

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates  
[Hansard]

**Legislative Assembly**

**WEDNESDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER 1896**

---

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, 30 SEPTEMBER, 1896.

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

## PETITIONS.

## BOWEN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. DAWSON presented a petition from the Chamber of Commerce and Mines, Charters Towers, praying for the extension of the Bowen Railway from the present terminus to junction with the Northern Railway near the 37-mile peg.

Petition read and received.

Mr. SMITH presented petitions of similar purport and prayer from the Divisional Board of Wangaratta and the Municipal Council of Bowen.

Petitions read and received.

## QUESTION.

## INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION BILL.

Mr. JACKSON asked the Premier—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce, this session, the Bill to provide for conciliation in industrial disputes which the Governor's Opening Speech stated had been prepared?

2. If so, about what date?

The PREMIER replied—

1. Yes.

2. Taking into consideration the present progress of the business of the House, I am not able to fix any approximate date.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

## BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

The PREMIER: By the indulgence of the House, I desire to make a short Ministerial statement with regard to the business of the House. The principal measure before the House now is, of course, the Land Bill, and I think the whole of the House will agree with me that it is very desirable that that Bill should be put through this session. We ought to do all we can to press that measure forward, seeing that it is one which very materially affects the whole of the interests of the colony. As far as our legislation is concerned, we have a large number of Bills ready which can be introduced at any time. The Attorney-General has all the Bills that relate to his department—the Bills relating to trustees, to juries, and to insanity—ready. These can be introduced at any moment, but what is the use of introducing Bills if there is not time to discuss them? Then with regard to fisheries I have two Bills prepared. One is a Bill to consolidate and amend the law relating to pearl-shell and bêche-de-mer fisheries of the colony of Queensland, and incorporating certain provisions of the Native Labourers Protection Act of 1884, and the other is to consolidate and amend the law relating to fisheries—the whole subject of fisheries. There are certain Bills we must necessarily pass this session. One of these is a Bill dealing with the Civil Service Act; that must be passed, because the term of office of the members of the board expires on the 1st of December next. Another Bill that must be passed is one dealing with the Railway Commissioner.

Mr. GLASSEY: That won't take long.

The PREMIER: I do not know what will take long, as almost everything is contentious that is brought into this House. Then there is the Rabbit Bill—we ought to deal with that—the Fire Brigades Bill, and the Conciliation in Industrial Disputes Bill, which is a very important subject.

Mr. BROWNE: When are we going to sit four days a week?

The PREMIER: What I would propose is that we should sit from the time we meet until half-past 10 o'clock, and allow members who wish to do so to address *Hansard* during that time, and then that those who want to do business should stay till 1 o'clock in the morning. There will also, of course, be Loan Estimates and a Loan Bill to discuss. These ought to receive a good deal of attention from the House, as they are important subjects. I mention these matters in order to give the House an insight as to the amount of work we have in front of us.

Mr. BROWNE: Let us have Friday sittings.

Mr. McDONALD: And Mondays.

The PREMIER: We would not get a bit further forward if we had those sitting days. The only way to get the business through is to sit all night.

Mr. DAWSON: But you won't sit; you go to bed.

The PREMIER: As far as I am concerned I should go to bed, but I should be perfectly ready to begin work at 6 o'clock in the morning. I think I have given hon. members an idea of the amount of business before the House, and I hope they will take the matter seriously into consideration, and try to help the Government to get forward with the business quickly.

Mr. GLASSEY: Perhaps I may be pardoned for making a few observations.

The SPEAKER: There is no question before the House. The hon. member can only speak with the permission of the House. Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be heard?

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. GLASSEY: I merely wish to say that I am quite sure that there is every desire on the part of hon. members sitting on this side of the House to assist the Government with measures which it is desirable should be passed, but I do think that members have a right to complain of the way the Government have treated the House generally in not bringing forward—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot enter into a debate on that matter. If he wishes to make any remarks with reference to the business of the House or to elicit further information he can do so, but he cannot indulge in recriminations.

Mr. GLASSEY: I have no desire to indulge in recrimination.

The SPEAKER: But the hon. member was doing so, and as I have pointed out there is no question before the House.

Mr. GLASSEY: Then I shall say nothing further.

The PREMIER: You will have plenty of opportunities of discussing the matter.

## SUPPLY.

The PREMIER: Mr. Speaker,—I move that you do now leave the chair.

Mr. GLASSEY: I desire to make a few remarks following up what I intended to say previously. I think it is to be regretted that the Government have not introduced their most important measures before now. We have now been sitting since the 16th June—over three months—and yet the Land Bill, which as the Premier has said is the most important measure of the session, was not placed in the hands of hon. members for the second reading until the 15th September, and some of the measures enumerated by the hon. gentleman hon. members have not yet had an opportunity of considering. The Premier now mentions for the first time what important measures he is anxious to pass through, and hon. members on both sides of the House have a right to complain that those measures have not been placed in our hands before now. Any delay that has

taken place in the transaction of business is due to the delay the Government have shown in bringing forward their most important measures. I do not say this merely because I am sitting on this side of the House. I said at the beginning of the session, and say now, that members on this side have every desire to further Government business, provided that business is in the interest of the country. During the number of years I have been in the House, I have never seen so little hostility shown to Government measures as has been shown this session. Only recently the *Courier* had occasion to call attention to the matter I am now dealing with, and stated that the Government had not matured their important measures before the House met. The Premier in his manifesto mentioned that the Land Bill was one of great urgency, and yet three months elapsed before that Bill was placed in the hands of hon. members. Whatever delay has occurred is largely owing to the way in which the Government have dilly-dallied over the legislation, and put it off till the last moment. I have only to repeat, that if the Government are anxious to get on with business they should table it at once, so that we may know what is to come before us.

The PREMIER: Of course, the Government are to blame.

Mr. McDONALD: We know that.

The PREMIER: We all know that, but I would point out to the hon. member that full information was given in the Governor's Speech as to the business intended to be brought forward this session. I would like the hon. member to show me what opportunity has occurred for introducing measures from the time we met up to the stage we have now arrived at that has not been taken advantage of. The first measure that engaged our attention was the Federation Enabling Bill, as had been promised. Then there was the Financial Statement, and as financial Bills always take precedence of other business, we dealt with the Customs Duties Bill; and I am sure hon. members would not have liked the Constitution Bill to be left until the end of the session. So far as I know everything has been carried out in the most expeditious manner, so far as the Government are concerned, and we are prepared to bring forward our legislation when there is an opportunity. What is the use of encumbering the business-paper with measures which there is no probability of being discussed?

Mr. McDONALD: Why did you do it in other sessions? Last session and the session before there were more Bills than we could get through.

The PREMIER: What good did it do? If it did no good then, that is no argument in favour of doing it now.

Mr. DAWSON: As a matter of fact you adjourned several times through want of business.

The PREMIER: There has been no case of that sort this session. At any rate, the amount of time lost in that way would not amount to many hours. Of course, we must get on with the Estimates by degrees; there is no hurry with them, but they must be put through before the session ends. I am only making this statement to indicate what we are particularly desirous of getting on with, and I think it is the opinion of the House that we should get on with the Land Bill as being the most important measure that can come before us. When we have got through that it will be time enough to submit other Bills. I certainly did not intend to raise any animosity or opposition by what I said; I simply made the statement to consult the convenience of the House as a whole.

Mr. McDONALD: I think if anybody is to blame it is the Premier himself.

The PREMIER: Of course.

Mr. McDONALD: Apart from the "Of course" business, as a matter of fact when the hon. member for Bundaberg in the early part of the session stated that he had been elected leader of a section in this House, which is the largest section upon this side, the hon. member refused to recognise him, and therefore he had nobody to negotiate with for the transaction of business.

The PREMIER: I am bound by parliamentary practice and procedure.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. member will break through parliamentary practice and procedure as often as it suits himself. In refusing to do that he compelled everybody upon this side to get up and make his own case in his own peculiar way. I am very sorry the hon. member has fallen into his own trap, and feels very uncomfortable, as he evidently does, that business is not getting on. I am also sorry for his supporters who may want to get away. I am as desirous of getting away as anybody.

The PREMIER: I am in no hurry.

Mr. McDONALD: The majority upon this side will sit here as long as hon. members on the other side, and we are willing to go on over Christmas and keep it up all the year round.

The PREMIER: We have something else to do.

Mr. McDONALD: There was a great amount of time wasted over the Federation Bill and the Inebriates Bill. The Home Secretary knows the latter was never intended to be gone on with. As a matter of fact it has been before Parliament for four sessions, and has been used as a stop gap when the Government were not ready to go on with ordinary measures.

The PREMIER: I will put it at the head of the paper to-morrow, if you wish.

Mr. McDONALD: If the hon. member desires that Bill to go through I will assist him. If the hon. member had met hon. members on this side at the outset as he should have done, and had recognised the hon. member for Bundaberg as leader of a party which could have assisted him, we would have been much further ahead; but now every hon. member on this side has to "paddle his own canoe" in his own little way, and the hon. member is in a fix.

The PREMIER: Why does not the hon. member for Bundaberg take his proper title as leader of the Opposition; then we will recognise him?

Mr. BROWNE: There is one way of getting on with the business, but the Premier does not seem to agree with it; that is by sitting on Fridays.

The PREMIER: Not at all; we are getting on very fast just now.

Mr. BROWNE: Upon one or two occasions we have sat for only one and a-half days in the week. I objected to these adjournments, and said that in a month's time there would be a rush of work, and received a snub for my pains. During the last Parliament we sat four days a week. In one session we began on the 3rd August, in the next it was on the 26th July, and in the third it was on the 11th August. This is the 30th September, and, to use the words of the Premier, we are groping on trusting to Providence. It is all very well for hon. members who live in Brisbane. Hon. members on the other side have very little business to do, and take a deuce of a long time to do it; but I do not think it is just to hon. members on this side. I would like to sit four days a week, and get through with business.

Question put and passed.

#### RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

#### GOVERNMENT PRINTING, ETC.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £32,383 be granted for the Government Printing Department. The vote was apparently about £5,000 in excess of the vote for last year. Of that £5,000, £1,000 was required for new type

in consequence of the large amount of printing that had to be done in connection with the electoral rolls and the Parliamentary Library catalogues; £1,500 was required for extra hands and overtime; an extra £1,000 for the printing of *Hansard*; an extra £1,500 required for readers, compositors, machinists, &c., forming the permanent staff. There were also a few small increases in accordance with the system. In connection with the item "Artist, six months, £156," there was a mistake, as the salary was only £150 a year, and this officer was to be tried on probation for a period of six months. He was to prepare certain illustrations indicative of the resources of the colony, which were to be supplied to lecturers or agents for the colony to carry to other portions of the world. The salary was a small one, and he hoped the experiment would be successful, but if after the expiration of six months it was not found advisable to continue it, it would not be continued.

Mr. GLASSEY asked if the whole of the work done by the department was credited to it. There was some misconception in the minds of hon. members with respect to the earnings of the department for each year, and he understood that it was not credited with the whole of its earnings.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman was right, and he had made an omission in proposing the vote. There was £1,400 extra on the vote as the result of a change which he had made in the system, by which nobody in future would pay the Government Printing Office at all, with the exception of departments or offices getting work done in connection with trust funds. For instance, printing done in connection with the brands fund would be paid for. The census printing would also be paid for, as it would be covered by a special vote; and in the same way the library catalogues would be paid for out of the special vote for the purpose. The Registrar-General, the Registrar of Titles, the Railways partly, and the Post Office partly got work done at the Government Printing Office, and they used to send in cheques to the department, but that confused the figures, and he had made arrangements this year by which no department could claim that they had to pay anything for printing. In order to afford some information upon the work of the Government Printing Office, he had this year directed the preparation of a report, which, though it was not statutory, had been laid on the table of the House. From that it would be seen that during 1895 £33,492 7s. 3d. worth of work had been executed by the Government Printing Office, which was £4,000 more than was done in 1894. Of course, in connection with the work done for the other departments, he had no control over it as to their requirements; it was therefore always impossible accurately to forecast what a Government Printing Office vote would be. He determined that this year there should be no supplementary vote, and as the vote for extra hands was always exceeded, he asked this year for £2,500, so as to be able to keep on the permanent and supernumerary staffs. They would be worked with economy, and no work that was not necessary would be done.

The Hon. G. THORN was satisfied that if the session lasted on to Christmas the vote of £3,000 for *Hansard* would not be sufficient. He rose chiefly to refer to an injustice which was done to Mr. Gregory, the Government Printer, who had been over thirty years in the service. Shortly after separation that gentleman was appointed to a position in the office, and his position was very little better now than when he was first appointed, though he now held a very responsible and confidential position. During the time he had been in office there had never been a word

against him, and he deserved great praise for the work he had done. The salary was altogether inadequate for an officer of Mr. Gregory's standing. He saw an advertisement in the papers recently for a Government Printer for New South Wales at £800 a year, and the work there was not more arduous, responsible, or confidential than it was here. The officer in question turned out *Hansard* in a very rapid manner, and deserved great credit for that work also. Even the leader of the Labour party would see that he was underpaid, and he hoped the Home Secretary would see his way to increase the salary to at least £600. The hon. gentleman had not forgotten other old and tried Government servants, and there seemed no reason why this officer should remain stationary for so long at £500 a year.

Mr. GRIMES was rather surprised at the claims of this officer not being recognised by the Government. He was now doing the work of his predecessor at £150 a year less, although, according to the return supplied, the volume of work had increased, and its value was £8,495 greater than when his predecessor was in office. He noticed also, in reading over the report, that great savings had been effected in the department; on the item for postage stamp paper alone £1,200 had been saved, and many other economies had been effected. When the head of a department busied himself and used tact, judgment, and business capacity in effecting savings for the Government, some of those savings should go into his own pocket. There was another reason why the services of this officer should be recognised. In the early days of the colony, before there was a Government Printing Office, he was a partner with the late T. B. Stephens in the *Courier*, and he gave up a good position there in order to become second in command in the Government Printing Office, in the hope that some day he would succeed to the chief post in the department. He had waited long for the position, he had performed many of the duties of chief during his predecessor's occupancy of the office, and he ought not to receive less remuneration than his predecessor. It was not giving proper encouragement to this officer to give him £150 less than his predecessor.

Mr. GLASSEY: Was his predecessor not overpaid?

Mr. GRIMES: His predecessor's salary passed year after year in the House, and if he was overpaid the salary should have been questioned. He hoped the Government would recognise the claims of the Government Printer to increased remuneration. Even if he was paid 2 per cent. on the turnover of the department his salary would be £650, and that was not much for an officer in his responsible position.

Mr. TURLEY: Would you pay the Under Secretary of the Treasury on the same principle?

Mr. GRIMES: The Under Secretary's position was a very different one. The work of the Government Printer was work actually done under his superintendence. He trusted the Government would recognise the claims of that officer, and hoped that an increase would be placed on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. McDONALD: The Government Printing Office was one of the best managed departments in the service, judging from the report, which he hoped would be made annually, and its workings showed that the cry against the Government undertaking the creation of State departments for the performance of work was a fallacy. During the last four years there had been an annual saving effected of nearly £5,000. If the amount of work done by the printing office had been debited to it, the saving would have been considerably over £6,000, and in view of

the fact that the department charged less than the work would be done for by outside firms, probably another 12½ per cent. might be added to that amount. The Government Printing Office was so well managed that it deserved praise from every hon. member, and it was a lesson to the Government as to the advisableness of indulging in a little more State socialism. He had been through the printing offices in the various colonies, and the Queensland office was a credit to those who managed it, and that being so, there might be some reason in doing what had been asked by the hon. members for Fassifern and Oxley. But they had been told repeatedly that the finances were not too good, and possibly the Government had not seen their way to increase the salary of the Government Printer to £600; but if the hon. member for Oxley and the twelve or thirteen other hon. members who did not want the extra £150 which had been given to them for salary chose to hand over that amount to the Home Secretary, he could not only give the Government Printer an increase, but also give increases to other officers in the department. He wished to compliment the department upon the splendid manner in which it was worked. It was a credit to the colony.

Mr. DANIELS would very much like hon. members to take the advice of the Premier, and not waste time. No one denied that the present Government Printer was a good man; he did not believe they could get a better; but he did not think that gentleman was tremendously overworked. He had been a long time in the Government service, and, no doubt, if he had been able to better his position outside he would not have remained. He thought £500 a year was quite sufficient.

The HOME SECRETARY: He would like to point out that there was a tendency on the part of hon. members to protest against increases to those in receipt of high salaries, and he would not ask for an increase in any salary unless there was a justification for it. About the 1st January, 1894, Mr. Gregory had been promoted from the position of Assistant Government Printer to that of Government Printer. As second in command Mr. Gregory had received £450 a year. But he had also the right, after thirty years' service, to a continuation of his salary at the rate provided by the Act of 1863—that was, he got a sum by way of deferred pay. It had been with a view to retrenchment that the change was made, but when Mr. Gregory became Government Printer on the 1st January, 1894, he received an addition to his salary of £50 per annum; he also received quarters, fuel, and light, valued at another £100 a year, so that in reality he got £150 additional salary. Therefore the Government had thought that any further increase would be unfair, in view of the fact that many in the service were receiving no increases. He was of opinion that the previous Government Printer, who had been paid £650 per annum, had received more than the colony could afford to pay. In regard to the present Government Printer, he could say, with an intimate knowledge of the working of the department, that since he had taken the position of Government Printer he had saved more than sufficient to pay his salary twice over. In regard to the one item—water-lined paper alone—by his knowledge and experience the Government Printer had saved between £700 and £800 a year. Previously there had been one large contract for paper, and one firm had a monopoly, but the present Government Printer got his supplies in small contracts, and thus effected a large saving. In about three months the Government Printer could retire from the service on his deferred pay; but if he (Mr. Tozer) was

in office next year, in consideration of the value of Mr. Gregory's services, and knowing that the work he did was worth more than they were paying, he would be prepared, if the circumstances of the colony warranted it, to ask the Committee to increase the Government Printer's salary. He would not put any increase on the Supplementary Estimates, because very few increases had been given—in fact, there had been no increases in salaries over £200. Of course, an expert was required for the position, and he felt sure that the Government of New South Wales, who were advertising for a Government Printer at a salary of £800, would have been only too glad to avail themselves of the experience of Mr. Gregory, had it not been for the fact of his arrangement with regard to deferred pay. Consequently it would never pay him to leave our service and go to New South Wales. But there was the inducement; they gauged the value of the services of the Government Printer at £800 per year, and no doubt their work was worth it. He believed there was no man in Australia more fit to do that work than the Government Printer in charge of the office in Queensland. He felt that he should give him that meed of praise, because from his experience of the working of the office for the past two years he was satisfied that they did not yet know the economies which that officer had exercised, and they had not been in the direction of a reduction of wages.

The Hon. G. THORN would like to know under what Act Mr. Gregory would be entitled to leave the service in three months' time?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Act of 1863, under which he would be entitled to a pension of two-fifths of £500.

The Hon. G. THORN: That was a very small amount.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON: While he had been quite satisfied to maintain the remuneration Civil servants had been receiving, he was not disposed to agree that increases should be indiscriminately or generally given until the colony had fairly emerged from the depression which had surrounded it. But Mr. Gregory's case was unique; its circumstances were entirely different from those of ordinary members of the Civil Service. He was very pleased to hear what had been said by the Home Secretary regarding the ability shown and the economy practised by that gentleman in the conduct of that very large department, and was quite certain the hon. gentleman would not have given him such a large meed of praise unless he had thoroughly well deserved the eulogy. Mr. Gregory at the time he entered the Government service was in partnership with the late T. B. Stephens. When he applied for the position of Government Printer there were two candidates for the office, Mr. Beal and himself. Mr. J. C. Beal was awarded the office, and at the same time a letter was sent to Mr. Gregory, under the signature of Mr. Manning, then Under Colonial Secretary, telling him that he was appointed to the position of overseer of the printing office at the salary Mr. Beal was then receiving—namely, £390 per annum. In consequence of that intimation he relinquished his partnership with Mr. Stephens, but when he entered upon his duties he found that instead of receiving £390 as had been promised, he was only to get £300 per annum.

Mr. DAWSON: Pure repudiation.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON: He considered it so. That was in 1866. The whole of the circumstances were in type, and he was sure the Home Secretary had seen the statement. By that curtailment of salary Mr. Gregory had during his long service suffered a diminution of revenue to the extent of £2,250. There were therefore special circumstances in connection with Mr. Gregory which should render the consideration of

his position by the department an imperative duty. He was justly entitled to a considerable increase on his present salary, and it was to be hoped that if he did not receive an increase this year a substantial increase would be placed on the Estimates next year, so that the State might in some measure retrieve the promise made to him when he was first appointed, and also give him that position which he might reasonably have expected when Mr. Beal retired.

Mr. TURLEY would like to have some information regarding the position of other employees in the Government Printing Office. That was the only department of the public service where the employees did not come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. He understood that a considerable number of men in that department had been employed from twenty to twenty-five years and upwards, and that none of them had yet been brought under the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: That would not be any advantage to them.

Mr. TURLEY: It would be a considerable advantage; it would give them security of tenure, and they would be entitled to certain leave every one or two years, whereas if they took a holiday now their pay was stopped. The matter had been referred to several times in the House, and it had been almost promised that the men would be placed under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. In 1890 the hon. member for Bundaberg and the late Mr. Donaldson pointed out that there were a great many men in that department who had not come under the Act, and contended that they ought to be put upon the permanent list as soon as possible, so that they might feel some security in their positions; but the Home Secretary said that the board had not had time to go through the office, and he was not able to say whether these men would be placed upon the list or not. There was a small department in the office in which the employees had been classified, but it was more by accident than anything else. The members of the lithographic staff had been originally in the Treasury Department, and were classified while there, but were transferred to the Printing Office afterwards. It was only reasonable that some explanation should be given as to why men who had been twenty years in the service should not come under the provisions of the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY did not see that these officers would gain any advantage by being brought under the Act. If they had been in the classified divisions of the service they would have had to contribute 4 per cent. of their salaries to the superannuation fund, which would have been a heavy charge for men employed in mechanical trades. Now that the superannuation system had been abolished, what would be the good of placing them in the classified divisions of the service? It would be a disadvantage. At present they got a fortnight's holiday in the year. In a large department like this many extra hands were necessarily employed, and the best he could do for them was to give them full work. The permanent hands were quite as well off as if they were classified, and he had received no applications to classify them. Nobody on the permanent list could be dismissed without the Government Printer referring the matter to the Minister; and in regard to wages, the object was to keep them in line with wages generally paid in the trade. If they were put in the classified list they would receive wages quite out of proportion to their work, and upset the whole system of the office. It was no use putting them in a different position from others in the same industry, and the highest wages were paid. The machine ruler, for instance, received 11s.

per day. If he were in the classified list he would receive an increase of £10 a year, which would put him above others who were doing the same class of work. The Government Printer had organised a system in the same way that the education people were not classified. The Government Printer observed the merits of each man, and made recommendations when there were vacancies. The foreman ruler had recently died, and another officer had been placed on the list as head of this branch. Why certain specified persons appeared upon the list in the Estimates and not others was a matter of departmental arrangement. There were three permanent officers who were receiving large salaries, and he had transferred them to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. TURLEY: They were classified before they went there.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were doing special mechanical work. He did not know that those who appeared upon the list received any benefit from it. They worked under the same system, had the same holidays, the same rules, and the same employer. The men were satisfied, and it was better to leave men who were in mechanical trades as they were. So far as he was aware they had no complaint.

The Hon. J. R. DICKSON explained that the lithographic department was at first attached to the Treasury, because in those days the lithographing of the debentures in connection with all our loans was conducted in the Treasury under supervision of the officer having control of the securities. At that time Mr. Knight, who was in charge, and one or two of his subordinates were placed on the Civil Service list. When they afterwards dealt with inscribed stock of the Bank of England the lithographic department was transferred to the Government Printing Office. The complaint of some of the officers that they should be placed on the Civil Service list was by no means a recent one. While he was in office he had a request made to him by a number of the employees that they should be placed in a more permanent position, one of the reasons for the request being that though some of them had been in the office for from twenty to thirty-five years they were subject to dismissal at any time by the Government Printer. It was all very well for the Home Secretary to say that the sanction of the Executive must be given, but the fact remained that these men not being gazetted could be dismissed with a week's wages by the Government Printer, and no Government would set its face against the Government Printer, who was manager of the department, and say that a man should remain when he said he should go. He did not say the request would be a reasonable one from men who had served only a short period, as they might exhibit qualities which would render dismissal justifiable. That could not be said of men who had for many years been in the department and had proved their ability, and they should be placed in a more secure position. They complained that they had no right of appeal from the decision of the Government Printer; but they were not without a right of appeal to the Home Secretary, although it could not be expected that that hon. gentleman would take the view of the subordinate as against that of the manager of the department. They complained that employees of fifteen and twenty years' standing were treated in the same way as employees of only twelve months' standing, and that their wages were docked for all the time they happened to be absent from work. He did not think that any private establishment would treat their men in so parsimonious a manner. The men also complained that in the matter of promotion and leave of absence the Government Printer had a right to

do as he pleased, and they could not receive their just due except at the will of the Government Printer. They could be dismissed at a week's notice, and in times of sickness their wages were stopped. That was not the treatment received by well paid members of the Civil Service, who got six and twelve months' leave of absence on full pay. Those men had a fair claim to consideration by the Executive, and they might fairly be given the benefits of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FINNEY: The Home Secretary would find that there were employees in the Government Printing Office who were anxious to be put on a better footing. There were men there who had been in the service for thirty-five years, and if they were absent an hour from their employment they had their wages docked for it. If they wanted a holiday, an advance in salary, promotion, or anything else, they had to go to the Government Printer, and it all depended upon his will whether they got what they asked or not. He did not say that the Government Printer would not deal fairly and wisely, but he did not think that men who had been in the service for twenty and thirty-five years should be liable to dismissal at a moment's notice, or to have half a day's wages stopped for absence for that time. The keenest trader in the city would not do that sort of thing with his employees. He had it from several quarters that the matter had been going on for a long time, and the men were very anxious to be placed on the classified list under the Civil Service Act, so that when they had a grievance they could appeal to the Minister. From all he could understand, the men in the Printing Office were in a worse position than those in any other branch of the Government service, and he hoped the Government would see their way to put men—many of whom had been for a great many years in the service—on a better footing than that of merely employees from day to day. Another complaint made to him was that men who had been from fifteen to thirty-two years in the service had their wages deducted if they were absent from work, even if it was due to sickness, and he did not believe that any firm in the city would treat old employees in that way. If a man was absent through drunkenness, certainly his pay should be stopped, but that was a very different matter. He understood that the men had been trying for years to get placed under the Civil Service Act, and that a sort of promise had been given them that it would be done, and he hoped the Government would place them on the same footing as the men in other departments.

The HOME SECRETARY: This was the seventh year that he had asked for money for the Government Printing Office, but this was the first he had heard of the complaint referred to by the hon. member. In regard to another matter, the employees in the Government Printing Office had found no difficulty in approaching him direct, and he had investigated their grievance. He quite understood the men making no effort for the first four years that he had administered the department to be placed on the classified list, because that would have forced them to contribute to the superannuation fund, but now that the superannuation clauses had been repealed they desired to be classified. It was most inconvenient bringing the matter up in that Committee, because he could not deal with it upon hearing only one side. The question was much bigger than hon. members imagined; it opened up the question whether all the other unclassified men in the Government service should not be placed on a similar footing. There were the railway employees, for instance, and the sailors on the Government boats. He had received no such application from any branch of his depart-

ment. Mr. Gregory informed him that those men received a fortnight's holiday in the year, and if a man was absent through illness he was not charged for his absence; but if his sickness continued, it was then considered as part of the man's leave. If the men came to him with a grievance that they were charged for absence through sickness, he would be inclined to relax the rule—if one existed—seeing they were so liberal in such matters in the other departments—in fact, they were rather too liberal. He would mention the disadvantages of being placed on the classified list. It would be noticed that the storekeeper was off the list this year. The man had been in the department for a very long time, but unfortunately he was addicted to continual intemperance. He had been a classified officer, and his case had to be sent up to the Civil Service Board. The board, of course, recommended that he should be dismissed, and he was dismissed. The matter had then been brought under his notice by the Government Printer, and he, taking human nature as he found it, and in consideration of the man's long service and the fact that there was no pension attached to it, and that there were lucid intervals when the man's services could be profitably utilised, had placed him on the unclassified list; he had become sober and steady, and was perfectly satisfied with his position. If he had been put on as a classified officer again he would have come under the Civil Service Board, and would probably have gone off again; but he had appealed to him to be put on the unclassified list, and he was there now doing good work.

The Hon. G. THORN was pleased to hear that the head of the Government Printing Department was not the hard taskmaster he was painted just now by the hon. member for Toowong. He knew all along that the hon. member was wrong. A little while ago there was a strong expression of opinion on the part of the Committee that the Government Printer should receive an increase of salary, and as it was rumoured that the Home Secretary would not be in his present position next year, but in some other position more to his taste, he would like to know if the hon. gentleman would have any objection to place on record in his office, for the information of his successor, the fact that the Committee were of opinion that the Government Printer should get an increase of salary, and that he had made a promise that such an increase should be provided on the Estimates next year.

The HOME SECRETARY: The best record I have is what has been said to-day.

Mr. McMASTER: They had heard from the Home Secretary that the Government Printing Office was remarkably well managed, and that if the men had any grievances to complain of, and made him acquainted with them, they would be rectified as far as possible. The hon. gentleman had also stated that the Government Printer had received an increase of £50 in his salary and a house worth £100 a year, which would give an apparent advance of £150 per annum. But it should be remembered that his predecessor received £650 a year in cash and the same house, so that he actually got £750 a year, or £100 more than the present Government Printer. He (Mr. McMaster) had always maintained that, other things being equal, the office should carry the salary, and it had been shown that afternoon that the present head of the Government Printing Office was equal to his predecessor, and had effected savings to the amount of more than twice his salary for two years. He therefore thought that Mr. Gregory should be placed in the same position as his predecessor. He had no doubt that the

Home Secretary would keep his promise in the matter—that he would see that justice was done, not only to the Government Printer, but also to all the men under him.

Mr. TURLEY: The Home Secretary said that if the employees in the Government Printing Office had any grievance they should represent it to him, and that he did not know that the grievance now complained of existed.

The HOME SECRETARY: I certainly never heard of it.

Mr. TURLEY: The matter had been brought before the House on several occasions. The hon. gentleman now told the Committee that a man who had been classified under the Civil Service Act was given to intemperance, and was therefore dismissed by the Civil Service Board. The board no doubt dealt with the man in a manner that they thought was just, and he was of opinion that if a man in permanent employment gave way to intemperance so that he could not look after his work the sooner someone else was got who would look after the work the better. He had no objection to this man being put back if he worked all the time, but they did not want men in the service who worked only during lucid intervals. In 1890, Mr. Wimble pointed out that employees in this office should be in the same position as men in other offices, and the Home Secretary said he did not think the board had had time to go through this office. On a previous occasion, in 1877, Sir T. McIlwraith said the wages in this department should not appear in a lump sum, because, although the men were mechanics, some were fulfilling more important duties than many clerks whose salaries were placed separately on the Estimates. The then Colonial Secretary said he would take care that the officers referred to should be placed upon the Estimates the next year, and that was done; but when their offices became vacant they were not filled up. The hon. members for Toowong and Bulimba had told the Home Secretary that there was a grievance, and that hon. member must now know it did exist.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know it yet.

Mr. TURLEY: The men complained that they were not put upon the same footing as other Civil servants. If there was no appeal beyond the head of the department in this office, why should men in other departments have an appeal to the Civil Service Board? They ought to be under the direct control of the Minister also. If it were necessary that officers in other departments should have this appeal to the Civil Service Board, the same privilege should be meted out to employees in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. FINNEY hoped the Home Secretary would make himself aware of this grievance if he were not already aware of it. If these officers would receive no benefit from being classified, that was their business. Now that the 4 per cent. contribution had been done away with, that difficulty did not stand in the road, and if the men were anxious to be upon a permanent footing and not be liable to be dismissed at the will of any officer, they should be so dealt with. He had been told by one of these men that if they were away for an hour or two their salary was stopped during that time, even if they had met with an accident, and he called that very sharp practice. If the head of a department was going to economise upon those principles it was false economy, and the hon. member should make inquiries to see for himself whether these grievances existed.

Mr. STORY said there were some reasons why these employees should be placed upon the Civil Service list. He did not know anything about the matter himself, but he had received a circular which he should refer to.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was sent to everybody but the Minister.

Mr. STORY thought it only courteous that he should read it. The reasons of these men for wishing to be placed on the list after they had been a certain time in the department were that many of them had been employed from fifteen to thirty-two years; that the Government Printer could dismiss men at any moment, and the man dismissed had no right of appeal; that men of thirty-two years' standing in times of retrenchment or during sickness were treated in the same way as employees who had only been in the place for twelve months—namely, by having their pay stopped; that in seeking promotion, increases, or leave of absence, the Government Printer had the sole right to decide, there being no system in the office by which an employee received any privileges except at the will of the Government Printer, and that by granting these concessions the Government would have nothing to lose, as the only difference it would make would be that their salaries would appear upon the Estimates, and the employees would have the satisfaction of knowing that in all things tending to their welfare they would receive every consideration from the Government as well as other Civil servants. He understood that no reflection was being cast upon the Government Printer or anyone in his department.

The Hon. G. THORN said these men, who were wage-earners, were anxious to be placed in the same position as other Civil servants; and it was for the Home Secretary to answer the hon. members for Toowong and Bulimba, and say whether he did not think that those men, after a certain term of service, should not become Civil servants and be treated as other Civil servants were treated.

The HOME SECRETARY reminded hon. members that the House had appointed a board part of whose duty was to classify the officers employed by the Government. Lately the Treasurer stated in his Budget Speech that there were from 10,000 to 12,000 persons in receipt of pay in the Queensland service. Of that number about 2,000 were engaged by the year, leaving about 8,000 receiving daily or weekly wages. For over thirty years they had a system at work in the Government Printing Office, and every one had given the Government Printer and the department his modicum of praise. Under the circumstances he did not think it fair to ask him to make a change in the system which would involve probably 8,000 daily and weekly men doing good work being changed to yearly men doing bad work.

Mr. TURLEY: 8,000! That includes the whole of the railway men.

The HOME SECRETARY: They would all have the same right surely! He was only showing that it was a big order. The Civil Service Board had not recommended the change suggested with respect to the employees in the Government Printing Office, and the men had made no grievance of it. If the change was made he would also have to consider whether the Government Printing Office was not being run against the trade.

Mr. TURLEY: Not at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: He would have to consider that. He could offer no opinion upon it, but he knew that he was repeatedly deputised by persons coming to him and complaining that the Government Printing Office was doing certain work and paying such wages that they could not get their work done. The matter was one that would require very serious consideration, as it did not affect the Government Printing Office alone. The question had been raised now that the superannuation was abolished.



If a superannuation system was passed in connection with a new Civil Service Bill, they would all fly out of any desire to be classified.

Mr. TURLEY: They should be compelled in the Government service to make provision for themselves.

Mr. GRIMES wished to say that the Home Secretary himself had put the claims of Mr. Gregory to consideration even more strongly than hon. members had done; and to say that next year he would think about it was a poor return for the attention to business and business tact which the Government Printer had manifested. Mr. Gregory's claims should be recognised at once by placing an amount on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. TURLEY asked if the Home Secretary would make inquiries into the complaints which had been made, and see whether it was advisable that those men should be placed on the Civil Service list?

The HOME SECRETARY: If the employees of the Government Printing Office thought they had a grievance and made representations to him showing their reasons for the request they made, he would inquire into their grievance.

Question put and passed.

#### ADVERTISING BOARD.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £5,350 be granted for the Government advertising. The vote was the same as last year, and was for the advertising by all the Government departments except the railways.

Question put and passed.

#### INSANITY.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £40,607 be granted for Insanity and Hospitals for the Insane. The report of Dr. Scholes, the Inspector of Asylums, would show that there was an increase in the number of patients. Last year the management had been economical considering the number of patients. With the exception of the clerks, who were put down for increases of £10, there was a regular system of classification, and the increases to the attendants were in accordance with that system. The main increase in the vote was for the purchase of a piece of land at Toowoomba.

Mr. GLASSEY: And a very big price it is.

The HOME SECRETARY did not think so. The land had not yet been purchased, but was only under offer. He had had the land valued by the most competent persons in Toowoomba, and he had visited the spot himself. He was satisfied that Toowoomba was a more suitable place to send insane people to than Goodna. He regretted that it had been necessary to erect wards of wood, but the present institution was only a temporary one, which it was intended to replace by degrees as they could afford it with one of brick or stone. There should be no wood used where insane persons were confined, as there was always a risk of fire, but they had had to do what they could until good times came. They were always extending what he considered their principal institution—namely, that at Toowoomba. The piece of land on which the asylum stood was too small, and Dr. Hogg, at a considerable amount of trouble, had found that he could get the piece of land now under offer. He (Mr. Tozer) had at once entered into negotiations, and the land was now under offer at less than the price ruling in that neighbourhood. Of course, as the contract to purchase was only conditional, if Parliament did not vote the money he would not buy the land, but it was absolutely necessary for the extension of the institution that the land should be bought. The area was 104 acres 1 rood 10 perches, and the purchasing price £10 an acre. The land was very near to the asylum.

Mr. KING: It is cheap at the price.

The HOME SECRETARY: He thought so.

Mr. GLASSEY: Why don't you buy it for yourself, then?

The HOME SECRETARY: He would be glad to take it as a speculation for himself. He had not let a single soul know that the Government wanted to buy it, otherwise they would not have got it for £10 an acre. The land was only about four miles from the Toowoomba railway station; it was splendid arable land, was cleared and fenced, and ready for agriculture. He thought it was worth £10 an acre. He looked upon Toowoomba as the sanatorium of Queensland, and there was more chance of insane persons recovering there than in a less salubrious climate. It was far better to buy the land now at £10 an acre than have to pay £100 an acre ten years hence.

Mr. GLASSEY hoped that unless stronger reasons were advanced than those given by the hon. gentleman that the Committee would not sanction the purchase. There was sufficient land at Goodna for all purposes.

The HOME SECRETARY: Dr. Scholes says that it is impossible to extend the Goodna Asylum.

Mr. GLASSEY: Nonsense! On the hill next to Wolston there was abundance of land which could be procured for £1 an acre, and for various purposes it was not worth that. Yet the hon. member asked the Committee to agree to the purchase of land at Toowoomba at £10 an acre. He recommended the hon. gentleman to concentrate his buildings in onespot as much as possible, in order to economise—not with a view to preventing the patients enjoying all the pleasures that could be given them, but to afford the utmost facilities for their improvement and final cure. It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to say that he looked on Toowoomba as the sanatorium of Queensland. He had not a single word to say against Toowoomba, but if the argument of the hon. gentleman held good he should prove it by showing the number of cures effected at Toowoomba, as compared with the number of cures of similar cases at Goodna and elsewhere. He strongly recommended the hon. gentleman to concentrate his buildings in one particular spot, and so avoid the expense of having several different staffs. That had been found necessary in Great Britain, but here they spread their buildings over different localities, increased their staff, and had to pay an officer £100 a year to inspect the institutions, which would be unnecessary if the buildings were concentrated in one place. He would not object to spending £2 an acre on the purchase of a small area of land, but he was certainly opposed to giving £10 an acre for the area it was proposed to buy.

The Hon. G. THORN also thought that £10 an acre was too much to pay for this land. Where were the members for Ipswich that they were not present to advocate an increase in the asylum at Sandy Gallop? There was ample land there for an extension of the institution, and by enlarging it they would decrease the cost per head for management by a considerable amount. There was not a finer place in the colony than Sandy Gallop, and he questioned whether the site from a sanitary point of view was in any way inferior to the site proposed to be bought at Toowoomba. At any rate, he was opposed to paying that exorbitant price for land at Toowoomba.

The HOME SECRETARY: The land was not required for the purpose of increasing the buildings at Toowoomba, but for the purpose of enabling the hospital authorities to treat the patients properly by employing them in industrial pursuits, and for the purpose of giving them sufficient land on which to keep cattle for the convenience of the patients, as the present

paddock was altogether too small. The purchase of this land would not interfere with Ipswich in the slightest degree. It might be necessary to increase the accommodation at Sandy Gallop. Dr. Scholes said—

“The ward at Goodna will be kept for the gradual increase of patients here; and Diamantina cannot be given up until another male ward is built at Toowoomba, where any further additions should be made, as Woogaroo is now large enough, and any further extension here is not desirable.”

A thousand patients were as many as there ought to be in any one asylum. The piece of land at Toowoomba was just opposite the asylum, and if that was purchased the patients could be employed in a way that would result in a profit to the institution and tend to restore their mental balance. In his opinion there should be farms like that attached to all their public institutions where the patients could be suitably employed.

The HON. G. THORN: Doctors, like lawyers, differed in opinion; and though one might say that the asylum at Toowoomba should be extended, another might say that the establishment at Sandy Gallop should be increased. He would like to know where the members for Ipswich were that they did not advocate the claims of Sandy Gallop?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member is now tediously repeating himself. He has asked about a dozen times where are the members for Ipswich, and they have been here the whole time.

The HON. G. THORN was very sorry they did not defend the interests of their district. He held that £10 an acre was too much to pay for that land at Toowoomba, and did not believe that more than one-third of that sum was paid for it originally.

Mr. GLASSEY suggested that the Home Secretary should withdraw this purchase of land.

The HOME SECRETARY: Nothing of the kind; it is necessary.

Mr. GLASSEY: Then he should move its omission from the vote, because he did not think it was required. They had been told that the land was not required for building purposes, but was to provide employment for the inmates. If they were to grow vegetables, then the area was too large. If it were to grow cattle, then cheaper land would do. The fact was some person in Toowoomba wanted to sell some land, or had some interest in the transaction. If the land were near Woogaroo, where there were many inmates, there might be some force in the arguments of the Home Secretary, but the price was too high.

The PREMIER: You evidently do not know much about it.

Mr. GLASSEY: He had been over the land, and knew the number of patients at Toowoomba. There were very few people there, and there was no force in the proposition made. It was all very well for Dr. Scholes to recommend this purchase. He was paid £100 per year for inspecting asylums, and no doubt it suited him to have them established at different parts of the country so that he would be able to make so-called inspections, instead of having all the buildings concentrated in one place, and saving the taxpayers' money. He trusted that the purchase would be withdrawn for the time being to give the hon. member an opportunity of seeing whether there was any land available at Woogaroo.

Mr. GRIMES: It had been acknowledged on all hands by medical men that it was a good thing to find employment for the inmates of these institutions, as it would assist in their cure. He commended the action of the Government in seeking to enlarge the area of land connected with the institution, so as to combine

agriculture with it. This had been done to a certain extent at Goodna, and he found from the report that a large quantity of vegetables had been raised there. Nearly 5,000 gallons of milk had also been supplied to the institution from cows kept there, and he knew a large number of pigs were raised there. This work was carried on without any expense, as it was done by the inmates. The Home Secretary had stated that there was no intention to extend the buildings at Goodna, but they were going to extend those at Toowoomba, as the climate there was more suitable for such patients. One reason why the Asylum at Goodna should not be extended was that portion of the land was subject to flood, and it was a matter of surprise that no lives were lost in 1893, when the inmates had to be removed to higher ground. Ten pounds an acre was cheap for this land if it was fit for cultivation; and as for getting land at Oxley for £1 per acre, he was sure it could not be obtained for less than £10, and then it would have to be cleared. This land, he understood, was already cleared and fit for cultivation, and was close to the institution. It was a very good bargain, and he would support the item. He found from the report that the death-rate at Goodna was 6·7, while at Toowoomba it was only 4·6, so that the statistics bore out the statement of the Home Secretary, and it was far better that the cooler climate should be chosen for institutions of that sort.

The HOME SECRETARY would tell hon. members how the matter originated. When he went up to Toowoomba he found near the asylum building a suitable paddock. He knew that Dr. Hogg was greatly circumscribed in the matter of land for cultivation, and he was assured that the institution could be saved a large sum per year if they had land to cultivate. He asked Dr. Hogg what he thought he could get the paddock for, and he was told that it could not be got under a high figure. That was in 1891, before the boom, and he then pooh-poohed the idea of giving such a price, though he thoroughly approved of getting the land. After the boom, when the price of land went down, he thought there was a possibility of doing something, and expecting that if he looked for the land for the Government he would have to pay excessively for it, he commissioned Mr. Ryder to ascertain in a quiet way if it was possible to get the land for a reasonable sum, and he had been really surprised to find that the owners were willing to place it under offer for £10 an acre. Then he communicated with Drs. Scholes and Hogg, and they said that if the land could be got at that price it was a bargain. He believed it was a bargain, and that within five years the products from the land would more than pay for the whole cost of it. He had gone carefully over Goodna, and there was not a perch of land there fit for cultivation. He found out that it was all rock when he was looking for a site for a cemetery, when he was considering the question of doing away with Toowong. There was no doubt whatever that the metropolitan asylum for the colony would have to be at Toowoomba. That was well understood, and that was why there were no wooden buildings put up there. Hon. members should know also that the buildings at Toowoomba were paid for out of loan, while those put up at Goodna were paid for out of revenue, because they were looked upon as temporary. If they had to keep 700 or 800 patients inside they would require a large number of warders, and it was in furtherance of the cure of the patients that the land was required, to give them some outside employment. He asked hon. members therefore to sanction the purchase, about which there was no job and no suspicion of a job.

Mr. GLASSEY found no fault with the purchase of ground upon which the patients could be employed, as he looked upon that as desirable and essential, but he objected that by having those institutions scattered about different parts of the colony the cost was considerably increased. They should have a central building, and if Goodna was not a suitable place for it they should go somewhere else. He had been frequently to Goodna during the last ten years, and for building purposes at any rate there was no better site in Southern Queensland. He repeated that good land could be got nearer to Wolston for very much less than £10 an acre, and if the land at Toowoomba was purchased the products from it could not be consumed by the patients there, and railway carriage upon what was sent elsewhere would take a good deal from the profits. He did not favour the purchase, but if hon. members generally did he would say no more.

Mr. McMASTER was pleased to think that land was to be purchased to give the patients some outside employment, which would be very much better for them than to have to wander about doing nothing. The hon. member for Bundaberg must know that there was no land at Goodna fit for cultivation. The hon. member admitted it was good for building purposes, but that was not what was required. Toowoomba was the proper place for those people, and he was surprised at their being able to get land within three miles of Toowoomba for £10 an acre. The land at Toowoomba was far superior to that in the vicinity of Goodna. He did not know whether there was any scrub land available at Goodna, but he knew that some years ago it had cost £15 an acre to clear scrub at Oxley, and if the same scrub had to be cleared now it would cost £10 an acre. The Government would act wisely in securing the land at Toowoomba, because if they let a year or two pass without buying the land they would have to pay far more for it. He believed that in two years the land would repay itself, and it would undoubtedly prove of great benefit to the unfortunate patients.

The HOME SECRETARY said that he had now got the correspondence which had taken place at the inception of the matter. [The hon. gentleman then read correspondence from Dr. Hogg in corroboration of his previous statements. Dr. Hogg pointed out that the land available for grazing and agriculture in the present paddock at Toowoomba was too small to supply the wants of the institution, but that the purchase of this land would enable sufficient dairy cattle to be kept to meet the needs of the asylum. He also referred to the fact that when the present land had been bought in 1878 it had cost £2,800, or nearly £19 an acre, as compared with the £10 an acre for which the land now under offer could be purchased.] Dr. Scholes also advocated the purchase of the land in the interests of the asylum, and in order to satisfy himself he had written to the Gowrie Divisional Board, which had valued the land as worth £10 an acre at the very lowest estimate. He had then submitted the matter to the Premier, as the Premier was a resident of Toowoomba, and the hon. gentleman had approved of the purchase. Taking everything into consideration, he was satisfied that, in this instance, it was wise to buy the land, which was cheap, and was also necessary in the interests of the institution.

Mr. GLASSEY desired to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to another matter. There was a considerable amount of dissatisfaction amongst the lower grades of attendants in the asylums, who believed that there were not frequent enough changes in the upper grades to

allow those in the lower grades an opportunity of obtaining advancement. He believed the hon. gentleman was about to visit Goodna shortly, and he might then look into the matter. The hon. gentleman would find that during the last nine or ten years there had been very few changes. Nine years ago there were twenty-one warders in the first class, ten in the second, and thirteen in the third, and there they remained. The time had arrived when some changes should take place which would advance the interests of the men in the third class, who had received no benefit from any changes during the last few years.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was mistaken in saying that they received no benefit. Only during the last fortnight a vacancy had occurred in the reception-house at Rockhampton, and a warder with his wife was transferred there, which meant a considerable promotion in the way of salary. The classes were arranged by the superintendent of the asylum, and he must have so many officers in each class, but as vacancies occurred warders were transferred from one asylum to another, and there were always the regulation increases for length of service. He had never received any complaints from these officers, but he was going up there on Monday, and if he found that the men had any complaints he would inquire into them. The only suggestion that had been made to him was in regard to the quarters for female nurses, and that had been attended to. If a number of men in any institution had any grievance, they should put it in black and white and send it to the Minister. If they did not do that, they deserved no redress.

Mr. GLASSEY: The hon. gentlemen knew perfectly well that those men had made their grievance known to the medical superintendent, who was the proper channel through whom complaints should be made; and if the complaints had not reached the Minister, it was not the fault of the men. However, he was glad to know that the hon. gentleman was going up to the asylum on Monday, and he was sure that he would find that the complaints he referred to were well founded.

Question put and passed.

#### RECEPTION-HOUSES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £2,720 be granted for reception-houses. There were a few increases in the salaries of the smaller paid attendants in all those institutions.

Question put and passed.

#### PRISONS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £25,888 be granted for prisons. There was an increase of £20 in the salary of the visiting justice at Brisbane. There was also an extra clerk employed at a salary of £90; the other clerk and the messenger also got an increase of £10 each. The warders were classified, and received certain increases according to the regulations. In some instances it would appear as though a warder was getting a lower salary, but that was because a vacancy had occurred and had been filled by the appointment of another man. The superintendent of St. Helena got an increase of £50, but that was really the amount he was entitled to on promotion. The clerk to the storekeeper received an increase of £20, and other officers £10 each. The superintendent of the gaol at Townsville received an increase of £10. There was an increase in contingencies, as the amount voted last year had been found insufficient. The amount for gratuities to discharged prisoners, which he very much approved of, was increased by £100, and the allowance for extra cost of living at Thursday Island gaol was

increased by £19. There was a new item for £50 for a medical officer at Rockhampton, and £375 was set down for the repair of the jetty at St. Helena, which had been eaten by cobra. He also asked for £200 for extra cost of living for warders, so that they should all be under the same regulations in that respect as other Civil servants. Altogether the vote was increased by about £1,200. If hon. members desired further information on the subject he would refer them to the very complete report of the Comptroller of Prisons, which had been laid on the table.

Mr. McDONALD asked whether the hon. gentleman had received any complaints regarding the management of Stewart Creek gaol at Townsville?

The HOME SECRETARY: He had had the very reverse. He had himself visited the gaol when he was up there some time ago, and saw that everything was very satisfactory, and the Comptroller-General, who had recently visited the place, reported to the same effect. From what he knew of Superintendent Downey, he could not credit that the management of the gaol was anything but satisfactory.

Mr. McDONALD called the attention of the Home Secretary to certain letters that had appeared in the Townsville papers concerning the management of the gaol there. They referred to grave irregularities, and the matters should be inquired into.

Mr. CASTLING: The only letters he had seen were in the *Worker*. The governor of the gaol was an efficient officer, and he had never heard a word against the management of the institution.

Mr. McDONALD: You mean the *Democrat*.

Mr. CASTLING: It was all the same. He did not remember letters in any of the other papers.

Mr. McDONALD: Letters appeared in the *Herald* as well as the *Democrat*, in one of which it was said that it was by no means an uncommon thing for the warders to go upon duty more or less drunk. The writer stated that he had seen a warder almost stagger up to his tower the first thing in the morning, and later on in the day sing out to a prisoner to bring him some water, which had to be hauled up by the line kept for the purpose. Then it went on to relate the circumstances. The main point was that the warders and officials were charged with being drunk, and charges of cruelty had also been made which ought to be inquired into.

Mr. CASTLING: He had been in Townsville for some time, and had seen many prisoners. He had always noticed that they were fatter when they came out of gaol than when they went in.

The HOME SECRETARY: Personally he did not inquire into complaints that were made by the Press, but the officers of the department did so. He found that the Comptroller, who had just come down, had seen these letters, and had made inquiries, and said it would be impossible for any prisoner to see a warder going into the tower. It was not at all likely that the superintendent would allow a warder to go on duty while drunk. He had had a good deal of anxiety in regard to the warders at this place, and had visited severe punishment upon three or four of them on account of intemperance, although not while on duty. He had warned them, and he was at present considering two cases. He did not like to dismiss men for a first offence of drunkenness, but in a service like this temperance was essential, and the men should at all times have their reason about them. But a man who was found drunk twice did not remain in the service any longer. There

was some substratum of truth in what the hon. member for Flinders had said, but he had remedied the matter by removing the offender.

Mr. HOOLAN: It was not so much the conduct of the warders when drunk that had been complained of, as their conduct towards the prisoners when they were perfectly sensible. The Home Secretary was too much of a martinet altogether, and would like to shut the prisoners completely away from public view. The Government would like to prevent the prisoners from showing any human feelings at all, and would like to stop their mouths after they came out. The prisoners here were secluded as much as those in Siberia. Most people in Queensland had acquaintances in gaol, and they found it very difficult to see them. Even if a member of Parliament went there to see a friend, what was the result, particularly since the hon. gentleman had charge of the prisons? He had to stand off ten yards distant, the prisoner was brought up by a body of warders like a dumb beast, and he had to be seen through the iron gratings, as if a person was going to visit a prisoner with murderous intentions or to suggest some unheard-of villainy. That was the reason men were transferred to the Townsville gaol, so that they could exercise an arbitrary and despotic system, and the indignities the prisoners were subjected to there were something atrocious. If they were put fairly before the public, the public would not stand it for a moment. If a warder showed any disposition to clemency, or to any relaxation of the extremely strict regulations, he was reported to the Home Secretary by some of the tyrants in the service, and he was then removed and harassed about until he got the sack. The prison system should be laid open to the Press and to responsible members of the public, that the public might see what happened there. He wanted the hon. gentleman to explain the removal of a prisoner from the Boggo-road Gaol at the dead of night to the gaol in Townsville? Why was there such a maladministration of justice as that a prisoner sentenced in Rockhampton should be manacled and sent down here manacled, thrown on the wharf at 2 o'clock in the morning, and kept there until 6 o'clock till the Black Maria arrived to take him to Boggo-road Gaol? And when responsible persons, not hop and trot and hopscotch persons, but members of Parliament in a body, wanted to see him they would not be allowed to see him, though they might yet take the place of the hon. gentleman who now had charge of the prisons. What was the answer to that? Were prisoners to be travelled about the country in manacles and sent down here from Rockhampton chained to the leg of a bedstead, and sent in hobbles to the water-closet on board the ship? What was the reason that man was sent from here to Townsville gaol? Was it that he might be subjected to some torture or misery, or perhaps hypnotised to get him to say what he did not know, or to force him into some infringement of the strict rules and regulations that he might be brought to the triangles?

The HOME SECRETARY: Whom do you refer to?

Mr. HOOLAN: Martin, the Ayrshire Downs prisoner, who at the last general election the hon. gentleman declared in the Gympie Press to be a political opponent of his own. He would scorn to treat any political opponent like that, but the hon. gentleman and the Government of which he was a member did not. They consented to do that degrading, dirty action—to deal with a man like that without letting anyone know of it, and after bringing him down here, for fear some little mercy might be shown him, send him back again to that little salt-hole on Ross Creek—a

modern Siberia. The accusations made in the Townsville Press by educated men, who had been there and afterwards wrote of what they saw there under a *nom de plume*, showed what the place was and how the prisoners were treated by the prison authorities, who subjected men who were at their mercy as prisoners of the State to all sorts of petty insults, slights, and vexations, and to the refusal of little things which the prison regulations allowed. It was all very well for the Comptroller to say that was not so. He did not see those things.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did you see them?

Mr. HOOLAN was not allowed to go there or he would very quickly see them. The Government were not game to let him go where he could see them, and he could, therefore, only say what he heard about them. He could tell them some little things with regard to their model prison of St. Helena that would make them bristle, but he did not want to do that. He knew more of what transpired there than the hon. gentleman did. The hon. gentleman would have to explain how a prisoner sentenced at Rockhampton to fifteen years in St. Helena came to be removed to Townsville, where it was not intended he should be sent. It showed that there was something radically wrong in the State, and that the persons at the head of the Prisons Department connived at what was wrong and improper.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members had listened to one side of the story; he would now give them the other. The man who was responsible for the removal of Martin was the hon. member for Burke himself, because when Martin was in Brisbane the hon. member came over to him and told him that it had been represented to him that Martin was going to be cruelly treated—"tortured" was the word the hon. member used—in the gaols down here. He guessed from conversations he had had with the hon. member that what was referred to was the fact that Martin had had a dispute with the doctor at St. Helena, and when he came out he made that a charge very plainly. He therefore at once appreciated what the hon. member said, and in consequence he warned the Comptroller that there was to be no room given for any grievance or charge of ill-treatment of Martin, and under the circumstances it was thought far better to send him to Stewart's Creek. The hon. member for Burke was responsible for Martin's transfer, and he now threw the responsibility upon him (Mr. Tozer). Martin had been used to the same kind of climate as he would have in the North, and it would have been greater torture to him to have sent him to St. Helena, where the cold in the winter was intense. Martin had been one of the best conducted prisoners when at St. Helena. He had known that there was not the slightest possibility of any torture being inflicted upon Martin at St. Helena, and he had never complained of anything of the sort when he had been there, but in order that there should not be a ground for grievance he did what he thought the hon. member wanted him to do, and sent Martin to a prison where he would be under men who had had no associations with St. Helena. He left it to the Committee and the public to judge whether the transfer of this prisoner was the proper course under the circumstances.

Mr. HOOLAN: The hon. gentleman always told them that instead of airing grievances in Parliament they should go to the head of any department against whom there was a grievance. He had come down here entirely new, and this was his first grievance. Reliable information had been given him that Martin feared torture himself. He was a man with a bad reputation

whilst he was a good man, and men with such reputations suffered more in prisons than any others. He had gone straight to the Home Secretary, and asked him for an order to see Martin in Boggo road, and the hon. gentleman had said that he could write out his own order and he would sign it. He did so, and he interviewed Martin in Boggo road, and told him that he need fear nothing, as his friends in Parliament and elsewhere would see that he was subjected to no indignity. The hon. gentleman himself bore out the suspicion that had existed by his remarks. If the hon. gentleman was in a position to see that the prisoner was subjected to no cruelty, why had he inflicted upon him the cruelty of sending him to a miserable little prison like that at Stewart's Creek, where he was likely to be subjected to torture? The hon. gentleman went down to St. Helena every fortnight, and Martin's friends in Parliament would also have seen about his treatment. He had interviewed Martin in Boggo road, not only to tell him what the hon. gentleman had said, but to ask him about his trial. He should have been the first person whom the hon. gentleman should have consulted about the removal of the prisoner; but he had been allowed to put upon himself the indignity of going on board the "Lucinda" in order to visit Martin at St. Helena. However, the steamer never went near St. Helena, but went to Leper Island instead. The hon. gentleman took very good care that neither he nor any other friend of Martin had an opportunity of seeing him before his removal, and he believed that the hon. gentleman had secretly connived at his removal to Townsville gaol, a little bit of a prison under petty officers who were more the creatures of the State than officers of the State, and much better fitted for drudges in a common lodging-house than to be officers in one of Her Majesty's gaols.

Mr. DAWSON: It was just as well, now that the matter had been brought up, that there should be a distinct understanding before the vote went through. The hon. member for Burke had brought a charge against the Home Secretary's Department, in which the Home Secretary himself was involved. With regard to shifting prisoner Martin to Stewart's Creek Gaol, the general rule was that no prisoners in the North were sent to that gaol who were sentenced to more than two years' imprisonment; in fact, it was not considered advisable to send any prisoner there for six months on account of the unsuitable nature of the gaol. It was a cruelty to confine any man there for more than six months, and to send a man there for fifteen years was abominable. That was really an addition to the sentence, and the man could never have been sent there unless there had been some special reason. Whether the hon. member for Burke had hit upon the correct reason he did not know, but the fact still remained that James Martin, a political opponent of the Home Secretary, was the only prisoner who had been sentenced to more than two years' imprisonment who had ever been sent to Stewart's Creek Gaol. He challenged the hon. gentleman to bring forward another case. What he had particularly risen about, however, was to find out a little more about the explanation of the Home Secretary with regard to Martin's removal. If he could understand the language of the hon. gentleman, he had removed Martin because he feared that the doctor in charge of the prison at Boggo road or St. Helena would do something to Martin which would place the prisoner's life in danger; that the doctor would torture him in such a manner as to endanger his life, and the hon. gentleman had removed him in order to save him from that fell intention of the doctor. Had they a doctor in the prisons in Brisbane

who would use his position to torture a prisoner and endanger his life, so that it became necessary for the head of the department to remove the prisoner away from the intention of the doctor? It appeared from the statement of the hon. gentleman that after Martin came out of gaol before he made certain complaints against the doctor, and that if he was kept there now the doctor would pay him back by torturing him or doing something that would endanger his life. Before that vote passed they ought to have that statement cleared up, and understand what the hon. gentleman meant.

Mr. McDONALD certainly thought that they would have had some explanation from the Home Secretary after what had been said by the hon. members for Charters Towers and Burke. The Home Secretary would remember one particular case in connection with the union prisoners of 1891, which turned out very seriously. Had it not been for the intervention of the hon. gentleman in that instance the prisoner would have died.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is what was said.

Mr. McDONALD was speaking about the case of Julian Stuart. When that man was in St. Helena Dr. Wray insisted that there was nothing wrong with him, though it was well known that he had always suffered considerably, and would not allow him any particular diet which was calculated to do him good, but insisted on his having the prison diet, which was practically killing him. When the hon. gentleman went down to St. Helena he saw the state of the man, and ordered his immediate removal to Toowoomba, and the man became so ill shortly after he got there that he was sent to the general hospital, and it was some considerable time before he got better. There was not the slightest doubt from the statement made by Martin regarding Dr. Wray and certain officials that he had some suspicion that some attempt would be made to get him to break the prison regulations, and so have him brought to the triangles. Prisoners had been carted from one end of the colony to the other, and treated in the most undignified manner, chained together and dragged about like dogs; and that was not a state of things which should be allowed in any civilised country, more especially in a case where it is a political prisoner.

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. McDONALD: They had got the Home Secretary's own word for it; he wrote a letter to a Gympie paper in which he stated that he was one of his political opponents. The Secretary for Public Instruction had made the Ayrshire Downs cases a political matter at the general election, and the members of the Government generally had lost no opportunity of using industrial disputes, and whatever crimes were supposed to be connected with them, in politics in every shape and form. And what for? To try to discredit the Labour party. Their case was so weak, putrid, and rotten that they had dragged all the despicable things they could think of into politics, and perhaps they had got on to the Treasury benches by that means. But now they wanted to discard those things as they were afraid of them. The members on that side had not forgotten the manner in which Julian Stuart was treated, and it was only natural that Martin should have a suspicion that he was likely to be treated in the same way. At any rate Stewart's Creek Gaol was not a proper place for Martin; he would have been far better in St. Helena or in Rockhampton Gaol.

The HOME SECRETARY was prepared to answer the hon. member who had just spoken, or any statement in regard to the action of his department in connection with prisoners, but he was not prepared to answer the insulting observations of the hon. member for Charters Towers, who had put words into his mouth that he had never uttered. The hon. member for Burke told him that he had a deep-seated impression that if Martin was sent to St. Helena he would be ill-treated; and he (Mr. Tozer) felt that it would not be right to incarcerate that man there, where that impression would remain with him. Dr. Wray said there was no reason to remove Stuart, from a medical point of view; but he (Mr. Tozer) looked at the case from a common-sense point of view, and removed him to Toowoomba Gaol, where Stuart became a changed man. He got seriously ill afterwards, and was sent to Toowoomba Hospital, where he got better. It was right in law and by custom to remove prisoners from Brisbane to Townsville or from Roma to Rockhampton. It all depended upon what was necessary in the interests of gaol discipline. If a man had made a serious complaint about the superintendent of the gaol at Roma he would be transferred to Brisbane, and so on. Boggo road was not a suitable place to keep a prisoner in for a long time. He knew that a great deal of outdoor work was done at Stewart's Creek Gaol, because he had been called upon to supply additional warders, but whether Martin had been employed outside or not he did not know. Although he knew there was no justification for a complaint of the nature made in the case of Martin, when a man had such an impression upon his mind, he tried to remove that impression. The gaol rules did not say that Martin should serve fifteen years at Stewart's Creek Gaol, and if the work there was injurious to the health of the prisoner, he would be removed. Of course they could not put a prisoner in exactly the place he wished to be in, but he was informed by the Comptroller that Stewart's Creek had the best accommodation for prisoners in the colony. It was specified distinctly that it was the Northern penal establishment, and it occurred to him that it would be wise that the impression Martin had in his mind should be removed, and for the present he would remain at Stewart's Creek. So far as the health of the place was concerned, he did not think there was the slightest reason for complaint. In regard to the statement that he had alluded to Martin as a political opponent, all he had done was this: A gentleman named Fisher was putting up for Gympie at the last election, and took occasion to state that he preferred to be classed with the least of the great at the Trades Hall than with him (Mr. Tozer) or his friends; and as an innocent rejoinder to that desire he replied, "What does he say to 'Shearblade Martin,' the general organiser of the Australian Labour Federation, who has some difficulty over a firestick incident at Ayrshire Downs?" What harm could that do?

Mr. HOOLAN: He did not tell the Home Secretary when he went to consult him that there were fears in Martin's mind, because he was a man who knew no fear, and was not as cowardly as some members of Parliament. He had no knowledge of what was in the prisoner's mind, and that was why he had asked permission to interview him. If the hon. member believed what he said about Stewart's Creek Gaol, why did he not throw it open to public inspection? The Comptroller of Prisons might be the most honourable man in the world, but he did not believe him, and he never believed anyone who made a bold assertion and was not game to say, "Come and examine it for yourself." If he said to a man, "Your house is a

cesspool. It stinks. You should have the inspector of nuisances to see to it." If he was an honourable man he would say, "Send along your inspector of nuisances. You are a liar. It does not stink." The hon. gentleman was afraid to allow a magistrate of the colony sworn to uphold its laws to visit Martin at Townsville, and yet he expected them to believe his Comptroller, whose salary depended upon his words, and who dared not sit there in the corner and not back up the hon. gentleman. Did he think they were children? Until the hon. gentleman could prove by a fair investigation that he was a liar he would say that the management of the prisons was tyrannous, and that the removal of Martin was entirely improper, and was connived at by the hon. gentleman. He was prepared to back up his words in the presence of the Comptroller. They were not afraid to let them go up and see the lunatics; Dr. Scholes led them round through all the wards with the greatest courtesy, and showed them everything. But they were afraid to let them see the prisoners because they were their political opponents, and they would have to meet them on the floor of the House hereafter. The prisoner Martin was not removed for the good of his health or because he was afraid of Dr. Wray. They would be a poor lot if they could not circumvent Dr. Wray. They would not be worth their salt, and the hon. gentleman would not be worth his salt if he allowed a semi-lunatic with tyrannical instincts like Dr. Wray to boss him. The offence for which Martin was first imprisoned was sedition, the most honourable crime any man could be charged with—an attempt to overthrow the Government in order to rectify wrongdoing. That was what he had been sent to gaol for, and if he did not think the man had worthy metal in him he would not be there to speak for him. It was because he knew, from the metal in his composition, that he would turn round and bash any warder who put an indignity upon him, that he went and asked him to control his temper, and to tell him that so far as he could he would look after him. The hon. gentleman had circumvented him by taking the man away to where he could not look after him, and they knew that special orders had been sent after him, and that no stronger or stricter orders had ever been sent by the Czar after a prisoner removed to Siberia.

Mr. DAWSON was sorry the Home Secretary thought he intended to insult him when he asked him what was the real meaning of the explanation he had given in answer to the hon. member for Burke. The hon. gentleman said he had removed Martin for the sake of his health to Stewart's Creek Gaol, and the reason his health was in danger was that he feared some action on the part of the prison doctor, he supposed Dr. Wray. In his second statement the hon. gentleman informed them that the suspicion was in Martin's mind, and in order that Martin might not be tortured in his mind he had been sent to Stewart's Creek. That threw a flood of light on the position, and if that was so he would let the matter drop and say that Martin should be grateful for the hon. gentleman's kindness and consideration. The hon. gentleman also objected to what he had said about Martin being his political opponent, but he would remind the hon. gentleman that during the last election he used one of the Gympie papers to damage his opponent, Mr. Fisher.

The HOME SECRETARY: To answer an attack made by him upon me. I could not damage him.

Mr. DAWSON agreed that the hon. gentleman could not damage him, but he tried to do so, and, in trying to do so, the hon. gentleman classed Martin with Mr. Fisher as his political opponent. The hon. gentleman was gifted with

the marvellous lapse of memory at stated periods, and he would call to his mind the following paragraph from what he had written on that occasion:—

"Mr. Fisher desires to be classed with the least of the great at the Trades Hall. Granted. What does he say to 'Shear-blade' Martin, the late general organiser of the Australian Labour Federation, the boon companion and personal friend of Mr. Glassey, the recent canvasser for Mr. Kerr?"

Mr. KERR: Which was a lie.

Mr. DAWSON:

"He has at present some little difficulty over a fire-stick incident at Ayrshire Downs. By some this is considered a special qualification. His present address is Rockhampton Gaol, Class No. 6. Will Gympie ratify the connection?"

Yet the hon. gentleman had the consummate audacity to say that he had never regarded Martin in the light of a political opponent. He had expressed his belief as a prominent member of the Government that Martin was guilty before he had been tried. If the hon. gentleman did not say that with a view to prejudice Martin's trial, he had done it with the object of damaging the chances of Messrs. Fisher, Glassey, and Kerr. There was only one man in Queensland who would venture to do anything of the kind, and that was the hon. gentleman who was entitled to call himself Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am very glad the paragraph brings itself home to you.

Mr. DAWSON: It would suit the hon. gentleman better than any man he knew, and if the hon. gentleman wanted to enter into a contest as to whether it fitted him or the hon. gentleman himself more perfectly he was willing to do so at any time the hon. gentleman liked.

Mr. McDONALD: It was only recently that he had seen the paragraph which had appeared in the *Gympie Times*, and he left it to the hon. gentleman's sense of justice whether, if a Labour organ had commented in the same way upon any man who was accused of a crime, that paper would not have been immediately hauled before the bench. If the hon. gentleman had not stigmatised Martin as a political opponent, he would not have been forced to take up the position he had taken up that evening. That letter had been extensively published at the time of the trial, and in an indirect way it had excited prejudice when there was no need for it. Another matter which should be inquired into were some statements which had appeared in public prints with reference to the action of the superintendent of the Townsville Gaol. It had been stated that he actually read letters written to prisoners aloud in the presence of other prisoners at the muster, and on one occasion the letter which had been read was from a prisoner's wife, and contained something of a very private nature. It was most scandalous that such an indignity should be put upon even the worst of prisoners. On another occasion an aboriginal prisoner, for some breach of the regulations, had been sentenced to solitary confinement on very small rations, which made him crazy, and he was only prevented from cutting his throat by the intervention of other prisoners. The superintendent had then taken him under the gallows, and said what he would do to him if he did such a thing again. When such things appeared in public prints there must be some truth in them, and he asked the hon. gentleman to make inquiries.

Mr. HAMILTON said that it was absurd to call Martin a political opponent. He had not committed any political offence; but had been sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment for one of the most scoundrelly and dastardly crimes a man could commit. What was there political in that? Because the man was a unionist it did



not follow that he was an opponent of the Government, as he believed many supporters of the Government were unionists.

**The HOME SECRETARY:** The hon. member for Charters Towers had read a garbled extract. In his absence, and when he had been unable to reply, a candidate who had been an hon. member of that House had used violent language against him, and his only means of replying to the slander was through the Press. He had answered the statement that Mr. Fisher would prefer to be classed with a certain class of people by asking him if he preferred to be classed with a man who had been general organiser for the Trades Hall. He had said nothing about the charge, or what was likely to be the result of that charge. It had been published all over the colony that Martin had been arrested, and his object had not been to damage Martin, but to show that one of Mr. Fisher's associates was at that time charged with the crime of arson. He would have been the last man to utter a word before Martin's trial which would have influenced his trial. How could it influence his trial to say that he was connected with a fire-stick incident? The mere repetition of what was known to everyone in the colony could not injure Martin. He had drawn the attention of the electors of Gympie to the sympathy of Mr. Fisher with Mr. Martin, with the result that Mr. Stumm was in that House, and he was very glad of it.

**Mr. DAWSON:** The hon. gentleman had practically admitted that his object had been to effectually squelch a political opponent—that he had induced the electors of Gympie to reject Mr. Fisher and send Mr. Stumm into that House. That was the reason why he used Martin as a political opponent. A more unfortunate thing was that the hon. gentleman held the position of Home Secretary, and wrote to the Press prejudging the case. No other meaning could be got out of the case than that the hon. gentleman wanted to prejudice Martin, and the result of his influence was that Martin was now in Stewart's Creek Gaol. It was unfortunate to have Mr. Stumm in the House and Mr. Fisher out of it, but it was still more unfortunate that a gentleman holding the position of Home Secretary should give an emphatic opinion upon a case which had yet to be tried before a jury.

**Mr. KING:** Some time ago two prisoners escaped from Roma Gaol, and an inquiry was held. He would like to know the result of the inquiry?

**The HOME SECRETARY:** Both the superintendent and chief warder were cautioned to be more careful in future.

**Mr. KING:** When on a previous occasion he had referred to the conduct of the gaoler at Roma, the Home Secretary said Mr. Schneider was one of the best officials in the service. He should be very sorry to think there was any other individual in the service even as bad as he was. He had a motion on the paper all last session with reference to a matter that occurred at the Roma Gaol, and the hon. gentleman took very fine care that the motion should not come on. It had been stated that it was cowardly to attack a man who had no opportunity of defending himself, and he would be the last to do so if he had not very good reason for his action. The man in question was not fit to hold his position. It was said that there was some sort of bond of brotherhood between him and the Home Secretary, but he would not mention the rumours. The motion he had on the paper last year read as follows:—

"That an Address be presented to the Governor, praying that His Excellency will be pleased to cause to

be laid on the table of the House all papers and correspondence in connection with an inquiry held in Roma Gaol concerning the diamonds of Ah Gee, a prisoner, who was discharged from Roma Gaol on the 6th September, 1894, and who did not on that occasion receive back his property, or that portion of his property—namely, the diamonds—which were afterwards found on inquiry being held into the matter at that place."

A good many hon. members had asked him the meaning of the motion; but he had not said much about it, hoping that he would have an opportunity of explaining it. He would give the Committee the facts as he knew them, and they could then judge whether the gaoler at Roma was fit to hold his present position. The Chinaman Ah Gee was apprehended between Charleville and the south-western border for evading the poll tax, and got six months' imprisonment in Roma Gaol for that offence. At the same quarter sessions another prisoner was sentenced to Toowoomba Gaol. Hon. members would be aware that Roma was about 170 miles this side of Charleville, and Toowoomba was about 215 miles this side of Roma. The consequence was that the constable who had charge of the two prisoners handed the Chinaman over to a constable who was there to meet him on the Roma platform, the Charleville constable going on to Toowoomba with the other prisoner. When he handed the Chinaman over to the Roma policeman, he handed over his bundle, less the diamonds. Between Roma and Yeulba, a distance of thirty-eight miles by train, the policeman found out his mistake, and gave the diamonds to the policeman on the platform at Yeulba. The next train going up that evening the policeman at Yeulba handed this property over to the guard of the train. The guard of that train, on arriving at Roma, handed the diamonds over to the constable who took charge of the Chinaman on the Roma platform, and he handed them over to the gaol authorities, and got a receipt for them. When the Chinaman was discharged he got his property and something purporting to be diamonds, but which were not diamonds. When he got to Chintown among his countrymen, it was found that he had not got his diamonds, but bogus pieces of glass. He made some inquiry, but was unsuccessful, and he then went to Mr. Dyball, a solicitor, through whose intervention an inquiry was held, and the real diamonds were then found. If the authorities had said that they had lost the diamonds he could have understood their position, but seeing that something else purporting to be diamonds were given to the Chinaman instead of his own property, and that the real diamonds were found after an inquiry was held, he thought there was something very wrong. His motion last year was that the documents in connection with that inquiry should be laid on the table of the House, but as it had never come on, and the documents had not been laid before the House, he took this opportunity of clearing himself, because some members thought he was making a charge purely and simply for the purpose of injuring the character of a gaol official, which he had not the slightest intention of doing. The information he had was that when the inquiry was held an attempt was made to put whatever fault there was in connection with the matter on the shoulders of the policeman, instead of on the person who was in charge of the property of prisoners in the gaol. The statements he had made were made on information received, and he only mentioned the matter now that he might not lay under any cloud of suspicion as to his motives in the matter. He hoped the Home Secretary would be able to give him some information on the subject.

**The HOME SECRETARY** would like to get some information from the hon. member, who had been good enough to say that between the



governor of the gaol and the Home Secretary there was some bond of brotherhood. Would the hon. member explain himself?

Mr. KING: There was an impression in the minds of a great many of the public in Roma, and among some of the gaol officials, that there was some bond of friendship between Mr. Schneider, the superintendent of the gaol, and the Home Secretary, otherwise that gentleman would have been discharged from his position long ago. And he was of opinion that there was something in it. One of the warders in the gaol, who was a particular friend of his, was discharged, because, he believed, it was supposed he had given him some information, which he had not done. When the man came down to him and told him that he had got the sack, he said, "It is a good job you have, for I consider you were only wasting your time there." The consequence was that that man was now a respectable alderman in Roma, instead of being a warder in a penal establishment. That was all the explanation he had to give the hon. gentleman.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the mare's nest the hon. member had unearthed! After insinuating that there was a bond of connection between an officer of the department and the Home Secretary, the hon. member made this bogus statement. The fact was that the superintendent would have been entitled to promotion to Stewart's Creek Gaol at an increase of nearly £100 a year, but he had not been promoted on account of this matter; that was how he had been punished. The hon. member had really not brought one scintilla of evidence against Mr. Schneider. The person who got the stones was the chief warder, but he (Mr. Tozer) blamed the superintendent because he did not take the precaution to see that everything down in the book was delivered to the prisoner on his discharge. Mr. Schneider held for his proper and consistent performance of duty the Legion of Honour given to him by his sovereign. That officer had done his duty; he (Mr. Tozer) had done his, and that was the only bond of connection between them. This man laboured under the disadvantage of being an Austrian who did not understand the idioms of our language; he had a very brusque manner and he was not able to defend himself, as a Minister could, on the floor of that House against accusations made against him. The hon. member had not even given his authority for the statements he had made; for all they knew the Chinaman might have been his authority. He had made what inquiries he could, and the result was that besides these two pieces of stone which the Chinaman carried about in the belief that they were diamonds—which they never were—they were two glass Chinese buttons. All these things were placed in a little bag, but when they were being handed to the Chinaman on his going away these two pieces of stone fell out. The Chinaman took away his buttons and afterwards represented that the diamonds were missing. Search was made and these two pieces of stone were found. They were handed over, and it was never alleged that they were other than the pieces he had lost. No one asserted that the things he had were other than pieces of quartz, and the hon. member was now advocating the cause of a Chinaman, upon whose authority he said that the warder had been guilty of neglect. Bones was the man who had given the hon. member this information, and Bones had a down upon Schneider, who kept him in his place. Schneider had something to answer for, but a more conscientious, loyal, and zealous man he had never known, but he made mistakes, and had been censured. For this very offence in not taking precautions to secure two pieces of stone he had lost his promotion to Townsville Gaol.

Mr. KING said there was no "mare's nest." With regard to the two stones that fell upon the floor, how did the other pieces get there? Only two pieces went in, and they went in with the prisoner, and when he went out he received something purporting to be the same. He did not know whether Schneider or Featherstonhaugh, the warder, was to blame, but somebody was to blame. The hon. member took very good care not to lay the papers upon the table.

The HOME SECRETARY: You can have them at any time.

Mr. KING: Even supposing these were only buttons, they might have been very valuable to the Chinaman. He did not want to stir up any "mare's nest," and thought a full investigation should be made. He believed that Schneider did get a rap over the knuckles, and the hon. member had admitted that he was to blame for not taking more care.

Mr. HAMILTON: As time seemed to be of very little value, he could tell another story, showing that the Maranoa was not the only district where such attentions were paid to Chinamen. A Chinaman at Maytown had committed some offence, and was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. A policeman was deputed to take him to Cooktown; this Chinaman had some gold that he was allowed to pack up and take with him. They got to the Laura River one afternoon; a packer named Long Williams heard a shot. Shortly afterwards the policeman rode in his direction and asked him if he had seen a Chinaman, whom he said he had fired at and missed. Afterwards some Chinese packers camped near Williams. Williams thought it strange that the policeman should have missed the Chinaman, so after dark he crawled to where the policeman was camped, and saw him taking things out of a bag, and burning some and keeping others. In the morning he went in the direction where he had heard the shot, and there found the dead body of a Chinaman. He interviewed the policeman and received £25, on account of which he said nothing. But the policeman had to take his Chinaman down to Cooktown. He went straight to the Chinamen's camp, picked one of them out, took him to Cooktown, and that man afterwards got eighteen months. He (Mr. Hamilton) did not ask the Home Secretary for an explanation of this, as it happened about fifteen years before the hon. gentleman took office. He mentioned it merely to show that he could tell as good a story as the hon. member for Maranoa.

Mr. KING objected to the hon. member stating that what he had said was a story. What he had stated were facts.

Mr. TURLEY: The Home Secretary pointed out that they had an extensive report from the Comptroller of Prisons, and in that report he found some fairly good information. They were often told that the coloured portion of the population were law-abiding; that if the white man would only follow the example set him by the coloured person he would be a much better man than he was. From this report he found that the Chinese, Polynesians, and Asiatics in the colony numbered 18,578, and the total of the white population and aboriginals was 441,000. In our prisons there were 3,081 white persons, or one in every 143 of the total population.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is passed through in one year.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes. Out of the Chinese, Polynesians, and Asiatics there were 483 in prison, or 1 in every 38. That was a considerable difference, and the offences for which the latter were imprisoned were not small offences. Taking Mackay, there were there

forty-five cases for murder and attempts to murder, and for shooting and stabbing eleven cases, making fifty-six altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : Was that all by coloured people?

Mr. TURLEY : Judging by the population there and the advertisements in the *Government Gazette* offering rewards to persons able to give information concerning murders supposed to have been committed there by Polynesians, he presumed that it referred to coloured people. In the Bundaberg district a man was murdered by six or seven of those people, and three or four of them were afterwards taken up for it. In another case there a man left his wife in their house, and after going a little way along the road he was stretched out by six or seven more of them. An alderman in the Mackay Council recently said he was afraid to go fishing on the river without taking firearms to protect him from attack by the Polynesians, and the same feeling existed at Bundaberg. There were then places in Queensland where on account of the labour which some people thought it necessary they should have to carry on their industry, persons were afraid to go unarmed beyond the lights of the town. Most of the offences could be traced to Malayta men from one of the Solomon Islands.

The CHAIRMAN : The hon. gentleman is going away from the question. I point out to him that it will be a more fitting time to discuss that question when we come to the vote he will find on page 94 of the Estimates.

Mr. TURLEY : He was dealing with the question of the criminal propensities of those people—a question which was dealt with in the tables of the report submitted to the Committee in connection with this vote.

The CHAIRMAN : If the hon. member will confine himself to what he is now stating he will be quite in order, but he went beyond that.

Mr. TURLEY : If he did not discuss the question now he would be told, when they came to the vote to which the Chairman referred, that it had nothing to do with crime. The majority of the men convicted of murder and other serious offences were found to be Malayta men, and yet out of a total number of 1,305 kanakas introduced last year, no less than 308—about one-fourth of the total number—were Malayta men. It seemed an extraordinary thing that they should bring those people here when they knew their propensities—they thought it no crime to be revenged upon anyone who put any indignity upon them. The matter was one that deserved serious consideration.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION : It was most lamentable that human beings would commit crimes, and that coloured people were not free from that unfortunate propensity. The hon. member had quoted figures to show that one in 141 of the white population of the colony was in prison, whilst one in thirty-eight of the coloured population was also in gaol; but the hon. member had overlooked the fact that on an average one in five of the population was an adult male, and that very few women or children were in gaol; whilst on the other hand the coloured population consisted almost exclusively of adult males. He did not arrive at the conclusion from the figures quoted by the hon. member that the coloured population was any more criminal than the white population. Making the allowances he had referred to, the figures would run out something like this—that there would be one in prison to 142 of the coloured population, as against one to 141 of the white population. The criminality was therefore about the same in each case. When they remembered that the coloured races had not had the advantages of education and of

the churches, nor of listening to the speeches of hon. members on the other side, the small proportion of the coloured people who committed crimes was really astonishing. The hon. member apprehended an imaginary danger. He had known people go about armed with a rifle and revolver in order to defend themselves against aborigines when there was not one within 100 miles of them; he had also known people go about armed against ghosts, but it did not follow from that that their apprehensions were justified. The hon. member might take comfort from this fact—that there were only about six murders committed in the year, whilst there were about sixty suicides, showing that really human beings were vastly more dangerous to themselves than to other people.

Mr. BROWNE : If when hon. members on the other side were referring to the burning down of woolsheds hon. members on his side had made such an unchristian, cynical speech as that delivered by the Secretary for Public Instruction, who was supposed to preside over the destinies of the youth of the colony, there would have been an outcry. It was not the burning of mere wood and iron which the hon. gentleman was sympathising with but crimes of the worst description—crimes which made widows and orphans, and outrages perpetrated upon defenceless women. The hon. gentleman made a joke about that. The hon. gentleman, who was also head of the kanaka department, had sneered at the murders which had been committed, and said that mostly they murdered one another. Evidently so long as they killed one another, it did not matter, because for everyone who was killed the hon. gentleman could get two more. He had listened to the debate for several nights while his friends were fighting the battle of men who they contended had been wrongfully tried. He had never minimised crime in that direction. Any man who burned down a woolshed deserved all the punishment meted out to him; but human life was more sacred even than a woolshed, and it was a disgrace to Queensland that they should see every year rewards advertised in the *Gazette* for undiscovered murders. He had given figures something like those quoted by the hon. member for South Brisbane last year, and he did not think that the Secretary for Public Instruction had stated the case quite correctly. It would, unfortunately, be found that there were a good many female prisoners, and that there were also a good many youngsters sent to prison every year, and they were all included in the list of white prisoners. Scarcely a week passed in Brisbane that young boys were not sent to prison. Another thing which had to be borne in mind was that when in the previous session he had pointed out that the excessive mortality amongst kanakas was rendered all the more serious by the fact that there were no children, but that the deaths were those of adults, he had been derided by the Secretary for Public Instruction and others; so that it would be seen that coloured criminals had friends in high positions in that House, which was more than could be said of white prisoners.

The HOME SECRETARY : The hon. gentleman had made a statement on premises that were not accurate. Did he mean to tell hon. members that the gaols contained an abnormal number of blacks?

Mr. BROWNE : They pass through the gaols.

The HOME SECRETARY : But what for? All criminals were passed through the gaols. There was nothing in the report on which the hon. gentleman could found an argument of that sort. He (Mr. Tozer) visited St. Helena and Boggo road constantly, and comparing the number of black people with the whites the number was very small indeed. Of course, coloured people, like whites, passed through the police

gaols for minor offences, but he was speaking of the penal establishments. He did not think he had ever known a Polynesian to be in gaol for an offence against property.

Mr. BROWNE: No, but for worse.

The HOME SECRETARY: In that respect the hon. gentleman's argument was wanting, because he stated that the criminals were never caught. He was not going into an argument as to whether there was a stronger criminal element among black men than among whites, but the fact remained that they did not get into gaol as freely as white men.

Mr. BROWNE: Have there not been half a dozen executions?

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member must remember that the Malaytans were savages. There were two tribes, and they disputed amongst one another. They were consequently looked up to protect themselves. Assault according to our law was a crime, but it was not so in their case. He had carefully watched the records of the Polynesians in gaol, and he found that they obeyed the rules, were amenable to discipline, and that their offences were mostly against one another. As a general rule the number of Polynesians in gaol was very limited. Chinamen were in much larger proportion, and they committed offences against property. It must be borne in mind, too, that the black men were tried by white men, and that they often got into gaol when a white man would get off.

Mr. JACKSON noticed that there were five prisoners executed in Brisbane Gaol last year, and that the executioner had disappeared from the Estimates. Did the Home Secretary anticipate that there would be no executions this year? He would also like to have some information in reference to what was proposed to be done with St. Helena. He noticed that the Comptroller alluded to the fact that the accommodation was quite inadequate, and that the separate treatment as a means of reforming prisoners, of which the Home Secretary strongly approved, could not be carried out. He understood from the hon. gentleman last year that the Government contemplated building a gaol on the mainland. St. Helena, which could only be reached by steamer, must be a most expensive place to maintain. No doubt if St. Helena were sold by the Government it would become a popular place of resort for Brisbane people, and the amount received for it would be sufficient to defray the cost of a new gaol. The hon. member for Burke had made a complaint about the difficulty he had had in gaining admission to some of the gaols. He must say that he had had no such difficulty. He had visited Stewart's Creek Gaol three or four months ago, and thought it was a model gaol. The prisoners were at work in the open air, and struck him as being far more contented than those at St. Helena.

The HOME SECRETARY: As to the disappearance of the special vote for the executioner, that had been merged into the general vote, in deference to the wishes expressed by hon. members on former occasions. The hangman was still retained, as the law had to be carried out.

Mr. McDONALD: Of what nationality were the five persons executed last year?

The HOME SECRETARY: If he remembered rightly, mostly kanakas. There were one or two from Thursday Island, but he did not remember a white person being executed last year. With regard to St. Helena, the Comptroller-General had simply brought under the notice of the House a fact that he (Mr. Tozer) had mentioned once or twice before—namely, that the buildings at that place were old-fashioned,

and did not afford all the accommodation required. Any Minister having charge of a wooden gaol must always feel considerable anxiety because of its liability to fire, and he hoped that he would yet be able to mature a scheme for removing the gaol from St. Helena, which was expensive and difficult to manage, to some more suitable place. They would be able to accommodate the prisoners in Stewart's Creek Gaol, at Rockhampton, and at Boggo road while new buildings were being erected, but he had not hitherto been able to undertake that work because the Government had not the necessary funds. He was quite aware of the disadvantages connected with St. Helena. The warders had to be separated from their families; the conditions of life there were altogether different from what they ought to be in a gaol, and he would be glad to make some alterations by which they could have the gaol on the mainland, but that could not be done at present, as they had not the money.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION would point out, in reply to the hon. member for Croydon, who stated that there were a great many women and children among the prisoners in their gaols, that the total number of prisoners in gaol last year was 3,093, of whom ten were children. The number of suicides in the colony last year was sixty-eight and the number of murders twenty-two. There was one murder at Mackay and eight suicides at Brisbane. The hon. member could draw any deductions he liked from those facts. The hon. member was good enough to charge him with sympathy with crime, but he would like to know what evidence the hon. member had for that statement. He had never impeached juries, or brought charges against judges and said they should not have sentenced prisoners after they had been convicted, or taken any line of action that would justify any hon. member in accusing him of sympathy with crime, whether it was committed by a kanaka or a white man. When a man was sentenced to be imprisoned for fifteen years, he did not say that it was a hardship for him to live in the North of the colony, where 60,000 white men lived. Were they to suppose that because a man was sent to gaol they must send him to Manly, or find some sanatorium for him on the Blue Mountains? He had never said that it was undignified for a coloured man to be in gaol, and had not endeavoured to minimise crime in any way. The insinuation of the hon. member that he sympathised with crime was absolutely uncalled for and particularly ridiculous.

Mr. BROWNE: The hon. member had brought in a lot of stuff about suicides, and in effect had argued that if six women cut their own throats and another woman was knocked on the head by a blackfellow she ought not to growl.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I never said that.

Mr. BROWNE: No; but that was the argument of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman referred to the sympathy on this side with men in gaol, and said they had expressed open sympathy with criminals; but he defied the hon. gentleman to find one single expression of his in *Hansard* which showed that he had ever expressed sympathy with crime or criminals. The way the hon. gentleman referred to the French Revolution, with a continual taint of blood on his mouth, would make people believe that he was in sympathy with crime; and he had no hesitation in saying, from the way the hon. gentleman defended those black criminals and made light of their offence, that he had a great deal more sympathy with crime than was ever shown by any members on that side of the House. The Home Secretary had said that the offences committed by coloured prisoners were

all offences against property. That was the only kind of offence with hon. members opposite; life was nothing with them. The report of the Comptroller-General showed that five executions took place in Brisbane last year, and the whole of the men executed, according to the Home Secretary, were coloured aliens. Yet the Committee were told that those prisoners were in for light crimes—only petty offences. But setting fire to a squatter's woolshed, which he did not in the least minimise but recognised as a crime, was reckoned by this hon. gentleman the crime of all crimes. He (Mr. Browne) considered that a crime against the life or person of a citizen was a ten times bigger crime than any crime against property.

Mr. HAMILTON had listened carefully to the Secretary for Public Instruction, and really did not think there was anything in his remarks to justify the statement just made that he sympathised with kanaka murderers. The hon. gentleman simply stated, in reply to an insinuation, that he did not sympathise with crime whether it was committed by a blackfellow on a white man, whether it was murder, or the burning of a woolshed, or any other description of crime. There was nothing to justify the statement of the hon. member for Croydon. The hon. member for Kennedy stated that crime was on the increase, but it did not appear so from the "Vital Statistics."

Mr. JACKSON: I quoted from the report of the Comptroller-General.

Mr. HAMILTON: He found that murders were on the increase in 1895; but there was nothing to justify the insinuations that had been made.

Mr. HOOLAN: Hon. members opposite disclaimed any sympathy with crime, and were constantly accusing hon. members on his side of being in sympathy with it. He had great sympathy with any person in misfortune, no matter what the crime might be; but if the Government were not in sympathy with crime, why did they not take precautions to bring it home to the perpetrators? The *Gazette* teemed with rewards for murders, but none of them were discovered. They had allowed undiscovered murders at Mackay to rest as a stain upon the colony when they might have used the public funds to try to discover the perpetrators. They seemed to be openly in sympathy with those murders. Would anyone tell him why they offered £1,000 for the discovery of the people who burned a woolshed, and yet concealed in a weak and timorous way the persons amongst whom that money was divided? The Government had allowed six persons to be butchered in the most barbarous way at Mackay, and the matter was made a laugh and jest of by hon. members, and by the Press, and in the refreshment room of the Assembly. The burning of a woolshed was looked upon as a much more serious crime. How many fires did the hon. gentleman know of that were caused by the firestick brigade? Commercial people were monthly and yearly cheating the insurance companies, and nine out of every ten fires in the colony were intentional. The Government bond at Croydon was burned down twice, but all the Government did was to offer a £10-note as a reward for the discovery of the perpetrators. In some cases lives had been lost, but no reward had been offered, and therefore he said the Government were in sympathy with crime. But they would use all the funds of the colony they could lay their clutch upon to catch the persons who offended against a certain class of property—the mortgaged property of the colony. There had been only one conviction for arson during six years, and that was a woman at Woollongabba, and it was doubtful whether

she was properly convicted. The Government were ten thousand times more in sympathy with crime than hon. members on his side, and every action of their lives showed it.

Question put and passed.

#### REFORMATORIES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £2,155 be granted for reformatories. The amount was the same as last year.

Mr. BROWNE asked if there was any likelihood of the State Children's Bill being brought in this year? It was said to be ready in 1893.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: The Bill was ready to be brought forward any day, but it was a matter of finding time. What with the Land Bill and the amount of discussion they had upon every possible subject, it was difficult to say when the Bill would be brought in. He would have much pleasure in showing it to the hon. member.

Question put and passed.

#### WATER POLICE—LYTTON.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £1,115 be granted for water police. The amount was the same as last year.

Question put and passed.

#### BENEVOLENT ASYLUM, DUNWICH.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £13,130 be granted for the Benevolent Asylum at Dunwich. There was an increase of £30 to the clerk, postmaster, and telegraph operator, and a decrease of £10 to the matron, who was new to the position. There was another cook at an increased salary, and the item for provisions and contingencies was increased by £430, owing to the increased number of patients. The total increase in the vote was £470.

Mr. GLASSEY asked the hon. gentleman if he could give any information regarding the number of married couples at Dunwich, and as to whether proper accommodation had been provided for the whole of them. Were any in that class still separated?

The HOME SECRETARY: They were trying an experiment with the boarding-out system, but he did not know that it was likely to be a success. The cost of an inmate was about £12 a year, and it occurred to him that where both husband and wife were both eligible for Dunwich it would be advisable to give them a sum not exceeding 10s. a week, which would be £26 a year; but that was beginning to be very much more expensive than if they were provided for at Dunwich. Lately, therefore, he had not recognised the principle, as he did not think it wise to do so. Unless each case was thoroughly scrutinised, it was found that they might be relieving children of their duty to their parents, which was most undesirable. Where possible he endeavoured to make the home comfortable for the old people, and in some cases where they had no children he gave a small allowance outside to help them on. There was no special rule governing it, and he went carefully into the merits of each case himself. About £1,000 had been expended in that way.

Mr. GLASSEY: Are there any number of aged couples at Dunwich?

The HOME SECRETARY: Not more than about half a dozen. Of course there were some who were afflicted with rheumatics, and to send them out would be only to make them a burden to themselves and to everyone else. They all had a great desire to get away from Dunwich, but inquiry often resulted in advising them to stay where they were. He was not extending the experiment, as he found it was better to work them down at Dunwich, where they could be kept under some system. When they came into

town they got orders, and he did not know whether the people gave them orders or money, or whether they drank it or not.

Mr. GLASSEY did not bring the complaints of aged couples under the hon. gentleman's notice with a view of enabling children to shirk the duties they owed to their parents. Persons who would do that were mean and paltry and very indifferent citizens. What he always urged was that old couples who from poverty had to go to Dunwich should not be separated; the hon. gentleman should endeavour to provide them with such accommodation at Dunwich as would enable them to live together there. Another matter to which he directed attention was that in the schedule to the Estimates he found that Dr. Smith, the medical superintendent, who was now on leave of absence, got £500 a year with emoluments, and that the acting medical superintendent there was getting the same emoluments and £600 a year. If Dr. Smith was amply paid at £500 a year, why was it necessary to give the acting medical superintendent an increased salary?

The HOME SECRETARY: The arrangement made with the acting medical superintendent was of a temporary character; it was at the rate of £50 per month during Dr. Smith's absence. The difficulty was to get a competent medical officer capable of taking charge of such an institution, and that was the best arrangement he could make.

Mr. GLASSEY: I'll guarantee to get you half a dozen in a day—all medical men with high honours.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; but not fitted to take charge of an institution where there were more sick persons than in the Brisbane hospital, and where there were neither skilled subordinates nor nurses. Dunwich was not only a workhouse; it was a hospital for incurables. In addition to his medical work the superintendent had to carry out the entire management of the institution; and when it was remembered that there were nearly 1,000 persons there, it would be seen that £50 a month was not at all a large price to pay for a thoroughly efficient *locum tenens* to Dr. Smith. He felt stranded when Dr. Smith's health broke down, and to find an efficient successor to him gave him a vast amount of trouble.

Mr. BROWNE: Is it only a temporary appointment?

The HOME SECRETARY: Dr. Smith, according to the latest information, was to leave England at the end of the present month. Although he had not derived so much benefit from his holiday as he anticipated, he felt himself able to come back and resume his duties, which he (Mr. Tozer) presumed would be about the end of the year.

Mr. GLASSEY understood that a number of complaints had been lodged against the acting medical superintendent, and that an inquiry had been going on. Was that inquiry finished; and, if so, what was the result?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not finished yet.

Mr. JACKSON was astonished to hear the Home Secretary say that the system of boarding out had not been a success, but he hoped the hon. gentleman would not stop it until he had given it a further trial. The principle seemed very good. It was practically introducing the system of old-age pensions which had lately come prominently forward in New Zealand and New South Wales. At Dunwich there were between 800 and 900 persons, or 2·43 per 1,000 of the population—a very large proportion, although not perhaps so great as in some of the other colonies. They were really creating a pauper city, which was anything but a pleasant thing to look at, and for that reason he strongly advocated

the giving of what might be called small pensions to enable old people to live away from Dunwich. It would be found just as cheap in the long run, and, from the State point of view, more economical. Last year the Home Secretary said it was proposed to use the Diamantina Orphanage as a hospital for incurables. He supposed the excuse given now would be that there were no funds for the purpose. There was the same necessity for the classification of paupers as there was for the classification of prisoners, and it seemed to him that boarding out would be one method by which paupers could be classified. The argument of the Home Secretary seemed to show that the system of boarding out tended to remove the responsibility from the children. There might be something in that; but he could not see that any greater stigma attached in the one case than in the other. It would be a purely departmental matter to make inquiries in each case. Had he been aware that the department was assisting people outside, he could have informed people who were in great need, but who could not go to Dunwich; but he thought that there was no chance of getting any help. There was one case in particular of a very old colonist living at Beenleigh that many hon. members on his side were aware of; but he could not say whether his case had been brought under the notice of the hon. gentleman.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes; he is getting help.

Mr. JACKSON: He was very glad to hear it, as his was a most deserving case.

Question put and passed.

STEAMERS "LUCINDA," "OTTER," AND "MINER."

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £5,998 be granted for the steamers "Lucinda," "Otter," and "Miner." Practically the salaries of the officers were restored to what they were before. The engineers on the "Lucinda" and "Otter" were down for increases of £12 each. The chief officer of the "Otter" was down for £12, and the assistant engineer £12. There was an increase of £108 for the seamen, cook and steward £12, and there was an additional seaman. On the "Miner" the master was down for an increase of £18. There was an increase of £96 in the item for seamen, £12 for the fireman, and £12 for the youth. It had been found that the vote for coals and incidentals had been insufficient last year, and £700 more was asked for the three ships. The vessels were getting older and required more repairs; and as the Marine Department, after a careful examination, said that the steamers required a thorough overhaul, he was asking for £500 more. The total increase in the vote was £1,482.

Mr. BROWNE did not feel inclined to allow the increase in the vote to pass. Every year there was a considerable amount of trouble over the "Lucinda." He had objected to this vote every year since he had been in the House, and he intended to continue his objection. An increase of £1,482 was now asked for, or about 34 per cent. more than the vote for last year, which had been insufficient on account of certain unforeseen expenditure. They were asked to vote £216 on the "Lucinda," which was supposed to be laid up in 1893, but which had been in commission every week during the last twelve months conveying illustrious visitors and illustrious members of Brisbane society up and down the river. There had only been an engineer kept on board the "Lucinda," but he objected to the expense, and he intended moving a reduction. The vessels had been half the time in charge of temporary hands, who took little interest in them. In 1893 the expenditure on the three boats was £4,313; in 1894, after the extreme retrenchment, the expense came down to £3,998;

in 1895 it had increased to £4,516; and this year it had jumped up to £4,998. In 1894 the Home Secretary had told them that the entire cost of the "Lucinda" trips only amounted to £30 or £40 in the season. Then they must be run remarkably cheaply; they must have got their coals and everything else for nothing. When they had been discussing the Marine Defence Force vote they had been told that the amount on the Estimates was all the country could afford. The whole amount of that vote was only £7,851, whilst those three boats in the Brisbane River cost nearly £6,000. The vote for the Labour Bureau was only £6,590. The Registrar-General's Department—one of the most important departments in the service, and regarding which it had been long complained that sufficient money was not spent to enable them to get satisfactory statistics—only got £5,805, less than those three boats cost. The allowances to charitable institutions all over the colony, other than hospitals, only came to £3,550. They had, since the opening of the session, witnessed the laying of the foundation of the agricultural college—a thing which had been advocated and promised time after time during the past twenty years. The amount set down for that was only £4,000, whilst they spent nearly £6,000 on those boats. He believed the "Otter" and the "Miner" were put to some useful purpose, but he did not see why poor people all over the country should have to support a boat like the "Lucinda" to carry people about who were well able to pay for their passages in other boats. They had heard a lot about socialism, but the most extreme socialism was displayed by the society people of Brisbane who flocked to cheap trips on the "Lucinda," an instance of which occurred a few weeks ago at the opening of the sailing club in the Hamilton Reach. It was very easy to be generous with other people's money, and there was not a week on which the "Lucinda" did not go down the river on a picnic excursion, and the next morning they read that the Hon. John Smith had a most entertaining tea party on the "Lucinda," or that Mrs. Someone entertained a select party on the "Lucinda" at afternoon tea and that everyone enjoyed themselves very much. He had no objection to people enjoying themselves, but the public should not be called upon to pay for their locomotion.

The PREMIER: Have you ever asked for the boat and been refused?

Mr. BROWNE knew that she had been offered by the Home Secretary to the party on his side, but he contended that it was not his to offer. Personally he did not want any cheap and genteel loafing on the "Lucinda."

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is the same on the railway.

Mr. BROWNE: It was not the same. He regarded his free railway pass as part of his wages for attending Parliament.

The PREMIER: Is not the "Lucinda" just as much the property of the country as the railway?

Mr. BROWNE: It was, but his position did not give him the right to cheap rides in the "Lucinda" in preference to other people.

The PREMIER: The same argument will apply to a train.

Mr. BROWNE: He had yet to learn that the Premier or Home Secretary could grant free trains to anyone. If they did the Commissioner, Mr. Gray, would have something to say to them. There was no doubt that the boats in question were getting into a dilapidated condition. There was a regular crew in the "Otter," but when there was any aristocratic party going on board other seamen and officers had to be employed as casual hands. Of course, those hands did not take the same interest in the vessels as a regular

crew would do. If the vote was not reduced it would be far better to keep all the boats in commission instead of sweating one crew when two crews should be employed, but he did not think that any crew should be paid to act as lackeys and valets to a lot of society people in Brisbane. He moved that the item "Engineer in charge, £216," be omitted.

The HOME SECRETARY wished to place on record a very nice speech which was made last year by a member of the Labour party, a gentleman who was so warmly supported in the Logan electorate against a Government candidate. He referred to the late member for Toowoong, Mr. Reid. Mr. Reid's language was so expressive that he would read the speech as it was delivered. [The hon. gentleman here read from *Hansard* a speech by Mr. Reid to the effect that he did not believe in cutting down the vote, because since he had become a member of the House he had learned that the "Lucinda" and "Otter" were absolutely necessary, and that if the "Lucinda" was sold, and the "Otter" was being used in some other way, the Government would have to charter some other steamer to take the place of the "Lucinda."] That was the conscientious conviction of a man who understood the question, and who had held a different view before he became a member of the House. For the last seven or eight years that question had been brought before the Committee, and the public were beginning to get a surfeit of it. Hon. members might think that their agitation on that subject was agreeable to a certain class of electors, but those people required no evidence against the Government, for they had made up their minds that whether the Government had the "Lucinda" or not, they were no good. If the hon. member should occupy the position of a Minister of the Crown he would find that a Minister had other duties besides attending at his office every day. When he was in Adelaide he was the recipient of the most unbounded hospitality from the democratic Premier of that colony, which he recognised, and most cordially thanked him for.

Mr. HOOLAN: It was all very well for the hon. gentleman to talk about hospitality, but not long ago his charity was appealed to in connection with that direful disaster in New Zealand, and the Government did not show their wonderful and superfluous generosity then. When the call of the widows and orphans came to their doors what did they do? Simply ignored them with brilliant sneers—

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

#### BILLS OF SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Council returning this Bill with an intimation that they insisted upon their amendment in clause 4 to which the Assembly had disagreed. [For reasons stated *vide* report of Council proceedings, page 1007.]

The consideration of the message was made an Order of the Day for to-morrow.

#### AUSTRALASIAN FEDERATION ENABLING BILL.

##### MESSAGE FROM THE COUNCIL.

The SPEAKER announced that he had received a message from the Council returning this Bill with an intimation that they insisted upon their amendments in clauses 2, 16, 17, 20, and 21, and the proposed new clause to follow clause 16, to which the Assembly had disagreed. [For reasons stated *vide* report of Council proceedings, page 1011.]

## MERCANTILE AMENDMENT BILL.

The SPEAKER also announced the receipt of a message from the Council, returning this Bill without amendment.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. HARDACRE: I do not know whether the Premier has any object in dealing in this manner with the message of the Council in reference to the Federation Bill. It seems to me that the motion for the adjournment of the House, after the reading of the message, is for the purpose of shelving the Bill. If it is intended to kill federation, this is not the proper way to do it. The House should certainly be allowed to take the message into consideration and decide what should be done. At any rate, it should not be put on one side and allowed to go by default. A motion should be made that the message be taken into consideration at some future time—say to-morrow or Tuesday—so that we may have an opportunity of dealing with it. It is the most important matter that has been before the country for a long time—a matter in regard to which the other colonies are expecting us to do something, and not leave it in abeyance. They have asked us to meet them in some way, and we certainly should respond to their request or else give them a definite statement that we are not in a position to join in with them in their proposed convention. It should not be allowed to be put aside in this quiet manner.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at five minutes past 11 o'clock.