure devilment, is strictly parliamentary?

The CHAIRMAN said he did not think the expression was strictly parliamentary.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he would withdraw the expression and call it *diablerie*.

Mr. NORTON: Is that in order?

Mr. W. BROOKES said what he was going to say was, that although the hon. member for Mackay had aimed his blows very skilfully, yet he (Mr. Brookes) differed from him entirely on one point. The hon. member seemed to lump up all the newspapers together in one common bond of uselessness. He talked of the *Zeitung* in terms very unjust to that journal.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, no!

Mr. W. BROOKES said it was the only German paper in the colony. Let him be clearly understood. He was not, of course, infallible. He was only giving his opinion, which hon. members opposite might take or leave as they liked. If it were not for the *Zeitung* a very important class of their colonists, the Germans, would be very badly informed as to their colonial politics. They might read a paper in their own language when they certainly would not read *The Farmer and Planter*. The very name of that paper had an offensive odour to him. If it was dead he was sincerely glad of it. But to come to business, he was talking seriously now to the hon. member.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: I thought you were all along.

Mr. W. BROOKES said all that kind of talk was obstruction of a not unpleasant kind, but it was a waste of time, and he would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to drop it and let the Committee go to work.

Mr. NORTON said he was somewhat surprised at the remarks which fell from the hon. gentleman who had just sat down. Could the hon. gentleman point to any place in *Hansard*

where the explanation referred to was made last year, or was it omitted from *Hansard*? It was very strange that hon. members could not find it in *Hansard*.

Mr. W. BROOKES: It was fully made.

Mr. NORTON said he was glad to hear it, and should like to know by whose authority it was omitted from *Hansard*. That was a very important point. If it had been omitted from *Hansard* somebody ought to be hauled over the coals for it. But he thought the hon. member had heard the explanation outside, and was under the impression that it had been made in that Chamber. The hon. gentleman had referred to the Colonial Secretary in a manner that he (Mr. Norton) scarcely liked to hear. He said the hon. gentleman was not a gazetteer, that he was not a dictionary, and that he could not carry everything in his head. Did the hon. gentleman mean to imply that the Colonial Secretary did not fully understand the affairs of his office? If he did they were surely coming to a very extraordinary pass. They had a Treasurer who had not had time to get into the affairs of the Treasury; a Minister for Works who had only just gone into the Works Office, and had not yet got control of it; and a new Minister for Lands who scarcely knew anything about the working of his office. There was not a Minister who understood the work of his office fully except the Chief Secretary. And yet that was the Government that, after preparing the Estimates of Expenditure and submitting them to that Committee, came down, and not one of them, except the Chief Secretary, was able to give any information about them. Was not such a state of things ludicrous? The Colonial Secretary ought to be able to give the information asked for without going to any trouble to do so, because so much was said on the matter last year that one would naturally suppose that he could not expect that it would be passed over in silence this year; and therefore he would come prepared to show what had been done in each case, what amount of money had been paid to each of the papers named, and by whose authority in each case the papers had been instructed to insert those wonderful advertisements. He (Mr. Norton) regretted very much the turn affairs had taken, but he was sure that if hon. members opposite were sitting on his side of the Committee they would feel that they were only doing their duty to their constituencies in demanding information they had asked for and could not get.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: You have been promised it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was promised last year.

Mr. NORTON: They were promised it when the vote was passed. The whole matter would have been passed over in silence and hushed up if it had not been taken up by that side of the Committee. Not one word would have been said. He certainly thought they should have the information asked for.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman asked the Colonial Secretary to give a detailed statement of the amounts paid to each newspaper in November and December last. The Colonial Secretary said he had not the information with him, and on that they had spent three-quarters of an hour talking about the incompetency of the Colonial Secretary. Did it not appear to be rather trifling with the dignity of Parliament? The Colonial Secretary said he had not got the figures with him, and that he would lay them on the table as soon as he could get them. They had a full discussion on the subject last year, and what was the use of hon. members asking for what they knew they could not get?



Mr. MURPHY: The Colonial Secretary ought to have had the information.

The PREMIER: All the bills and accounts? Supposing he had not got them, what then?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Postpone the vote.

The PREMIER said the vote was not asked for now. They were asking for £1,500 for this year, and the sanction of Parliament would yet have to be got for the expenditure of that £3,500 on the Supplementary Estimates. Of course hon. members could ask a Minister any number of questions about statistics he had not got in his possession, and keep on asking for an answer which they could not get that day, but which they would get to-morrow.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the Colonial Secretary had had from the 2nd of November, 1886, until the 14th September, 1887, to produce those figures. The Premier himself had admitted that the subject was discussed last year, and gave as one reason why hon. members on that side of the Committee were uselessly occupying time by asking unnecessary questions, that it was thoroughly discussed during last session. But that was the very reason why members on that side contended that the return should have been placed on the table that night. The matter having been fully discussed last year, the Colonial Secretary was put in a position to know exactly what the Committee wanted; he had had ten months to supply the information and had not given it yet.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he would read what the Colonial Secretary said on the subject on the 2nd November last, ten months ago. He was asked who authorised the insertions, and the Colonial Secretary replied:—

"I cannot say now, but when the vouchers come in, the authorities for the expenditure will accompany them, and until then I cannot give that information. The bulk of the advertisements were certainly authorised by the clerks of petty sessions under the Act."

Now, he could hardly believe that clerks of petty sessions would authorise the insertion of those advertisements in eight or nine different papers in districts where the papers did not circulate. Take the advertisements in the *Zeitung*, for example: the names were not advertised in German, and consequently were not understood by Germans. He thought the Colonial Secretary, seeing that the information was asked for last session, should have been prepared with it that night, and he certainly hoped they would see it to-morrow. At the same time, if they allowed that vote to pass they would have to wait till next session for the information.

Mr. PATTISON said he for one hoped that the Colonial Secretary would produce the papers to-morrow, and would suggest that the item be postponed, because he would not consent to deal with the matter until the information was forthcoming. It was promised last session, and it was wanted now. He thought the Colonial Secretary had had ample time, if he wished to do what was asked, to get the information during the dinner-hour. That had been suggested, and he did not see that there was such a vast amount of work to be done in preparing the information. He hoped the vote would be postponed until to-morrow, and without that assurance he thought they should not allow it to pass.

The PREMIER: Obstruction!

Mr. PATTISON said he objected to the Premier's interjection of "Obstruction." They were not obstructing. They were asking for reasonable information which the country would demand, and which hon. members would demand, even though they might be accused of obstruction. Hon. members had a right to demand the information, and they would have it.

The PREMIER said he hoped the hon. member would remember that he was in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, and not at a meeting of the divisional board of Gogango, where he believed the hon. member was accustomed to do exactly as he liked.

Mr. MURPHY said he would point out to the Chief Secretary that he was simply repeating himself. Last year he used exactly the same words to the hon. member for Blackall, and accused the hon. member of addressing the Committee as though he were addressing the Gogango Divisional Board. That was beneath the dignity of the hon. gentleman.

The PREMIER: Truths have to be repeated sometimes.

Mr. MURPHY said he thought the Committee were entitled to the information asked for, and any steps they might take to force it from the Government would be justifiable. He did not think they should pass a single vote on the Estimates without considering the state that the Government had brought the finances of the country into, and without getting every particular that would elucidate the different votes. If the Colonial Secretary had used reasonable diligence and intelligence he would have read up the debate of last session, and come prepared with all information that hon. members on either side were likely to require; and he did not think they should pass the item in question without getting that which they desired.

Mr. NORTON said the Chief Secretary reminded the hon. member for Blackall that he was in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. He (Mr. Norton) would remind the Chief Secretary that he was in the Legislative Assembly Chamber. The hon. member was not content with bossing his own party, but wanted to boss the Opposition; but if he thought he could do so he was very much mistaken indeed. If the hon. gentleman wanted to promote difficulties for himself and his Ministers he had adopted the best possible course. The hon. gentleman must understand that he was not going to bounce the Opposition, but if he took the matter as he ought to take it he would adopt a different kind of tone, and the sooner he did so the better. Why, the hon. gentleman should remember that he could not even boss his own party, to say nothing of not being able to boss the Opposition. He thought the hon. gentleman would see on reflection, and if he applied a little of his common sense to the question, that the way in which he had addressed the hon. member for Blackall was not right.

The PREMIER said he perfectly knew the proper manner of dealing with hon. members, but the tone of the hon. member for Blackall was so distinctly offensive, and deliberately offensive, that he felt it his duty as leader of the House to take notice of it.

Mr. PATTISON said he disclaimed any idea of being offensive either to the Chief Secretary or any member of the Assembly, but he did not think the remarks made by the hon. gentleman were such as might be expected from one holding such a position. It was not the first occasion on which the Chief Secretary had referred to him and his local position as chairman of a divisional board, mayor of Rockhampton, or president of the Chamber of Commerce. He had held those positions in Rockhampton, and he believed with credit to himself, and he certainly could say what many members on the Government benches could not say—that he had never yet made a failure of anything he had undertaken. He was a novice in politics, but the same success that he had met with in other positions he believed would follow him, and that as member for Blackall he would be successful in spite of

everything the Chief Secretary might say. He came there expecting to receive information; that was all he asked for. If there was anything offensive in speaking in plain and unmistakable terms and endeavouring to extract information, he had yet to learn it. He could make himself remarkably offensive if he thought fit to do so, and he thought the Chief Secretary had given him good grounds for doing so. But he had no such intention. He had quite as much respect for that Assembly as the Chief Secretary, but he was not going to allow the hon. gentleman to dictate to him. He came there to represent his constituents and he intended to do so. The information he had asked for he again asked for, and, unless that information was forthcoming, he for one would not allow the vote to pass.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he was very sorry that a misunderstanding had arisen, and he did not think sufficient consideration had been shown to the Chief Secretary. The hon. member for Blackall, who felt himself aggrieved, should remember the company from which the Premier had lately departed, and should remember that the hon. gentleman now probably considered himself a triton among minnows, as he had lately been associating with all sorts of distinguished persons, whom they read of in the newspapers, and whose portraits appeared in the illustrated papers. He thought the hon. member for Blackall had shown a little undue warmth, and should have taken into consideration the very great men the Premier had lately been associated with. At the same time he (Mr. Morehead) agreed with the member for Stanley, who, he was sorry to see, was not in his place, that the hon. Premier showed a slight want of tact in not suiting himself to his company. They were not all dukes. They were not even all right honourables. They did not all disapprove of the policy of Gladstone, and did not tell New York interviewers that Gladstone was all wrong; that they were Liberals on this side of the world and Conservatives on the other. They did not do all those things, and probably the member for Blackall had not considered that. A little more of the varnish would have to be knocked off the Premier; and the member for Blackall was quite able to do it, and to do it properly. He would ask the Premier to condescend to come down to his audience. He (Mr. Morehead) admitted they were not all counts, and had not all of them got decorations dangling from their necks. They might aspire to them, but they had not got them yet. They might possibly be like Napoleon's soldiers who were supposed to carry a marshal's baton in their knapsacks, but they had not yet got their batons. If the Premier was strong, therefore, let him be merciful; if he had all those advantages of mixing with the great—which they had not—and especially at the expense of the country, he should not be too hard upon them, but should pardon their little failings and idiosyncrasies, and if he could not associate with them let him at least endure them. He could assure the hon. gentleman that the Committee would thank him for his patronage if he would only come down to the level of the Chamber and the people he was talking to.

Mr. W. BROOKES said if it was understood all over the Committee that they were to have a chaffing match no one would enjoy it more than he should. Of course, he felt that the leader of the Opposition in that House was not a mere private member, and though he really did enjoy the hon. gentleman's flippant remarks he could not see their bearing upon the business before the Committee. If the feathers of the hon. member for Blackall were ruffled, more was the pity. No one intended to trouble the hon. member. If the hon. member kept his self-respect on

his sleeve he was certain to have it plucked at. The hon. member must learn to take things more quietly. When he had had as much badgering as he (Mr. Brookes) had had in his short life, he would learn to be more temperate. The hon. member for Barcoo had stepped in, and he would just put a shot into that hon. member. That hon. member had taunted the Colonial Secretary with not having all the papers ready to hand. If the hon. member was logically followed in that desire by every member of the Committee, the Colonial Secretary would have to bring a cartload of papers into the House to comply with such an irrational demand.

Mr. NORTON: His despatch-box would hold all the papers that are wanted.

Mr. W. BROOKES said he really could not hear what the hon. member said, and he did not want to hear it. How did the question stand? The Colonial Secretary had promised that the papers wanted by the hon. member for Blackall would be laid on the table.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: When?

Mr. W. BROOKES said the junior member for Cook asked "When?" but that was not of very much consequence, because, as the Premier had stated, the money had all been spent. They were dealing with the matter more or less candidly and more or less hypercritically, but, as had been stated, the amount would appear on the Supplementary Estimates, and that was the proper time to continue the debate. He was sorry to have to include the junior member for Cook amongst the unreasonables, as that hon. member was generally so sound. He hoped they would waste no more time, and that the Committee would get to work.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he had a few words to say in explanation of what had fallen from the junior member for North Brisbane. It was not unreasonable for him to demand "When?" because they had had a sort of inferential promise from the Colonial Secretary on the 2nd of November last year that they would get the information as soon as he knew how the money was expended, and that from that day to the present they had heard no more of it. If they allowed their present opportunity for taxing those costs to pass, as soon as the hon. gentleman got his Estimates through it would be "good-by" to it, and they would have no opportunity of sifting the matter. He did not want to obstruct the Government in their Estimates, but he wanted to have the matter thoroughly sifted. It was admitted that the Government had got themselves into a financial mess, and there were many things which had been promised, and which hon. members would not now get because the money was gone. He thought that other hon. members wanted to know where the money went to, and he intended to sift the Estimates very carefully, and hoped other hon. members of the Committee would do the same.

Mr. BLACK said he thought the Colonial Secretary would do well to postpone the vote and go on with the rest of the Estimates. He quite agreed with the remarks which fell from the hon. member for Cook, who had just spoken, and he also agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for Blackall. The Government made a loss on last year's transactions of £460,000, and the Committee wanted to know where the money had gone to. They must know how the expenditure was incurred, in order, if possible, to prevent its occurrence again. When they went back to their constituencies they would find numbers of persons to ask them if they could account for the deficiency of £460,000 on last year's transactions, and therefore the Committee, and members on his side particularly, were justified in criticising most

minutely the Estimates submitted to them for the next year, and in getting as much information as possible concerning the expenditure of the money voted for last year. He would ask the Colonial Secretary to postpone the vote.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he thanked the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Lumley Hill, for the kind belief he expressed that he (the Colonial Secretary) would not keep his word and put the papers on the table of the House to-morrow. The hon. member had expressed that belief inferentially, he would admit, by saying that if the Committee lost grasp of him at present and passed the vote they would get no information. He saw no reason to postpone the vote, and he could only add that he would see that the papers were laid on the table of the House to-morrow morning.

The Hon. G. THORN said that the Committee should be satisfied with the statement made by the Colonial Secretary that the papers would be laid on the table to-morrow, showing what newspapers had received that amount of money. He might as well state that it was very little use crying over spilt milk. The money was gone, and it would have to be voted. What they had to look to was that a further amount of £1,500 was asked for next year, and he was under the impression himself that, instead of £1,500, something like £3,000 or £4,000 would be required. In the face of the fact that the elections would probably take place, and that there would probably be a number of additional names to be inserted on the quarterly rolls, he was inclined to think that the sum required under the vote would amount to something like £5,000 for next year, and consequently the amount set down, £1,500, was to a great extent misleading. They had to look at the Estimates-in-Chief for the year, and if the vote now before them was misleading, it was quite possible that other votes on the Estimates would be misleading. The Opposition were quite right in insisting on getting every information and in trying to cut down the Estimates, because times would soon be very bad indeed. They would soon see 1866 repeated only in a more severe form—he was certain of it. It was part of the duty of the Opposition to cut down the Estimates, and he should assist them in doing so, and he thought the Chief Secretary ought to be only too pleased to see the Opposition insist on cutting them down. He was satisfied that the public works policy of the colony would soon come to a standstill unless there was an immediate reversal of the present land policy, which would be the great question at the next general election. Only for the present land policy the colony would not be in its financially embarrassed condition. The subject had been pretty well thrashed out, and he hoped the Opposition would now allow the vote to pass. When the vote for the Defence Force came on he should have a great deal to say, and perhaps the vote would be wiped out altogether.

Mr. MURPHY said there had been plenty of time since November to produce the information required, and he agreed with the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Lumley Hill, that the Committee had no right to take the word of the Colonial Secretary that the return would be laid on the table, and let the vote pass. He should like to see the return laid on the table first and deal with the vote afterwards. The junior member for North Brisbane was a jackal for a lion, because whenever the Premier was attacked he got up to defend him. He was described the other day as "the Premier's puppet."

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Puppy?

Mr. MURPHY: "Puppet," he thought. He was too old to be a puppy. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Murphy) was unreasonable in asking

that the Colonial Secretary should be prepared to give the information required when passing his Estimates, and that he would need a cartload of papers in order to do so; but there was an hon. gentleman lately on the Treasury benches, the hon. member for Enoggera, who was always ready with any information asked for, though he had a larger department and was asked many more difficult questions. Why, then, should the Committee be put off by the Colonial Secretary from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year? The demand of the Opposition was perfectly reasonable, and the information ought to be supplied. And the country should know that the information had been withheld.

Mr. PALMER said it had been remarked by the hon. member for Fassifern that it was part of the functions of the Opposition to cut down the Estimates. How could that be when the Government brought down the Estimates and refused to allow them to be reduced? It was not in the power of the Opposition to reduce them. Again, how was the sum of £1,500 going to meet the expenses connected with advertising electoral rolls for the year 1887-8 when a general election was going to take place?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he believed the Colonial Secretary had thanked him for implying that the papers would not be forthcoming; and if the truth must be confessed, he must say that he had very little faith in the Colonial Secretary or his promise. The vote ought to be postponed until the Committee were in possession of the information. The discussion would, at all events, show other Ministers that it was necessary to be prepared with the information hon. members might reasonably expect when the Estimates were passing through.

The Hon. G. THORN said they were not asked to cut down the Estimates in the present instance; but he could tell the hon. member for Burke that in this colony and the other colonies the Governments had been only too glad to get the Opposition to cut down their Estimates.

Mr. MORGAN said he thought the Committee were entitled to the information as to the expenditure of the money in question.

The PREMIER: It is promised.

Mr. MORGAN said he was coming to that. The information had been promised; and if it had not been promised, it might be got by means of a motion for a return giving the particulars. As the information had been promised, he thought the vote might be allowed to go; but before it was passed he wished to draw the Colonial Secretary's attention to the fact that the expenditure of which they had heard so much had not been stopped, but was still going on in the present financial year. He held in his hand a Brisbane paper of July 15th which contained no less than six columns of those electoral rolls.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What paper?

Mr. MORGAN: The *Evangelical Standard*—the paper that died and was alive again. In the following issue there were eight columns of those advertisements. In the issue of July 15th, the electoral rolls of Enoggera, Bulimba, Moreton, Darling Downs, Bundanba, Fassifern, Aubigny, and Stanley, were advertised; and in the issue of July 22nd those of Darling Downs (three divisions), Aubigny, Bundanba, and so on, were advertised—all rolls of country electorates. He did not blame the Colonial Secretary directly for the expenditure. It was the clerks of petty sessions who incurred it. If those gentlemen involved the country in expenditure of that kind, the Colonial Secretary ought to call upon them to pay it out of their own pockets.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the *Evangelical Standard* was a Brisbane paper, and must get instructions direct from the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN said, not necessarily. He knew how orders for those advertisements were sent in.

Mr. MOREHEAD: You have had them yourself.

Mr. MORGAN said the orders for those advertisements were sent by clerks of petty sessions.

Mr. STEVENSON: Instructed by the Colonial Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN said he did not know that. It was decidedly wrong; that was why he objected to it. If the clerks of petty sessions did not send them on their own responsibility, it ought to be known from whom they had instructions. The expenditure was very serious, and he wished to know where was the necessity for advertising the Darling Downs and Stanley rolls in a Brisbane paper. The local papers ought to have the preference. The Act required that the advertisements should be inserted in some paper generally circulating in the district. What he particularly rose to point out was that the expenditure was still going on; and although they might let the vote for last year go, they ought to call the attention of the Colonial Secretary to the fact that it was continuing.

Mr. BLACK said he was astonished at what they had now ascertained. He thought that after the Colonial Secretary's attention had been drawn to the matter last year it was not likely the mistake—presuming, of course, that it was a mistake—would occur again. The hon. member for Warwick had thrown an entirely new light upon the matter. They now found that that expense was still going on, and that the Estimates were based upon the same figures. He held in his hand a comparative statement of the expenditure of last year in the Colonial Secretary's Department, and found that under the heading "Miscellaneous Services" there was spent no less than £19,204. There had been no information as to how that money was spent. No doubt those subsidies to Brisbane papers came out of that vote. The additional light thrown upon the matter by the hon. member for Warwick justified the Committee in demanding the postponement of the item until the question was thoroughly settled.

Mr. CHUBB said unless the Colonial Secretary was prepared to take the responsibility of those advertisements, the hon. gentleman should give the names of the clerks of petty sessions who ordered the advertisements. He could recollect that before the late Government left office they were charged with subsidising newspapers to an enormous extent in their own interests—so much so that in order to set the matter at rest a return was moved for by the hon. member for Cook, Mr. Hamilton, showing the amount spent in advertising during the last year of their existence. The Premier laid the paper on the table of the House in March, 1884, and it showed that for the year ending December 31, 1883, the total amount spent was £4,315 13s. 6d., all over the colony. In 1885 Mr. Lissner moved for a similar return, which was tabled up to June 30, 1885, and it showed that the expenditure of the previous year in that direction was £10,802 3s. 9d. He did not know whether that expenditure was increasing or not, and he thought they ought to have the information asked for by his side of the Committee.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said that last year he moved for a return of the Government expenditure in advertising, and it amounted to £12,500. It was continually increasing, and he would

now ask the Colonial Secretary, since it was pointed out that foolish and extravagant expenditure in an utterly misdirected and wasteful way was still going on, whether he really expected the Committee to give much credit to any of his assertions after what fell from him on 2nd November last, when he said he would see into the matter and put it right. He never had had a high opinion of the hon. gentleman, and always thought his was a very feeble appointment, and now he was confirmed in his opinion. He considered that proofs of most senile folly on the part of the Colonial Secretary were furnished to the Committee in regard to the waste of public money going on in the direction mentioned.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he thought the hon. member was rather "begging the question." The Colonial Secretary had not told them whether the expenditure was still going on. In regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Warwick, there had been no denial or assertion from the hon. Colonial Secretary; but it would be interesting to know from that hon. gentleman whether the statement was correct or not.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said, of course there had been a certain amount of expense going on.

Mr. PATTISON: An uncertain amount.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said there were the quarterly rolls, so far as the electoral portion was concerned, and there were other things which had to be advertised in the Colonial Secretary's Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD: In the same way as before?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: In the *Evangelical Standard*?

Mr. MOREHEAD said the Colonial Secretary had hardly given them an answer. Had advertising been going on in the same way as last year, at the same rate of expenditure, in the same papers, and by the same authority?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not know in what papers the clerks of petty sessions were advertising the electoral rolls. No advertisements of that kind were given by the Colonial Secretary's Department.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that was the first time he had ever heard of a Colonial Secretary sheltering himself behind clerks of petty sessions. The hon. gentleman either knew or did not know whether the advertising had been done by clerks of petty sessions. If he did know and did not tell the Committee, he was not fit for the position he occupied, and if he did not know he was still the less fit.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he wished to know from the Colonial Secretary if he thought that it was a fair thing that the Darling Downs electoral roll should be published in the *Evangelical Standard*, which was a Brisbane paper, with a very small circulation, he imagined, in the Darling Downs electorate?

Mr. W. BROOKES said the question appeared to him to be passing into an absurdity. Of all men in the Committee the leader of the Opposition ought to know very well that after what passed last session it was quite certain that no such leakage was taking place now.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: But it is.

Mr. W. BROOKES: What a faculty for misunderstanding those gentlemen must have! It was really monstrous. He thought the question should be allowed to quietly rest. The junior member for Cook had spoken of the *Evangelical Standard*. He (Mr. Brookes) did not know much about that paper—he knew that it had died.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: It has resurrected.

Mr. MURPHY: It always comes to life when any electoral rolls are to be published.

Mr. BROOKES said he did not know whether it was living or not; but he thought the information of the hon. member for Cook was rather gratuitous, and certainly of no importance, when he told the Committee that the *Evangelical Standard* had no influence with the electors on the Darling Downs.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: I said it did not circulate on the Darling Downs.

Mr. BROOKES said that the hon. member spoke so glibly that he forgot what he said. He might be mistaken, but he understood the hon. member to say that the *Evangelical Standard* had no influence upon the electors of the Darling Downs. The hon. gentleman was quite right when he said it did not circulate in that district. He happened to be right that time by accident. The hon. gentleman never read that paper himself, although it would have been much better for him if he had.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: I have been a constant reader.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Do you read it yourself?

Mr. BROOKES said all the information would be laid before them to-morrow, and he took the opportunity of saying that he knew the Colonial Secretary would keep his promise.

Mr. STEVENSON: He promised it last year.

Mr. BROOKES said it had been stated by the Premier that that item of £3,500 would be fully discussed when they were considering the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: We would like it a little sooner.

Mr. BROOKES said there was no other interpretation to put upon the matter than that hon. members on the other side, with the assistance of the junior member for Cook, were distinctly wasting the time of the Committee.

Mr. NORTON said he thought that the Opposition were quite right, and he thought they had a right to be guided by their own opinions, and not by those of the hon. junior member for North Brisbane. That hon. member seemed to have the faculty of speaking as if he were a member of the Government—as if he were the fifth wheel. He did not know whether the hon. member wished to be made Colonial Treasurer or not, but he appeared to be qualifying himself for that position. He (Mr. Norton) wished to point to a remark which fell from the Premier when he made his Financial Statement, and in connection with that he would refer to what had fallen from the Colonial Secretary that night. The hon. gentleman pointed out that he had discovered recently that some of the officers holding appointments in the Civil Service had been taking upon themselves to expend money without Ministerial authority, and that he was going to stop that. Notwithstanding what the Premier had said, the Colonial Secretary had told them that evening that the clerks of petty sessions had taken upon themselves to expend money without Ministerial sanction. He presumed that if authority for that expenditure came from anyone it should come from the Colonial Secretary, but that gentleman did not seem to think that authority had been given by him. From whom, then, had it come? It was iniquitous that that expenditure was going on without any control on the part of the Ministry. The clerks of petty sessions had no authority

under the Act to take any action without the authority of the Colonial Secretary, and should not proceed without instructions from him. It was quite right, of course, that those advertisements should appear, but it was also necessary that the Minister should supervise the actions of the clerks of petty sessions, and know before those advertisements were published, in what papers they were going to be inserted. The Colonial Secretary had not only the right to insist that that should be done, but it was his business to see that it was done. If he had done that he would have been in a position to tell the Committee what expense the clerks of petty sessions were incurring, in what papers the advertisements were appearing, and what was likely to be the cost. He was sure hon. members on his side were doing no more than their duty in emphasising the action of the Government in regard to that matter. It was all very well to say, as one hon. member had said a short time ago, that the business of the Committee was to pass the vote for the present year. So it was; but they could only expect to control the expenditure for the present year by pointing out the maladministration of last year, and the expenditure that had taken place without the authority of the Minister. For that reason he said the members on both sides of the Committee were bound in duty to their constituents to point out all the improper expenditure that had taken place, and to do so in such a manner that Ministers would not forget what had been done; and to do it so that not only their constituents but the whole of the colony should be perfectly well informed of the manner in which that matter of electoral rolls had been neglected.

Mr. WHITE said he must confess he did not at all like the state of affairs as represented by the hon. member for Warwick—that was, the insertion in a Brisbane paper, in July last, of the up-country rolls. If the clerks of petty sessions had the power to insert these lists they should insert them in the local papers. He should like to know who had given those advertisements to Brisbane papers. Was it the clerk of petty sessions in Brisbane, or was it the clerk of petty sessions at Ipswich? He was aware that the Ipswich papers circulated in the Stanley district up to Gatton; beyond Gatton the Too-woomba papers met them; but there were very few people in the electorate who got any Brisbane papers. The lists should certainly be inserted in the local papers, and he considered it a monstrous thing that the lists for Stanley and the Darling Downs should appear in Brisbane papers. It was a complete waste of the public money, and it pained him very much to find that was the case. He felt aggrieved that it should have been allowed to continue.

The Hon. G. THORN said that when he got up some little time before, he had known that the game was still going on, and the hon. member for Warwick had given the proof of it. The Colonial Secretary had told them that he had not authorised the insertion of those advertisements in the *Evangelical Standard*, and he (Mr. Thorn) was not prepared to vote the amount asked for, but would vote for the postponement of the item. Hon. members must not suppose for a moment that the *Evangelical Standard* was a paper not worth supporting. He could tell hon. members that the paper had some influence, and the friends of the Government could never allow it to die, with a general election looming in the distance. When he saw the advertisement in the *Evangelical Standard* he knew it was only done to resurrect it as he might say—and very quickly it was resurrected. There was a chance of getting a lot out of the Government on the eve

of the general election, and in addition to that there were the Government supporters, who generally advertised largely in the *Evangelical Standard*. He was not aware who were the new shareholders, but perhaps some hon. members of the Committee were shareholders. He hoped hon. members of the Opposition would not despise that paper. It had some weight, and when its fiat went forth that a certain candidate was to be supported, whether he was good or bad, he was supported at all hazards. The Colonial Secretary might say yea or nay to the question asked by hon. members on the other side. He (Mr. Thorn) did not believe that any clerk of petty sessions authorised the insertion of the advertisement in the *Evangelical Standard*; he believed the advertisement came from the Colonial Secretary himself. He hoped the hon. member would be able to contradict the statement, and say he did not authorise it; but he (Mr. Thorn) thought the hon. member did authorise it and nobody else.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that, if the hon. the Colonial Secretary did not know, he might get the information from the Under Secretary, who was in the Chamber. That gentleman might know whether the advertisement was put in without the consent of the Colonial Secretary.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Fassifern was under an extraordinary delusion in saying that the *Evangelical Standard* was a great political organ. He (the Premier) had seen the *Evangelical Standard* three or four times during the last few months, and its interest in secular affairs was such that he thought it did not even mention the changes in the Government during that period. As far as he had observed, the paper had entirely ceased to take any interest in worldly matters.

Mr. CHUBB said it might interest hon. members to know the provisions with regard to advertising the electoral rolls. The 29th section of the Act said:—

“Fourteen days’ notice of the sitting of every quarterly registration court shall be given by the electoral registrar by advertisement in some newspaper usually circulating in the district.”

Then the 34th section provided that after the holding of the court the electoral registrar shall make out a correct list and—

“Cause a copy of such list to be published once at least in some newspaper circulating in the district.”

That was intended to apply to some newspaper printed and published in the district where the rolls were prepared; it was not intended to meet the case of a metropolitan newspaper circulating all over the colony. The local paper was intended, although by a stretch of words it might be made to apply to the *Evangelical Standard* or the *Zeitung*. He (Mr. Chubb) had risen to repeat the statement made by the Chief Secretary when making his Financial Statement, when he referred to expenditure incurred by officers without authority. The hon. gentleman said:—

“It is intended to intimate to all the subordinate officers charged with the expenditure of money that for any officer to incur any liability on account of the public service without the previous sanction of the Minister will be taken as conclusive evidence of the incompetency of that officer to fill his position.”

What they wanted to know was whether the advertisements—not for last year, but for the present year—published in the *Evangelical Standard* were published with the sanction of the Minister, or published by the instructions of clerks of petty sessions.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said some of the advertisements had been published by his authority, and it had been the general rule for

the Colonial Secretary to order the extra publication of some of the rolls in papers which were likely to be of service in promulgating the news amongst those who were likely to benefit by it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he would like to know what papers the hon. gentleman had authorised to promulgate the doctrines and the advertisements; he would like him to state the papers that were apparently subsidised. The Government were simply wasting time in trying to get on with the vote before giving the information which the Committee had a perfect right to demand. The Committee would be very weak and foolish if it let the Government go any further with the vote before getting the information.

The PREMIER: What information are you asking for now?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he wanted to know what papers continued to be subsidised, and he wanted the whole of the information before he let the vote through. There was nothing in the Act to justify the Minister in going in for that lavish style of advertising; and how the hon. gentleman could expect to make scapegoats of a few clerks of petty sessions he (Mr. Hill) could not understand. The Committee ought to have the fullest information, not only as to what was spent last year, but as to what expenditure was going on now. They had had only one paper quoted at present, but they would have time to look up some more to-morrow, and the Colonial Secretary would then be able to give a full statement of all that had been supplied with advertisements, and at what cost. The *Evangelical Standard* might have ceased now to take any interest in worldly or political affairs, but it was certainly a very lively electioneering agent at one time. He believed it did not think it had received a due reward from the Government. There was another paper—the antipodes as it were—which was rather badly treated, and it had a considerable circulation throughout the colony. It was a very disreputable paper, he admitted—the *Figaro*.

Mr. DONALDSON: You are its landlord.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was, and he was afraid it would not be able to pay the rent. That paper ought certainly to get some advertisements; it had as much right to them as the *Evangelical Standard*. He would recommend the Colonial Secretary to postpone the vote and go on with some other business.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he must take exception to one remark of the hon. member, that he was trying to make scapegoats of the clerks of petty sessions. He did not want to do anything of the sort, and was perfectly willing to bear whatever blame might attach to him. The bulk of the money spent in advertising was spent in accordance with the law, which directed that the clerks of petty sessions should advertise the rolls.

Mr. STEVENSON asked whether the Colonial Secretary authorised the advertisements this year in the *Evangelical Standard*?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I believe I did—two quarterly rolls.

Mr. STEVENSON said that in that case the clerks of petty sessions could not be to blame. But what was the good of advertising in a paper of that kind? It could not have a very large circulation; indeed, he himself had never even seen it. It was monstrous that such a costly advertisement should appear in a paper which had no circulation to warrant it; and it was monstrous that they should be asked to pass a vote of that kind without some information with regard to it. The information was promised last year, but it was not yet forthcoming. The hon.

gentleman could procure it in two minutes if he liked. The Under Colonial Secretary was sitting in the gallery, and all the Colonial Secretary had to do was to ask him for it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: He cannot give it.

Mr. STEVENSON said he ought to be in a position to give it, and until they got it, hon. members were quite justified in insisting that the consideration of the vote should be postponed. From what had fallen from hon. members on the other side, he believed that they also would support a motion for the postponement of the item.

Mr. DONALDSON said that, when the vote was before the Committee last year, the Committee learnt with surprise the large amount that was spent in advertising the electoral rolls. Indeed the Government did not seem to be aware of that large expenditure until the matter was brought forward by the hon. member for Mackay; and it seemed to come upon them as a surprise. If his memory served him right, the Colonial Secretary said then that the bulk of the expenditure had been incurred through the clerks of petty sessions without consulting him—

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In accordance with the law.

Mr. DONALDSON said that no doubt many of the clerks of petty sessions had exceeded their duties, inasmuch as the rolls were published not only in the papers printed and circulating in the districts, but also in others which were not printed in the districts, and had little or no circulation there. A strong feeling was expressed that obscure papers like *The Planter and Farmer* and the *Evangelical Standard* should be subsidised to such a large amount, and the Colonial Secretary promised that it should not occur again—that he would inform the clerks of petty sessions that in future no advertisements of the rolls were to be inserted in any paper without his consent. That, of course, would not apply to a paper printed and circulating in a district, such as the *Darling Downs*, and which printed the *Darling Downs* roll; the Committee would not have objected to that power being left in the hands of clerks of petty sessions. What the Committee thought and said on that occasion was that to advertise those rolls in obscure papers in Brisbane for the purpose of subsidising them was a monstrous shame. What they wanted to know now was whether the Colonial Secretary had fulfilled the promise he gave to the Committee last year, or had he acted contrary to that promise? He was very sorry to see the hon. gentleman badgered so much.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It does not hurt me.

Mr. DONALDSON: Perhaps the hon. gentleman has forgotten the promise he gave last year?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, I have not.

Mr. DONALDSON said that in that case he would ask the hon. gentleman whether all the advertisements that had appeared in papers not printed in the district had been inserted with his consent? If they had, he must take the responsibility of incurring that enormous expenditure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied that the Under Colonial Secretary brought him a list of papers, which, with him, he went through, and selected those which were likely to be most useful to be advertised in. Those were the papers to which the clerks of petty sessions were authorised to send the electoral rolls. He had himself personally authorised the insertion of two quarterly rolls in the *Evangelical Standard*.

Mr. MOREHEAD said the quarterly rolls seemed to be the daily bread of the *Evangelical Standard*. He wished to point out that he was not in error in an earlier part of the debate, in saying that the *Evangelical Standard* had died. He held in his hand the number of that paper for August 26th, in which it was stated, "From this date the Queensland *Evangelical Standard* ceases to be." That was in August: the rolls had ceased in July. But in September they apparently saw rolls ahead, for on the 2nd September they made a fresh start—they rolled up again—and gave as a reason for the reappearance of the paper in an address to their readers—of whom unfortunately, up to the present time, he had not been one—that they saw plunder in the distance, and had therefore come out again.

Mr. GRIMES said that some hon. members who had taken part in the debate had exhibited a large amount of jealousy. One hon. member was not satisfied because a paper which he was interested in did not receive so large a share of the Government advertisements as certain other papers. He (Mr. Grimes) was not a shareholder in the *Evangelical Standard*, nor did he think it necessary to stand up in support of it—the paper was quite able to defend itself—but he might say that it was just as worthy to receive a share of the Government advertisements as any other paper. The whole debate seemed to have arisen because certain papers which hon. members considered should be supported had not received the amount of support they expected.

Mr. DONALDSON: Nonsense!

Mr. GRIMES said one hon. member complained that *Figaro* did not receive sufficient support, and said that if it did, it would be able to pay its rent more promptly. That was plainly expressed by the hon. member for Cook, who seemed afraid that he would not get his rent unless the Government gave more advertisements to that paper. That was about the bottom of the whole discussion, and the sooner they dropped it and went on with the business the better.

Mr. DONALDSON said the hon. gentleman was completely mistaken in his ideas. A great number of members in that Chamber were not connected with papers at all, and he did not think there had been any expressions that would indicate a feeling of jealousy with regard to the matter. The question was that a large amount of expenditure had taken place uselessly; that there was no necessity for it, and that the bulk of the advertisements had appeared in obscure papers. He took an interest in the subject, but he had no interest in any newspaper; nor did he care whether advertisements were inserted in papers outside the district or not. But he thought it would be quite sufficient if the rolls were published in the papers published in the district without going beyond it. That was the only idea he had on the subject. As to the suggestion of jealousy, he did not think that half-a-dozen members in the Chamber were sufficiently interested to be jealous.

Mr. MURPHY said, with reference to the speech of the hon. member who had just sat down on the other side, in all probability the paper referred to circulated in his constituency. There was not so much disinterestedness about his speech after all. The hon. member was connected with that paper.

Mr. GRIMES: No.

Mr. MURPHY: It circulated in his district, therefore he had got an interest in it.

Mr. DONALDSON rose to a point of order. Was it parliamentary to impute motives to an hon. member?

The CHAIRMAN said an hon. member was not justified in imputing motives to another hon. member.

Mr. MURPHY said he did not think he was imputing motives in saying that that journal circulated in the hon. member's district, and therefore he had an interest in it. He did not say that he had a share in it, but in all probability it was to his interest to support that paper. He (Mr. Murphy) was in no way connected with any newspaper, but still he was anxious to find out the items of the vote they were now asked to pass. Exactly the same answer was made last year, when that vote was under discussion, that had been made that night. Why in the meantime had the Colonial Secretary not made the inquiries he promised last year to make? He was reported in *Hansard* of 1886, page 1502, to have said:—

"There are some accounts, such as that of *The Planter and Farmer*, which will be very minutely scrutinised, and I hear that they can be cut down considerably on account of some method in which the advertisements have been inserted in the paper."

Why had they not been cut down; why did the same or an increased amount appear on the Estimates if they were cut down last year or this year? The Committee were promised that, and that promise had not been carried out. They had no more information now than they had last year. It had been promised but was not forthcoming, and he thought if they kept on discussing the matter all night they would be perfectly justified in doing so, unless the Premier agreed to postpone the item. He did not think they ought to allow any business to go on unless the Premier would do that.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. H. Jordan) said the hon. member for Warrego had put the question in a very clear and distinct light. He had asked the Colonial Secretary distinctly to explain whether he had taken that matter under his own control, and to that he had received a distinct answer. The Colonial Secretary stated that he had taken the matter of the publication of the rolls by the clerks of petty sessions under his own control, and given directions as to the papers in which the rolls were to be published. Nothing could be clearer than that. The hon. gentleman had answered fully as far as his memory served him. There was, therefore, no longer any uncertainty as to what was being done. That question was raised by the hon. member for Warrego, who insisted upon knowing what was being done now; and, that having been clearly and distinctly answered by the Colonial Secretary, he (Mr. Jordan) thought those who were now opposing the progress of business could have no further excuse for their demand to have the vote postponed.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he did not at all agree with the hon. the Minister for Lands, who, he thought, did not quite grasp the position. Hon. members on his side of the Committee were not opposing the progress of business, but were simply asking to have the vote postponed until they got the information that had been promised by the Colonial Secretary. If the vote were passed now and the returns were laid upon the table to-morrow it would be too late to discuss them in committee. The only way in which it could be done would be to move the adjournment of the debate. He did not think that the Government would in any way be giving way in postponing the vote. The Committee were certainly entitled to the information asked for, and doubly entitled to it considering the strongly expressed opinion and the long debate that took place upon the subject last session. They could easily go on with other business. It was not at all unusual to postpone a vote when full

information was not in the possession of hon. members respecting it. At present the hands of hon. members were practically tied in discussing the question until they got full particulars of the expenditure, which the hon. the Colonial Secretary had in no way refused to give. He was sure that it would tend to the progress of business if they postponed the vote now and resumed it to-morrow, when they had got the information they required. There would be no loss of time.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said the Colonial Secretary had already promised to give the information asked for to-morrow afternoon, and the Committee must accept that promise. They could not for a moment suppose that it would not be fulfilled. The hon. member for Barcoo, Mr. Murphy, had stated just now—he thought the hon. member's memory must have failed him—that the Colonial Secretary had promised last year to go into the question of the large amount of money that was paid to *The Planter and Farmer*, and that that promise had not been fulfilled; whereas the Colonial Secretary had stated that he had gone minutely into the charges made by that paper, and that they had been largely cut down. He also stated that his memory did not serve him to give the exact figures, but he would be prepared to lay the statement on the table to-morrow. Again and again his hon. colleague had promised that he would supply the information demanded—and very properly demanded, he (Mr. Jordan) must admit that—to-morrow. It was impossible for him to do so that night, because he had not the figures. Neither was the Under Secretary, who was in the gallery, able to supply them; he must go and look for them. No doubt he could find them readily, but that could not be done until to-morrow. Therefore, where was the reason for postponing the item? He could not see it.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that the hon. gentleman had given a very strong reason for the postponement. He (Mr. Morehead) was sure that no member doubted that the Colonial Secretary would carry out the promise he had made, but if they allowed the vote to go now and the return was laid upon the table to-morrow it would, for all practical purposes, be too late for discussion. As he had said before, it could only then be discussed under motion for the adjournment of the House. Therefore, practically, the Minister for Lands held the same opinion that he did. No harm could be done by postponing the vote. That was all they asked, and until they got the information they desired they were perfectly justified in doing so. It was a matter involving a large expenditure.

The PREMIER said the question now under discussion was whether the sum of £1,500 should be voted for advertising for the present financial year, and hon. members on the other side said they would not consider that question until the Colonial Secretary produced a return asked for that afternoon.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: Last year.

The PREMIER said that was the exact position the Committee were in. They were asked to vote £1,500 for the current year and no one took exception to it; but hon. members said they wanted a return which would not have been asked for if they had not known that it could not be given, and they were stopping the business because it was not given. He had seen that done before. He thought that was about the sixth time he had seen it done, but it was always recognised as an extremely unfair proceeding. Any member could ask a Minister for information which could not be furnished at the moment, without giving a single previous intimation on the subject,



but that was recognised as an extremely unfair thing to do. Hon. members were now asking that the vote should be postponed, not till to-morrow, but until the end of the Estimates; which was practically the same period as the Supplementary Estimates would come on. The matter would then be very properly under discussion, because the sum expended on the advertisements, with regard to which they wanted information, would have to be submitted to the Committee for their approval, yet hon. members were asking them to postpone that item till the same period.

Mr. STEVENSON said he thought the Premier and Minister for Lands were trying to mislead the Committee. The vote they had to do with now had reference to information which was promised last year.

Mr. MOREHEAD : On the 2nd of November.

Mr. STEVENSON : And they had not got it yet. The Minister for Lands said there was only one paper—*The Planter and Farmer*—about which the Colonial Secretary had promised them information.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said he wished to correct the hon. member. He did not say there was only one paper, but that the hon. member for Barcoo had stated that the Colonial Secretary did not give the answer which he promised to give last session about the enormous amount of money expended on one paper. He did not say there were no other papers in question, but simply stated that the hon. member was mistaken, because the Colonial Secretary had distinctly intimated that he had gone very carefully into the advertisements in that particular paper and had cut down the amount.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL : He did not tell us to what amount he cut it down.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS said that would, of course, be done in the paper the Colonial Secretary would lay on the table to-morrow.

Mr. STEVENSON said he would read what they were promised by the Colonial Secretary. After some remarks by the hon. member for Mackay, the hon. gentleman said :—

" Since I last addressed the House on this subject last week I have received a report from the Government Printer as to the probable cost of advertising the quarterly electoral rolls for this year, but I have not yet been able to ascertain the authorities upon which the advertisements were inserted in the different papers. That can only be obtained when the vouchers are sent in, and that will be very shortly, I believe. The total cost of advertising in the whole colony, the Government Printer has told me, will be something under £3,000.

" The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN : The North will not get much of that.

" The COLONIAL SECRETARY : That is all I know about the matter at the present time. There are some accounts, such as that of *The Planter and Farmer*, which will be very minutely scrutinised, and I hear they can be cut down considerably on account of some method in which the advertisements have been inserted in the paper.

" Mr. BLACK : The account for that journal is £1,050 at present.

" Mr. NORTON : Who authorised all the insertions?

" The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I cannot say now, but when the vouchers come in the authorities for the expenditure will accompany them, and until then I cannot give the information. The bulk of the advertisements were certainly authorised by the clerks of petty sessions under the Act.

" The Hon. J. M. MACROSSAN : The Act says the advertisements must be inserted in one paper.

" The COLONIAL SECRETARY : As far as I can ascertain the bulk of them have been authorised by clerks of petty sessions, and I believe there is one place at the least where the clerk of petty sessions has put them in two papers. But, as I have already intimated, until the vouchers come in it cannot be ascertained who authorised the insertion of the advertisements. The Government Printer informs me that he thinks the cost for

the whole colony will be under £3,000, and that probably it will be less by cutting down some items which he thinks can be justly cut down. Of course the Government Printer has arrived at his estimate in the same manner as the hon. member for Mackay has arrived at his—namely, by measuring the advertisements, in the different newspapers sent to his office, according to law. When the vouchers come in the whole thing will be more fully considered, and it will be explained who gave the authority. I know for certain that nearly two-thirds of the whole have been authorised by clerks of petty sessions. It is very well known to hon. members that there has been great activity indeed in collecting names for the roll this year, and in consequence of that the advertisements have assumed a larger size than the Government anticipated they would assume."

He considered that after those remarks made by the Colonial Secretary they certainly might expect that the hon. gentleman would be in a position now to give them the information promised, but he was not and could not even tell the Committee who authorised the insertion of the advertisements in the papers. The hon. gentleman said that he took the responsibility for some of them, as, for instance, the advertisement in the *Evangelical Standard*; but he did not tell the Committee who was responsible for the others. He (Mr. Stevenson) thought the Colonial Secretary ought to be responsible for the whole lot, and considering that he promised to investigate the matter and give them the information, he maintained that the hon. gentleman should have been able to obtain it in twelve months. But the hon. gentleman was not able to give it now, as he ought to have been able to do, and that was a very good reason why the Committee should postpone the vote until they got the information. If they were satisfied with it the vote would no doubt be passed, but he certainly thought it ought not to be gone on with until they knew what was the amount paid for the advertisements, and who authorised them. In his opinion the Colonial Secretary should be responsible for the whole, and not blame anyone.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I do not blame anybody.

Mr. STEVENSON said the hon. gentleman ought to be able to give them all the facts to show that he was responsible, and not blame any official. He thought the hon. gentleman should withdraw the vote for the present.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the Premier stated that that was a very unfair way of doing things, and of criticising a vote of that kind. He said that they were asking for information which they had no right to expect the Colonial Secretary to give. He (Mr. Lumley Hill) maintained that they had every right to get the information they asked for.

The PREMIER : The hon. member has a perfect right to ask for the information, but he has no right to expect it at a moment's notice.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said they asked for a good deal and did not get it. He did not think that it would do the Colonial Secretary any harm to postpone the vote until the Supplementary Estimates came on. Nor did he think they were likely to do any business that night if the hon. gentleman persisted in pushing on that vote. He thought that after the reasonable demand which had been made for information, not only the Opposition, but independent members on the Government benches, were perfectly right in putting their foot down and refusing to pass the vote until they got that information. Ten minutes would have got it. In the interval at tea-time the Colonial Secretary could have got the information if he had liked. If the Premier or the Colonial Secretary thought they were going to pass their Estimates through the House like ukases of the Czar they were very much mistaken. If they did not extend the ordinary courtesy that

was extended on such occasions they would find considerable difficulty in getting through the Estimates. He thought they should be establishing a bad precedent if they passed the Estimates first and waited to get the information afterwards. The Committee would go very much astray from its duties if it bowed down to that kind of interpretation of parliamentary usage. Both the Chief Secretary and the Colonial Secretary must understand that it was useful and necessary to give proper information, and it was absurd that they should endeavour to dictate to hon. members. The action of the hon. gentlemen amounted to nothing else but dictation.

The PREMIER said the Government not only were willing but desired that there should be criticism. They invited the fullest criticism. He often wished that there was fuller criticism of items. The hon. member said the Government ought to extend courtesy to the Committee. The Government asked in return that hon. members should extend courtesy to the Ministry. His hon. colleague had been treated with the grossest discourtesy, and by no one more than by the hon. member who had just sat down. He had been treated with the grossest discourtesy by the hon. member for Cook. He thought the Government were entitled to expect ordinary courtesy, and they certainly wished to show it. He had pointed out that the information insisted upon was information that could not possibly be given, and moreover it was not strictly relevant to the matter before the Committee. The Government would give that information or any other information, but it was just as reasonable to insist upon their giving it at a moment's notice as it would be to ask on the next item of the Estimates for full particulars as to postage, and incidental expenses, and how much was spent on postage in each day of the year.

Mr. MOREHEAD said, as far as the charge of discourtesy was concerned, the Premier himself was not free from the charge of being discourteous to the hon. member for Blackall. He would now suggest that the items be taken seriatim, and those portions of the vote which were objected to, be held over. The salaries could be voted, and that objectionable item postponed until the Supplementary Estimates came on. He thought that would meet the case if the hon. gentleman could see his way to adopt the suggestion.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said the Chief Secretary accused him of the grossest discourtesy towards the Colonial Secretary. All that his discourtesy amounted to was that he declined to accept for gospel what the Colonial Secretary said. He had every reason to discredit, or not to implicitly believe, what the hon. gentleman had said. They were promised the information ten and a-half months ago and had not yet got it. They were entitled to ask for it and had a right to get it, and he said they would be flinching from the duties which they took upon themselves as representatives of the people if they allowed such a vote to pass without the fullest information being supplied.

Mr. ADAMS said he was extremely sorry to think that they were losing the time of the country in that manner. They had been told that they were trying to obstruct, but if there was any obstruction it came from the Government side of the Committee. The members of the Opposition asked that a particular item should be postponed, but the Chief Secretary refused, and said it would have to be put off until the end of the Estimates. He could not see that they were likely to pass the vote that night, and he would suggest that they adjourn

for the night and bring it on the first thing to-morrow. It had been said by one hon. member that there was a jealousy between the different newspapers and their proprietors, but he did not think that could be the case in any way. He was sure he was not interested in any of the papers, but it had been acknowledged that the advertisements were inserted in papers that did not circulate in the districts. Last year the whole matter was thrashed out, and it was promised then that the information should be laid on the table of the House. Now, taking into consideration that some considerable time had elapsed, he thought the papers should have been handed round to hon. members at the opening of the session. They were not dealing altogether with what was done last year. Last year it was pointed out forcibly that too much money was being spent, and yet this year the same thing appeared to be going on, and he thought hon. members were entitled to know what had been spent. The Colonial Secretary had said last year that the expenditure had been incurred by the clerks of petty sessions, and that he never knew anything about it until he saw the advertisements in print; but he (Mr. Adams) thought that for the future the Colonial Secretary should take every care to see that nothing was published without his authority. When they saw that some of the electoral rolls were published six, seven, eight, and nine times in different papers he thought it was high time for the Government to make a stand; particularly when the law only required that they should be published once in a paper circulating in the district. He agreed with the statement that it would have been far better if those rolls had not been published in so many papers, and if the money was spent in giving greater publicity to Government land sales. He had pointed that out last year, and was perfectly convinced that Government land had been sacrificed for want of sufficient publicity being given to the sale of it. As they were not likely to pass the vote that night, if the Colonial Secretary was not prepared to postpone it, the best thing he could do was to move the Chairman out of the chair.

Mr. NORTON said the Premier complained of the delay that had taken place in discussing that question, but one would think that what had been said about it last year would have been sufficient to prevent that kind of expenditure being incurred again. But he found in the *Evangelical Standard* of the 15th July last a list of names in the electoral districts of Enoggera, Bulimba, Moreton, Oxley, Darling Downs, Rosewood, Bundamba, Fassifern, Aubigny, and Stanley. All those were published in the *Evangelical Standard* of the 15th July last; and on the 22nd July last they found names in the divisions of Warwick, Toowoomba, Ipswich, Gatton, and Bundamba. Who saw the *Evangelical Standard*? It was not a paper in which business men usually published advertisements they wished to have circulated all over the colony. He asked why, in the name of fortune, those names connected with the electorate of Warwick should be published in that paper? Could the hon. gentleman wonder, when that sort of thing was repeated in that glaring way, that hon. members should take up time in discussing it?

The PREMIER: It is not taken up with that question at all, but in asking for information which they know they cannot get.

Mr. NORTON said the whole time was taken up in discussing that question of the unnecessary waste of money in the publication of advertisements which were of no use whatever. The time had come in the history of the colony when it was incumbent upon the Opposition—if the Government would not do it—to see that the

expenditure was not abnormally increased. The expenditure had been increasing at an enormous rate since the present Government were in office, and if they would not do anything to check the expenditure they might depend upon it that if the Opposition got a fair opportunity they would not only take care to check expenditure, but to publish throughout the colony what the Government were doing, and so leading to the deficit which was now so serious a check to their progress. It was that wasteful expenditure that necessitated the land tax; and the Committee were right in making an attempt to check it, and in trying to find out how it occurred. He presumed the advertisements he had referred to were published in the *Standard* with the authority of the Colonial Secretary, and he would like that hon. gentleman to say what benefit the electors in those remote districts obtained from the publication of their names in that paper. The hon. gentleman could give no satisfactory answer to that; and he (Mr. Norton) said it was disgraceful that the public money should be wasted in that way.

Mr. MOREHEAD said if the hon. gentleman leading the Government would not accept the proposal he made, and which he thought was a very reasonable one, to take the items *seriatim*, and postpone that one item upon which information was asked, there was no other alternative left him but to move the postponement of the vote.

Question—That the vote be postponed—put.

The PREMIER said he had pointed out just now that the suggestion to postpone the vote involved the postponement to the end of the Estimates.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no harm in that.

The PREMIER said, of course, there was no harm in it. Hon. members on the other side would be satisfied if they could postpone the vote, and, by acting in a most unusual and discourteous manner, succeed in embarrassing the Government. That was the advantage to be gained by it. As he had already stated many times, had the request been made for information which the Colonial Secretary might reasonably be expected to furnish at a moment's notice, hon. members would be perfectly right in insisting that it should be furnished before the vote was passed. The information asked for that evening had never been asked for before, and it had never been promised before in the form in which it was asked; and therefore to accept the position as proposed would be to admit the propriety of action which he said was grossly improper and discourteous and most unreasonable. He therefore could not consent to anything which would admit the propriety of action which he considered to be improper. He preferred that hon. members who took up such an unreasonable position should have the satisfaction and responsibility of preventing any business being done that evening. He had no objection to that, if that was the position they took up. It had been said distinctly that that vote would not go through until the Colonial Secretary gave the Committee that information, which, of course, he could not give them that evening. If that course of action was to be recognised as a principle to be followed in future, any hon. member would be entitled to take up the same position, and no business could be got through at all. They might take any page of the Estimates, and a member might get up and say, "I must have this information to-night." It would be no use for the Minister in charge of the department to

state that he had the information in his department, but had not got it with him in the House, but would lay it before the Committee to-morrow; the answer would be as it had been that night—"We will not go any further until we get that information." That was one of the simplest modes of obstruction. Such a thing had been done before. He remembered a case where one hon. member had refused to allow the Stores vote to go through until all the vouchers were produced for the whole year. That had been done, and was successful, and it could always be done if any member was unreasonable enough and unfair enough to take up that position. Take the case of the Gaols vote. There was an item there for provisions and incidentals, and any member might get up and ask how much was spent for provisions in each gaol; and from the tone which had been adopted by some hon. members that night, they would probably say, "Until that information is given this vote shall not go any further."

Mr. PATTISON: Quite so. I say so again.

The PREMIER said that was a sort of thing any member with sufficiently little regard for his own dignity, and for the dignity of that Chamber, might do. Of course, the Opposition could obstruct the Estimates, but he was not for that reason going to concede that they were right in the position they took up, which he would be doing if he acceded to the request made by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he might as well remind the Premier of the circumstances surrounding the vote. When it was introduced it was by a mere accident, on account of something said by the hon. member for Port Curtis, that the discovery was made that the vote for last year had been exceeded. After that it was found that a definite promise was made ten months ago by the Colonial Secretary to furnish certain returns.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. MOREHEAD said that his idea of a promise and that of the hon. gentleman opposite must differ very much indeed. A promise made in Parliament appeared not to have the same sequence as a promise made outside, according to the hon. gentleman. The Premier talked about the Opposition having wasted time; but he denied that *in toto*. They had given no factious opposition; he had even suggested a way out of the difficulty in order that they might get on with business. The information should be supplied to the Committee, and not to the House, as would be the case if the promise of the Colonial Secretary were accepted.

The PREMIER said he had been looking through the speech made by the Colonial Secretary last year, in which he was said to have made a promise; but he could not find it.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL: Page 1502.

The PREMIER said he had read that speech carefully. The hon. gentleman said that when the vouchers came in the whole thing would be more fully considered; and that the Government Printer thought the cost for the whole colony would be under £3,000; and that when the vouchers came in, the authorities for the expenditure of the money would accompany them, but until then he could not give the information. He (the Premier) did not see that any promise was made to supply a return of all those vouchers.

Mr. STEVENSON said that was a lawyer's quibble. The Colonial Secretary said last year:—

"There are some accounts, such as that of *The Planter and Farmer*, which will be very minutely scrutinised, and I hear that they can be cut down very considerably on account of some method in which the advertisements have been inserted in the paper."

If the hon. gentleman scrutinised them as he promised surely he could give the result of that scrutiny. It was pure quibbling on the part of the Premier to say that no promise was made. The Colonial Secretary also said last year that until the vouchers came in it could not be ascertained who authorised the insertion of the advertisements; and that led hon. members to believe that he would find out who did authorise their insertion. Surely that was as good as a promise, and the information ought to be given now after the lapse of ten months and a-half. He was satisfied that the Colonial Secretary himself would not take advantage of the quibble raised by the Chief Secretary, and that if he had the information—which he believed the hon. gentleman had never taken the trouble to get—he would give it to the Committee now. He forgot all about the promises he made, or he was too lazy and too little interested in the matter to take any trouble about it at all. Therefore he had not the information and could not give it to the Committee. They had a right to get information now that had been promised ten and a-half months ago.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he thought the promise was read by the Premier himself. It was an inferential promise, if not a verbal promise, and they ought to have the information before they passed the vote. They had a right to demand it.

The CHAIRMAN: I may point out that the question before the Committee—

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he was quite within his rights in addressing the Committee.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Chair!

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said hon. gentlemen were calling out "Chair." The Chairman rose before he (Mr. Hill) sat down, therefore he was still in possession of the floor.

Mr. FOXTON said he rose to a point of order to ask whether the hon. gentleman was in order in continuing to address the Committee after the Chairman had risen.

The CHAIRMAN: I did not rise to stop the hon. gentleman. I merely thought I might call his attention to the fact that the question before the Committee is the postponement of the vote before it. The hon. member is at perfect liberty to speak; but it struck me that the hon. member had forgotten what the question was.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he had not forgotten the question before the Committee. He knew that he was in order, and within his rights in addressing them. If he had not been in order he should have bowed to the Chairman's ruling at once. He wished to place his views upon record, and should certainly vote for the postponement of the vote, and proceed to consider then what should be done afterwards.

Mr. DICKSON said he had taken no part in the discussion, because the Estimates bore his name, and he was, therefore, bound to support them; but seeing that they had wasted the whole evening in discussing the item before them, and hon. members were asking for information, he would suggest to the Premier a course that would enable the Estimates to be pursued without any interruption. It would be unfortunate to postpone the vote, because it would place it in the position that it would have to be discussed after the whole of the Estimates had been gone through. Therefore, at that late period of the evening, it would be better to postpone the vote until to-morrow, at which time the Colonial Secretary would be able to come down with the information which hon. members desired to possess. They

would afterwards be able to proceed with the Estimates in due course. He merely offered the suggestion for the consideration of the Premier with a view to preventing any interruption in the ordinary course of the Estimates.

The PREMIER said if hon. members had wished to waste the whole evening they could have the satisfaction of knowing that they had done so. The whole evening had been practically wasted, but if he had given way and agreed to the postponement of the item he would have set a most dangerous precedent. It was most undesirable and a most unreasonable request. He moved that the Chairman leave the chair and report no progress.

Mr. MOREHEAD said he took exception to what had fallen from the hon. the Premier. There had been no obstruction, at any rate on the part of the Opposition. A very strong supporter of the Government, the junior member for Cook, was the only member who threatened obstruction. Two or three times he had asked the Premier to take the vote as far down as the item under dispute, nor would any member on the Opposition side have objected. During the last hour he had tried to induce the Premier to adopt that course.

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman avoided the question. He took exception to the postponement of the item, because it was obstructed on the ground only that a Minister at the moment did not give information which in the nature of things he could not give. No Ministry could possibly take their Estimates through the Committee if such requests were made. As for obstruction, it had been as plain a case of obstruction as he ever saw.

Mr. MOREHEAD: By whom?

The PREMIER said the Opposition and the hon. member for Cook determined to obstruct the vote. It was quite plain, and it was threatened immediately after 7 o'clock.

Mr. STEVENSON said he supposed the real reason why the Premier had "caved in" was because his "whip" had gone round, and found they could not carry the vote. He noticed that the "whip" had been very busy lately.

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said he wished to say a word about being made a scapegoat of for his side of the Committee. There were three other hon. members among the Government supporters who had spoken upon the question—namely, the hon. member for Stanley (Mr. White), the hon. member for Warwick, and the hon. member for Fassfern. They objected to the vote in the shape it was until they received certain information. He did not see why he should be branded and ear-marked as the only deserter from the true fold over the business. The information asked for was very necessary, and when they had received it he should be willing and ready to assist the Government in getting their Estimates through.

The PREMIER: In this way?

Mr. LUMLEY HILL said they wanted to have that extravagant expenditure accounted for, and to know where the money was to come from to make both ends meet. If they were to pass the Estimates through on the mere mandate of the Premier, without any criticism or any objection, how were they ever to get into any better position than they were in at present? He thought that what had been done that night had been of great use to the colony, and that the colony would appreciate the efforts of those members of the Assembly, in its proper light, who had been anxious to have a thorough investigation into the way in which the money went.

The PREMIER said that in order to facilitate further investigation into the way the money went, and at the same time to shorten the length of the session, hon. members who wanted statistical returns should give at least twenty-four hours' notice to the Minister in charge. He hoped hon. members who wanted such information would give the Minister notice the day beforehand.

Mr. SALKELD said he had been about to make a similar remark to that which had fallen from the Premier. Hon. members who wanted information might indicate beforehand what return they would like, so as to avoid another hitch. They should go all through the Estimates and indicate what extraordinary information they wanted; that would facilitate business very much.

Mr. BLACK said that, in order that there might be no doubts on the matter, he would inform the Colonial Secretary that, in addition to the expenditure for advertising the electoral rolls last year, he would like to be furnished with particulars of the advertisements in July last which had been referred to. They had been referred to especially in connection with the *Evangelical Standard*, but it was quite possible that on inquiry they would find that a number of other papers had been advertised in in the same reckless manner.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Do you mean up to June last?

Mr. BLACK: Up to the present time—all the information the hon. member can give us to-morrow.

Mr. MOREHEAD: Mr. Fraser,—I think I had better withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. MURPHY said he would ask the hon. the Colonial Secretary if he would be prepared with all the information the department was in possession of with regard to other items of the Estimates; otherwise there would be no end to the matter. If they got no further information on other matters—Defence, for instance—than the hon. member had been able to give them upon that one, he did not see how they were ever to get forward with the Estimates. He hoped the hon. member would come down fully prepared to-morrow, not as he had come that night, after having had twelve months' notice of what was required. The Committee would require information on a number of other items, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would be prepared to give all the information they were likely to require.

Mr. NORTON said that when the Estimates were before the Committee last year the members on the Opposition side dealt very kindly with the Colonial Secretary because he was new in office; but the hon. gentleman must not expect, after having been there for a long time, that hon. members would let him off so easily if he were not prepared with information which they might choose to ask for, and which they had a right to expect. That was just a friendly hint to the hon. member that he had better come down to-morrow prepared with all the information possible, because it was just as well he should understand that he was let off last session because he was not expected to have the information then that he was expected to have now.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY said he wished to express his thanks to the hon. member for his past kindness. He was very much obliged to the hon. member. He was not aware of the fact before.

Question—That the Chairman leave the chair, report no progress, and ask leave to sit again—put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported no progress, and obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. It is proposed to put Supply at the top of the paper to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at three minutes to 10 o'clock.