

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

MONDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 1889

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 23 September, 1889.

Queensland Executors, Trustees, and Agency Company, Limited, Bill—third reading.—Stafford Brothers Railway Bill—third reading.—Drew Pension Bill—first reading.—Granville and Burnett Bridges Bill—second reading.—Discases in Sheep Act Amendment Bill—second reading.—Supply—resumption of committee.—Adjournment.

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

QUEENSLAND EXECUTORS, TRUSTEES AND AGENCY COMPANY, LIMITED, BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of the HON. C. POWERS, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council, for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

STAFFORD BROTHERS RAILWAY BILL.

THIRD READING.

On the motion of Mr. SMYTH, this Bill was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council, for their concurrence, by message in the usual form.

DREW PENSION BILL.

On the motion of the PREMIER (Hon. B. D. Morehead), the House, in Committee of the Whole, affirmed the desirability of introducing a Bill to make special provision with respect to the retiring allowance of William Leworthy Good Drew, Esq., Auditor-General of Queensland, in the event of his being appointed to the office of chairman of the Civil Service Board.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported the resolution, and the report was adopted.

FIRST READING.

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

GRANVILLE AND BURNETT BRIDGES BILL.

SECOND READING.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS (Hon. J. M. Macrossan) said: Mr. Speaker,—It will be within the recollection of hon. members that a Treasury Bills Bill was introduced and passed in this House, under which a certain sum was put down for certain bridges; one bridge over the Mary River, and one over the Burnett River; but it has been found necessary to pass an Act of Parliament to legalise the transaction. I think the amount stated in the Treasury Bills Act was £45,000 for the Burnett River Bridge, and for the bridge over the Mary River I think the amount stated was £40,000. This Bill is for the purpose of legalising the transaction, and it provides in the first place for a bridge over the Mary River, to be called the Granville Bridge, at a site which has been selected by the local authorities and the Government Engineer of Bridges. No doubt the members for the district will know more about the site than I do. The site selected, after long and anxious discussion with the local authorities, is one entirely above navigation, connecting Norway street on one side of the river with Cardigan street on the other side. It was selected because it was above navigation, and for other reasons as well.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: On what side of Maryborough is it?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: It is a long way above the present landing place for steamers.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Is it anywhere near the present bridge?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: No; it is a long way above it, several miles above by the river in consequence of the numerous bends. It is above the saw-mills, on the Maryborough side, near Norway street, and connects with Cardigan street on the Granville side. That bridge is to have a clear carriage way of 24 feet wide, with a footway 5 feet wide on each side. The Bill does not provide for a bridge so wide as that; but the Engineer of Bridges thought it better to provide for a bridge of that width. It is to be constructed entirely of iron and steel, the superstructure as well as the cylinders, and the total cost of the bridge, owing to the favourable position of the site, is to be £36,350, or slightly less than the amount provided for in the Treasury Bills Act. The bridge over the Burnett River, which is to be of similar dimensions, will be much more costly. It is to be erected a short distance—some ten or twelve chains—below the proposed railway bridge, connecting the railway between Maryborough and Bundaberg. Unfortunately, owing to the unfavourable site and the length of this bridge, it is going to cost somewhat more than was granted in the Treasury Bills Act. The present Engineer for Bridges, some twelve or eighteen months ago, estimated the cost of the bridge for the Engineer of Railways at £44,716. That is about the amount provided in the Treasury Bills Act; but a great deal of it was to be of wood, and the Engineer of Bridges recommends that the whole of the bridge should be of steel and iron, even the decking, which is provided for in the Mary River bridge as well. Hon. members may think it rather strange to have decking made of iron; but it is fluted somewhat like corrugated iron, and is to be filled in and covered over with tarred metal, so that the surface of the bridge will be the same as an ordinary road; but the actual decking will be of steel. The approaches are very long, and are to be of the same material—that is supposing the local authorities agree to the extra cost. The cost of the whole work, according to the engineer's estimate, is £56,500. I believe from information which I have received as to the amount of traffic going across the Burnett River at this place by steam ferry, that the takings will be more than sufficient to pay the principal and interest back in forty years as provided for by the Act.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is if the tolls are kept on.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: They will have to be kept on, so as to pay the principal and interest. They are to be first-class works under the Joint Local Authorities Act. There is a divisional board on one side of the Mary River, called the Granville Divisional Board, which will act in conjunction with the Municipality of Maryborough; and on the Burnett River there is the Gooburrum Divisional Board, which will act in conjunction with the Municipality of Bundaberg. The Government provides half the funds by loan, or rather by gift, and finds the other half by loan, which is to be paid back.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: About £60,000.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: As I pointed out, there is an increase of £10,000 or £11,000 on one bridge, and a decrease of nearly £4,000 on the other side—that is, on

the estimated cost; there is no telling what the actual cost will be until the bridges are constructed. As far as I am personally concerned, I should prefer using the timber which they have in such abundance in the district, but the Engineer for Bridges thinks another loan would be required for re-decking if timber was used, and for that reason he is of opinion that the iron and steel bridge will be less expensive in the end, although it will be more expensive in the beginning. The Bill provides for the erection of toll gates by the joint local authorities, and the collection of tolls, which of course will be necessary to enable the authorities to raise revenue for the payment of the interest. It also provides for the management of the traffic by the local authorities. I think, Mr. Speaker, there is no necessity for me go any further into the matter, as the House has already affirmed the principles of the Bill by making provision for the cost of three bridges in the Treasury Bills Act. I may say that there was another bridge spoken of at that time which is not provided for by this Bill—the bridge over the Brisbane River. That has been left out, owing to the disagreement between the local authorities as to where the site of the bridge should be; When they come to some agreement, no doubt that will be considered. There are three different designs provided by the Engineer of Bridges for the Burnett bridge. The first, as I mentioned, is estimated to cost about £45,000, having seven 110 feet steel spans over the river, with timber decking, and timber approaches as at first contemplated. The second, marked "B," is the same as to length, but has steel decking, and tarred metal roadway, with steel spans only, the approaches being of timber. The third, marked "C," has steel spans, and metal roadway throughout the entire length of the bridge and approaches, and is estimated to cost £56,500. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Mr. Speaker,—It is rather a singular thing that this Bill which is brought in to authorise and provide for the erection and maintenance of public bridges across the Mary River at Maryborough and Burnett River at Bundaberg, omits to deal with the only one thing that requires legislation at all. It deals with a variety of subjects already provided for by the existing law, but omits to deal with the one important point upon which legislation is necessary, that is to authorise the obstruction of the rivers mentioned as public highways. One would have thought that that question would have been fresh in the minds of hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches, when not very long ago an Act had to be passed authorising the temporary closure of the bridge over the public highway of the Brisbane River. These bridges will be obstructions to navigable rivers—both of them.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: No.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I do not know where the bridge is going to be at Bundaberg. It may be at the rocks.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: It is immediately below the railway bridge.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: I forget where that is to be, but certainly the bridge will be an obstruction to navigation. Large steamers can go up higher than that, and persons who have wharf frontages above the bridge are certainly entitled to make use of those frontages. And I have seen large vessels, three-masted ships, barques, in the Mary River above the proposed site of the bridge. Navigation will be entirely stopped there. I do not offer any objection to the sites for the erection of the bridges at either

of those places, if those who know those sites best and are most interested in the matter desire that they should be erected there; but it will be necessary to legislate very clearly and distinctly on the question, so that no proceedings can be taken against the bridge authorities, whoever they may be, for obstructing the navigation of the river.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The swing in the Maryborough bridge is never opened.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: That is very likely. How long was the swing in the Brisbane bridge left unopened before it was closed four years ago by law, and yet the court issued an injunction to restrain the corporation from closing it because it would obstruct the navigation. It will be necessary to make very clear provision for that in this Bill. The hon. gentleman mentioned that he had made no provision for a bridge over the Brisbane River. It is a pity the hon. gentleman did not deal with this question. Last year a good deal was said about the intention of the Government to provide a bridge over the Brisbane River. This year, perhaps because it is an inconvenient subject, it has been put off till the distant future. There is another bridge I expected to have found dealt with; that is the bridge over the Bremer at Ipswich. It has been talked about for years, and the necessity for it is, I think, universally admitted. I cannot congratulate the Government on this Bill. It is chiefly remarkable for its omissions. As to the provisions it does contain, it makes no difference whether they are passed or not.

The HON. C. POWERS said: Mr. Speaker,—With regard to the remarks of the leader of the Opposition as to the necessity for the insertion of some clause in the Bill relative to the stoppage of navigation above the proposed bridges, I may remark that the closure of the Victoria Bridge at Brisbane only extends to the 31st December, 1890, and that question will have to be attended to before that time arrives. The necessary amendment in the present Bill can be made when the Bill is passing through committee. With regard to the other objections of the hon. gentleman, it must be remembered that the present Local Government Acts provide for municipalities getting loans, and then carrying out the works for which the loans are granted. In this Bill it is necessary to legalise a loan under which the Government carry out those works. The work has been thrust on the local authorities by the legislature under the Local Works Loans Act, and this is a case where, although the local authorities borrow the money, the Government carry out the work. The provisions are such as the joint local authorities ought to be entitled to make.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: They can do it under the Joint Local Authorities Act.

The HON. C. POWERS: Difficulties have already arisen in connection with this particular matter, and I am glad to see that the Government have deemed it necessary to get over those difficulties by specially authorising the joint local authorities to do what is here provided. As I said, the legalisation of the loan is necessary, seeing that the Government are going to carry out the work; the question of the closing of the river to navigation can be dealt with in committee.

Mr. BARLOW said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not presume to criticise the legal provisions of the Bill, but I would respectfully suggest to the Minister for Mines and Works that he might frame a general measure in connection with bridges. I have again to bring under the notice of the House the state of the Bremer Bridge, which, I may say, is in such a scandalous

condition that I fully expect there will be a serious accident there before very long. I notice that for the next meeting of the Ipswich Municipal Council, Alderman Springall, one of the aldermen representing North Ipswich, has given notice of the following motion :—

“That a deputation from this council wait upon the Minister for Mines and Works, urging the necessity of a new bridge to connect North and South Ipswich, as the present structure, being used for rail and vehicular traffic, is dangerous to life and limb.”

That is no exaggeration ; it is dangerous to life and limb, and I think the best thing that could happen would be, when no one was on it, that the bridge should collapse altogether. When I brought this matter before the House, on the second day I had a seat here, I stated that we should not, in any respect, abandon our claims to what we considered to be a new bridge free of expense. I stated on that occasion that the present railway bridge was from the beginning a makeshift, and that if that bridge had not been there—if the diversion of traffic had not taken place round Woodend, necessitating an enormous expense for the Saddler's crossing deviation—Ipswich would in all probability have had a bridge free of expense. Therefore, although the objects of this Bill appear to be in themselves equitable and fair, I cannot, on behalf of the Municipality of Ipswich, without their express sanction, abandon that contention, which I have held since I have been here, that Ipswich has a special case by reason of this bridge having been originally a railway bridge. The present condition of the bridge is one of absolute danger. The memorial I had the pleasure of presenting to the Commissioners with respect to a new station at North Ipswich may have the effect of compelling attention to the matter, for I am certain if something is not done very soon, some very serious accident will happen there. I do not expect the Government to do everything at once ; but I would suggest to the Minister for Mines and Works that he should prepare and bring in a comprehensive measure dealing with bridges of this kind. That would afford a certain amount of elasticity, so that on some bridges tolls might be exacted, and on others not ; and on some bridges one proportion of the cost should be paid by the municipality, and on others a different proportion or none at all. I again earnestly ask the consideration of the Government to the state of affairs at this bridge. The decking is giving way under the constant traffic of horses' feet and vehicles ; and I have no hesitation in saying that in a very short time, unless something is done, it will be entirely and absolutely unsafe. I anticipate that the Ipswich Municipal Council will, at their next meeting, which takes place either to-day or next Monday, appoint a deputation to wait upon the hon. gentleman ; and I ask him to give his earnest consideration to their representations.

Mr. ADAMS said : Mr. Speaker,—With reference to the bridge over the Burnett River, there is no contention as to the keeping open of navigation, simply because there is no navigation above the site contemplated. The bridge goes up the river as far as there is any navigation. It is true that many years ago, when the town of Bundaberg was first formed, vessels up to 200 tons could get two miles higher up the river, yet since that time the river has so silted up that it is impossible for a vessel of any size to get beyond the spot where it is now proposed to erect the bridge. It will, therefore, be unnecessary to make any provision for keeping the navigation open. The Bundaberg people, who, I may say, have on more than one occasion asked to have the bridge erected, are quite prepared to pay their portion of the cost. From

the existing steam ferry they are receiving some £2,800 a year, and their expenses in labour and wear and tear of machinery come to about £700 ; and when they get the bridge they anticipate that it will reduce their expenditure to about £300 a year. Therefore they will have ample to pay, not only the interest on the money borrowed, but the principal also. I do not think there can be any objection to the construction of these bridges, seeing, as I have already said, that they will not obstruct navigation.

Mr. HODGKINSON said : Mr. Speaker,—I know nothing of the claims of these districts to these bridges, but I would like to point out to the House that it is committing itself to a large expenditure. We have had an estimate from the Minister for Mines and Works, which somewhat varies from the amount specified as the limit in clause 4 of the Bill, but if we turn to clause 11 we find provision is made for an increase of the estimate by which the rate of contribution by the Government will be proportionately increased, so that we are, in fact, committing ourselves to an unknown liability. Why is it necessary to bring in this special Bill for the construction of such bridges ? The bridges at Breakfast Creek and Bulimba were constructed under the powers the Government already possess. Why should these bridges not be constructed in the same way ? Why is it necessary that these bridges, in the present state of the colony when there are demands for a settlement of the financial affairs of the colony, should be erected on the most expensive system ? It is very strange that in a great republic like America, with a population of 60,000,000 and an immense surplus revenue, they are satisfied with wooden bridges. Here we are going to do one of two things. We are either going to restrict the material for these iron bridges to the factories in the colony which will involve a huge excess of cost in favour of the protectionist, by which the North does not benefit and to which it is utterly opposed, or else we are going to send to England for the material and thus deprive the colonists of work to which they are justly entitled. It might be reasonable enough to demand that the bridges over the Norman and Endeavour Rivers should be constructed of iron, because there is an absence of proper timber in those districts ; but here in the very midst of the greatest timber district in the colony, in sight of almost inexhaustible forests, we are going to construct iron bridges on the pretext that at some distant date they will be less costly than wooden bridges. We have had some experience of these promises and know they must be regarded with some doubt, but it seems to me very singular that this should be taken as a time for experimenting. The colony is dissatisfied with the whole financial position of the colony at the present time, and yet we are going on bit by bit, a little deviation here, a little branch railway there, a bridge in this favoured locality, and a bridge in the other favoured locality ; and no member of this House knows upon what principle those works are proposed and carried out. Has any information been laid before us in support of the building of an iron bridge in comparison with a wooden one ? I could give myself plenty of instances as to the duration of wooden bridges. We know very well that the piles of some old bridges have been taken up and found as sound as the day they were put in, and yet when we are hampered with financial difficulties, we are going to the unnecessary expense—and in a district where there is abundance of the necessary material—of building an iron bridge. If this Bundaberg bridge was made of timber, we know a large amount of employment would be given to the resident population in that place. If it is made of iron, the advocates of freetrade

will carry their way as they did with regard to the material required for the Brisbane waterworks scheme; they will probably have their way in this matter, and we will pay an unnecessarily large amount out of the country. There are members on the opposite bench who are freetraders, and they will not pay 25 or 60 percent, over the home price to put up the bridge at Bundaberg, or over the Mary River. Is there any reason why this should be done? It seems to me utterly devoid of common sense. The proposal is made at a time when we have made repeated demands for a settlement of the financial question in dispute between the North and the South, and that settlement we will have before the session closes.

Mr. McMASTER said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to object to the construction of these bridges, as I have no doubt they are necessary. I agree with the hon. member for Ipswich that it is a pity the Government did not bring in a more comprehensive scheme, and deal with bridges, which must be dealt with very soon. I will refer to a bridge that is by no means a local one. It is on a highway, and I think that the Government ought to step in and assist in a material way in its construction. I refer to the bridge over Breakfast Creek, on the Bowen bridge road, which is a mail route. It is the route the mail has taken to Gympie for the last twenty years, so that it cannot be said that it is a road that leads nowhere. Even the mails for Maryborough are carried that way sometimes. I think it very hard to ask the local authorities, who have already built the Breakfast Creek Bridge, to build another bridge within a mile and a-half of it. The Government is to contribute one-half of the cost of the bridges over the Mary and Burnett Rivers. If they would do that with Bowen Bridge, I have no doubt the local authorities would be satisfied to pay the rest of the cost. Booroodabin and Toombul have built the Breakfast Creek Bridge at a cost of £14,000, £1,000 of which was contributed by the Government. Now the Windsor Shire Council and Booroodabin Division are called upon to build this other bridge on a main road. I know that the Windsor Shire is endeavouring to get the local authorities all along the line to contribute.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The municipality ought to contribute.

Mr. McMASTER: They are endeavouring to get the municipality to contribute, but if it is to contribute to the cost of that bridge, then we may just as well ask the local authorities to contribute to the maintenance of the Victoria Bridge. The Municipal Council of Brisbane have quite enough to do to pay their way, and have nothing to spare. I do not think it is at all likely that they will assist in building the bridge. They were asked to contribute to the Breakfast Creek Bridge, but they refused to do so. I do think that the Government ought to include such bridges as the one spoken of in any scheme that they bring forward. The hon. member for Burke has, no doubt, several bridges in his mind which the Government ought to contribute to. Evidently he never loses sight of Northern grievances, and appears to be the champion for the North, and is going to demand a settlement of accounts before the session closes. I hope the Government will bear in mind this Bowen Bridge road Bridge, and contribute at least one-half of the cost. I do not think it fair to ask the local authorities to build it on their own responsibility. The tax payers of Booroodabin, Windsor, Toombul, and Enoggera will have to contribute to the cost of these bridges, and why should not the inhabitants of the Mary and the Burnett districts contribute something towards the cost of building a new bridge on the Bowen Bridge road? I do hope

that the Government will take this matter into consideration. I know that the local authorities intend to go to the Government and ask their assistance. If I were a member of the local authorities concerned I should simply let the Government construct the bridge, though I believe the Postmaster-General's Department is independent of that bridge now as the mails are carried by railway.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL (Hon. J. Donaldson): The mails are not carried that way.

Mr. McMASTER: It used to be the mail road. Cobb and Co.'s coach travelled that way twenty years ago, and McCallum's coach has travelled the same road for many years past. The mails have been carried by that road ever since Gympie was open, and I consider the Government ought to contribute at any rate one-half of the cost of a new bridge.

Mr. ANNEAR said: Mr. Speaker,—Having been absent for so long this session I feel almost a stranger in the House. I have seen by the papers that it is desired by hon. members on both sides of the House to close the session as early as possible, and I have no wish to prolong it in any way; but when a matter affecting my constituents as this does is brought forward I do not think I should be right in allowing it to pass without remark, especially after some of the remarkable statements that have been made by members on this side of the House, statements which I hope will never be acted upon in this colony. With reference to the Granville Bridge, I believe the estimate submitted by the Minister will be amply sufficient for the completion of that bridge. When the question of constructing this bridge was previously before Parliament we had an estimate from the engineer of something like £21,000, and I stated at the time that I felt sure the bridge could not be completed for that sum. But, as I have said, I fully believe it can be built for the amount mentioned by the Minister for Mines and Works. The site, I presume, is Norway street; but I see that the 8th clause of the Bill provides that before either of these bridges is constructed the question of the site must be submitted to the local authorities for their approval. The hon. member for Burke, Mr. Hodgkinson, stated that no one could say what these bridges would actually cost, because they are to be constructed of iron.

Mr. HODGKINSON: I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the hon. member would only look at the papers which have been laid on the table of this House, showing the cost of wooden and iron bridges constructed up to the present time, he would see that when iron bridges have been constructed in the colony they have not cost more than 7 or 8 per cent. above what they would have cost had the material been imported. The hon. member also asked, "What is the life of an iron bridge?" Well, we have many of those bridges in the colony. We have the Victoria Bridge, which was built twenty or twenty-five years ago.

Mr. WATSON: No; seventeen.

Mr. ANNEAR: I understood that it was built twenty-five years ago. However, that bridge is, in my opinion, as good to-day as it was on the day of its construction, and I feel sure that the Government are taking the proper course in constructing, of iron, bridges of a permanent character like the Granville and Burnett bridges. The hon. member further says that this colony is a great timber country. Surely it is not a better timber country than America. There is plenty of timber in America, and the whole of the bridges there were at one time constructed of wood; but there has not been an important

bridge constructed of wood there for the last twenty years. When I visited America I saw scores of the old wooden bridges being taken down and rebuilt; the buttresses were being constructed of masonry, the cylinders in the water being of iron, and the superstructure of steel. Wooden bridges are now entirely out of date. I do not want to go into what I have seen; but when a statement of that kind is made I think it is my duty to mention what I have seen, and state what I know. I hope that when tenders are received for these bridges the manufacturers in the colony will be given a good preference. The hon. member referred to America as being a great and wealthy country. It is a wealthy country, and why? Because they protect their own people. Tweed mills can be seen all over America. If a person wants to buy a suit of English tweed there he will find that it is taxed 70 per cent., but he can get a suit of clothes of American manufacture good enough for any man, as cheap as in Brisbane or Sydney. The leader of the Opposition referred to the fact that no provision is made in this Bill for a swing in the bridge. I hope the Minister will see that there is a swing provided, because there are saw-mills, sugar-mills, and a great refinery at Yengarie above the proposed site for the bridge. I have not the pleasure of knowing the present engineer, but I can state that swing bridges, such as I saw in America, are very simple. A little engine is placed above the road in the middle of the structure, and one man can open the bridge and close it in three minutes. One can see swing bridges of that character in hundreds of places in America where navigable rivers have to be kept open to allow ships to pass up and down. I cannot understand why the Government are going to construct two bridges at Bundaberg. I know it was the intention of the late Government to construct a combined bridge for railway and ordinary vehicle and foot traffic. The Brooklyn bridge, which cost over £3,000,000, is a combined bridge, having five roadways, two for vehicles, two for the railways, and one for passenger traffic. I shall strongly support the bridge over the Burnett River; but I should like to see a good bridge there, which could be made suitable for both railway and ordinary traffic. I see here that there is £56,500 to be spent on a bridge apart altogether from the railway bridge. I think that more than half that money could be saved if a combined bridge were built, and that a bridge could be constructed to meet all requirements of both railway and road traffic, without this large expenditure. I hope the hon. member for Ipswich will not for one moment think that I am going to oppose any measure that may be brought forward for the construction of a bridge over the Bremer River; but it must not be allowed to go forth to the country that the Bremer Bridge is going to collapse. The cylinders and girders are all of iron, and are, in my opinion, as good to-day as when they were put in. If more bridge accommodation is required, all that is necessary is to put another row of cylinders alongside the present bridge, and make the road for ordinary traffic as wide again as it is at the present time, which can be done at a very little cost, as compared with the erection of a new bridge. Where is the necessity for a new bridge? If anything has gone wrong with the present structure, it is the timber on the deck, and not the cylinders.

Mr. BARLOW: The bridge shakes now like a clothes line.

Mr. ANNEAR: Bridges are made to shake. I happened to work on the Ipswich bridge. The girders at both ends of the Ipswich bridge rest on rollers, and it is so made that when the weight comes on the bridge it will shake, and

many other bridges in the colony are made upon the same principle. If the bridge did not shake it would be very likely to collapse. I believe there are a few honest, true protectionists in the House, and they will see that it is to our interest—if we are to become a great country—that we should do something for our own people. We have done something in this direction, and I think I am correct in stating that the Minister in charge of this Bill will bear me out when I state that up to the present time we have kept between £200,000 and £300,000 worth of bridge work in the colony that used to go out to other countries; and that has been a great advantage not only to the people, but to the State. The hon. member for Burke spoke about iron bridges. What are most of the bridges across the Thames, at London, made of? They have iron cylinders chiefly; and the life of an iron bridge is not known; and, should either the hon. member for Ipswich or myself live for 100 years, we should see the iron and concrete part of the Bremer bridge as good as it is now. I congratulate the Government upon having brought the matter before us, and think that it will be to the interest of the State. I know the feeling of the people in Bundaberg, that they are willing to pay half the money; but it will be to their interest if a combined bridge is built, to carry the two different kinds of traffic, instead of having two separate bridges.

Mr. SMYTH said: Mr. Speaker,—I quite agree with the hon. member for Ipswich. The State will have to pay £42,500 towards the construction of these two bridges, and who will have to pay the interest upon that sum? The taxpayers generally will have to pay it. I do not say that the Government are wrong in paying this money; but I say that all places should be treated alike. I recollect some time ago my colleague and myself waited upon the Minister for Mines and Works in regard to a bridge to cost between £3,000 and £4,000 across the Mary River above Deep Creek, and he told us he could only pay one-fifth. We have not had one farthing out of the £100,000 spent upon bridges. Some hon. members talk about the wrongs of the North, but they have had most of this money and my electorate has had none of it. My electorate contains the largest town in the colony outside of Brisbane, and its population is over 12,000; but we have never received any of that money. I shall oppose this vote, as I think all places should be treated alike. Bundaberg is well taken care of. It is to have two bridges costing over £70,000 just alongside each other, and I think that town and Maryborough should be left out altogether. I could never get anything out of the Government for a bridge of any sort, and my electorate is connected with a very large farming district such as Lagoon Pocket. And there is an immense timber traffic, and whenever there is a small flood in the river, which very often happens, all communication is cut off. We have the material on the ground for making a bridge; we do not want timber or iron, we have the metal and the sand, and want a bridge with concrete piers which will stand the flood water and which will be everlasting. The rock foundation is only about eight or ten feet down, and we are willing to pay half the cost of the work. We do not want to see Ministers coming down with these Bills; I suppose, if this pass, we shall have four or five of them down next session—one for Bowen Bridge, for instance. I therefore think this Bill should be altered, and that all parts of the colony should share alike.

Mr. O'CONNELL said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not think that Bundaberg is exceptionally well favoured in this case. Brisbane has the Victoria

Bridge free of cost; Cooktown has a bridge free of cost; Mackay has a bridge free of cost, and Rockhampton has a bridge free of cost. We were promised this bridge years ago, and an amount for it was put upon the Estimates; but the McIlwraith Ministry went out of office in the year 1883. All bridges have been made with the exception of that over the Burnett River, and I do not see why it should be opposed.

Mr. SMYTH: I did not say you ought not to have it.

Mr. O'CONNELL: The hon. member said he was going to oppose it. It seems that we are going to have a bridge upon less favourable terms than other places have had them. We are asked to pay one-half, when it was expected that we could have obtained it as other places have obtained their bridges, at the cost of the general revenue of the colony. This is quite a new institution, asking local authorities to contribute one-half of the cost of these bridges in large centres of population. I do not agree with the argument against building the bridge of iron or steel, that, because we have lots of wood, we should use it. That seems to be a very poor argument. The Victoria Bridge has had to be re-decked at a cost of £4,000, and it had only been re-decked a few years previously. It is false economy to use a material which we know is perishable, when by increasing the first cost of the structure, we can make it imperishable.

Mr. WATSON said: Mr. Speaker,—In regard to the comparison between wood and iron, I look upon wooden bridges as only temporary structures, while iron bridges are everlasting. Even when the iron of the cylinders gives out, there is the concrete inside left, which will stand for ever. I trust that when tenders are called for these bridges a local tender will be accepted, even if its amount is 15 per cent. higher. The acceptance of a local tender will give work to many people who are at present going about doing nothing. There are several iron foundries in the colony which are very badly in want of work, and even if 25 per cent. has to be paid the work will be kept in the colony. I was very sorry to hear what was said by the Hon. Sir Thomas McIlwraith the other evening, that there was only one colonial tenderer for the Brisbane Waterworks. I may state that that one tenderer had no plans or specifications to go by. He had to furnish them for himself, and I believe that if the plans and specifications had been given, we would have had several colonial tenderers for that work. I believe, moreover, that the work would have been as cheaply manufactured in the colony as in the old country. We all know perfectly well that in one shop you can obtain a suit of clothes at a cost of £3, while in another the price for the same quality may be £5, which shows what different prices may obtain in the same country. I really trust that the Minister in charge of the Bill will see his way, if possible, to accept a colonial tender.

Mr. LUYA said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not rise to offer any opposition to the construction of these bridges, but merely to point out that it would be just as well to make provision for having proper openings in them. It is a most serious matter to close the waterway, and even though there may not have been any agitation in that direction up to the present time, it is just as well to ascertain if there may not be a large minority, at all events, who are opposed to closing up the waterway altogether. If such is the case, it would be necessary to provide for proper openings. Another matter to which I wish to draw attention is with regard to the decking.

I notice that the decking is to be tarred metal in preference to wooden decking. If it is to be used in preference to wood decking, such as there is on the Victoria Bridge, it is perfectly right, as that bridge will cost about £1,000 a year to repair the woodwork; but I do not think that tarred metal is preferable to a roadway of wooden blocks. Such a roadway will last longer, and is far better as a roadway than tarred metal. Tarred metal is like any ordinary roadway. The metal is constantly breaking up if there is a large amount of traffic over it, while it is not as easy to repair the roadway of a bridge as it is to make repairs in an ordinary street, because of the very large amount of traffic which all converges at one point in crossing a bridge. I merely throw out this as a suggestion which the proper authorities may take into consideration before they decide upon the question. With regard to the material to be used in these bridges, I am rather inclined to look with favour upon the proposal to construct them of iron and steel, because in crossing navigable streams the woodwork may be subject to the attacks of the cobra. Undoubtedly, we have timber far superior to that which they have in America for constructing bridges—in fact, wooden bridges in America are merely a kind of trestlework—but it is impossible to get to the timber needing repairs in wooden bridges built over wide and deep rivers. It is a different matter from repairing an ordinary road bridge. Under the circumstances I should never think of building wooden bridges, as they would be like the old Victoria Bridge. If it is decided to construct these bridges of iron and steel, I trust that the foundries, both in the North and South of the colony, will be supplied with proper drawings and specifications, and that they will be given a proper chance of tendering for the work. I do not advocate the acceptance of colonial tenders if they are a long way above the prices which the material can be imported for, but if they are 15 or even 20 per cent. above the outside tenderers, I think they should get the work. I would not approve of accepting a local tender if it is more than 20 per cent. above others, as that is sufficient protection for them to get. I hope and trust that the Government may see their way to give the contract to local foundries, as I can assure the House that at the present time our iron-workers are very much in want of some work. They are every bit as badly off as the timber merchants are, and I can tell the House the latter are pretty badly off just now.

Mr. STEVENSON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am not going to enter into a discussion as to whether wooden, or iron and steel bridges are the best, although I think we have received very valuable information upon that point from the hon. member for Maryborough, as to his experience during his travels in America. I wish to point out to the Government that before they proceed to construct these bridges they should see that there are proper approaches to them. It will not do for them to proceed as the late Government did and construct bridges without having approaches to those bridges. Two or three years ago we had bridges built in that manner, such as the bridge at Mackay, and the bridge in my own constituency at Clermont. The Clermont Bridge was built and stood without approaches for about eighteen months, and it took me about another eighteen months to get the Government to make the approaches. The money was simply wasted until that was done, and yet the Engineer of Bridges told us that that was a bridge. I think it was about fifty yards from the road which led to it. I hope the present Government will take care and not make it necessary for members of Parliament to come to this House and beg and

pray to get approaches made to the bridges which will cost nearly as much as the bridges themselves.

Mr. COWLEY said : Mr. Speaker,—I think the hon. member for Gympie, when he said he would oppose this Bill, did not thoroughly understand the matter, because it would amount to an act of repudiation if the Bill were rejected. Last year we voted the money for the construction of these bridges, and therefore it would be unjust to oppose the passing of this Bill now. A matter to which I wish to draw attention is this : We voted a certain sum of money for the construction of these bridges last year, and I think that sum should not be exceeded, and that the Government should not be asked to contribute more than they guaranteed to give. That amounts in the one instance to £20,000, and in the other to £22,500, but under clause 11 that may be exceeded to a considerable extent. I consider that if the House agree that a certain sum of money shall be given for the construction of these bridges, any extra expenditure should be borne by the local authorities, and not fall upon the general public. As to the merits or demerits of iron and steel or wooden structures, we have very little to do with that, as the Government, through their engineers, have decided that iron and steel bridges are the best. If the local authorities most concerned are favourable to the proposal, it would be folly for this House to object to it. When the Bill goes into committee, I trust that clause 11 will receive due consideration before it is passed, as it really asks us to agree to an unlimited expenditure.

Mr. TOZER said : Mr. Speaker,—I know the localities in which it is proposed to erect these two bridges, and I may say that, so far as the bridge at Bundaberg is concerned, it appears to me an injustice is being done to Bundaberg in being asked to contribute anything at all to the cost. Taking the colony from one end to the other ; what other river, except the Herbert—which was not mentioned by the hon. member for that district, but which I mention as calling for a bridge at the public expense—has not had a bridge built over it at the public expense ? With the exception of the Burnett and the Herbert, every other river from Cooktown right down to the Logan, as far as my memory goes, has one bridge, forming a public highway, erected at the expense of the colony as a whole. Bundaberg, by reason of its only being a recently discovered place, has not been so favoured, and therefore I think the people of Bundaberg have a very good case for having a bridge built across the river as a public highway at the expense of the whole colony. Whether it will be a combined bridge is a matter which will, I trust, receive the consideration of the Railway Commissioners, as we do not want to find, as in several other places, two bridges built alongside one another when one will do just as well. That is a matter which the Government may well take into consideration. In nearly every other part of the world I see they are making bridges which serve both for railway and ordinary purposes, and so save money. I wish to ask the Minister for Mines and Works what principle is involved in the building of a second bridge across the Mary, seeing that there is already one public highway constructed across that river at Maryborough at the public expense ? That bridge serves the demands of what I consider to be the whole of the travelling public of the colony, but now they are to have a second bridge. I feel that some assistance should be given by the general taxpayers when very large bridges are to be built over rivers where the local authorities could not build them themselves, and for that reason I shall give a lukewarm support to that bridge.

I do so simply because I think the Government should render some assistance to localities even better situated than that place, so far as regards a desire for settlement. I was present with a deputation headed by the hon. member for Burrum that waited on the Minister the other day with respect to another bridge. There is no bridge at present over the Mary River from the town of Maryborough right up to the Dickabram Bridge. There was a bridge over the river at Tiaro, connecting the electorate of the hon. member for Burrum with my own. That bridge was erected some time ago, and the Government neglecting to take the necessary precautions to protect their own highways, that bridge and another above it were completely washed away. The people that used that bridge are agriculturists endeavouring to make a living, and a rather poor one then ; and on going to the Minister the other day to ask him to replace that bridge, which was well known to be a public highway, his answer to the deputation that waited on him was : "No I will not replace the bridge, but I will tell you what I will do ; I will give you £1,000 towards the erection of a bridge there." Now, I ask the hon. gentleman what difference is there in principle between the erection of that bridge and the erection of this proposed bridge over the Mary connecting Maryborough with Granville ? Why does the hon. gentleman come down now and ask the general taxpayers to assist in building this latter bridge over the Mary at a distance of only two and a-half miles from another bridge already erected over that river ?

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS : No, no !

Mr. TOZER : I am not speaking of the distance by the river ; but you can go from one bridge to the site of the other, in a distance of two and a-half miles. Why does not this principle of calling upon the general taxpayer to contribute half the cost of the Granville Bridge, apply to the replacement of the Tiaro Bridge ? I ask the Minister if he now affirms this principle with regard to the Granville Bridge—and I do not disagree with it—to reconsider what he will give towards the erection of the Tiaro Bridge. With reference to swing bridges, I may say that extensive irrigation works might be erected on the Mary River, and there is a beautiful lot of land there that might be utilised by that means. I hope the Government will recognise that fact, as no doubt the time will come when that will be entered upon, and the navigable portion of the river for sixteen or seventeen miles above Maryborough should be secured, so that shipping might come up there at some future time. I have heard a rumour that when the Government do build swing bridges it is found they will not open, like the one at Townsville, and certainly the Government should not go to the expense of erecting large swings unless they are sure they can be worked. So far as this Granville Bridge is concerned, I give it my support, in the hope that the Minister will see his way to extend the principle involved to the erection of bridges in other localities and districts requiring bridge accommodation as much as this does.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said : Mr. Speaker,—I wish to make a remark or two with reference to the knowledge of the hon. member for Maryborough of the Ipswich bridge. He has stated that he was at the building of it himself, and that it will last for a long time yet. I entirely agree with that ; but the hon. member must have forgotten the fact that when that bridge was built there were very few inhabitants on the north side of the river. The formation of the town on the north side of the river at Ipswich is exactly in the shape of a horse-shoe, and though I

have not the exact statistics with me, as I did not know this Bill was coming on, I will make a rough estimate and say that I take it there are 5,000 or 6,000 inhabitants in North Ipswich at the present time. Not only has that to be considered, but there is a lot of country at the back to be taken into account, and there are a lot of people settled about Kholo, Pine Mountain, and the district, and, although the bridge may be strong enough for some time, there is not half room enough on it for the traffic. In reality there is no work in the colony more necessary than the Ipswich bridge. In consequence of the formation of the town on the north side of the river being in the shape of a horseshoe people have to go a long round, and have sometimes to travel two and three miles to their work. I have been deprived of a school for my children myself in consequence of the state of the present bridge. I should be afraid to let my wife or girls go across that bridge without sending some of the older boys to guide them across the place. It is not easy to frighten me, but I have often been afraid in going across that bridge. In consequence of the situation of Ipswich, we really want not one, but three bridges there. The eastern suburb requires a bridge, there is another required at Woodend, and there might be another at Saddler's Crossing. The bridge accommodation at present is most inconvenient, as people have to come from all sides to use the present bridge, and scarcely anyone crosses it without being afraid, as the traffic is so great. I have seen six bullock drays loaded and a line of railway trucks loaded with timber on that bridge at the same time. I do not say that my statement with respect to the population of North Ipswich is correct, but it is as near as I can give it, and I want to know if anybody can tell me how many people this Maryborough bridge will reach when it is made. When I was in Maryborough there was nobody living across the river where the proposed bridge is to be placed. My object, however, is not to oppose this bridge, but to try and have the Bill made general and get Ipswich a bridge if not two or three.

The PREMIER : You mentioned four.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : One good one is necessary, and the others need not be more than bridges for foot passengers connecting the pockets. That would answer for the present time. The population of North Ipswich is nearly as large as that of Maryborough altogether.

Mr. ANNEAR : No.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : It is if I include Kholo and along the Brisbane River, where the road over the bridge leads to, and it is thickly populated almost right through to the Brisbane River. The hon. member knows Ipswich as well as I do, and he knows you have to cross the river from Ipswich to get to all those places. People from all round the district have to come to that one spot to cross the river, and they are often afraid of their lives while travelling over the bridge. There is, I think, something practical in the statement of the hon. member for Maryborough that the bridge at Bundaberg should be a combination bridge. Where is the necessity in a place like Bundaberg for two bridges within a stone's throw of each other? Why not combine them? The combination bridge at Ipswich has lasted and done its work very well for ten or fifteen years; but now it is overcrowded, and we cannot stand it any longer. The traffic is so great that it is a miracle some awful accident has not taken place. The practical suggestion of the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, would be better than nothing. Why not put up another row of cylinders and

widen the bridge, or do something to make it suitable for the traffic? It is now too narrow and too dangerous for the public to travel over. The need and the danger connected with that bridge in Ipswich has not been by any means exaggerated by the hon. member who spoke before me, and I think the Government would do well if they gave us a promise that some alteration of that bridge will be provided for in this Bill. In that case I shall be willing to support it. But I do not intend to stand here and see the eyes of the country picked out for favourites by giving them these bridges, while those who are so badly in need of them are neglected for years and years. Really a new bridge, or some addition to the present one, has been wanted for the last twelve years or longer, and I may tell the Government that the Ipswich people will have it.

Mr. MACFARLANE said : Mr. Speaker,—I am very glad indeed to have the support of my hon. friend, the member for Stanley, in advocating the Ipswich bridge. We Ipswich members have been accused by that hon. member, for a long time past, of not doing our duty—

Mr. O'SULLIVAN : I never accused the hon. member.

Mr. MACFARLANE : In reference to this bridge, we have been fighting for a bridge at Ipswich for many years. Even before the late Government took office at all, the want of a bridge there was very much felt. True, we have a bridge, but it is one that you may term rather a railway bridge than a traffic bridge across the Bremer. In this respect we are worse off than almost any town in the colony, and have been more badly used. If it had not been for this railway bridge I believe we should have got a traffic bridge from the Government twenty years ago. But because we have this railway bridge we have to do the best we can, and the public have frequently to risk their lives in crossing it. There have been a large number of very narrow squeaks. We have naturally been longing for a new bridge for years past. Six years ago, after the late Government took office, a survey was made for a new bridge over the Bremer, and a site was selected. I believe more than one site was selected, and the suggestion made by the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear—to put down a new row of cylinders and widen the bridge—was taken into consideration, but the engineer who made the survey declared that that scheme would not be feasible. Another proposal was to put outriggers on the present bridge, but that was not considered feasible, and the only thing to be done was to get a new bridge. Consequently the site was selected, and the survey made, but we are just in the same position that we were six years ago. If the Minister for Mines and Works would simply declare to the House what he intends to do in connection with those matters, it would save a great deal more discussion. If he would bring in a general Bill dealing with the bridges of the colony as a whole, and providing that each district should get its turn, some decision could be arrived at; but there are only two bridges provided for in this Bill, while other places are left out, and no indication given when their wants are likely to be attended to, and that makes members urge the necessity of their particular bridges. If on the other hand, the Minister declared that it was his intention to bring in a bill early next session dealing with the whole question, on the plan of the Government paying half the cost of the bridges and giving forty years for the payment of the other half, the local authorities could take into consideration what would be the best thing to be done with regard to asking for new bridges; but so long as

there is nothing definite submitted to the House so long shall we have these long rambling discussions until the end of time.

Mr. BUCKLAND said: Mr. Speaker,—The hon. member for Clermont referred to certain bridges in his electorate and at Mackay which were unapproachable when they were finished, and to the fact that the Government had had to go to very considerable expense to make approaches to those bridges. The plans of those bridges had been supplied by the bridges department of the Works Office, and I can inform the hon. member that a similar accident, if accident it can be called, occurred in connection with the bridge over Breakfast Creek, near its mouth. Plans for that bridge had been supplied by the bridges department of the Works Office; tenders were called for, and accepted; the plans were sent home, and the successful tenderer accepted a tender from a large iron manufactory in the old country for the work. But when the bridge was erected over the creek it was too short by 15 feet. That evidently shows the necessity for better supervision over the department in which those plans were drawn. I do not say whose fault it was, but the fact remains that the joint local authority who erected the bridge were put to considerably increased expense through the bridge not having been made to fit the creek. I am not going to oppose the second reading of the Bill, because I think it would be an act of repudiation if the House were to refuse to sanction the erection of these bridges after the money was voted in the Treasury Bills Act last year. Reference has been made to the difference in the cost of erecting wood and iron and steel bridges, and those hon. members who have been residents of the colony for the last twenty years, and who have seen the construction of bridges over many tidal creeks—I speak more particularly of this portion of the colony—must know that in nearly every instance they have had to be repaired at very heavy expense, or to be entirely re-constructed. There is a bridge now, close to the city, that is in an extremely dangerous state. I refer to the Bowen Bridge over Breakfast Creek. It is scarcely fit for the traffic passing over it. In fact a temporary bridge has had to be erected to carry the traffic, and I feel certain that the House will be called upon at no distant date to provide the funds necessary to erect a suitable bridge over that part of the great Northern road, which is one of the most important roads out of the city, and leads to a large and populous district. I shall support the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. GANNON said: Mr. Speaker,—I am very glad to hear the hon. member bring forward the bridge over Breakfast Creek. As member for the district I have been worrying the Minister for Mines and Works and the Premier with regard to that bridge. I am now communicating with the local authorities for the purpose of bringing under their notice certain matters in connection with that bridge which have occurred between the Government and myself. As to these particular bridges, as the amount is on the loan vote, I shall not oppose them. I only rise to call attention to the fact that I have not lost sight of this bridge across Breakfast Creek, which is a very necessary one indeed. The Government, I may say, have not lost sight of me, for I have taken very good care that they hear from me on the subject; and they seem inclined to help the local authority as much as they can to get the bridge fixed up as soon as possible.

Mr. PALMER said: Mr. Speaker,—I have only had time to glance hastily through this Bill, and two matters have struck me in connection with it. The first is the imposition of

tolls. This principle has been set aside years and years ago as an antiquated custom, and one which no Government would recommend at the present day. Surely there ought to be other ways and means of collecting money for keeping bridges in repair without resorting to the disused system of obstructing traffic by sticking up people for their tolls, which has been out of date for so many years. In New South Wales, I believe, the system was kept up until the last ten or twelve years, and the last of them has been abolished by the force of popular opinion against them.

The PREMIER: There is a toll-bar on the road to the racecourse at Randwick—on the main road.

Mr. PALMER: I was under the impression that the system had been entirely done away with, but one isolated case will not support a principle which has been condemned scores and scores of years ago. We might as well revert to the stocks for punishing a man instead of locking him up. The next thing that attracted my attention was that there is no provision in the Bill for a waterway. I know that on the Mary River, above the place where it is proposed to erect the bridge, there is navigable water with very large interests involved in it. It will be necessary to keep the way open for ship traffic above the bridge, otherwise the people interested in the matter will be greatly dissatisfied. With regard to material, wherever we have seen bridges constructed of timber in this country we have found that in a very few years it costs more to keep them in repair than the original structures cost to erect. In New South Wales, or in any country where large bridges are constructed, we find that advantage is taken of the way in which iron can be put together to form permanent bridges. Perhaps the finest bridge in the Southern hemisphere is the one across the Hawkesbury River. That bridge is built entirely of iron, on stone piers, sunk to an enormous depth; it was manufactured in England, and constructed by an American company. With regard to the cost of these bridges, I was not present when the Minister for Mines and Works moved the second reading of the Bill; but I take it that the Government would be prepared to extend the same principle to any local authority that is willing to go as far as these local authorities are going with regard to providing for the construction of any bridges that may be required. Any local authority who can make out as good a case, and are willing to provide one-half of the cost, ought to be entitled to the same consideration from the Government. It stands to common reason that that should be so. These are the only matters that struck me on glancing over the Bill, and apart from them, I am very willing to give it my support.

Mr. GLASSEY said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not rise to oppose the second reading of the Bill, but to corroborate what has been stated by the hon. members for Ipswich, and strongly supported by the hon. member for Stanley, with regard to the bridge over the Bremer. There is a very widespread feeling in Ipswich and the surrounding districts with respect to the danger of the bridge that spans the Bremer. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member, Mr. Annear—who no doubt spoke with some degree of authority, as I believe he has had some practical experience in bridge building and railway making—and whether it is well founded or not, there is unquestionably a very widespread feeling as to the dangerous condition of that bridge. I may also say—and I trust the Government will pardon me for saying it—that there is also a widespread feeling that in consequence of the opposition shown by Ipswich for some length of time towards the party at present

in power nothing will be done by the Government towards that district. I hope there is no ground for this feeling. I ask if it is wise or prudent, when the Government is formulating a works policy, of whatever nature it may be, when there is a just and legitimate claim put forward by a district like Ipswich—and I think the claim with respect to the Bremer Bridge is a just and legitimate claim—to keep up a feeling of that kind, and deprive it of its legitimate due? I hope the Minister for Mines and Works will take into his most serious consideration what has been advanced during the debate from both sides of the House, and see that some general scheme of bridge-building shall be inserted in this Bill before it is passed into law, and that the claims of Ipswich are not forgotten or ignored. That will to some extent, if not entirely, remove the feeling with respect to the unwillingness of the Government to make any concessions towards Ipswich and the surrounding districts, to which I have referred. I say this with all due respect to the Government, and I trust they will pardon me for having introduced it. With respect to the bridge itself, I can say—having frequent communication with the district, and representing the electorate immediately surrounding it—that there is a very general feeling that a new bridge is required, to prevent any disaster that is likely to occur in consequence of its dangerous condition at the present time. But, as the hon. member for Stanley contended, apart altogether from any danger that may exist in respect to that bridge, the claims of the district are such that they should have a new bridge to meet the very large and increasing traffic that is carried on between Ipswich and the surrounding country in that neighbourhood. I heartily corroborate the statements made by those hon. members, and I trust the Government will see their way to lay down some general policy with regard to bridge building, and that facilities will be given to all towns and districts requiring bridge accommodation, on the same basis as is laid down in the Bill before the House.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

DISEASES IN SHEEP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL said: Mr. Speaker,—The object of this Bill is to provide in the first place for the quarantine regulations, and in the second for travelling stock. At the present time nearly all the colonies in Australia are free from scab, and sheep introduced by vessels are put for three weeks in quarantine and have to be dressed three times. That is found to interfere considerably with the introduction of sheep into this colony, and at the conference held in Sydney in 1886, it was recommended by the various inspectors that some provision should be made to shorten that time, at the same time keeping full control over the danger of introducing disease. At present the only colony in Australasia where scab exists is Western Australia, but I do not think there is the slightest chance of any sheep being introduced from there. However, under this Bill they would not be allowed to land, because that colony will not have been for twelve months prior to the passing of this Bill free from scab.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: What about New Zealand?

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: New Zealand is not one of the Australian colonies; but the Chief Inspector of Stock informs me that it is not free from scab.

The PREMIER: We do not let them in from there.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: The only way in which they could be introduced from New Zealand would be as food on the steamers. But those would not be allowed to land. In this Bill power is given for the destruction of pens, fodder, and so on, that might have been in use by sheep carried in that way. That is a provision that is not in the present Act. It is rather ridiculous that sheep may be introduced from any of the other colonies overland and not require any permit, if they are certified to by the inspectors of the adjoining colonies as being free from scab; whilst on the other hand, if they are shipped from Sydney, Melbourne, or Tasmania, they cannot be landed here unless they undergo the three weeks' quarantine. That is not only a large expense and trouble, but it interferes with the purchase of valuable rams introduced from Tasmania; because, in many cases, the time taken up in quarantine is so very long that it prevents people buying. I may also point out that it has been a considerable loss. One hon. gentleman in the House has lost considerably through the treatment of his sheep in quarantine. Clause 4 provides that any person travelling sheep in the future will require to get a permit stating what route the sheep will be travelling by. It is introduced for this purpose: At the present time no permit is necessary, and it is not difficult to steal sheep from a run, because if anyone is found with these sheep he can say they belong to the owner of the station, and it is quite possible that no one but the owner could detect the theft. By having the permit, the magistrate or inspector can check such statements, and if there is no permit, steps can be taken to ascertain whether the sheep were stolen or not. I was informed only to-day that on the Darling Downs during last season there had been three lots of sheep stolen. In one case 1,500, in another 1,100, and in another 800. It is certain that if this provision had been in force it would have been one restriction. I may say at once that there is not sufficient provision made in this clause, as it does not provide a penalty. There should be a penalty which I will propose in committee. Again it is not as comprehensive as I could wish it to be.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: The penalty is in clause 5.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: That is a different thing. That is a penalty for travelling by a different route than the one mentioned in the permit. The sheep may come from New South Wales, and be declared to be travelling up the Warrego, and instead they may be taken by the Bulloo or Paroo, and it is necessary that there should be a penalty for that. Clause 5 provides for giving the necessary way-bill. I may say, in connection with this matter, that I think the law in this colony should be the same as in New South Wales. In New South Wales the law provides that any person wishing to travel sheep from one place to another must get a permit, but if the owner wishes to turn them back, or if they have remained for less than four months on any run, then a fee would have to be paid for the whole distance travelled by the sheep. That clause was inserted in the New South Wales Act for the purpose of checking what were called "grass pirates"—people who never made proper provision on their own runs for their stock, and when bad times came travelled their sheep until the season broke, and then took them back again.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: We have heard of them here.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: I do not think we have had as much experience of that kind of thing in this colony, but the time is not far distant when we shall have to adopt a similar clause. The 6th clause in the Diseases of Stock Act of 1867 is repealed, and clause 7 is substituted. It provides:—

“Every owner or person in charge of any travelling sheep intending to drive the same across any run within the meaning of the Diseases in Sheep Act of 1867, or within the meaning of the Brands Act of 1872, or along any road which may intersect or form the boundary line of any such run, shall give the proprietor or occupier of such run not more than forty-eight nor less than twelve hours’ notice of his intention by leaving such notice at the house or homestead of such proprietor or occupier, or at the head station on such run or holding; and any owner or person in charge of any such travelling sheep who shall neglect to comply with the provisions of this section shall on conviction in a summary way for every such offence forfeit and pay any sum not exceeding twenty pounds.”

As the law stands now, a person travelling with sheep can go on to a cattle run without giving notice of his intention, and the consequence is that frequently sheep are on a cattle run for days before they are discovered, and they also frequently stray over more than the prescribed distance from the road. Hon. members will agree that it is necessary to protect the owners of cattle runs. Now also that we have grazing farms established, and a number of small farmers in the interior, it is as necessary that the owners of those farms should be protected as well as the large runholder. Clause 8 provides that the Governor shall have power to make certain regulations under the Bill. At the present time we have not, as they have in the other colonies, power to make regulations by which the Bill can be thoroughly worked. I think the regulations both in New South Wales and Victoria are even more stringent than the Act itself—that is, they are quite consistent with the Act, but where it does not fully explain what is intended, the regulations make ample provision in that respect. It is quite necessary that we should also have regulations in Queensland, and power is therefore given in subsection (c) to make regulations—

“For the detention, dressing, and disinfecting of sheep while in quarantine.”

and, in subsection (e), for—

“The disposal of fodder, litter, fittings, or effects used on board ships with or about imported sheep.”

It is quite possible that the fodder and fittings on board a ship which has carried diseased sheep might be landed in some way a few days before sailing, and there would be very great risk of disease being introduced by that means, so that regulations on that subject are necessary. I do not think there is anything further that I need explain at the present time in connection with this matter, and I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr. JESSOP said: Mr. Speaker,—As I shall not have an opportunity of saying anything about this Bill when in committee I should like to point out an amendment which I think might be introduced in the Bill. I quite agree with the general principle of the Bill, but do not altogether approve of clauses 4 and 5. Clause 4 provides that—

“Every owner or drover in charge of travelling sheep shall, at the time of his departure, be provided with a way-bill containing the particulars set forth in the second schedule hereto.”

If that provision is enforced, the Government will have to create more inspectors or directors, or they will put stockowners to very great inconvenience.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: It is only in certain districts that the provision will apply.

Mr. JESSOP: I quite understand. I need go no further than my own district to show how the clause will cause inconvenience. I have been a sheep director there for many years, and can see where the trouble will arise. I will take as an illustration Warra Station, which is thirty-four miles west of Dalby. If the owner of Warra wanted to move his sheep to another station he has, about fourteen miles distant, he would have to come nearly forty miles to me, or, if I was not at home, go to the inspector at Toowoomba for a permit. I think some provision should be made as to the minimum distance for which a permit should be required, say, fifty or sixty miles, so that persons travelling their stock from one holding to another should not be put to the inconvenience of having first to go a considerable distance for a permit. I could mention scores of cases in my own district, where people have two holdings—one near Dalby, perhaps, and another eighteen miles away—and to remove their stock from one to the other they would have to travel along the main road, and possibly across a reserve; and under the provisions of this Bill they would have to get a permit just the same as a man who was going 500 miles. It would be a great hardship to have to travel about the country for a permit in such cases, and no benefit would accrue from the enforcement of the provision. However, the matter is one that can be remedied in committee, and I hope the hon gentleman in charge of the measure, will adopt the suggestion I have made, so that no permit shall be required where two holdings are within a reasonable distance of each other. Such an amendment will save a great deal of trouble to stock owners.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said: Mr. Speaker,—I do not profess to have a personal acquaintance with this matter, but I know that some time ago there was a strong difference of opinion amongst stockowners on the subject, especially with regard to the question of scab, and making less burdensome the conditions which were imposed with respect to imported sheep. I know that among stockowners, some were of opinion that the restrictions might safely be removed or lessened, whilst others considered that it would be dangerous to remove them. Their argument was principally that scab exists in New Zealand, and that nearly all the steamers that trade with New Zealand also go to Tasmania, from which sheep are especially desired to be imported, and that, therefore, it was not at all unlikely that infection might be introduced by that means. A great many persons took that view; and although the late Government were very much urged to deal with the matter, the objections were so strong at that time that there did not seem to be any prospect of a Bill becoming law. I forget what members of the House took part in the discussion, but I know that their objections were very strong, and that they always pointed out what seemed to be a very serious danger. Of course if the disease once got into the ships trading between New Zealand and Tasmania, and between Tasmania and Melbourne, it might get into the Australian colonies, and the loss to stockowners would be very serious. Those objections were made at that time, and the hon. gentleman did not tell us in moving the second reading of the Bill whether they have been removed, or whether the other colonies are unanimous on the subject.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: They are.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: At that time I know they were not.

The POSTMASTER-GENERAL: This Bill is in accordance with the regulations in the other colonies.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: If the other colonies are all of the same opinion I certainly shall not offer any objection to the measure, because the danger will come to them first, and they are quite as much interested as we are in seeing that proper safeguards are provided. I would just call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the phraseology of the 2nd clause, which states that "Any sheep arriving by sea from any Australasian colony in which scab does not exist, nor has existed during the preceding twelve months" may be released from quarantine after being disinfected. Who is to be the judge of whether scab has or has not existed in a colony for twelve months? Surely a declaration of the Governor in Council ought to settle that. How are you to prove in a court of law, when the question arises, that scab does not exist and has not existed in a country for twelve months? I call attention to this matter, because anybody who violates the law is liable to a penalty on being convicted. It is usual in cases of that sort to provide that the fact shall be established by a proclamation of the Governor in Council. As to the matter referred to by the hon. member for Dalby, of travelling sheep from one selection to another, I can see that great difficulty may arise under the provisions of the Bill. It seems hard lines that a man should have to run about for a permit to travel sheep from one paddock to another. The hon. member does not in the least exaggerate the matter. If a man has two selections—and we have been making all sorts of provisions lately to enable small selectors to hold more than one selection—and he takes his stock from a small paddock to a larger one without a permit, he will be liable to a penalty of £20.

Mr. DUNSMURE said: Mr. Speaker,—There is one thing I would like to point out, and that is, in connection with the 7th clause, which defines the meaning of the words "sheep run." I know of one case in which a man kept a few pet sheep, and he could claim that a person in charge of travelling sheep should give him notice. I think there ought to be a certain number fixed, so that we may know what is a sheep run and what is not.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH: Anything is a run under the Brands Act. A farmyard is a run.

Mr. DUNSMURE: I suggest that a number such as 500 or 1,000 should be mentioned.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

The committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

On the motion of the COLONIAL TREASURER (Hon. W. Pattison), the Speaker left the chair, and the House went into committee to further consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

STATE SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (Hon. J. Donaldson) moved that there be granted for the year 1889-90, £6,850, for State schools, inspectors, and contingencies. He said there was an additional inspector on the Estimate at a salary of £350, and an increase of £200 in the amount down for contingencies—travelling expenses.

Mr. UNMACK said he wished to know if any change had been made in the term for which an inspector remained in charge of one particular district?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the term had been increased from two years to three years.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said there had been an additional inspector appointed last year, and now another had been appointed. The number seemed to be increasing very fast, although he noticed that the number of teachers for whom they would be asked to vote salaries was considerably less than last year, while the number of schools had increased. Had those inspectors sufficient leisure to enable them to hold an annual conference? An annual meeting of inspectors would be a most desirable thing in the interests of the service, and in the interest of the inspectors themselves who could compare notes of what was going on.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said a conference of inspectors had been held last year, and a great deal of useful information had been obtained. A large number of questions had been remitted to them by himself, and by the teachers' union in East Moreton. It was his intention to have annual conferences, and he believed a great deal of good would be done. In regard to the number of inspectors, he did not think there were anything like enough of them. There were some schools that were inspected only once a year, and the consequence was that the teachers became very lax in their duties sometimes, and after a time a report would come down to the effect that the school had not been doing well. All the schools in the colony, except those in the very outlying districts, should be inspected at least twice in the year. To do that there was not a sufficiently strong staff of inspectors, and it was very desirable that there should be.

Mr. UNMACK said he was very pleased indeed to hear that last year there had been a conference of inspectors. The colony had been deprived of the benefits of those conferences of inspectors for some years, and it would have been much to the interest of the department if they had been continued. However, he was glad to hear that they were to be resumed. In regard to the number of inspectors, he strongly endorsed the opinion expressed by the Minister for Public Instruction, and should have no objection if another one or two were appointed, because he knew they were absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman had said that some schools were only inspected once a year, and he (Mr. Unmack) could add that when they were inspected, it was done in such a hurried manner that the examination was not as perfect as it should be. He was disposed to think every school should be inspected twice a year, and he had no fault to find with the number of inspectors. There had been twenty-five additional schools opened during the past year, and a similar number during the previous year, while in all probability there would be some thirty or forty more next year, so that more inspectors would be required. The fact that the teachers would know that their schools were to be inspected twice a year would improve the manner in which they did their work.

Mr. SMITH said the question was raised last year as to the advisability of the inspectors residing within their districts, but the Government had not considered the question then, and he now wished to know whether the Minister thought it advisable to carry out the suggestion. The inspectors were very few and far between, but if they resided in their own districts they

would not only be able to inspect the schools more regularly, but would also be of great assistance to the school committees.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that, as a matter of fact, some of them did reside within their own districts; but some districts were so tremendously large that it made very little difference whether the inspectors resided within them or not.

Mr. SMITH: There is no inspector residing in the North.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member was right. When the number of inspectors was increased the question of locating them in their own districts would be worthy of consideration. But it would be no saving to have the inspectors residing at great distances from Brisbane if they had to attend a conference every year.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he did not see the advantage of the inspectors living in their own districts. If there were permanent inspectors attached to particular districts there might be something in it; but he thought it very important that there should be changes of inspectors. There should be, as nearly as possible, one uniform system of inspection; but there should be a succession of inspectors, otherwise there might be inspectors who had favourite schools, favourite methods, or favourite fads. With regard to the conference of inspectors that had been held, he wished to know what form their recommendations would take—whether they would be pigeon-holed, laid before Parliament separately, or embodied in the annual report.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was not time to embody the report of the conference in the annual report for the present year, because it contained such a large amount of matter. He had not been able to read the whole of it yet, though he had read the most important parts. It was intended to make some alterations in the regulations—nothing very important—before long, and the report of the conference would come up for consideration in connection with them. With regard to the printing of the papers, it would be very expensive to print the whole of the information contained in them, but he thought that very interesting and valuable extracts might be made.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he wished to know whether it was intended to popularise the conferences of inspectors by allowing the teachers' association to send delegates.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not think that would work; but any recommendations made by the teachers would receive due consideration. If they were submitted to him, and he thought proper, he would submit them to the conference.

Mr. UNMACK said he would ask the Minister whether he had any objection to allow any hon. member to inspect the report of the conference in manuscript?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Certainly not.

Mr. UNMACK said he would take the opportunity of inspecting the papers. He also wished to know whether it was intended that the General Inspector should make periodical inspections. It was necessary that he should do so, occasionally at all events, because in some cases there might be differences between the teachers and the district inspectors. The only other item on which he wanted information was with regard to travelling allowances. Last year one additional inspector was appointed, and £100 additional was set down for travelling expenses. The present

year there was another inspector appointed, and the amount additional set down for travelling expenses was £200.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the amount voted for travelling expenses last year was £1,900, and the amount expended was £1,852, so that he did not think £2,100 would be too much for the present year. With regard to the General Inspector, that officer had already been at the schools at Maryborough, Gympie, and Teewoomba, and other schools between Brisbane and those places. He had also spent some time in the South. It was intended that in future the General Inspector should inspect and report on the leading schools in the colony, and not do so much in the office.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said that about fourteen years ago, when he first took charge of the department, he prepared a memorandum with regard to the duties of the General Inspector. He was curious to know whether those instructions—he thought they took the form of a memorandum approved by the Executive—were in operation now?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. gentleman did prepare a minute some years ago defining the duties of the General Inspector, but he thought that the present General Inspector did not know of its existence. The paper had, however, been brought out of the pigeon-hole, and he was now running on the lines there laid down.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said that, in his opinion, the General Inspector ought not to be an assistant under secretary. He ought to be sufficiently afield to enable him to assist the Minister in the office with information he collected out of his office.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was no doubt that the General Inspector ought to have some personal knowledge of the schools in every portion of the colony. That officer knew all the old teachers very well, and could at once advise the Minister with respect to them; but there were many teachers new in the service about whom he knew nothing personally. In future fully half, if not more than half, the time of the General Inspector would be occupied in visits of inspection to different parts of the colony.

Mr. GLASSEY said he considered the number of inspectors insufficient, considering the size of the colony and its sparse and scattered population. He considered they should not begrudge the expenditure of a few hundreds of pounds per annum, with the view of having an efficient staff of inspectors. With respect to the General Inspector travelling more than he had hitherto done, that was only right. It was altogether wrong to retain an officer of such capacity and ability in the office, when he should be engaged in the very necessary work of inspection. Would the Minister for Public Instruction give the Committee any information as to the number of days the inspectors travelled in the year? Considering the travelling allowances paid to some persons in higher offices, the sum of £2,100 was too small if those inspectors travelled a large number of days in the year. He should have something more to say on that vote later on.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the travelling allowance to inspectors was a guinea a day, so that the amount of the vote depended upon the number of days they travelled. In some districts that would be increased, as coach fares were allowed in addition to the guinea a day, but that only applied to two inspectors who had to travel very long distances in the interior, where the coach

fare was very high. There was also an understanding with the inspectors that if the allowance was not sufficient to cover the expenses they should make representations to the department, stating the facts of the case, when they would get an additional allowance. He had every reason for believing that the vote would be quite sufficient, as last year the amount expended was £1,852 12s. 10d., and there was only one additional inspector for the present year.

Mr. SAYERS said he would ask the Minister for Public Instruction where those inspectors resided?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not know where they all resided, but he knew one or two of them lived at Toowoomba, while others lived about Brisbane.

Mr. SAYERS said he had asked the question because of its connection with the travelling allowances. He had been given to understand that all the inspectors lived about the metropolis, and he wished to know whether they drew their travelling allowances from the time they started?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that when an inspector went North from here to Townsville he got his fare up by steamer, but he did not get a guinea a day in addition.

Mr. PHILP asked why he should get his steamer fare? Why should he not live in the district? Look at the loss of time and extra expense to the country of allowing a man whose work was in Townsville to live in Brisbane. The inspector of Customs, the judge of the Supreme Court, and other officials had to live in the district, and it would be far better if those inspectors of schools were also obliged to live in the districts in which their work was carried on.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that the hon. member could hardly have been listening to the debate. He had shown that it was impossible for some of the inspectors to live in the districts in which their work lay. The district one inspector had under his charge, for instance, extended from a little distance behind Toowoomba right away down to Thargomindah. There was another district extending from behind Bowen, and taking in Tambo, Blackall, Isisford, and Forest Grove had been added to that district lately. He admitted that in large centres where there were a number of schools, such as Townsville, Rockhampton, and Maryborough, it might be advisable for the inspectors in charge of those districts to reside within them; but the difference so far as saving was concerned would be very little, because it was now considered advisable to have conferences of inspectors, and they would have to come down to Brisbane to attend the conference every year.

Mr. HODGKINSON said the point at issue was not so much the saving, although there would be a saving in the preliminary portion of the journey—the unnecessary portion. The point at issue was that the people who paid so much towards the expenses of the schools, and for whose benefit the schools were maintained, should, at any rate, enjoy the expenditure of the money expended by the department. The difficulty was again the whole system of centralising the departments in Brisbane. There was, no doubt, a widespread feeling of antagonism amongst Civil servants against residing in the North, and that was not confined to any class or rank. Eight out of ten of the persons appointed to the Civil Service of the country had been residents of the South, or were connected with Civil servants in the South, or else had sisters, cousins, or aunts in the South. That was a matter he hoped the Civil Service Board would look into.

The reason for the desire to be stationed in the South might be largely attributed to the fact that when there was a chance of a vacancy it was known in the metropolis long before it was known even in the district in which the vacancy occurred, and the consequence was there were fifty applicants for it, and the billet was filled before the nest was cold and almost before the retiring occupant left it. What the hon. member for Townsville had voiced, was simply the demand of the North to have a fair share of the expenditure of revenue they provided, and out of which those officers were supported. They had a right to any benefit to be derived from the expenditure of that money.

Mr. MACFARLANE said the Minister had informed the Committee that there were some of their schools which could only be inspected once or twice in the twelve months. He would like to ask whether there were any schools in the outside districts which could not be inspected at all; and if so, how many?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there were a few schools in the far outlying districts of the colony that were not inspected last year, but he did not think they numbered more than about half-a-dozen.

Mr. SAYERS said that in Charters Towers there were three schools, and there was likely to be a fourth shortly; in Townsville there were five schools, and there were, besides, provisional schools; then there were Bowen, Hughenden, and, at a short distance, Cooktown and Cairns; and he thought it was only right that one of the inspectors should reside in that part of the colony. Last year he had raised the same objection, and was told it would be done away with by the hon. gentleman.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I never made any such promise.

Mr. SAYERS said the hon. gentleman had not made a distinct promise, still a half promise was made on the subject when the Estimates were going through. He thought they should now have a definite promise from the hon. gentleman, as he did not see why those gentlemen should be allowed to live down South and spend their money down there, when the whole colony had to pay their salaries. The matter could be easily settled. They had judges and other officials, and schoolmasters who might eventually become inspectors, living in the North and he could not see why the inspectors should not be obliged to reside there also. He supposed that within a small radius in the North there were a hundred schools, and they should provide sufficient work for one inspector.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had thought over the matter some time ago, and in the case of the last two appointments made the inspectors had been warned that they would have to be prepared to reside in any part of the colony they might be called upon to reside in. The present was the last year of service with the inspectors in their present districts. There would shortly have to be a revision of the districts for the next three years' work, and that would be a very good time to take into consideration the question of making the inspectors reside in the districts to which they were appointed. He admitted that in a centre like Townsville, where there were a large number of schools, an inspector might be asked to reside there, but they could not ask to have one away up at Normanton. In some of the Southern and Western districts to which he had referred, they could not ask the inspectors to live there, as, in the first place, they would not be able to get the necessary accommodation.

Mr. HODGKINSON: In what part?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had referred especially to two districts. One inspector had to deal with a district extending down to Thargomindah; he had a large number of schools to inspect, and a great deal of his time was taken up in travelling. Again, with regard to Blackall, Tambo, Isisford, Aramac, Muttaborra, Winton, and now Forrest Grove, and one was about to be started at Boulia—it would be very difficult to fix upon one particular place for an inspector to reside in those districts.

Mr. HODGKINSON: Police magistrates have to reside there.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that was because their work was in one town or district, but school inspectors had to travel hundreds of miles. When they were re-allotting the districts next year for the succeeding three years that would be a very good time to determine the question about some of the inspectors residing in other parts of the colony.

Mr. HUNTER said the hon. gentleman seemed to admit the justice of the demand that some of the inspectors should live in the North, and had told the Committee that the proper time to adjust the matter would be next year. But he (Mr. Hunter) would like to point out that those officers would then be under the Civil Service Board.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: No.

Mr. HUNTER said he thought they would. As he had referred to the Civil Service Board, he would point out that they had been told by the Press—which generally got information as to appointments to the Public Service before members of that House—that two Brisbane gentlemen were to be members of that board. He trusted that the third would be a Northern man, or one who had resided in the North and knew something of its conditions and requirements, so that the Northern people might be able to expect justice in that direction. At present every Civil servant who could possibly do so resided in Brisbane, and they could only expect the same thing to continue if the Civil Service Board were connected wholly and solely with Brisbane.

Mr. UNMACK said he would like to have another word about those Executive minutes. It was clear from the evidence given before the Civil Service Commission that one respecting a pay clerk had been ignored and quietly set aside, and they had heard by accident that evening that a second Executive minute, and a very important one, had been ignored for something like twelve or thirteen years. That was the minute in reference to the instructions laid down for the guidance of the General Inspector, which it appeared strictly defined the duties of that officer. It had been acknowledged that that minute was never acted upon, and that the General Inspector did not really know what his duties were. He would like to know from the Minister whether it would not be worth while to root out the pigeon-holes of the department and see whether there were any more Executive minutes to be unearthed and brought to light?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had seen the document referred to, and he did not think it was an Executive minute, but he would not be positive on the point. If his memory served him correctly, it was an instruction drawn up by the then Minister for Education, the present leader of the Opposition, but he did not think it had ever received Executive authority.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said after a lapse of nearly fourteen years it was scarcely to be expected that he should be able to say whether the document referred to had received Executive sanction or not, but he thought it must have done so. He saw on entering the office that a change of the kind was required, and the General Inspector's duties were defined accordingly. At any rate it was acted upon, and the General Inspector of that time did not care to undertake the duties as defined under it, and resigned in consequence, and Mr. Anderson then assumed the duties of General Inspector. Having been acted upon at that time, he assumed that it had been acted upon afterwards.

Question put and passed.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, in moving that £500 be granted for special instruction, said that £250 was voted last year for drawing instructors, and he now asked £300 for that purpose. The remaining £200 was a new vote for drill instructors.

Mr. HODGKINSON: Where is it expended?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said one drill instructor was appointed at Bowen about eight months ago, and he was awaiting the vote of the Committee before he appointed any others. The scheme proposed was to pay the military drill instructors engaged in various parts of the colony to drill the larger boys attending school in all centres where there was considerable population. It was not likely that they would be able to do that in the outlying schools, but it could be done in places like Townsville, Rockhampton, Maryborough, Brisbane, and Toowoomba—in fact, wherever the defence force had drill instructors. They could drill the more advanced boys, and he had also an idea in his mind of forming cadet corps among the boys. Hon. members who visited the last encampment at Lytton would bear him out in saying that the boys in the cadet corps went through their drill in a manner that was a credit to the colony; and he hoped that before the next encampment there would be a larger number of those cadet corps established. Mr. Le Vaux, who was at that time head teacher at Roma, had been since transferred to Indooroopilly, where he was pleased to hear that gentleman was getting up another cadet corps; and he hoped to see one in Brisbane before long. The boys could be easily drilled; and they never forgot it afterwards, and the cadet corps would be a very good place to recruit from, as the boys grew up into young men. The vote was purely experimental, and he did not think it would reach nearly as far as he could wish it; but, if the scheme proved successful, it would be the duty of the Minister to come down and ask the Committee for a much larger sum next year. With regard to drawing, there had not been many applications for teachers. One had come in from Townsville, and it was proposed to teach drawing there. He thought the time was not far distant—in fact, he hoped that next year drawing would be one of the subjects taught in nearly all the schools of the colony. The pupil teachers were all learning drawing, so that they would be able to impart it when appointed as teachers. It was a matter in which they had to move a bit slowly, because there were so many teachers who were not competent to teach drawing; but the sooner it was made part of their school curriculum, the better.

Mr. SAYERS said he did not think the amount for drill instruction would be nearly enough, especially as every town in the colony

which possessed a defence force would expect to share in it. How much was it intended to pay each drill instructor?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the amount would vary from £10 to £40, in accordance with the number of schools the drill instructor attended.

Mr. HODGKINSON: That will be in addition to his present salary?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Certainly. At some places £10 would be a sufficient remuneration; at other places, £20; while in Brisbane, where there was a large number of schools, more than that would be given. He had received several applications from drill instructors, but he did not intend to make any appointments until after the vote was passed.

Mr. SAYERS said if the amount was to be limited he was afraid a great many places would be kept out in the cold. Brisbane alone would swallow nearly the half of it. There were defence forces at Charters Towers, Townsville, Brisbane, Maryborough, Gympie, Ipswich, Toowoomba, and other places—how far would the £200 go among them all? And one place was just as much entitled to a share in the vote as another.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had already pointed out that the vote was a purely experimental one, and that if it was the success he anticipated he hoped to put down a much larger sum on the Estimates for next year. It must also be remembered that three months of the current financial year had already gone by, and that a month or two months more would elapse before any appointments were made. He should take the larger towns first, and the vote would be large enough to provide for twelve or fifteen drill instructors.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he thanked the Minister for Public Instruction for placing that vote on the Estimates, and he hoped it would be the foundation for a much larger vote for the purpose in future years. No expenditure could result in more good, and he trusted it would be arranged as much as possible in accordance with a rule already prevailing in the department—namely, payment by results. It might be considered advisable to hall-mark proficiency in military drill by giving prizes for personal efficiency, and also for efficiency in bodies, that was to say, to a proportionate percentage passing a certain examination in drill each half year. Naturally, it would not do to make it a matter of numbers, because the schools in the metropolis and the larger towns would have a great advantage. The sum was, perhaps, as much as could reasonably be asked for as an experiment, and the additional recompense would no doubt be a great consideration to the drill instructors.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked whether drill instruction was to be given in school hours, and whether the instruction would be given to pupils attending other than State schools?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said drill instruction would certainly not be given during school hours. It was quite possible that one drill instructor might have half-a-dozen schools to attend, and he would have to so arrange his visits as not to interfere with the education of the children. With regard to the other question, it had not occurred to him before. It was a question that had been sprung upon him, and it was one which the hon. member would agree with him required some little consideration. At present he did not see any objection to it.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said his reason for asking the question was that children were taught in other schools besides national schools, and that

those persons who maintained schools of their own helped to maintain the national schools as well. He was one of thousands who not only paid for teaching their own children, but also had to pay their taxes for the support of the national schools. Some of their taxes would go to pay for the drill instructors, and that being so, he was of opinion that schools outside the national schools had a perfect right to a share in the drill instruction.

Mr. UNMACK said he was afraid the subject introduced by the hon. member for Stanley had a very much wider range than the hon. member seemed to expect. The hon. member said that the parents of children attending certain schools also contributed towards the cost of the national system of education, and that therefore they ought to be allowed to participate in the drill instruction proposed to be given to scholars in the State schools. But there were many scores of private schools in the colony, and the parents who sent their children there also contributed towards the cost of the national schools. Would the hon. member ask that those drill instructors should be sent to all those private schools at the cost of the State? He wished to direct the attention of the Minister to another matter in connection with the drilling of school children. He had noticed in some of the Brisbane schools that drill instruction was given to the children in the hottest part of the day in summer in the open air. All schools had not play-sheds, but even where they had the drill instruction was given in the open air, probably because there was more room. It must be most injurious to the youths that they should be drilled in the burning sun in summer time. In the winter it did not matter. He had seen the children go away from their drill exhausted. That he was sure was neither the wish of the Minister nor officers of the department, and it only required a general instruction to be given to have the practice stopped.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said private schools numbering not less than 100 children might be taught drill.

Mr. SMITH said he was pleased to see that vote on the Estimates. He was one of those who suggested it last year, and he hoped the Minister would see his way to increase the vote next year. The amount certainly was very small, but as the hon. gentleman said it was merely an experiment, he (Mr. Smith) hoped it would be a success. He should like to see the system extended by having cadet corps established throughout the colony. There were a great many boys sufficiently old to join such corps, and in every way it would be of advantage to the boys. They would become better citizens, and would be in training and ready to join the defence force. A suggestion had been made by the Minister which he hoped he would reconsider—that was having the boys drilled out of school hours. If that plan was carried out, the boys would evade drill in every way. The hours now fixed for instruction were quite long enough, and the boys themselves thought so. If the hon. gentleman's idea were carried out, the boys would look upon drill as a kind of imposition.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he wanted to know whether the Minister would have any objection to private schools numbering not less than 100 children being taught drill?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had not the slightest objection to the proposal, but he could not give any pledge that the drill instructors would go to the private schools. The matter was an experiment. The question was rather a big one, and was worthy of consideration. He could not answer it straight

away, because that was the first time it had been brought under his notice. He would not like to give a pledge that he could not carry out.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said it would be no more of an experiment as applied to private schools than to State schools.

Mr. ISAMBERT said when he spoke on that subject last year he pointed out the necessity for establishing a teachers' college, which would have great advantages, if even only from a defence force point of view. They required to defend themselves, and drill the youth of the colony. In the past, opinions were divided on that question; many looked upon such a vote as that for drill instruction as unnecessary; but opinions had changed, and he believed in the right direction. If the defence vote were cut down by £10,000, and the money applied to the establishment of a teachers' college, the defence force would gain. He did not state that because he knew it was not possible. The Government would not have proposed the expenditure in the defence force if it was not necessary. He only used that as an illustration, that even if the defence vote was cut down by £10,000, it would be the gainer, and the advantages of a teachers' college would be, as it were, a present. The discussion upon drill instructors pointed the lesson that if they had a teachers' college there would be efficient and proper drill instruction, and there would then be no need for special drill instructors. He would like the opinion of the Minister for Public Instruction as to whether the Government intended to establish a teachers' college.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he agreed with the hon. member that the time was not far distant when they would have to establish a teachers' college. The fact was that at the present time they had some excellent teachers in charge of schools; some very good teachers below them again, and the pupil teachers also were well taught. After the last named were once classified there was no great inducement for them to become extra-efficient. He was strongly in favour of a teachers' college, and although the General Inspector had formerly been against it, he was glad to say he had altered his opinion, and thought that the time had arrived for the establishment of such a college. When it was established they would be able to have drill efficiently taught—not the system now in vogue; but they would have to keep abreast of the most recent methods in drill, which were changing day by day.

Mr. PHILP said he would like to ask the Minister for Public Instruction whether notice was ever taken in the inspectors' reports of the condition of school play-grounds? In some parts of the colony teachers planted the grounds with trees; but in other parts the play-grounds were just like prison yards. He thought some encouragement should be given to those teachers who encouraged the growth of trees round the schools. His attention had been particularly called to the subject by passing a school near the gaol. It struck him that the school yard was like a gaol yard, and the gaol yard, which was planted with trees, like what the school yard should be. The gaol yard was planted with trees, but the school was perfectly bare.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the practice of the department at the present time was that if the school committees planted trees in the ground the department paid half the cost. The inspectors always reported on the state of the playgrounds, and he only wished they would pay attention to the suggestion of the hon. member for Townsville. The department would assist them in planting

trees in all the playgrounds of the colony. The expense was not very great, because they got assistance from the acclimatisation and botanical gardens in the supply of trees.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he would like to know whether the hon. gentleman had come to any decision with reference to the matter brought under his notice some time ago—namely, the teaching of Dr. Richardson's temperance lessons in State schools.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said a deputation waited upon him some time ago asking him whether he had any objection to the teaching of temperance as a subject in State schools, and he stated then that if they were able to make arrangements with the teachers to teach it as an object lesson he had no objection to it being taught, but he certainly objected to it taking the place of any subject at present taught. He did not know how they had succeeded in that.

Mr. MACFARLANE said some teachers were willing to teach those lessons, but others were against it, as they did not consider themselves qualified to teach the subject. An order from the Minister, however, would induce them to take it up. He (Mr. Macfarlane) was informed that those lessons were adopted in the Roman Catholic schools in Ipswich, and other non-vested schools, with very good results.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he would like to know whether the hon. member meant by temperance, total abstinence, because there was a great difference between the two. He did not think they had much reason to apprehend any great excess in regard to drinking on the part of the native youth of the colony. As a rule the native Australian was sober, and drinking here seemed to be confined, as in Europe, to those who belonged to the more Northern countries. But teachers like other men were liable to temptations, and it was possible in time that if a gentleman with a particular crank occupied a high position in the Education Department, some teachers might think it a proper thing to curry favour with him by teaching what the hon. member called temperance, but which he (Mr. Hodgkinson) more correctly described as total abstinence, while other teachers, perhaps superior men, could not conscientiously teach the crank of total abstinence, because the boys knew that they took their glass of beer occasionally, or whatever they chose to drink. The question was to be looked at in two lights. He was a warm supporter of temperance, but not a supporter of total abstinence.

Mr. MACFARLANE said lest there should be some other member of the same opinion as the hon. member who last spoke he might explain that Dr. Richardson's text-book did not teach total abstinence, but the nature of beer, whisky, and other alcoholic drinks, and would show the rising generation what to drink and what to avoid drinking. If people knew the nature of all they ate and drank they would be more guarded perhaps in their food. The text-book to which he referred was compiled by one of the greatest analytical chemists in Great Britain.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said a cadet corps was started some time ago at Charters Towers, by Mr. Allom, for the older boys who had left the State school. Could the hon. gentleman or the Premier tell them how it was getting on?

The PREMIER said the hon. gentleman need not be the least uneasy about that cadet corps. He (the Premier) had as high an appreciation of Mr. Allom as the leader of the Opposition had, and that cadet corps had been taken care of and

was getting on all right. The hon. member for Townsville had taken a great interest in the corps.

Mr. SAYERS said he hoped the Minister for Public Instruction would take that matter into consideration, and appoint drill instructors where the people had started cadet corps, which were a credit to the colony, so that youths who had left school might be encouraged to join. He did not think the Committee would object to vote a larger sum for such purpose, provided, of course, that the people first showed their *bona fides* by starting cadet corps.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that in many places, unless something was first done by the Government, the people would not take much interest in the matter. There were only two cadet corps in the colony, so far as he was aware—namely, at Charters Towers and Roma. He was desirous of establishing them all over the colony wherever there was a large enough number of youths. Certainly the department would assist places where cadet corps were organised, and would place no obstacle in their way.

Question put and passed.

SALARIES OF TEACHERS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION in moving that there be granted for the service of the year 1889-90 a sum not exceeding £142,150 for salaries and contingencies in connection with teachers, said that vote was £1,100 less than it was last year. The amount for salaries of teachers for the present year was £105,000, as against £108,800 for last year. The amount actually expended last year was £104,333 7s. 4d. He asked now for £105,000. The amount for capitation allowances was increased by £2,500, and the incidental expenses showed an increase of £300. The amount for the instruction of pupil teachers showed a decrease of £200, and altogether there was a decrease of £1,100.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said the amount voted last year must have been largely in excess of what was required. The number of teachers provided for last year was 1,323, and for the present year it was only 1,214, so that the number last year must have been largely over-estimated.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the Civil Service Commission had reported that there was a large excess of teachers, and he had laid down the rule that in all cases where there were less than thirty pupils to each teacher, no vacancies should be filled up. The resignations last year made a considerable reduction in the number. If the total number of the teachers in the service last year had remained in it, the vote would have amounted to £114,000. Any vacancies that occurred during the present year would have to be filled up.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said there was a diminution in the number of pupil teachers. In class three, there was a decrease of nine male teachers and nineteen female teachers, and that probably was accounted for by marriages and resignations. There was a diminution of thirty-five male pupil teachers and thirty-one female, and that was a very serious matter, because the service was recruited from the pupil teachers. He hoped the system of pupil teachers would not be discouraged.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said every encouragement was given to pupil teachers. For some years there had been a difficulty as to what should be done with all the pupil teachers, as it would have been a breach of faith had they not been allowed to become classified teachers. The Under Secretary had been very

anxious that the services should not get overgrown with teachers; but there had been no discouragement in any way. A good many had resigned because their parents had shifted from one part of the colony to another, and it had frequently happened that the vacancies had not been filled. The vote had been very carefully considered, and he was perfectly confident that a sufficient number of teachers had been provided for for the present year. Last year new schools had been opened, and promotions were made amounting to over £2,000.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said he wished to know if it was intended that free railway passes should be given to children going to school? He understood that the railway employés' children travelled free, and why not all children? He was travelling in a train in Sydney, and found that a family of five children travelled nine miles to school and back again for 11s. per annum.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could not answer the hon. member. The rate for children going to school had been considerably reduced. In regard to the children of the railway employés along the line, the Railway Department had made arrangements for conveying them to school free and taking them back again in the afternoon. That was one of the inducements held out for such people to live along the line.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said that far poorer people than railway employés had to pay for their children. Some of the farmers were far poorer than the railway employés.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had no doubt arrangements could be made with the Railway Department. He wished to give every facility for the children to attend school; but he could not control the Railway Department.

Mr. SMITH said he wished to know if it was the intention of the Government to provide residences for all head teachers? There was an amount of £1,250 for allowances in lieu of residences, and a similar amount was down last year; so that it did not appear that any new residences were being built. Generally speaking, State schools were in very nice positions, and residences would be a valuable adjunct to them.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said in places where no residence was provided the head teacher was allowed £50 a year. He had seen the necessity for having teachers' residences on the school grounds where possible, and several were being built at present. It was a matter that could not be done in a year or two; but where a new school was built, he had insisted upon a residence being put up at the same time. It was all very well for a local committee to collect subscriptions for the erection of a school; but they did not care about a residence for the teacher. They thought the department must take care of the teacher. He had every wish to see the teachers made comfortable as far as possible by having residences attached to the schools; but there were some places, such as Brisbane, where there was no room for a residence, and they would have to remain under the present conditions.

Mr. SAYERS said the local committee in a poor locality found great difficulty in raising one-fifth of the cost of the school, and the Minister had to use a little discretion with regard to providing the residence.

Mr. PHILP said it was one of the recommendations of the Civil Service Commissioners that thirty children ought to be taught by one teacher; but he had three or four good reasons

why, if thirty were sufficient for one teacher in the South, twenty-five were enough in the North, and he would read them :—

"The average number of children taught by each teacher should not exceed 25.

"Reasons.—1. This would often mean a larger number than the above, because it is impossible to arrange so that a uniform number of 25 scholars should compose each class.

"2. Where a larger average is taken, a very heavy burden is laid upon small schools; for then several classes are taught by the same teacher, whereas one class is sufficient, or, at the most two classes are sufficient to demand his entire care.

"3. Again, the lowest classes in a school are always the largest; these are often taught by young teachers, and where the class is above 25 great injury is done to both scholars and teachers. The injury is inefficient teaching, lowering of moral tone in children, and often ruined health to teacher; yet a young teacher cannot deal with upper classes.

"4. Upper classes should not exceed 25, for though a teacher can as well give his oral lessons to 200 as to 2, yet the individual reading, home lessons, exercises in writing, composition, etc., have to be examined and corrected, and this means a great deal of careful attention, which cannot be fairly given when a class is much in excess of 25.

"5. The teacher's influence should be especially felt in the higher classes, directing though to higher levels, striving to strengthen and promote noble characteristics. How can this be done when he is hampered by correction of exercises, or overtaxed by numbers?

"6. A teacher has said: 'Considering that our schools are worked at high pressure all the year round, that the attendance is irregular, that the subjects taught are not inconsiderable, that the temperature is often excessive, and that the work is exhausting, the average number of pupils per teacher should not exceed 25.'"

He knew of his own knowledge that if a man was able to do a certain amount of work in the South he could not do the same amount in the North, and teachers had told him that six years in the North took more out of them than eight or nine years in the South.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said his attention had been drawn to that matter before. While desirous of economising as far as possible, he thought he should be going in the wrong direction if he lost efficiency; and he was determined, before increasing the number of pupils per teacher beyond thirty, to give that number a fair trial. If it was found that the teachers could teach that number or more, the average would be raised accordingly; but if it was found that they could not teach that number then the number of teachers must be increased. He would be very sorry to overwork the teachers in the North, and he thought the question required great consideration. Complaints had been made, chiefly from young women in the North, that they felt their duties very heavy at the present time. He intended to get the best information on the subject; and if it was found necessary to increase the number of teachers there, he would do so, because he agreed that neither a male nor a female was capable of doing so much work in the North as in the South, on account of the climate.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he could not agree with the hon. member for Townsville. The ability to teach a certain number of children did not depend on the temperature; it depended partly on the hours of work and partly on the number of classes to which the teacher had to attend. The climate might be a reason why the hours of teaching should be less, but he did not think it was any reason why the number of children per teacher should be decreased. It was impossible to lay down any hard-and-fast line in the matter.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it was much harder for a teacher to manage twenty children divided into three

drafts, than thirty children who were all about equal. There was no hard and fast rule followed, inasmuch as in some schools there were a great many more drafts in proportion to the number of pupils than in other schools; and the General Inspector made his recommendations according to the amount and kind of assistance the head teacher should receive. In some schools it was desirable to have two or three assistant teachers, for instance, while in others there might be one assistant teacher and some pupil teachers. He had no personal experience of the climate of the North, but he thought there was a great deal to be said on that point. It was on account of the climate that the number of children per teacher was less in Queensland than in Victoria, where the average was forty.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said it was no more trouble to give instruction to a class of fifty in Townsville, than to give instruction to a class of the same number in Brisbane; but the climate in the North might be a reason why the hours of teaching should be shortened there. If one teacher had fifty children to attend to, he would be able to give the same instruction to those fifty children in one place just as well as in another, in one day. He was very glad to hear that the Minister adopted the same views as he held—that a hard-and-fast line could not be laid down. He had previously understood the hon. gentleman to say that he gave instructions, that wherever there was more than one teacher to thirty pupils, the number of teachers was to be reduced.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that he had stated that where the number of pupils was less than thirty to each teacher no increase would be made in the teaching staff; but there were special circumstances in which they had had to make appointments. An extra pupil teacher might be wanted in a school if there were a very large number of smaller children. From the complaints—particularly from the young female teachers—he had received from the North about their health, he was pretty well satisfied as to the effect of the climate, and he did not think the department would be doing right if they tried to overwork their teachers. They must not lose efficiency in order to economise.

Mr. UNMACK said he was afraid the hon. member for Townsville had brought that forward as another reason for the North obtaining Separation, for he was quite sure the hon. member had really made up his mind that that was another grievance which the North was suffering from. Nothing could be discussed from a rational point of view, but it was immediately made a grievance of the North. He thoroughly agreed with the Minister for Public Instruction in saying that nothing should be allowed to interfere with the efficiency of the teaching by adding to the number of pupils, or in any other way; but he could not see that there was any difference between teaching a certain number of children in the North and teaching the same number in the South. There was one matter which had so far been left out of the discussion. The whole of the evidence given, by both teachers and inspectors showed that they were unanimous in their opinion that throughout the colony thirty was the lowest number which should be taught by one teacher.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There was not a Northern teacher or inspector examined.

Mr. UNMACK said some of the inspectors had been in the North. However, he was not going to lay so much stress upon that point as upon another. Some of the teachers had stated that it would be much easier to teach a larger

number of pupils and obtain the same efficiency of instruction, provided schedule 5 were slightly revised. Schedule 5 laid down all the details of the subjects to be taught.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: That was one of the subjects referred to the inspectors' conference, and they made some very valuable suggestions about it.

Mr. PHILP said he could assure the hon. member for Toowong that if they wanted separation, they could bring it on every night in the week. The teachers in the North had asked him to bring forward their grievances. That was their only opportunity, whereas teachers in the South could go and see the Minister. The leader of the Opposition had stated it was not harder work teaching thirty children in the North than it was in the South, but the hon. gentleman did not know what he was talking about. He might as well say that he could get through as much work in the summer as he could in the winter in Brisbane, and he could assure the hon. gentleman that it was one perpetual summer in the North. He had a letter in which a teacher who had been transferred from Port Douglas to Copperfield said he could get through as much work in one week at Copperfield as he could perform in three weeks at Port Douglas. Then the correction of home exercises made a great difference. They had to be supervised, and that took more out of a man than anything else. There was no harder work than that of teaching in the colony, and they ought to show some consideration to the men who were training up the youth of the colony who were to rule the colony in the future. If they kept the teachers so hard at work that they became dispirited, how could they teach the young as they should? He had eight or ten pages of foolscap he could read in connection with the matter if the Committee wished it.

Mr. HUNTER said he agreed with the hon. member for Townsville that a smaller number of pupils should be allotted to teachers in the North, but for a different reason. It was far harder work for a teacher to keep order in a large class on a hot day. It was not so much a matter of lessons and of teaching as of keeping discipline. Most hon. members would agree with him that it was harder to keep children quiet in a hot climate than in a cool one, and they must remember that in the North it was summer all the year round. On that account he considered there should be a difference made between the North and South with regard to the number of pupils to each teacher.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said there was not much difference of opinion between the hon. member for Townsville and himself. He said it was not altogether a question of numbers. It was suggested that because of the difference in climate a teacher could not manage as many children in the North as in the South; but he did not think it was harder to teach forty infants in Townsville than in Brisbane. The teacher in Townsville might not be able to teach forty children all day, for the children could not learn all day, but it certainly would not take two teachers in Townsville to do the work performed by one teacher in Brisbane. That would be quite a different principle—the principle that a teacher in Townsville could do only half the work he or she could do in Brisbane. That was not a question of numbers at all, but depended upon a variety of conditions, and not altogether upon the climate.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: The teachers are always very glad to get away South.

Mr. HODGKINSON said the question could not be settled in a theoretical manner. He would sooner take the correspondence the hon. member for Townsville, Mr. Philp, had in his possession, and his opinion, than the opinion of hon. members who had no personal knowledge of the North. Hon. members of that Committee who knew nothing about the North appeared to think any reference to the North absolutely offensive; but Northern members were going to make those references, and they would adopt the policy adopted by the leader of the Irish party in the House of Commons. They would make the Committee so disgusted with them that ultimately they would be told to go in peace and say no more. Reasoning had no effect upon the Southern members. The Northern representatives were taunted for trying to do their duty. They were paying the hon. member for Toowong the greatest compliment they could pay him in adopting his policy; but that hon. member treated them with contumely. The manner in which that hon. gentleman had stuck, through thick and thin, in season and out of season, to his intention to refer on every occasion to the report of the Civil Service Commission was an example to the Northern members of how they should stick to the duty intrusted to them. It was unkind of the hon. member for Toowong to reproach them for adopting the means he had himself adopted. The question of schools in the North was not a question altogether of hours or of numbers, but it was a complex question involving numbers, hours, climate, accommodation, and, in fact, everything that affected human life. It was ridiculous for any man to contend that a person of Anglo-Saxon descent could work as well in an average temperature of 90 degrees as he could in an average temperature of 60 or 70 degrees. They had not got the same establishments in the North as they had in the South, as the population did not warrant the department in providing them; through not having them, the health of the teachers and the querulousness and health of the children was affected, and yet the rules which governed the conduct of the schools in the North, as to hours and subjects of study, were the same as they were in the South. As a rule, teachers of a high rank did not get a Northern appointment; subordinates in rank were generally appointed, and they had to become acclimatised to the North.

The MINISTER FOR MINES AND WORKS: They are sometimes sent there for punishment.

Mr. HODGKINSON said they were sometimes sent up to the North, as the hon. gentleman had said, for punishment; they were absolutely suffering in duress, and yet they were told there was no difference between the position of a teacher in the North and a teacher in the South. It was absurd.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said he had been necessarily absent from the House for a fortnight, and he did not wish hon. members to understand that he was going to make up for lost time, but he could not sit still and listen to the insinuations thrown out by the hon. member for Toowong with regard to the people of the North and the representatives of the North taking up everything as a Northern grievance and making it a pretext for arguing in favour of separation. He did not think the hon. member for Toowong was to be commended for the answer he had given to the hon. member for Townsville, as observations of that sort did not tend to promote the good feeling existing between the Northern and Southern portions of the colony. When an hon. member got up and referred to difficulties that had come under his own observation, and in connection with matters he was thoroughly

conversant with, it was a little hard to be met with flippant criticism from a gentleman who could not know as much of the subject. He entered his protest against any remarks of that kind being made. He was quite sure the hon. member for Townsville had not been actuated by a desire to thrust forward any Northern grievance in connection with that matter. Anybody who had been in the North must know that the physical strain upon teachers in that part of the colony was very great, and he thought every consideration should be shown them. No hard-and-fast rule should be laid down as applicable all over the colony, irrespective of climatic conditions. The Minister for Public Instruction would do well to give his best attention to the suggestions made by the hon. member for Townsville, and he was quite sure that the hon. gentleman in his anxiety to promote the interests of those who laboured under disadvantageous circumstances in the far North would try whether the grievances under which they had to labour could not be remedied. He wished to ask the hon. gentleman whether it was a fact that the female teachers in their schools were prohibited during the whole of the school hours from occupying a sitting position? Statements had been made in the public Press at times that it was a rule of their schools that female teachers had to be on their feet during the whole of the time they were engaged in their school duties. If any such rule existed the sooner it was abolished or modified the better, and particularly in the schools of the North, as he thought nothing could be more cruel than to ask their female teachers to be on their feet the whole of the time they were engaged in the performance of their school duties.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said his attention was called to that matter soon after he went into office; and he had immediately had a circular issued to the head teachers of all the schools in the colony abolishing the rule. The female teachers were now allowed to sit down, and need not stand longer than a certain time.

Mr. SAYERS said he had listened to hon. members on both sides complaining so much about the climate of the North. He had been twenty years in the North and knew what the climate was, and it was nothing like so bad as some hon. members tried to make out. It was warm, but it was a good climate, and they could rear as good natives in the North as in the South; young men who would in time be able to take as good positions in the colony as any born in the South. To hear some members decrying the climate of the North, one would think it was deadly to go up there. One or two places might not have a good climate; the place the hon. member for Townsville came from might not have a good climate, but Bowen, alongside of it, had an excellent climate, and the climate of Charters Towers, eighty miles away, could not be beaten. The climate on the tablelands of the North was better than the climate of Brisbane in the months of December and January. He objected to the continual complaining about the climate of the North, and would object to it every time it was done.

Mr. LISSNER said they were no doubt much obliged to the hon. member for Charters Towers, who evidently knew more about the climate of the North than anybody else. He had been in the North as long as the hon. member, and had as good a constitution, thank the Lord! In the matter of producing extremely fine young men he was a better man than the hon. member and could bring specimens into the House if required for evidence. The hon. member knew that the hon. member for

Toowong had never been in the North, and he got up and backed up what that hon. member had said with his experience of twenty years. For his own part, he knew that schoolmasters in the North suffered a great deal at times, and he had had a letter from Charters Towers, from which he found that the thermometer in an office there stood at 90 degrees three or four days ago. The further they went the more they learned, and the hon. member would know more about the climate if he made a trip overland through the peninsula to Croydon and Normanston. He was sure the hon. member for Townsville in bringing that matter forward was animated by no desire for separation on that account, and if he himself had charge of the papers in the possession of that hon. gentleman, he would ask the indulgence of the Committee while he read them.

Mr. PHILP said just to show hon. members that that was not a Townsville grievance, he would point out that the letter from which he had quoted said the question was first Northern, second general. It referred to the head teachers at Mackay, Charters Towers, Hughenden, Burketown, Normanston, Georgetown, Maytown, Cooktown, Port Douglas, Townsville, Bowen, and other places. He thought they represented the North pretty well. Then it went on to say that a tropical allowance was made on account of the great cost of living, and still more so on account of the great wear and tear of frame. He would ask the Minister what allowances were made to the teachers living in those places?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was no particular allowance made for residence in tropical Queensland. The allowance applied to all places at a long distance from the coast, and varied from £10, which was the lowest, to £30. That was for extra cost of living, not for wear and tear of frame; there was no allowance for that. That question was one of the most difficult the department had to deal with, because it was very hard to find out what the extra cost of living might be in any particular place. Again, if the head teacher, who received capitation fees, received an allowance of £20 or £25 for extra cost of living, it would be only fair that pupil teachers should get £10 or £15. He had gone into the matter most carefully more than once, and had taken cases as they arose, to try and make those matters fit in equally, but must confess that he had been disappointed with his own work. The General Inspector had also done so, and found just the same difficulty, because he did not know what the cost of living was in any particular place. The teachers all saw the reports; Brown knew exactly what Jones got, and thought he should get the same, so that there was continual dissension on the subject. He admitted that there should be allowances for extra cost of living. It was not fair that people living in the extreme North and West, where the cost of living was very heavy, should only receive the same pay as those who lived in places where living was much cheaper. After a railway was made to a place the teacher received less allowance than was allowed previously. He did not think the allowance had in any instance been taken away from the officer at that place when the railway was made, but it was reduced, and when a new teacher was sent there it was not granted in all cases. He did not care what amount of consideration was given to the subject, it was impossible to equalise the amount to be allowed. Altogether, there was something like £2,000 distributed amongst the teachers in that way this year. He had not got the exact figures, and spoke only from memory. At Burketown there was a fixed amount, and at Isisford,

Mr. HODGKINSON: How much does the teacher get altogether?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: £250; it was only a small school. One or two other places got fixed allowances also. He could assure the hon. member for Townsville that he did his best to mete out justice to all parts of the colony.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he could not see any insuperable difficulty in the way of the hon. gentleman getting all the information necessary to enable him to deal with the subject. He did not for a moment say that the hon. gentleman should get it personally; but what was there to prevent the Under Secretary of the department from getting, as a basis, the average cost of living in those places? He could form a very good estimate, by taking the average cost of the carriage of rations from the nearest port, or from Brisbane, or by getting the charges made in such boarding-houses as teachers were likely to frequent. When he got the cost of the main necessities of life—provided the department supplied the teachers with house accommodation—there was no difficulty in forming an estimate. He would like to know the total salary, including everything, received by the head teachers at Normanton, Georgetown, and Croydon; that was taking one coast town, and two inland towns?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was no school at Croydon. The hon. gentleman being the representative of the district, ought to know that.

Mr. HODGKINSON: I do not; I could not imagine it possible.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the teacher at Georgetown received £114 salary, £27 capitation, and £59 special allowance; altogether £200. The teacher at Normanton received £168 salary, £107 capitation, and £85 allowance; making £360. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member that it would be very easy to arrive at the amount by getting the cost of carriage of rations to any particular place, he would ask how could that be done. How could even Wright, Heaton, and Co. know the cost of the carriage of rations to every particular place? It was sometimes difficult to get even a supply of meat from the local butcher; in other places the cost of provisions of all kinds was very high, because there was no competition. All those things had to be taken into consideration. The department had received letters from teachers pointing out all those difficulties, and no doubt they were to a certain extent exaggerated. The allowances varied according to the locality, and in a few places far inland they were fixed amounts. He had recently made an appointment at Boulia. They could not allow only £20 there, so he made the salary for the teacher £200. It would be impossible to go by any hard and fast rule.

Mr. HODGKINSON said he was not finding fault with the hon. gentleman, for he believed there was no one more imbued with the sense of duty than the Minister for Public Instruction. He was attempting to assist the hon. gentleman by showing him how he could get the particulars he wanted. Take the case of Georgetown. Only the other day they passed a salary for an office-keeper there exceeding £200, a year the total income of the person who had the charge of the education of the youth of that place. Then there was Croydon, one of the most important mining districts in the colony, without a school at all, although it had been open three years. Unless he had been misinformed, the money had been subscribed some time ago.

1889—5 q

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Within the last few days, and it is not all subscribed now.

Mr. HODGKINSON: Was it not subscribed five or six months ago?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that five or six months ago there was a small sum collected, but nothing like the amount required under the Act. Since then £230 had been collected, and although the amount required was £300, he had accepted the guarantee of the local committee for the balance, and had called for tenders for the school.

Mr. PAUL said he wished to call attention to the system of promotion of teachers. He was given to understand that that was done by certain marks given by the inspector. If the inspector did not visit a school the teacher got no marks whatever, and it laid the inspector open to the charge of favouritism on the ground that he had omitted to inspect that school for the purpose of getting teachers in other schools promoted. He knew of an instance at Clermont where the inspector had not visited the school, and the teachers had in consequence not received the marks which entitled them to promotion. If the inspector did not visit any particular school the teachers there ought to be in the same position with regard to promotion as if he had visited it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the hon. member must have been misinformed. He had stated earlier in the evening that all the schools in the colony, with perhaps half-a-dozen distant exceptions, were visited every year by the inspectors. In any case, there were always previous reports to go upon. During that year there had been two cases where he had had no hesitation in granting promotion on the previous reports. There might be an odd case of the kind referred to by the hon. member, but he thought it was hardly likely.

Mr. BUCKLAND said he would direct the attention of the hon. gentleman to a hardship frequently suffered by school teachers with large families being transferred from one part of the colony to another. In many instances, he was informed, the amount allowed was totally inadequate to cover the expenses of the removal. It frequently happened that teachers with large families were removed from the South to the North of the colony, and by the time they got to their journey's end they found that their incomes had suffered a considerable diminution, because the department had not provided them with sufficient funds to cover their travelling expenses.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could assure the hon. member that he had been misinformed. Every teacher removed had a full and ample allowance for travelling expenses. But some teachers, immediately they were transferred, thought they were travelling with their hands in the pockets of the department, and were most extravagant. In those cases he reduced the amount sent in. One teacher actually stayed at a hotel, instead of going to the residence provided for him, and sent in the bill for his hotel expenses, which, as a matter of course, he at once disallowed. All travelling expenses at hotels, when on the road, as well as railway and steamer fares, were allowed liberally, but he was not going to allow any unjust charges to be made.

Mr. SMITH asked whether any special inducements were held out to school teachers for preparing boys for grammar school scholarships? It would be interesting to have a return of the number of boys, with their names, and from what schools, who had taken scholarships.

Some encouragement ought to be given to head teachers to prepare boys for those scholarships. In many instances the parents knew nothing about the regulations, and unless teachers took some interest in the work the boys were simply neglected—boys well adapted by their talents and opportunities for taking those scholarships.

Mr. UNMACK said he was afraid the few remarks he made about the North, and which were partly made in joke, had struck the nail upon the head. With regard to the criticism with which he had been favoured by the hon. member for Burke, he wished to say that he had never sought that hon. gentleman's approval of his actions, nor did he care whether he approved or disapproved. Whether the hon. gentleman chose to praise or to censure him was a matter of the most supreme indifference to him. The hon. gentleman would have failed in his usual rôle of political mentor if he had not sat upon some of them. It was the usual custom of that hon. member to sit upon some of them on that side of the Committee; and all he could say was that it went off them like water off a duck's back. He did not intend to say anything about the hon. member for Charters Towers, because that hon. member was more generous and considerate, and did not so often transgress in that way as the hon. member for Burke. He wished to know how much of the vote for pupil teachers had been spent last year, and what had been the percentage of pupil teachers who had passed the examination for promotion to a higher class?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the amount last year was £1,859 15s. 3d.

Mr. UNMACK: What percentage of pupils passed?

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said the question asked by the hon. member for Bowen was of sufficient importance to require an answer. The hon. member asked whether any special consideration was shown to teachers in schools who prepared boys for scholarship examinations. He did not know whether there was any rule by which those special services were recognised; but if not, there ought to be; because, as a matter of fact, in many of the schools the teachers went in the morning long before the ordinary school hours, and also devoted a considerable portion of their leisure on Saturdays towards preparing the boys; so that the boys who were clever and had the intellectual capacity were not forced on in the ordinary school hours at the expense of the other boys. If the teachers had not received any allowance or encouragement, he thought the suggestion that they should get consideration was a good one, and that some regulation on the subject should be framed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was no special consideration shown to those teachers. They had the honour and glory of passing the boys, and if they were marked as successful teachers they would get promotion. All those things were taken into consideration. In reply to the hon. member for Toowong, he might say that 460 out of 507 pupil teachers passed last year.

Mr. SMITH said, for the sake of encouraging a spirit of emulation amongst the school teachers, he hoped the Minister would accept his suggestion. The names of those schools in which the boys passed, together with the names of the teachers and the boys should be advertised in the leading papers of the colony. He thought that would create a spirit of emulation amongst the teachers who prepared the boys for those examinations. That was a very important matter; even if the boys did not pass the examinations, the spirit of emulation which would be encouraged would have good results.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said in all towns in the colony where there was a newspaper the names were published. The full list appeared in the *Courier* last year. He was informed that the list was supplied to the city papers, and he presumed the names of the local boys were copied into the local papers. As for advertising, he did not think the hon. gentleman would expect the department to pay for publishing the list.

Mr. UNMACK said the percentage of pupil teachers who passed last year was about 70 per cent. Now on the current Estimates the number of pupil teachers, male and female, numbered 426. That did not quite tally with the annual report which gave the number at 504, but the Estimates were brought down to a later date and gave 426. So that a fair average of those who were likely to pass seemed about 300. Each head teacher received £5 for every candidate he passed successfully and nothing for those he did not pass. Three hundred pupil teachers at £5 per head would amount to £1,500, yet the Minister asked for £2,000.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said, last year £2,200 was asked for, and for the present year the amount was £200 less. If the money was not wanted it was not expended. The department did not know what number would pass, and it was better to have too much than too little.

The Hon. Sir S. W. GRIFFITH: How many pupil teachers passed last year?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Four hundred and sixty. Of course it was only those pupil teachers who passed for whom £5 per head was paid. The head teachers received no fees for those who passed the higher examinations.

Mr. UNMACK said according to the average percentage of passes only £1,500 a year would be required. He would ask the hon. gentleman if, under the Audit Act, any transfers from one vote to another had taken place?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said: Yes. For departmental contingencies the amount voted last year was £1,000. That had to be supplemented by a vote of £124 8s. 6d., which was put on the Supplementary Estimates. The capitation allowances last year were £512 in excess of the vote, which was made up by a transfer from the surplus on salaries. The incidental expenses amounted to £3,075, and the amount voted was £2,700, the deficiency of £375 19s. 9d. being made up by transfers from the votes for travelling expenses, and the instruction of pupil teachers.

Mr. GLASSEY said there was a large number of lengthsmen and other railway employés in the colony, living away from centres of population. How were their children educated where there was no train accommodation to carry them to school? Had the hon. gentleman any idea of the number of such children?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had no information on the subject. Wherever a school could be reached by train, the lengthsmen's children were taken to school.

Mr. GLASSEY said had the hon. gentleman considered the propriety of appointing travelling school teachers who could run along the railways on tricycles and visit the various camps of lengthsmen, and impart instruction to their children? It was perfectly obvious that unless some such means were adopted many of those children must grow up uneducated. It was a very serious thing that the children of railway employés, in sparsely populated parts of the

colony, should be permitted to grow up without education, and he hoped the question of appointing travelling teachers would receive careful consideration at the hands of the Minister of Education.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he did not think there was a large number of children on the railway lines who were not getting education, and while he had not thought of appointing itinerant teachers to go along the railway lines, he would point out that they had several half-time schools in the colony to meet cases of that kind. The department was as liberal as it possibly could be, and wherever a sufficient number of children could be got together, schools were established. There were some half-time schools in the colony where only six or seven children attended, and he did not like to close them, though he would not open a school where there was only that number of children.

Mr. BARLOW said he could testify that the complaint of the hon. member for Bundamba was well founded. He (Mr. Barlow) knew a case in his own district, where a lengthsmen actually got into hot water with the Railway Department, and was now out of employment in consequence of his unwillingness to go to a place where his children could not get education. The man had called upon him several times, and he (Mr. Barlow) could not help saying that his conduct was most praiseworthy in seeking education for his children, and he had been trying to get the man something to do in town, so that he could get his children educated.

Mr. GLASSEY said he was not casting any blame on the Minister for Public Instruction, or his predecessor, in that connection; but, under present circumstances, it was impossible, unless some such method as he had suggested was adopted, to educate those children. Half-time schools would not meet the difficulty. At some camps there were three or four dwellings, sometimes five, but perhaps not half-a-dozen children old enough to attend school; and a difficulty arose where trains ran infrequently, as, for instance, on the Esk line, where they only ran three times a week, so that if they had half-time schools, the long distances between the places where they were situated would render it impossible for the children to attend. That difficulty occurred in the Western, Central, and Northern districts, and he saw no way out of it except by appointing travelling teachers, who should be permitted to travel along the line of railway on tricycles. In the old country he was a member of two boards where they had to administer the Education Act. At places where there was no school board the parochial and local boards of health, with which he had been for some time connected, took the place of school boards and possessed all the powers of a school board, with the exception that they were not able to build schools. He had given very much attention to the question of education for many years, feeling, as he did, the want of it in his youth, and he thought it was a great hardship that the children of large numbers of people in this colony, especially lengthsmen and other railway employés, scattered over sparsely populated parts of the country, should have no instruction whatever imparted to them, because, as he had pointed out, there were many cases in which, even if half-time schools were established, the children would be unable to reach them, either by train or on foot, on account of the distance. The fact that there was a large number of children in various parts of the colony receiving no education at all, was a matter that required very serious consideration, and he believed it would receive that consideration from the Minister in charge of the

Department of Public Instruction, who, he believed, was only too anxious to impart the fullest instruction to children in all parts of the colony.

The PREMIER asked whether the hon. member for Bundamba would give the Committee a little more light on the subject. Would he tell them what school board he was on, and where they used tricycles?

Mr. GLASSEY: I did not say they used tricycles.

The PREMIER: Would the hon. member tell them what school board he was on?

Mr. GLASSEY said he was on the Bedlington Shire Local Board of Health, in a large mining district near Newcastle, the population of which was 15,000 people. There were a considerable number of schools, and a large number of children. He was a member of that board for four years. There were no school boards, but the boards of health and the parochial boards took their place. He was also a member of the Morpeth Board of Guardians—a large union in the North of England, and would be too happy to give the hon. gentleman the names of the officials if he wished. There was a dense population there, of course, and there were the utmost facilities for the fullest instruction being given to children. He had taken a great interest in the question, and knew that in Queensland there was not much school accommodation in some districts, and the trains ran so irregularly, that they would have to take the teacher to the children instead of the children to the teacher.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said there was a good deal to be said in favour of the suggestion of the hon. member for Bundamba, and there was no doubt that tricycles could be used on the railway lines. He was surprised the idea had not presented itself before. He wished to ask the hon. gentleman a question in regard to the school books. Collins's series were being revised at the time he last had an opportunity of knowing what was going on in the department, and he would like to know if that revision had been completed.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said Collins's series were in use in New South Wales, and while on that subject he might say that he hoped to soon see an Australian reader. He believed there was to be a conference between the school authorities in reference to the matter, and New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia had already taken some action.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he hoped an Australian reader would be prepared. Collins's books were not so satisfactory as they might be, and he was very much disappointed with them. The higher class books he had not seen. Certainly their children ought to learn a great deal more about Australia than they did, in proportion to what they learned about the world in general; and not only in State schools, but in other schools. There was no satisfactory Australian geography that he knew of, and the geography of Australia was much more important to them than details of that of Europe or Asia. He very seldom came across a child who knew the geography of Queensland, and that of the other colonies was entirely out of the question. What child in New South Wales or Victoria knew anything about Queensland? How many members of Parliament in the other colonies knew much about the geography of Queensland? Some of them scarcely knew where it was. It was a matter that really ought to be considered, and the readings might be made much more useful. He hoped the hon. gentleman would not only join in the conference, but urge it.

The PREMIER said he quite agreed with what had been said by the leader of the Opposition. He often thought that if hon. members of that Committee knew a little more of the discovery of Australia it would open the eyes of some of them. They would find that it was not only found by Captain Cook, but by a great many other people. Their children should be educated in the history of what must eventually be a great country, if it was not one at present. More trouble should be taken in teaching their children matters concerning the first discoverers of the Australian Island Continent. A number of nationalities were concerned in that discovery beside the English.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it was a matter in which he took considerable interest, and it was a pet scheme with the Under Secretary, and also with the General Inspector. He could give the Committee every assurance that he would urge on the matter.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN said there was something very serious in what had been stated by the hon. member for Bundanba in regard to the children scattered along the railway line. The difficulty might be obviated if the Railway Commissioners were to endeavour to place married men near the centres of population, and single men further away.

Mr. MURRAY said there were hundreds of families scattered throughout the colony who were in a worse position than the lengthsmen along the line. The hon. member for Bundanba had suggested that teachers should be carried along the line on tricycles; but how did he propose to meet the requirements of the hundreds of families scattered throughout the country. They were the men who kept the lengthsmen and the country going.

Mr. GLASSEY said the hon. member had no right to throw obstacles in the way. The hon. member who represented a scattered district ought to suggest some means of meeting the difficulty he had referred to. He was suggesting a method of dealing with a difficulty that could be reached, and the hon. member was trying to throw obstacles in the way so that nothing would be done. That was the old conservative Tory way of doing things. When they found that a large number of people could be reached, then they endeavoured to throw as many difficulties in the way as possible, so that nothing at all might be done; and if the hon. member was so anxious for the people he had spoken of, he ought to suggest some means of meeting the difficulty.

The PREMIER said the hon. member for Bundanba talked as if he knew all about the matter. Twelve or fifteen years ago he (the Premier) had suggested that there should be a number of peripatetic—he would not say philosophers—but teachers, who could travel about and teach at the expense of the State, but not on tricycles, which was absurd. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Normanby that the people in the back blocks had much more right to be considered than those whom the hon. member for Bundanba proposed to reach by his nonsensical tricycle proposition.

Mr. MURRAY said the hon. member for Bundanba was mistaken if he thought he was raising any objection; but he thought that hon. member, in his generosity, might have included more than lengthsmen.

Mr. PHILP said the General Inspector had lately been sent to the Southern colonies to see how things were managed there, and he thought it would be a good idea to send him to some

parts of Queensland also. It would be a very wise plan if the Under Secretary went also occasionally. That gentleman had just returned from Europe, and a turn round the colony might do him good.

Question put and passed.

BUILDINGS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £27,085 be granted for the service of the year 1889-90 for buildings and supervision. The amount required for erection and furnishing of new schools, additions, and repairs was £25,000, as against £30,000 last year. The present foreman of works received a salary of £275, as against £325 paid to the previous officer. There was an increase of £20 for the draftsman, and there was a reduction on the amount for clerks.

The HON. SIR S. W. GRIFFITH said he wished to know whether the Government had any project in view with regard to the Brisbane Central State School. It could not remain alongside the railway station very long, and he had some doubts as to whether it could be put on the other side of the railway station.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the matter was one of extreme difficulty, because he did not think there was a very good site on the other side of the station. The present site was not large enough, and it was near a large thoroughfare. Since the opening of the Central railway station he had issued instructions that the pupils were not to be allowed to go out by Edward street, but by Adelaide and Ann streets, so as to avoid any danger of being run over by traps coming down Edward street, which was pretty steep near the school. He had thought the matter over several times, but he did not yet see his way out of the difficulty. Other schools would have to be built somewhere about; but there was no suitable site near the Normal School, nor did he think it desirable that there should be such a large school as that almost in the centre of the city.

Mr. LUYA said that last year he drew attention to a ridiculous clause in the specifications for buildings, and he was glad to say that it had been struck out. He must compliment the Minister on having effected a reform which would not interfere with the beauty or usefulness of the buildings, but would cause a great saving of money and time. The superintendent of buildings was one of the best men in Queensland, and he (Mr. Luya) looked forward to seeing a small increase in that gentleman's salary—in fact he understood that it had been promised—but he found that no increase had been put down. He hoped the Minister would by-and-by see fit to increase that officer's salary.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he endorsed all that had been said by the hon. member; and he regretted that he had not been able to see his way to increase the salary of the officer in question; but there were other officers receiving £400 a year, and if the salary of the superintendent of buildings had been increased, it would have given rise to discussion in the Committee, and caused dissatisfaction to other officers. He was aware that an increase had been promised, and it was only fair to indicate that an increase would be given next year.

Mr. UNMACK said that last year the Minister gave a kind of promise that he would consider whether it was desirable to transfer the supervision of buildings to the Colonial Architect's Department. The expenses of supervision and erection of buildings in connection with the Education Department were altogether out of

proportion to the sum required in connection with the whole of the buildings under the supervision of the Colonial Architect. Last year the amount required for the Colonial Architect was £4,000, and that required for supervision in connection with the Education Department was £1,600.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he had considered the matter, but he did not think there would be any advantage in transferring the supervision to the Colonial Architect's Department, because there were many small matters requiring immediate attention which could be attended to at once by the department having its own officers. Some years ago the experiment was tried of having repairs done by the Works Department, as well as the erection of buildings; but great dissatisfaction arose. He admitted that the percentage of expenses was rather high, but the work was well done, and it was attended to at once. The superintendent of buildings knew all the schools in the colony, and knew at once, when a report came in, what should be done; and then, under the control of the Minister, he directed the improvements, except in cases where the expenditure consisted of small amounts. The inspectors could authorise expenditure of sums not exceeding £5, and in such cases the work was sometimes done locally. The Under Secretary had authority to spend up to a certain amount, and, as he said before, the work was done at once; whereas if it had to be referred to another department, there would be a great deal of delay. Many of the works were superintended by officers of the Works Department who might be in the district; and that saved the expense of sending a foreman from the buildings branch of the Education Department.

Mr. TOZER said he had a letter from the secretary of a school committee, in which he said there was a large school very near completion, and there had not been one officer of the department to inspect the various works connected with the building since they were commenced. That was at Kilkivan. When a wooden building was erected, it was necessary to see that the timber was good while the work was going on, because one could not see whether it was good or not after it was painted. Sometimes the timber warped and shrunk greatly. He wished to ascertain from the Minister what system there was in connection with the erection of those buildings without inspection. If the case he had referred to was an isolated one, of course it could not be helped, but if it were not an isolated case something should be done by the department to have buildings examined in the course of erection.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that was an isolated case. There was also a school at Blackall, where there had been no inspection. In one of those cases they had been depending upon an officer of the Works Department going from Rockhampton to examine the building, and in the other upon an officer of the Works Department going from Maryborough; but those officers had been so busy they had not been able to inspect the schools, and the foreman of the department, being in another part of the colony, had been unable to do the work. Those were the only two cases which had occurred during the last two years. In cases where their own foreman could not personally inspect the schools, it was the practice of the department to appoint some one to look after the buildings. For instance, at Bundaberg at the present time, there was a foreman who had been appointed to see that the building was properly erected.

Question put and passed.

PROVISIONAL SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £20,300 be granted for provisional schools. That amount was an increase of £1,100 over last year. The actual amount expended last year was £18,386 2s. 10d., but there were always a great number of those schools being started in the colony, as in the case referred to by the hon. member for Bundamba. Wherever a reasonable case was made out for a provisional school, it immediately received attention.

Mr. TOZER said he took considerable interest in the question of provisional schools. He supposed there was no district in the colony where there were so many of those schools as in his own electorate, owing to the very scattered population. Many people desired to ascertain whether there was any likelihood of the Minister ever putting them on the same footing as those living in places where there were State schools? The people had to find the building in the case of a provisional school, while the Minister only found the teacher. He wished to know whether the Minister could not give the same assistance towards the erection of a provisional school as was given in the case of a State school? Supposing the people subscribed a half towards the cost of the building, was it not possible for the Minister for Public Instruction to find the other half?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the people who had to send their children to provisional schools had his entire sympathy. They were, he knew, put to great expense in having to provide the buildings for carrying on the schools, which might possibly cost £50 or £100. Such a sum would put up a very nice school if they had the same assistance as was accorded to the erection of State schools, but they had to pay the whole cost themselves; and in a scattered district it was a very heavy tax upon the people, who were mostly poor; but as that was the law at the present time he had to abide by it. He could assure the hon. gentleman that the matter had his entire sympathy, as he knew the poorer classes in the colony had to make great efforts to secure an education for their children; but he could not give any assistance in the erection of provisional schools until there was a modification of the law in that direction, which he hoped there would be soon.

Mr. ARCHER said he would like to ask the hon. gentleman what was the reason for the delay in building the school at Emu Park. Considering that the money required had been subscribed by the local people the school should have been already built, but he noticed from the Rockhampton papers that such was not the case.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the sole cause of the delay was owing to a difficulty about the choice of a site. The people of the district wanted section 18, while the department had selected section 9 or 10, and in the choice of the department the member for the district concurred, but, as a great number of people in the district objected to that site, the department were not able to build on either. They were only waiting until it was settled which site they would have. He believed the necessary amount of money had been subscribed, and tenders had been called for.

Mr. WATSON said he wished to ask the Minister if any allowance were made to female teachers who had to cross ferries. Many of them had to pay about £2 a year to cross ferries, and as they had small salaries, he considered the department should take the matter into consideration.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the department neither paid for ferries, nor yet for trams or railway fares.

Mr. TOZER said he had received several letters with reference to the school at Kilkivan. The people there had been a long time without a school teacher, in consequence of the school having been in a state of transition from a provisional to a State school; but the residents wanted to know whether a teacher would be sent as soon as the school was complete. A place like Kilkivan wanted a married couple, and he should like the Minister to inform him whether the department sent married teachers when the people requested it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said in country schools like that it was always the rule to have married teachers, and the reverse was the exception. In that case he believed he was right in promising that a married teacher should be sent without any delay.

Mr. McMASTER said that with reference to the payment of ferry fares he was under the impression that the Municipal Council of Brisbane carried all teachers free over the ferries under their control. The ferry referred to by his colleague was a ferry which was conducted by a company.

Question put and passed.

GRAMMAR SCHOOLS.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £3,364 be granted for Grammar Schools.

Mr. BARLOW said he would ask the hon. gentleman whether a little more could not be done in the way of opening up the grammar school education to a greater number of the children attending the State schools. He fancied the examinations were rather stiff, and that some of the grammar schools were money-making concerns, though he could not state instances. If they were money-making concerns, he thought that either the fees should be reduced, or, what was the same thing, a greater number of children should be allowed to go to them. There was no doubt they were a most powerful means of supplementing the usefulness of the State schools. The State carried the education of their children in the State schools up to a certain standard, but there were children of all classes in the community who came to the front and showed a capability to go further, and he was sure that the Minister would agree with him that that means of higher education should be encouraged. They might not at present be able to do much in the way of a university or in the way of exhibitions to universities, but he thought that there was room for an extension of the system.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that he thought they were very liberal in the matter of scholarships to the grammar schools. The examination might be rather stiff, but it was right to require that any pupil who got such an advantage should be able to pass a fair examination. One hundred and twenty scholarships had been offered last year, and only sixty-four pupils passed—fifty-six boys and eight girls, and it must be remembered that they had to pay sixteen guineas a year for every one of the sixty-four. He thought the State was very liberal in providing for 120 scholarships in the year.

Mr. BARLOW said he was exceedingly obliged to the hon. gentleman for his explanation. It was a question whether the whole system would not bear re-modelling. It was a wide subject, and could not then be discussed to its

fullest extent. Still the idea could be broached and considered by the public, whether it would not be advisable in the near future to have the grammar schools made State institutions, and thus relieve the State from the payment of such a large sum as sixteen guineas a year for each scholarship. The preliminary education was in the hands of the State, and he could not see why the first step in their higher education should not also be in the hands of the State. It was a wide subject that admitted of a great deal of discussion, and he did not expect an immediate answer.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE asked how it was that the amount for exhibitions to universities for 1889, was stated at £150 only instead of at £300?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that vote was only for the half year.

Question put and passed.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that the sum of £600 be granted in aid of technical education for Brisbane. He might point out that sums would be placed on the supplementary estimates in aid of technical education in other places. With regard to that vote, he thought the time had arrived when some conditions should be imposed by the State upon those receiving such grants. So far as Brisbane was concerned, he thought they received in subscriptions and fees about as much as was voted, and he believed they were doing very good work. He would like to see that work undertaken in other parts of the colony, but he thought the time had arrived when the amount voted should depend upon the amount subscribed and received in fees at each place, and the grant should be only of an equal amount.

Mr. ISAMBERT said he was glad the Minister was considering the advisability of giving that vote a wider application. There was one important matter which might be considered in connection with it. There were a large number of factories and workshops being established in the colony, and by taking a number of apprentices the proprietors got very cheap labour, and the apprentices were not taught the trades in which they were engaged; they were just slaves, and when their time was out they were more miserable than ever. There ought to be some system by which those factories should be compelled to pay a license fee for every apprentice they employed, and those fees should be applied to technical education and the apprentices should be obliged to attend the technical colleges. In the case of watchmakers, the watches were now made by machinery and the watchmakers had established a school where their apprentices might learn that portion of their trade which was not learnt in their premises. In the shoemaking trade the apprentices only learnt the making of one part, and none of them could make a shoe or a boot. Then again, in the case of the millinery business, young girls were engaged for a year or two as apprentices, and they got a whole 5s. a week for the second or third year. After four or five years they might look forward to receiving the magnificent salary of 10s. or 12s. a week, and when they had been ten years in the establishment they knew no more about the making of a dress than they did when they started. In many places they had to go back after tea and work overtime, for which they did not get a farthing, and as many of them had to go home long distances, that was not safe. They might compel those firms to contribute a license fee of £2 or £3 for every apprentice employed, and devote the money so obtained to

technical education, and in the technical schools the apprentices might be given instruction in reading, writing, arithmetic, and practical instruction in every branch of their particular trades. In boot factories, too, they should be taught how to make boots and shoes from beginning to end. Then, in the event of strikes taking place, those men would not have to submit to be dictated to and tyrannised over by either trades unions or masters, but could start in a small way on their own account. He dreaded the consequences of those factories. They were social evils, and a source of very great danger to the State, and it was the duty of the legislature to adopt means to prevent them from becoming so dangerous. He hoped the Minister for Public Instruction would take that matter into earnest consideration.

The PREMIER: No doubt he will.

Question put and passed.

ORPHANAGES (SUBDIVISION).

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, in moving that there be granted £21,810 for orphanages, said there was an increase on the amount voted last year, as the amounts put down then had been found to be insufficient. The amount voted last year for the Diamantina Orphanage was £5,500, the amount expended £6,326; the amount voted for St. Vincent's was £5,000, the amount spent, £5,600. The vote for Rockhampton was the same as last year. Last year the vote for Meteor Park was £2,200, the amount expended £2,542; and the £2,000 voted last year for Townsville had been exceeded by £450.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said there used to be a good deal of difficulty in obtaining from parents the amounts they contracted to pay for the support of their children. He would like to know whether there had been any improvement in that respect.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there was still considerable difficulty in the matter, but he was glad to say the amount collected last year was greater than in any previous year. Every effort had been made to recover the amounts due from parents who left their children in the orphanage.

Mr. TOZER said he did not know much about the orphanages, and would like to know if they were denominational.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Some of them are.

Mr. TOZER said application had been made to him since he had been a member of that House to endeavour to get two girls out of St. Vincent's Orphanage, and he had a great deal of trouble in the matter. He knew the man who wanted to get them out; he was their brother-in-law and a very respectably conducted man, and he wanted to get them out, because he had got into better circumstances than he had been in, by reason of some discovery in a mine. He (Mr. Tozer) was told that before the girls could be got out, their relatives would have to pay something like £100 or £200. He thought it very absurd that in a Government orphanage children should not be let out when their relatives wanted to get them out, and were prepared to keep them. He had made very strong representations on the point, because he was perfectly satisfied that it would be better for the girls to be with their relatives, who would look after them properly and introduce them into life, than to remain in the orphanage. He would like to know what system existed in regard to cases of that kind. Was not the department ready and willing to let children out of those institutions when their relatives were prepared to support them?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said there were various ways of getting children into the orphanages. They were taken in if they were orphans, and very often if they were deserted children. In the case referred to by the hon. gentleman, the girls should have been paid for by their friends. It so happened that many friends allowed children to remain in the orphanages until they began to be useful, and then wanted to get them out, after having neglected them for years. He objected to letting children go to friends in such cases; he would rather let them go to strangers. While on that subject he might say that orphans were now kept under State control to a greater age than in the past, and another alteration had been made with regard to the money earned by them. Sometimes a girl earned from £10 to £20 before the age of sixteen years; and, instead of allowing her to get the whole of that sum, she received only one-fourth, the balance being placed in the Savings Bank until she was twenty-one years of age. The great reason for that was that it had been found that kind friends who had lost sight of orphans, and took no interest in them for years, took them away when they had money, and helped them to spend it in a most extravagant way. He believed it had led to the ruin of some girls to let them out so early.

Mr. McMASTER said he would like to know what success had attended the hiring-out system since last year?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said it had been a very great success. Wherever it had been tried in any country it had always proved better than the barrack system, and it was also cheaper. The Roman Catholic orphanage did not board out, and were granted a capitation allowance of 5s. 10d. per week, the same as foster parents to whom children were boarded out.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would like to know if the children in those institutions were educated?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes.

Mr. GLASSEY said he would also like to know if when they attended schools outside they had to wear any distinctive dress or uniform, or did they wear various garments?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said they did not wear any uniform; they were dressed as other children were.

Mr. GLASSEY said he had referred to the matter because there had been a good deal of discussion on the subject in the old country some years ago, and it was considered a great hardship that those children should wear any distinguishing uniform, because they were pointed out as being poor, or orphanage children. It was far better that they should wear no uniform, but dress in the ordinary garb of children.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said there was one element in the garb of those children which he viewed with very much disfavour. He had brought the matter forward on a previous occasion some years ago, but it did not meet with much sympathy then. He did not like to see those children marching through the streets without boots or socks. He had seen those children walking barefooted in the Queen's Birthday processions, while the children from other schools had clean boots and stockings on. They ought to wear boots and socks, at least on the high days and holidays of the year.

Mr. ARCHER said he did not agree with the hon. member. Every morning, at Toowong, he saw healthy-looking children, apparently the

children of respectable mechanics, trooping to the public schools barefooted, and as cheerfully as possible. Why should not the orphanage children do the same? It was far better for them. It was not a sign of either poverty or neglect for children to walk about with bare feet.

The PREMIER said the question raised by the hon. member for Charters Towers was not whether the children of respectable mechanics should go barefooted to a public school but, whether the orphanage children ought to march barefooted in processions with other school children on the Queen's Birthday. In his opinion it created a sort of invidious distinction, which the orphan children themselves must feel.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that in their own school grounds the orphanage children ran about barefooted, but every child on being admitted was furnished with two pairs of boots. It must have been some years since the hon. gentleman saw them marching in procession with other school children barefooted.

Mr. LUYA said that if those children were in the habit of going barefooted all the year round, it would be a kind of cruelty to put boots on them on the one day devoted to pleasure. They would be in torture the whole of the day. It was far better to let them enjoy themselves to the fullest extent, which they certainly would not do if they had boots on.

The PREMIER asked if the hon. member would inform him at what particular period the children should begin to wear boots and shoes? He did not suppose the hon. member intended that they should go barefooted all their lives. Was it to date from the time they entered Parliament, which seemed to be the aspiration of every boy in Queensland? There must be some period when they must give up the unbooted system. He (the Premier) did not see why they should not wear boots and shoes.

Mr. LUYA said the time for the children to wear boots and stockings was when they left the orphanage altogether and began life on their own account.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said that in all European countries on Sundays and holidays children put on better clothes than they wore on the other days of the week. Those mechanics' children whom the hon. member for Rockhampton saw trooping gaily to school with bare feet, would put on boots and socks on Sundays. Those little creatures in the orphanages had human feelings, and they must feel the invidious distinction it created between them and the other children marching alongside of them with boots and socks on. He did not know whether the system was still kept up, but if so, it ought not to be. Not only on the Queen's Birthday, but on all occasions when it was supposed they ought to be better dressed than on the ordinary days of the week, they ought to have at least those essential articles of attire.

Mr. LITTLE said that many a time when a boy he had been glad to throw away his boots and go about barefooted. If he had his way he would give the man twenty-five lashes who invented boots, and coats as well. It was killing him, wearing a coat. He had never worn a coat so long in his life as he had in Brisbane. The best boys they had in Australia were the boys who went barefooted, and he was one of them. As a boy he went barefooted, and he believed he was one of the best men in that Chamber.

Mr. McMASTER said he agreed with the hon. member for Charters Towers that on festive occasions the orphanage children should be on a

par with the other children, as regarded the wearing of boots. Five years ago two or three gentlemen in Brisbane went round and collected a sufficient sum to buy shoes and socks for those children to wear on the Queen's birthday, but he believed, on the advice of the medical attendant, the offer was refused by the Government. If the children could not wear tight-laced boots, they ought to be supplied with easy slippers for an occasion of that kind, instead of being compelled to walk barefooted. There would be no difficulty in getting the money outside the Government. He knew of several gentlemen who would be only too glad to raise the money for the purpose.

The PREMIER said he quite agreed with the hon. gentleman. He did not see why those children should feel a sense of humility through not wearing boots. He should be very happy to subscribe for the purpose of providing them with boots.

Mr. LITTLE said the boys who were walking about barefooted now would be in that House by-and-by.

The PREMIER: They will not come in barefooted.

Question put and passed.

DEAF, DUMB, AND BLIND INSTITUTION.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that there be granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year 1889-90 a sum not exceeding £480 for the Deaf, Dumb, and Blind Institution. That amount was reduced by £130. He believed it would not be very long before there would be a school in the colony where the blind could be taught instead of sending them out of the colony. The land had been secured, and something obtained towards the cost of erecting a building.

Mr. UNMACK asked why the amount had been reduced by £130? There was no hon. member, he was sure, who would grudge the sum voted last year. He would rather see the vote increased than diminished. It was a charity that was well worthy of support.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the vote was cut down because no larger amount was required. The amount asked for would be sufficient.

Mr. BARLOW said he would ask whether the vote was a subsidy to the New South Wales institution?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes.

Mr. SMITH said: Was there any provision made for the building of a school? In a colony like Queensland they could well afford such a school, and should not be obliged to send away the deaf and dumb children.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: There is provision made on the usual conditions.

Mr. SAYERS: What were the usual conditions?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Grants in aid of schools.

Mr. SAYERS said did the hon. gentleman mean that one-fifth of the sum required must be raised by subscription? Did that apply to the whole colony?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said: Certainly not. Arrangements were made by the committee to collect the necessary sum and the department would erect the school.

There were, he was happy to say, only a few blind, deaf, and dumb children, and they did not want schools of that description all over the colony. The children would be educated in Brisbane.

Question put and passed.

MUSEUM.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION moved that there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1889-90, a sum not exceeding £2,423 for the Museum. That was £100 less than last year, that amount being the cost of the standard weights and measures that had been purchased. He would leave the vote in the hands of hon. members who knew as much about it as he did.

Mr. TOZER said some person in the Maryborough district had been collecting specimens on Fraser's Island, which, he thought, indicated that there was very great wealth there. He (Mr. Tozer) had been asked to take those specimens to Brisbane with him and hand them to the Government. He brought them down but he did not know who to give them to. They were not minerals, but specimens of economic earths. There was some stuff that would be suitable for pottery, and there was also something in the shape of peat. He brought those specimens down, and he did not know whether to hand them over to the geological collector or not. Was he the man who would find out whether there was anything in them? The person who got the specimens said some of them indicated coal measures. If that was the fact, there surely must be someone who could understand it.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said that if the hon. gentleman would hand them over to the curator he would be glad to give him every information about them. He generally did that with other samples.

Mr. UNMACK said he wished to direct the attention of the Committee to the salaries of two officers. He knew nothing about them, and had never seen them, so far as he knew. He referred to the geological collector and the taxidermist. The work those gentlemen were doing seemed most excellent, and there was not a museum in the colonies where such miserable pittance were paid. Those men were men of science, and it was really most desirable that they should receive better remuneration. The geological collector received £175, and the taxidermist £190 a year. He considered that those gentlemen ought to be much better paid for their services.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he could assure the hon. gentleman he knew nothing about those gentlemen. He was sorry to say he had not attended to his duties in connection with that department. The management of it was left to the trustees, who made certain recommendations. He proposed the estimate as he found it.

Mr. SAYERS said he wished to ask the Minister about the messenger and attendant; what were their duties? What did they want a messenger for at the Museum?

Mr. NORTON: There is no messenger.

Mr. SAYERS said those two persons received salaries equal to some of the higher officers. With regard to what the hon. member for Wide Bay said, he did not see why someone in connection with the Museum should not be able to ascertain what those specimens were. The colony contained numbers of minerals, and if they were sent down to the Museum there ought to be some officer to determine their value. It would be far better to have such an officer than to pay a messenger and attendant £104 a year each.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the attendant and messenger had to take care of the Museum. He did not know anything else about their duties, and he did not think there were too many assistants in the Museum.

Mr. SAYERS said he did not intend to oppose the vote, but he hoped the hon. gentleman would be able to give them a little more information about it next year, and that he would make provision for some officer who would be able to give the public information regarding the value of minerals and other things sent down to the Museum. He (Mr. Sayers) could not understand the vote for a messenger, as the hon. member for Port Curtis interjected that there was no messenger at the Museum.

Mr. NORTON said the messenger mentioned on the Estimates was not really a messenger, that was to say he did not run errands, but was employed in the Museum doing different kinds of work. There were two men employed, one of whom was always in front, and the other was sometimes there and sometimes attending to work below stairs. It was, therefore, a misnomer to call him a messenger. With regard to the whole vote for the Museum, he wished the Government could do a little more for it. For want of funds the Museum could not do such work as the hon. member for Charters Towers referred to. It was impossible that the gentlemen employed there could do it; but he (Mr. Norton) presumed that when the new Museum was built the Government would be able to supply more funds, in order that the officers employed might be better paid, and that other officers might be appointed so that the work might be carried out thoroughly and the Museum occupy that position in the colony which it was entitled to hold as a place of reference. He could assure hon. members that the trustees were most anxious to make the institution as useful as it possibly could be made.

Mr. LITTLE said he took his children to the Museum on a Sunday afternoon, and they were highly gratified. He did not see a messenger there, but he saw an instructor, who educated both himself and his children.

Question put and passed.

PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY.

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, in moving that there be granted to Her Majesty, for the service of the year 1889-90, a sum not exceeding £100 for grant in aid to the Pharmaceutical Society, said that was a new vote, and one that would assist the Pharmaceutical Society of Brisbane to carry on their work better than they had been able to do up to the present time. The fees received from students were not sufficient to enable the work to be done as well as was desired.

The HON. A. RUTLEDGE said he was very glad to see that vote on the Estimates. If his memory served him correctly, the late Government proposed to give £50 to the Pharmaceutical Society, but it met with so much opposition that it had to be dropped. Would the hon. gentleman tell them how it was proposed to expend that money—whether in books, or in fees to examiners, or any other way?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said the money would be handed over to the board, the same as the vote for the Museum was handed over to the trustees. The board was of course under considerable expense, having to pay the members who held examinations, and also to assist the students with books and otherwise, and the fees received were not sufficient to meet that expense. A great deal of work was done gratuitously by the board.

Mr. TOZER said if the society would have the effect of stopping the introduction of "Rough on Rats" or anything of that kind into the colony, that would be worth £100. They wanted something that would prevent the wholesale poisoning that was going on in Queensland.

Mr. MACFARLANE said he could hardly see the force of voting that money to the Pharmaceutical Society. They might just as well make a grant to the Oddfellows or any other society. Was that vote intended to be an annual one?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION said he thought a great deal of good would be done by that vote. It was a highly educational grant. He was pleased to see that the Pharmaceutical Society was doing good work, and he hoped to see that vote continued, and perhaps increased next year.

The Hon. A. RUTLEDGE said he certainly thought the Pharmaceutical Society was doing very good work. It prevented the letting loose on the community, as frequently happened before, a number of incompetent men who were intrusted with the very delicate and responsible duty of compounding drugs, by their ignorant discharge of which children had been poisoned, and sometimes grown people. He knew a case that occurred some years ago, where an individual it was proved had simply served a sort of apprenticeship to somebody, in a drug store somewhere or other, and on the strength of that got smuggled in as a qualified chemist, and poisoned a man in South Brisbane. He thought a board like that now in existence, which subjected candidates, who had passed a certain curriculum, to a test by which their competency to compound and dispense drugs was ascertained was deserving of a vote of £100. It was money very well spent.

Mr. TOZER asked whether that society was recognised by law?

The MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Yes; and a special Act of Parliament.

Mr. TOZER said he understood from the speech of the hon. member for Charters Towers that it was a trades union, and if that were so, the question would arise whether other societies of a similar character should not receive a grant in aid. He had known instances lately of young people in this colony being poisoned by persons selling poisons, especially "Rough on Rats," and if the Pharmaceutical Society would bring in a Bill to prevent the wholesale vending of poisons they would do a great deal of good. If they did not do something of the kind he would oppose the vote next year.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the MINISTER FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION, the House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again to-morrow.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER said: Mr. Speaker,—I move that this House do now adjourn. The Government business to be taken to-morrow will be—first, the Drew Pension Bill, second reading; then the second reading of the District Courts Act Amendment Bill; then the Supreme Court Bill in committee; then Ways and Means; and after that, if there is time, the Estimates.

Question put and passed.

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