

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 27 OCTOBER 1899

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 27 OCTOBER, 1899.

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

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Copies of all correspondence between Mr. Arthur Towns, the secretary of the Cunnamulla Voters' Association, and the Home Secretary's Department, together with all papers and other documents, including the electoral claim form of Henry John Carter, who appears on the Balonne electoral roll, Cunnamulla Division, as a qualified voter, No. 1042.

QUESTIONS.

THE LATE MR. W. L. G. DREW.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. On what date did the late Mr. Drew join the Public Service of Queensland?
2. What was the total amount paid to Mr. Drew by way of salary and pension from that date till the date of his death?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*) replied: On behalf of the Chief Secretary, to whom this question should have been addressed, I beg to say, in answer to the hon. member—

1. 15th February, 1862.
2. £32,089 5s.

PRINTING OF SCHOOL BOOKS IN THE COLONY.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) asked the Secretary for Lands, for the Secretary for Public Instruction—

Does the Government intend during the present session to carry into effect the suggestions contained in the draft scheme submitted to the Minister on the 18th August last by the Queensland Typographical Association, *re* the printing of school books in the colony?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*), for the Secretary for Public Instruction, replied—

No.

PETITION.

REMOVAL OF MR. CHESTER, GOLD WARDEN AT CLERMONT.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) presented a petition from miners and diggers on the Clermont Gold Field, praying for the removal of Warden Chester as speedily as possible.

Petition received.

SALE OF CROWN LANDS, HUMPY BONG.

On the motion of Mr. CAMPBELL (*Moreton*), it was formally agreed—

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing,—

1. The area of Crown lands sold by the Government in the Humpy Bong Peninsula from January, 1881, to date.
2. The amount obtained from the sale of the above lands.
3. The area of Crown lands still available for sale.
4. The value of such lands at the present time.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMPTION OF DEBATE.

On the Order of the Day being read for the resumption of the debate on the second reading of this Bill,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) said: I was addressing myself to this Bill at the time the hour for adjournment arrived—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member having spoken on this question in moving the adjournment of the debate when the Bill was before the House on the 20th of October, has forfeited his right to speak, and can only continue with the permission of the House.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: With the permission of the House I should like to make a few further observations.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not intend to say very much. On the last occasion when the Bill was before the House I think I was interrupted by the arrival of 6 o'clock. I was then proceeding to remark that I have every sympathy with men who are engaged in manual occupations, and who have to work very hard for their wages, and I have always exhibited a desire in my capacity as a member of this House to further legislation which has for its object the amelioration of the conditions of those who are poor and unfortunate. I do not know that it has yet been demonstrated that the Imperial Act on this subject has worked successfully in England. It only became operative in July last year, and the opportunity that has been afforded of proving whether the Act is one that works advantageously all round, because it should work advantageously all round, is not as sufficient as we should desire in order to warrant us in following their example. I am more particularly interested in the provisions of this Bill affecting shearers. Of course, shearers are not a class of persons to be found in England, and they are not provided for in the Act of which this Bill is, to a very great extent, a copy. We know that a great deal of heartburning has occurred from time to time between shearers and pastoralists with regard to the rate of wages. Everyone deplored the unhappy differences which arose from time to time between the employers and the employed in connection with that industry, but I foresee that if this Bill passes in its present form there is likely to be a recurrence of those unfortunate disturbances, because, if this Bill becomes law, the necessity will exist on the part of every pastoralist to insure every shearer in his employ against accident.

Mr. DAWSON: Why?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He would have to do it, because in the event of any accident occurring to his shearers in the shed, he would be liable to pay compensation to those shearers, in the same way as men who are engaged in the Railway Department or any other workshop would be entitled to recover against their employer for injury sustained by accident, with the occurrence of which the employer had nothing whatever to do.

Mr. DAWSON: In what clause do you find that?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is the scheme of the Bill.

Mr. FISHER: Shearing sheds are included.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Shearing sheds are included.

Mr. FISHER: Quite right, too.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Then the whole question arises who is to pay? The temptation that would exist if this Bill becomes law to action that would lead to the estrangement of master and man would be very great, because

the question must arise who has got to pay the premium? The employer would have to pay the premium, and then the question would arise, "How am I to recoup myself for the outlay I incur in providing premiums for insuring every shearer against the consequences of accident?" He would not be likely to tamely submit to pay those premiums out of his own pocket, in addition to the rate of wages which is supposed to be as much as he can afford to pay at the present time, in order to cover this insurance. The effect would be that he would endeavour to deduct from the men's wages so much as would cover the cost of the premiums in some accident insurance company, because he would have to insure every case. That would be likely to give rise to still further unhappy differences, which every well-wisher of the community would deplore. There is nothing on which men are more sensitive than on the question of wages, and it would be regarded as an infringement of their rights if an employer said, "The law makes me liable to compensate you for any injury you may sustain from accident while in my employ, and I must have a fund out of which I can pay the premiums for insuring you against the consequences of accident." The question would then be debated, Who was to pay—the employer or the person employed? and the whole fat would be in the fire. I am very gravely concerned to see the peace of the community preserved as far as possible by not passing legislation which will have the direct effect of bringing the two parties into conflict.

Mr. McDONALD: That is why you are sending away the contingent.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I do not think the sending away of the contingent has anything whatever to do with this question. Such a thing may never occur again, and it affects our national condition and prospects. It has nothing whatever to do with ordinary domestic legislation.

Mr. FISHER: Except the insurance of the men, which you approve of.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Because these men are going on an enterprise that is certain to result—at all events, the probabilities are that it will result—in some of them losing their lives.

Mr. TURLEY: Is it not the same with a man who goes to work?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No; the men who go to work do not go as targets for the bullets of sharpshooters. They do not place themselves in the way of bursting shells.

Mr. DAWSON: What about miners?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The cases are not analogous, and it is not wise for hon. gentlemen to attempt to draw comparisons between things which have nothing whatever in common.

Mr. LESINA: Statistics prove that more men are killed in the battle of industry every year than are killed in a first-class war.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: But just contrast the number of men engaged in the battle of industry with the number engaged in an ordinary battle. You may get 30,000 or 40,000 men on each side in an ordinary battle, but there are millions in British communities at all events, engaged in the battle of industry. There is no comparison whatever between the dangers resulting from the pursuit of one's ordinary avocation and the danger men incur going into a battle, especially in these days when the deadly character of the weapons used has reached such a pitch of perfection as it has now. For the reasons I have stated I am not in favour of provisions so drastic as these. It is said that this legislature has been behind-hand in the endeavour to make provision of this sort. Some hon. members think that the

provisions in the mining law at present in operation in this colony do not go far enough in this direction. I am one of those who are prepared to go to the utmost limit we can possibly reach in the endeavour to deal with men, whether individuals or companies, who are guilty of any negligence whatever whereby the men in their employ are likely to receive injury or have received any injury. I would deal with them without any mercy. I would impose heavy penalties and render them liable for every farthing of compensation. But when we have, as in this Bill, provision made that if a workman meets with an accident through his own want of care or his own want of common sense and common judgment, in the exercise of his avocation, compensation is to be paid to him—

Mr. TURLEY: It is not so in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is what is provided for under this Bill.

Mr. FISHER: No.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes; the only exception is this—

Mr. TURLEY: Read subsection (b) of clause 4.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That says—

When the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any civil liability of the employer.

That is to say he is still liable, notwithstanding this, to a civil action for damages for the injury resulting to the man.

Mr. TURLEY: Look at subsection (c).

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I will finish with this first. The subsection goes on to say—

but in that case the workman may, at his option, either claim compensation under this Act or take the same proceedings as were open to him before the commencement of this Act; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation for injury to workmen by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, both independently of and also under this Act, except in case of such personal negligence or wilful act as aforesaid.

That is to say that if an employer is guilty of some negligence, and an accident results, the servant can have his action against the employer, such as the law gives him, without regard to this Bill at all, and he would have a remedy under this Bill as well.

Mr. FISHER: Oh, no.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Yes, it is so under this Bill undoubtedly. This is a permissive provision.

Mr. FISHER: He can take one or the other, but not both.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: When the Bill gets into committee, that is one of the provisions I shall be inclined to strenuously oppose.

Mr. TURLEY: Look at subsection (c), which follows.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It says that—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall be disallowed.

That does not contravene anything I said just now. I said a man might be careless, or wanting in common sense and judgment in the exercise of his duty, and come by an accident in that way, but this subsection (c) deals with a case where the man has been "guilty of serious and wilful misconduct." What is "serious and wilful misconduct"? Why it is something far more than ordinary negligence on the part of a workman. "Serious and wilful misconduct" is a very wide term. It is very difficult to define what it is, but it certainly is something far more than the law contemplates in providing a remedy in respect of ordinary negligence.

Mr. FISHER: The language here is milder than in the Act passed by the House of Commons.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is the hon. member's only justification for bringing this forward, and I met that at the outset by saying that in my opinion the time which has elapsed since the English Act became law has not been sufficiently long to enable us to see whether it works satisfactorily or not. Twelve months is a very short experience of the working of an Act of Parliament in order to see, especially in the case of so drastic an Act as this, whether it is a useful Act or not.

Mr. FISHER: They want to get it extended to all the industries.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I think I pointed out before that in the old country the capitalists, as they are called, who employ workmen are much wealthier men, their operations are carried on on a scale of much greater magnitude, and their profits are immensely greater than anything experienced or known by employers of labour in these colonies.

Mr. TURLEY: I do not think that is so.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: We'll take the pastoral industry. I ask any hon. member whether he does not recognise the fact that the pastoral industry in this colony has for years been suffering from such a series of adverse circumstances that those engaged in it have had more than they could do to barely get a living.

Mr. McDONALD: What about the Treasurer's Statement?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: There can be no doubt about this: that in order to carry on at all many of them are obliged to plunge themselves more deeply into debt and make their interest bill much larger.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the price of wool?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Most fortunately for those men, within the last month or two, for the first time for many years, the price of wool is beginning to return to something like what it used to be when the industry was a profitable occupation, many years ago, in what are called "the good old times."

[4 p.m.] In the meantime, it is considered fashionable to decry the pastoral industry, and to say that these men are capitalists, and are not deserving of any sympathy. I think that all these men who are engaged in developing the resources of this colony are more deserving—some are equally deserving—but no class of men are more deserving of the sympathetic consideration of this House than the vast majority of pastoralists who are struggling for a bare existence on the lands of this colony. I can take my own electorate as an example, and I can say that I have been pained, while travelling through that district, where there has been a drought for the last five consecutive years, to find that the land there was absolutely destitute of grass. The poor farmers there have had to fight against losses year after year, and so has the poor pastoralist, although his operations extend over a wider area and embrace greater responsibilities than his more humble brother occupiers of the soil. All these men are battling with these difficulties; they are carrying crushing burdens on their shoulders, and I do not think it is right to impose any additional burden upon them such as would be imposed by this Bill in the case of those engaged in shearing, as there is really no parallel state of things in the old country. I say a parallel cannot be established in these cases—that is, in the capacity to bear additional burdens in the case of British employers and those engaged in the various productive and manufacturing operations in this colony. It

does not do to manufacture burdens in this respect, and although they do not look very serious when looked at separately—as distinct from all others—they really operate as "the last straw that breaks the camel's back." I have great sympathy with the shearers as a class.

Mr. FISHER: What you speak about is only a detail.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I know that; but the same thing applies to all the rest, and I am more particularly interested in this class of men, because there are many of them in my electorate. No doubt there is a difference in this way—and I am now speaking about the hon. member's justification for introducing this Bill, that it has come into force in the old country—in the shearing industry you have many men only employed for a few weeks or months by an employer; and so there is no parallel between them and the men employed in the old country, who are engaged all the year round, and who get their livelihood from one employer, who is probably a very wealthy capitalist or company. Under this Bill, as it stands, a shearer who only works for a few weeks or a few months, may subject his employer to very serious liability with regard to some unavoidable accident. That seems to me not to be in accordance with the soundest principles of justice.

Mr. DAWSON: Are you going to oppose the second reading?

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I am not saying that I am going to oppose the second reading of this Bill—I have not said that I am going to vote against that second reading.

Mr. DAWSON: I think you should indicate to the House whether you are or are not.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have a pretty open mind on the subject.

Mr. KERR: He has a lot of sympathy for the shearers.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I wish to base my sympathies in these matters upon a firm foundation. I do not like to buy my sympathy at other people's expense. I have always advocated the interests of this large class of men, both inside the House and outside of it; but I do not think it is desirable to allow my sympathies to altogether run away with my judgment in these matters. I like to be fair all round, more particularly—and I assert it again—when there is no parallel between the conditions prevailing in this colony and those which obtain in the old country. I do not think it is necessary for me to say much more on this matter, because I would not be a party to talking a Bill out. I believe that any hon. member who introduces remedial legislation should receive fair play. I was a private member myself some years ago, and I would like to extend to others the same opportunities that I should like to receive myself as a private member. I have been so extremely occupied during the last two or three weeks that I have really not had time to look closely into the Bill and properly examine its provisions. I shall hear what is said on both sides, and then form an opinion whether the Bill is one that should be passed or not.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): I may state at the outset that every hon. member on this side of the House thoroughly appreciates the attitude of the hon. member who has just resumed his seat when that hon. gentleman said he did not wish to talk this Bill out. That is something that we are not used to hearing from a Minister, and therefore we fully appreciate the statement now. But I would like to draw the attention of the House to this: That the hon. gentleman addressed the House on a former occasion for about a quarter of an hour, and has been addressing it for about half an hour this afternoon, and, after raising about forty

objections to the Bill, he calmly states to the House, without any apology, that his time has been so occupied lately that he has not been able to read the provisions of this Bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I did not say that.

Mr. DAWSON: That was almost the last remarks he made. He said that he was going to listen to the discussion and make up his mind afterwards.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I said I had not had time to weigh the *pros* and *cons*.

Mr. DAWSON: Then why did the hon. gentleman waste the time of the House, when he confesses himself that he knows nothing about the Bill? We have every respect for the hon. gentleman, and we shall be pleased to listen to him at all times; but I think it is rather calm assurance on his part to detail his objections to the Bill, and then confess that he knows nothing about it. That is exactly what the hon. gentleman did.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Oh, no!

Mr. DAWSON: I am speaking about the principles of the Bill, and I suppose the hon. gentleman has addressed himself to the principles of the Bill itself.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I have not tried to influence any hon. member.

Mr. DAWSON: Quite so. It would be reasonable to expect, if the hon. member has read the Bill, that he would make an emphatic declaration as to whether he is going to support the second reading or oppose it. He may object to some special provisions, but does he object to the main principle in the Bill? If not, I claim that hon. members are entitled to know from a responsible Minister—in this case the Attorney-General—we want to have that hon. gentleman's emphatic declaration as to whether he is going to support the second reading or oppose it. The hon. gentleman has engaged the attention of hon. members, and I do not object to listening to him, but we do not know now whether he is against the principles of the Bill, and he calmly assures us that he has not read it.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Oh, no. That is an exaggeration.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is not an exaggeration.

Mr. DAWSON: What is it then?

The HOME SECRETARY: Parliamentary rules will not permit me to say.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman can say it. He said it the other night in reply to the hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley. The hon. gentleman can empty his stomach at any time he likes. I have no objection. I do not care much about addressing the Chamber on private members' day, because they have not got a liberal allowance of time, and it is not wise to debate a matter at length. I would like to say that I am emphatically in favour of the Bill, and intend to support the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Fisher, right through. I am not only in favour of the general provisions embodied in the Bill of compensation to workmen, but I am in favour of every clause of the Bill, and will support it in committee. The idea of compensation to workmen is an excellent one. It has already been acknowledged in this colony by our statutes, and this is an attempt to amend the Compensation to Workmen Act which we have in existence. It appears to me that the only objection the hon. gentleman had was the inclusion of shearers. Why should not a shearer receive compensation? He has as much right to receive compensation as a miner.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: He is not engaged all the year round.

Mr. DAWSON: It is not the term of a man's engagement that counts; it is the fact of

whether he is injured by the negligence of an employer, even if he is only engaged for one hour. If, during that one hour's engagement, he is injured, whether he is a shearer or a miner, or anything else, he is entitled to compensation. What is it that clause 3 says? It reads—

This Act shall apply only to employment by the undertakers on or in or about a railway, factory, mine, quarry, shearing shed, or engineering work, and to employment by the undertakers on, in, or about any building which exceeds thirty feet in height.

Thirty feet in height is the crux of the whole question. I say if a man is working in a railway workshop, according to the hon. gentleman, he should be entitled to compensation if injured; but if he is a shearer and in a building exceeding 30 feet in height, he shall not receive compensation because he is not employed all the year round.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: I say if a man is looking about him in an engine shop and an engine comes along, and he is knocked down, he is entitled to compensation.

Mr. DAWSON: No, he is not, because he is not employed. That is where the difference comes in. You might as well say that if a man is knocking round a mine looking for a job, and a traveller knocks the truck off the brace and kills him, the company should be held liable. That man is not an employee. The whole point is that the man must be an employee.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON: And it is during the term of his employment, and while he is actively engaged at work, that the compensation comes in if he is injured. I say if any class of workmen are entitled to compensation the shearer is as much entitled to it as any other man. His life is as valuable to him as the life of the Attorney-General is to him.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The shearer is only employed for two months by one employer, who has to take out a policy, and has to pay as high a premium as if he were employing the men all the year round.

Mr. DAWSON: The length of the employment has nothing to do with the question.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Practically it has.

Mr. DAWSON: Not at all. According to that dictum it means that only the men who are employed all the year round should be entitled to compensation.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The burden would fall unequally upon employers.

Mr. DAWSON: It would not. All that is demanded is that if during the working hours a workman is injured he shall be entitled to compensation from those who employ him, and he has to prove his case in the court that the injury was brought about by the negligence of the employer. As a matter of fact that is the principle of clause 3, which specifically mentions a building, and it is most *appropos* to shearers. Why, an employer might have a building ten years old, and in it forty or fifty shearers employed. A strike not being handy enough in order that he may burn it down and claim the insurance money, he puts his workmen in and it collapses, killing two men and injuring a dozen others, and yet merely because they are shearers they are not to receive compensation. I say the thing is perfectly absurd. I hope the hon. member for Gympie will not give way. There is not one class of workmen in Queensland who should be exempted from the provisions of the Bill, and a shearer is as much entitled to compensation as a miner.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: If his employer is guilty of neglect he ought to get it.

Mr. DAWSON: Quite so; but I understood the hon. gentleman to say that his objection was that he did not agree that the Bill should be

applicable to shearers; that while he agreed with the English Act, he did not agree with this Bill, because it included shearers, and that they could not have anything about shearers in the English Act because there were no shearers in England. I am endeavouring to point out that there should be no differentiation between different classes of workmen. A shearer has as much right of protection of his life and liberty as any other workman. Though this really is a committee matter, still, as the question was raised by the Attorney-General, I thought it necessary to reply. I may say that I am very heartily in accord with this Bill, and I hope that the hon. member for Gympie will not give way upon that particular point.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): I am afraid that an interjection I made, no doubt in a disorderly manner, for all interjections are disorderly, prompted the hon. member to use an expression which I venture to say has never yet fallen from a gentleman occupying the distinguished position of leader of the Opposition. I have never on any previous occasion heard a leader of the Opposition deliver himself of remarks which were of so eminently a coarse, not to say of a disgusting, nature as those which fell from the hon. member.

Mr. McDONNELL: What were they?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am not going to repeat them, of course. The hon. member said that he expected to have an expression of opinion from the Attorney-General as to how he was going to vote on this Bill. He said he was entitled to that. I should like to know by what rule of the House he is entitled to know the views of any individual member?

Mr. DAWSON: It is not an individual, but a responsible Minister.

The HOME SECRETARY: On the contrary, this is private members' day. We are all private members to-day. We vote and take what action we like in regard to any measure which does not happen to be a party measure. This is not a party measure. If it were a party measure I could understand the hon. member desiring to know, and claiming that he was entitled to know, with other hon. members on the other side, what the attitude of the Government with regard to this matter was. But merely because the hon. member happens to occupy a position, the prominent position of a Minister of the Crown, I say it does not by any means necessarily follow he is bound to give the House anything more in the way of expression of his views than any hon. member in a matter which is not a party question. I think that the hon. member must have forgotten for the moment what the nature of this business was or by whom introduced, and the desire apparently of those who sit with him, and of the introducer himself, that it should not be regarded as a party question. We are all here to approach it just as we would do if some other set of men occupied the Treasury benches. I certainly claim for myself the right to express myself, either clearly or vaguely, if I deem it expedient, on this question or any question which is raised in a similar way. If the hon. member does not like it he will have to do without. The Attorney-General guarded himself, and very properly guarded himself, in a question of this sort, and I am going to do the same. I am not going to commit myself to an opinion entirely in favour of the Bill. It may have its good points; but, in my opinion, it has some bad points about it. I entirely agree with the remarks of the Attorney-General that a drastic measure—for it is a drastic measure—

of this character should not be taken up merely because it has been adopted by the Imperial Parliament.

Mr. DAWSON: I did not say that.

The HOME SECRETARY: It should have undergone a longer period of probation where it has been adopted than has been the case up till the present time in order to see how it worked—whether it was really of that advantage and benefit to the workmen mentioned in it, and for whose benefit it is alleged to have been propounded, or whether it is to their disadvantage. I should like to point out that the hon. member who last spoke acknowledged the courtesy of the Hon. the Attorney-General towards himself and towards the party which he leads.

Mr. DAWSON: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: But the hon. gentleman immediately proceeded, after that acknowledgment, to express himself in such a way as to call forth from my hon. colleague immediately a statement of, disavowal we will say, of the words which the hon. member, the leader of the Labour party, was putting into his mouth on several occasions. Now the hon. member is given to that sort of thing. We all know it, and the hon. member, when I have drawn his attention to that, has admitted it. It is a favourite tactic of his to—I will not say misrepresent what an hon. gentleman says—but to repeat the words of the hon. member to whom he is replying in such a way, intentionally or otherwise, as to convey a totally different meaning from that they were intended to convey. Perhaps, from the hon. gentleman's point of view, these sort of tactics are legitimate; but I do not think so. Whatever may be my faults as a debater in this House, I think that true courtesy as between opponents does not lie in the direction which is assumed, I think too frequently, by the hon. member in that respect.

Mr. DAWSON: I will choose you as a model.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not want to be taken as a model, but I am certainly not going to take the hon. gentleman as one. I am afraid that if I go on much more with that I will be told that I am trying to talk the Bill out; but I need hardly say that that is not my desire. The hon. member pointed out—at least so I understood him, and I do not want to misrepresent him—I understood him to say that no employer was liable under this Bill unless—

Mr. DAWSON: In the case of actual employment.

The HOME SECRETARY: The injury for which compensation was claimed was caused through the fault or neglect of the employer.

Mr. FISHER: Oh, no!

The HOME SECRETARY: Will the hon. member for Gympie allow his leader to accept the responsibility of his own words? I am sure he is quite able to explain what he meant without the assistance of the hon. member for Gympie. When I said that, the hon. gentleman, although he did not interject, nodded to show I was correctly quoting him. I only desire to quote him correctly. I do not desire to mislead.

Mr. FISHER: I say it is not the Bill.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then the hon. gentleman and his leader do not quite agree now what the Bill is. I took down the words of the hon. the leader of the Labour party at the time, and that was the way in which I understood him to express himself. I desire, of course, only to deal with expressions which he actually made use of, and the meaning he desired placed upon them. Now we are told by the hon. member in charge of the Bill that that is not the true interpretation of the Bill at all, and I agree with the hon. member for Gympie as far as that goes. We will see exactly what the Bill says, because

it is really a most important question. If this was a Bill which threw upon the employer liability merely for injuries which arose through his own neglect or default, I should be entirely at one with it; but it goes, in my opinion, a great deal further than that. In order to illustrate this, I will be compelled to quote somewhat from clause 4—

If, in any employment to which this Act applies, personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the 1st schedule to this Act.

There is not a word about culpability, neglect, or default of the employer. It is an absolute liability if a workman is injured in an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment. Then it is qualified in this way—

The employer shall not be liable under this Act in respect of any injury which does not disable the workman for a period of at least two weeks from earning full wages at the work at which he was employed.

That has got nothing to do with the question of culpability, negligence, or default—

When the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, nothing in this Act shall affect any civil liability of the employer, but in that case the workman may, at his option, either claim compensation under this Act or take the same proceedings as were open to him before the commencement of this Act; but the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation for injury to a workman by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, both independently of and also under this Act, except—

Mr. FISHER: "Except." He may take either of them.

The HOME SECRETARY:

But the employer shall not be liable to pay compensation for injury to a workman by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, both independently of and also under this Act, except in case of such personal negligence or wilful act as aforesaid.

Mr. FISHER: Let me point out—

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member has had his turn. I could understand these interjections if I were declaiming instead of arguing the matter calmly. It says what shall happen when the injury was caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whose act or default the employer is responsible, implying that the liability still continues, implying even there, without the express enactment of the clause itself, that there is a liability even though the negligence does not happen—

Mr. DAWSON: If it only implies, it must be a question of evidence before the judge.

The HOME SECRETARY: I hope the hon. member is not endeavouring to misrepresent me. I am pointing out that the clause itself makes it perfectly clear that there is a complete liability, subject only to the modifications I am now dealing with; and those contained in sub-clause (b) do not negative the liability except as to two remedies, if the accident arises through the neglect or default of the employer. Then, paragraph (c) says—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall be disallowed.

Now, the contributory negligence of the workman has nothing whatever to do with the question. It is not necessary that there should be any neglect or default on the part of the employer to constitute liability, and on the other hand there may be serious neglect—contributory negligence almost of the grossest character on the part of the workman, and yet the liability is not negated. The liability is still there though the workman is negligent in a very high degree, unless it can be shown that it was through his

serious and wilful misconduct—it must be both serious and wilful misconduct—that is the only condition which is imposed on the workman to negative his right to recover compensation.

Mr. DAWSON: No. That is governed by sub-section (b).

The HOME SECRETARY: No. That says, "except in case of such personal negligence or wilful act as aforesaid." That relates to two remedies against the employer if that is so, but, in order to avoid the liability of the employer under this Bill, if it became law, it would be necessary for that employer to show that the accident arose, not through the carelessness or negligence of the workman himself, but that he actually was guilty of serious and wilful misconduct in bringing it about—in deliberately doing it. In order to avoid the responsibility, the employer would have to show, as far as I read the Bill, that the workman deliberately brought about the injury upon himself. If that is so—and that I understand to be the meaning of the Bill—I want to know why, if this is a good principle to be applied to certain trades and occupations, it is not good enough to be applied all round. Why should certain occupations be singled out for the operation of this—because it is not a question of dangerous occupation, it is not a question of machinery or anything of that sort, it is under any circumstances irrespective of the negligence or want of negligence on the part of the employer, and quite irrespective of contributory negligence on the part of the workman? If that is to be laid down as a principle which is applicable to the occupations referred to in the Bill, it is good enough to be applied to every occupation under the sun in this community, that every employer should, therefore, be liable for all accidents to his workmen, or, to use the words of the Bill, "personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of his employment," I cannot understand for the life of me why certain industries should be singled out in this way for this peculiar method of arriving at compensation to be paid at the expense of the employer. It means, boiled down, simply this: that the employer must in all these industries take out an accident policy to insure himself against loss for injury occurring to workmen.

Mr. LESINA: What harm will that do?

The HOME SECRETARY: It will do harm in this way: if the workman desires to have that insurance, why not pay it out of his own wages rather than have it paid for him by his employer and deducted from his wages—because that is unquestionably what it comes to? If the employer has additional burdens imposed upon him by the State in connection with this employment, that is to say, if the workman has disabilities imposed on him in this way, undoubtedly his wages disability will appear in the shape of a decreased remuneration, otherwise—always assuming that the wages ruling in any particular trade at any particular time are lower than they ought—

Mr. LESINA: Does not competition regulate wages?

The HOME SECRETARY: Competition regulates them. It is a question of supply and demand, and if the provision of any particular legislation is such as to impose, as it were, a tax on the employment of certain individuals, then unquestionably those individuals will in some way or other, either directly through a reduction of their wages or indirectly in some other way, suffer for that. I have not heard any argument at all as to why these particular industries should be singled out. For instance, we have employment "in or about a railway, factory, mine, quarry, shearing shed, or engineering work," and "in or about any building which

exceeds 30 feet in height." If this principle is good with regard to a building exceeding 30 feet in height, why is it not good enough for a one-story building 29 feet high?

Mr. KERR: There is not so much danger.

The HOME SECRETARY: If that is the argument I venture to say there are many dangerous occupations which are not mentioned in the Bill, and which ought to be there. That is just my contention—if it is good enough for one it should be good enough for all. By no means have the dangerous occupations singled out. I am not aware that a man is more liable to tumble down stairs, or to tumble out of a window, in a 30 feet building than in a 29 feet building. It seems to me that most illogical and inexplicable distinctions have been drawn between the industries and occupations which are mentioned in the Bill and those which are omitted from it, whose names are legion. There are many dangerous occupations in this colony where men are employed out of doors altogether. They are not provided for, and I shall listen with a great deal of attention for any arguments which would convince me that it is desirable that the principles of this Bill should be made applicable to the particular industries and occupations mentioned in clause 3, and not to the thousand other occupations which, in many instances, are equally dangerous, but are not mentioned at all, and in regard to which the unfortunate workmen are still to have thrown upon them the responsibility of providing for their own insurance against accident. I presume there is a reason for this distinction, but the explanation has not yet been given to the House.

Mr. FISHER: I think it has.

The HOME SECRETARY: No one else certainly has attempted to speak in support of the Bill from the other side of the House.

Mr. FISHER: I stated that I followed as closely as possible the English statute.

Mr. LESINA: Which is doing good work.

The HOME SECRETARY: We have yet to learn whether it is doing good work. If the hon. member is going to come down to this Chamber and, as an argument, say that we ought to pass this merely because a similar measure has passed through the Imperial Parliament, I am astonished to find that the hon. member should think that a good reason for passing legislation of this kind. No experience has yet been gained as to what the effect of its passage through the Imperial Parliament is likely to be.

Mr. LESINA: What is your objection to the Bill?

Mr. FISHER: You want more information.

The HOME SECRETARY: I think we all want a good deal more information about it.

Mr. FISHER: You do.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The objection taken by the Minister seems to be to the inclusion of shearing-sheds.

The HOME SECRETARY: Which Minister?

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The Attorney-General.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is only one particular phase of the subject, and I am dealing with another. I want to know if shearing-sheds are to be included, why occupations other than that of shearers are not also to be included, many which I can mention as being much more dangerous?

Mr. DUNSFORD: One Minister says it includes too much, and you say it does not include enough.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member does not understand me. I say that the supporters of the Bill are on the horns of a dilemma. Either the Bill goes too far, so far as the particular industries which are singled out

are concerned, or else it does not go far enough, inasmuch as it does not include other occupations which are equally hazardous. It is for hon. members who support this legislation to show why this distinction has been drawn.

Mr. LESINA: Because statistics prove that accidents are more common in those industries than in others.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think so; but the onus of showing that lies upon the hon. members who support the Bill, I take it, and I am asking them to be good enough to enlighten the House with regard to those statistics.

Mr. FISHER: Well, give us a chance.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member has had his chance, and I should have thought that when he took upon himself the onus of introducing legislation of this sort, which is so drastic, and is likely to affect very seriously—beneficially or otherwise—a large number of important industries in this colony, he would have made himself acquainted with these matters, and would have enlightened the House with a view of inducing it to fall in with his views. I have no more to say on the Bill at present. I shall, probably, have a good deal to say in regard to the details when we get into committee, with a view, either to the excision of some of these industries and occupations which are mentioned in clause 3, or else to the inclusion of a large number of others which I am unable to differentiate from those which are mentioned. I shall not oppose the second reading, but I certainly think that it is a Bill which requires a very great deal of careful consideration. We appear to be getting on very well in matters of this sort. I know of no glaring instances in which men have been unable to obtain compensation where they had a just and equitable claim. I use the same remark that I used in regard to some other legislation that was pending not long since—that it would have been well for us to have watched somewhat longer, and seen how this worked in other places where they have taken upon themselves the responsibility of passing such a Bill as this into law.

Mr. CAMPBELL (Moreton): I wish to make a few remarks upon this Bill before the time for private business expires, though I have no desire to talk it out. At the outset I wish to say that I am generally in favour of the Bill. I believe it is a step in the right direction, in addition to the steps already taken in that way. I am connected with an industry which employs a considerable number of men. I take it no man deliberately invites an accident, especially one of a serious nature. The only danger under the Bill will be that there will be some men who may go in for minor accidents in the hope of getting two or three weeks' or perhaps longer compensation; but that can be provided against, I take it, in committee.

Mr. FISHER: They do not get anything for the first two weeks.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I notice that, but if they can make out a case and can get a doctor's certificate, say, for three weeks, they will be entitled to something.

Mr. FISHER: For one week out of three.

Mr. CAMPBELL: There is just room for a little scheming there, and from my own experience I know that that will occasionally be tried by a few men. Objection has been taken by the Attorney-General and the Home Secretary to the absence of provisions debarring a man from claiming for an accident that his employer has not contributed to. Well, I take it that it is a very hard thing for a man who meets with an accident through no fault of his own, and yet through no fault of his employer, to obtain no compensation at all. I have known such instances. For

instance, a fly-wheel may carry away through a flaw in a casting, which nobody knew anything about—either the employer or the employee—and I have known serious injuries to men through such a thing. It would be a very fair provision to compel all employers to fall into line, and those to whom employers sell their goods will have to contribute in that way. Again I say the cost of insurance to cover everything that an employer is liable for is so reasonable now-a-days that there ought to be no objection on those grounds. In the case of our firm we cover our employees against accident, and we work along together in the best possible way, and do not feel the burden at all. In fact, I may say that personally I feel a great deal more happy and contented under the condition of things now obtaining than I did under the old system, when the hat was everlastingly going round for subscriptions for someone who had met with an accident, or for his relatives. I should like to see a measure of this sort become law, and as I have no wish to talk the Bill out I shall say no more on the present occasion.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I should like to say a word or two in reply to the argument offered by the hon. member for Moreton. The hon. member suggested that a man might mangle under this Bill, that he might pretend to be ill or to have received some slight accident which caused him to lay up for three or four weeks, for the purpose of obtaining a holiday and compensation. Such a thing might happen, and we know that in all parts of the world there are men who will even impose on friendly societies in that way, and you cannot protect yourselves against men who will take a mean advantage of those particular institutions. There are men who would take advantage of every Act of Parliament in Queensland, but that is no reason why we should not retain those Acts of Parliament. So that the statement of the hon. member is no argument at all.

Mr. CAMPBELL: I did not use it as an argument.

Mr. LESINA: I know that, but the hon. member mentioned the possibility of malingering, and I thought it well to show that that was no argument against the Bill. It has been said that we should have some longer experience of the working of the Workmen's Compensation Act in England before we jump to the conclusion that we should adopt such a measure in Queensland. England has been called conservative, and it is said that the people are conservative in their institutions, that anything that has the stamp of age upon it is venerated by them, that they are slow to move, that reform movements there are gradual and not spasmodic as they are in other parts of the world. In other parts of the world reform movements go ahead by leaps and bounds and recede as rapidly; yet in conservative England, where they are said to be slow in adopting reforms, they have passed an Act which compels employers to compensate their workmen if they suffer from accident, and that accident is due to negligence on the part of their employer. As showing the result of the working of the Workmen's Compensation Act in England for 1898-9, I will give a few statistics. Since July of last year, when the Compensation Act became operative, the following are the comparative figures of non-fatal accidents, a record of which has been made by the *Labour Gazette*:—Railway, 13,992; mines, 4,582; quarries, 1,729; factories, 58,628; miscellaneous, 10,823; total, 89,823. That is an increase of 38 per cent. on the accidents chronicled in the previous year, when the total number of non-fatal accidents in those industries was 63,742. The following are the figures with regard to fatal

accidents:—Railway, 522; mines, 906; quarries, 135; factories, 600; miscellaneous, 238; total, 2,461. In the previous year the total number of fatal accidents was 2,119, showing that there was an increase of 14 per cent. during the last twelve months. Much of this increase is accounted for by the more accurate notification of accidents since the Act came into force, by the natural increase of the population, and by the exceptional prosperity of trade leading to more extensive employment. A review of the English Press will prove that this year has been very remarkable for the prosperity which exists in all trades, particularly the trades to which I have referred, and in which ten or fifteen times more persons were killed than will probably be killed in the Boer war. They are the men who carry on our peaceful industries, who dig our coal, who weave our cloth, and who are engaged in the active tasks of industry all over England. Those men are subject to the risk of accidents, being engaged in employments in which men sometimes lose their limbs, and occasionally their lives. It was for the purpose of protecting those men against the negligence of their employers that the British House of Commons passed the Workmen's Compensation Act, and that shows that the legislators of the old country have new aims, new ideals, and new hopes. I do not think it is a fair thing that we should be without such an Act in a country like Queensland, where the majority of the people obtain their livelihood by following the primary industries, such as mining, agricultural, and pastoral pursuits. It is a sign of the times when a country like England takes a step in that direction, and why should hon. members on the opposite benches close their eyes to those signs, and object to the passage of a measure to protect men engaged in dangerous occupations? On Charters Towers, Gympie, Croydon, and other goldfields a number of men are sent every day down to the depths of the earth in a cage suspended by a wire rope. We have inspectors whose duty it is to examine those ropes, with a view to protecting the men against accidents; but a rope may be of inferior material, or it may be a long time in use, and this may be due to the fact that the directors of the mine are too parsimonious to purchase a new rope, because they want to get big dividends out of the mine, and to make a lot of money out of the employment of those men. That inferior or old rope may part suddenly, and six or a dozen bread-winners for wives and children may be killed. Should we not provide against parsimonious employers being guilty of actions of that kind, and protect the workmen who are exposed to those dangers? The manner in which men in those positions meet the difficulties they have to contend with, and endure the hardships they have to suffer, shows a quiet heroism which, to my mind, is just as glorious as deeds of heroism performed on the battlefield. I am happy to raise my voice on behalf of this very beneficial measure, which has been proposed, I am sorry to say, by Mr. Fisher, the hon. member for Gympie, instead of by the Government, and if it goes to a vote I will exercise my vote in its behalf. I will give one other illustration as to how the Act operates in the old country. Here is the case—

For the loss of his right hand crushed under a heavy barrel, a labourer named Ernest Lawrence [5 p.m.] was, on Wednesday, in the City of London County Court, awarded 9s. a week for life against his employers, the S.A. Bonded Government Depot. The plaintiff lost his case under the Employers Liability Act, but won it under the Workmen's Compensation Act, which caused the judge, Mr. Commissioner Kerr, to order him to pay the costs.

If an English judge administering a plain honest English Act can award compensation to an English workman, why can we not do the same

thing here, and is it fair to induce English workmen to come out here where they have to put up with all sorts of risks and get no compensation at all? That is another aspect of the case. We entice a man from England where, under the present condition of things, he is receiving good wages, and may remain in the same employment for the remainder of his life, and where he has this protection; we entice him to come out here where he will get no compensation at all in case he meets with an accident. It is an extraordinary thing, to my mind, to think that men of ordinary benevolent instincts here will close their eyes to the fact that this provision is made in the old country for the compensation of workmen who meet with accidents which are not due to their own negligence, and it is extraordinary that the workmen of Queensland, who are carrying on its industries and helping it along, have not been given this protection which they should have had by this time.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*): I have read this Bill, and the principle, or a part of the principle, seems to me desirable—that is, if any negligence whatever on the part of an employer brings about an accident to one of his employees, any fair-minded man must at once say that the negligent person is responsible to the man who is injured. There is no getting out of that, and it does not want any argument. But it seems to me that under this Bill the employer has to take the whole of the natural risks of the man—risks which every man runs who lives and moves about—and it is not necessary that the employer should be careless or negligent at all. The man takes no risk of his life at all. He does not take the natural risks which belong to every one of us. The employer is to take all the risk without contributing in any way whatever to the accident, and without any negligence whatever on his part. That does not seem to me to be at all fair. Take the case where the employer and employees are working together at any kind of work, the employer has to take the responsibility for the risk which attaches to every man in life, and he has also to take all the responsibility for all the natural risks of the workmen's lives, and he is made responsible for any accident whatever that occurs to them. If this Bill were confined to compensation for negligence, I do not think one word would be said about it, and it would go through at once. But it is not so. I did not hear the Attorney-General's speech, but I have heard that he referred to shearing-sheds. It strikes me that many things may happen in shearing-sheds which the employer cannot control in any way at all; and see the position he would be in under this Bill. A man is running quickly or jumping over a fence, or in getting into the shed, and he sprains his ankle or breaks his leg, and the employer is responsible for that. He is certainly not blamable. A man using a knife butchering a sheep in some careless way cuts his hand; blood poisoning ensues, and the employer is responsible for that. We have often heard of accidents through a man stooping down, and a ram gets at him and butts him, and hurts him severely. What man in common sense will hold that the employer is responsible for that? The employee, it seems to me, has no individuality at all under this Bill. His life, so far as its risks are concerned, is merged into his employer's life, and the employer takes them all.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): Where do you get that in the Bill?

Mr. STORY: I get it here. The only case in which the man cannot claim compensation from his employer is where he meets with an accident as the result of his own wilful negligence.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: I do not find that.

Mr. STORY: I think it is so.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. FISHER: I explained that a dozen times.

Mr. STORY: I am not cavilling at this measure at all, but I did not hear the hon. member explain it once, though I heard him introducing the Bill.

Mr. FISHER: You are quite correct.

Mr. STORY: Clause 4 says—

If, in any employment to which this Act applies, personal injury by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment is caused to a workman, his employer shall, subject as hereinafter mentioned, be liable to pay compensation in accordance with the 1st schedule to this Act.

Then there are certain provisions which show that the employer is not liable in respect of any injury which does not disable a workman, but I have nothing to do with that now—I am not discussing it. Then it is provided that when the injury is caused by the personal negligence or wilful act of the employer, or of some person for whom he is responsible, nothing in the Bill is to affect the civil liability of the employer, but—

The employer shall not be liable to pay compensation for injury to a workman by accident arising out of and in the course of the employment, both independently of and also under this Act, except in case of such personal negligence or wilful act as aforesaid.

That is where the employee is wilfully negligent.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: There you are. Where would you get the case of a man spraining his ankle under that?

Mr. STORY: I do not know how the hon. member reads it, but I say that if a man is sent round to muster a lot of sheep and through his horse stumbling he is injured the employer is liable.

Mr. FISHER: Yes, if he was in the shearing-shed he would be.

Mr. STORY: He would? Why should he be? The employer had no desire or wish to see the man hurt, and it was only a matter of chance that he did not get on the same horse and do the same work himself; but nobody stands responsible if the same accident happened to him. Does it not seem that the natural risk and responsibility for it is taken off the one man under this Bill and put on the other in an unjust manner?

Mr. DUNSFORD: The man who is injured surely suffers something? Has he not taken that risk?

Mr. STORY: He takes the risk, but I say your engagement is that you take a certain amount of money for taking a certain risk. We know that all of us in our daily lives, walking upstairs or crossing the street, are liable to meet with some accident by mischance. That risk belongs to our daily life, and it seems to me unfair that these things and the responsibility for them should be shifted from the shoulders of one man on to another, who is unfortunate enough to be his employer, and who has all day long to take his own chance of the risks of life.

Mr. DUNSFORD: One man loses his life or a limb, and the other man only loses a few pounds.

Mr. STORY: But the other man might lose his life or a limb. From my knowledge of bush life, generally speaking, the worker is no more liable to accident than the manager. The manager of a station generally runs the same risks as any man in his employ. With regard to bush life this circumstance may occur: A man may not be a very good rider, and somebody will take delight in giving him an awkward and dangerous horse to ride, which he pretends is quiet. I say that the man who induced him to get on that horse would be responsible to the end of that man's life if any accident occurred; but where everything is fair and equitable, as far as possible, I cannot see why one man's chance should be shifted on to another man's shoulders.

Mr. DUNSFORD: This is a Compensation Bill.

Mr. STORY: I know it is, but why should compensation be paid by a man who is in no way responsible for an accident? If he is blamable in any instance, I would hold him responsible for the highest amount the law would allow. But if he is not responsible, you cannot or should not shift the natural chances of someone else on to his shoulders, and make him responsible for another man's action. It does not follow that the man who employs another is a richer man in any way than the man to whom he may have to pay compensation in case of an accident. Very often the man who works for another is much better off than the man who employs him. The employer has to accept his own liability to accident, but under the Bill he will have to accept also the liability of everybody he employs, unless an employee contributes to the accident himself. I listened very attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for Moreton, who stated that his firm insured their men. There is the whole question. He does not pretend that by insuring these men he has any special love or regard for them—although it is well known all over the city that his firm has been very kindly disposed towards their employees and has treated them very well. This firm simply insures these men to get rid of the risk of being proceeded against legally for compensation in regard to accidents. It is a mere business transaction. But the question is: Who should insure—the men or the employer? The employer simply insures his employees, just as he would insure a prize animal, so that if any loss should occur through accident somebody else will have to pay the compensation. This, I think, is bringing the matter down to a very low level indeed. This firm is doing exactly the same thing—shifting the obligation in regard to accidents on to somebody else. The hon. member for Moreton says that they insure their men while at work, and while they are away, and there are only about three occupations, outside factories, that insurance companies won't take—polo playing, bicycling, and something else—three dangerous sports. Every accident that occurs from want of knowledge or from clumsiness cannot be attributable to the employer, yet, under this Bill, he is chargeable and has to pay compensation. The result will be that if this Bill is passed every employer must deduct a certain amount from the wages of his men—whatever work they are engaged on—so that, as in the instances I have mentioned, somebody else should be made responsible for the compensation instead of the employer.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why should they not pay the rate?

Mr. STORY: According to the principle of this Bill, they have to pay this rate, and I say that this is not right. In this case, the man directly engaged would lose his individual responsibility with regard to accidents. He simply hands himself over to his employer. He says: "Whatever happens to me, my employer is responsible for it." Under these circumstances, the best plan for the employer would be to insure his workmen just as he does his buildings. Then, if anything happens, he has not to pay. I think, in these cases, every man should either insure himself or allow his employer to deduct from his wages a certain amount towards his insurance by his employer. Subsection (c) of section 4 bears out what I say. It reads—

If it is proved that the injury to a workman is attributable to the serious and wilful misconduct of that workman, any compensation claimed in respect of that injury shall be disallowed.

If it is proved that the injury is attributable to serious and wilful misconduct on the man's part, no compensation will be allowed. If, on the contrary, he is responsible for serious and wilful

misconduct, the employer is responsible for every accident that may happen, and a claim can be made for it. Where there is wilful or serious misconduct, the employee, in case of accident, may say, "I claim compensation from my employer." But if an accident happened five minutes after he left his employment he would be responsible himself. In my opinion no one should be placed in such a position.

Mr. GRIMES (*Oxley*): I must say that after reading this Bill I am not at all in love with it. I think the hon. member for Balonne has put in a nutshell the main objection to the Bill—that it takes away the responsibility of the workman for his own actions, and throws all the responsibility on his employer. I have had to do a great deal with men, during the best portion of my life, and I say that more care is manifested by employers for their men than the men have for themselves. More carelessness is exercised by the men than by the masters. Even in my experience as a master, I have had occasion to warn men against running certain risks: but this Bill will be the means of encouraging men to run still greater risks. I think if an employer bears the risk in connection with the negligence of his overseers or engineers, that that is quite as much as we can expect him to bear. As the hon. member for Balonne says, this Bill takes away from the individual the natural risk of his life. There is no question about that, and the hon. member for Gympie admitted it when he introduced this Bill, because he said—

It will enable a certain sum to be paid to an injured person, or to the dependents of a person killed where an accident has taken place, except where the accident to the workman was caused solely by the serious and wilful misconduct of the workman himself.

I think that is manifestly unfair. The men may contribute to any accident by their own negligence, their own stupidity, or by their own incapacity, and yet if you cannot prove that there was wilful misconduct this indi-

[5.30 p.m.] vidual has a claim on the employer.

The hon. member for Moreton has said the one effect of this Bill will be to put all employers on the same level. I cannot see that it does so. He pointed out that all employers will have to insure against accident, and in that way will all be on the same level. It may be that persons employing labour will insure against the risk of injury by accident, and put the cost of doing so on to the article which they sell, but there are manufactories in Queensland where such a thing would be quite impossible, as the price of the article is governed more by outside manufactures than by the manufactories in the colony itself. Take for instance the sugar mills. The price of that article is governed by outside markets rather than by what is produced in the colony, and in that case the employer will have this extra burden thrown upon him, and not be able to recoup himself in any way.

Mr. LESINA: Look at the State assistance the sugar people get.

Mr. GRIMES: That is quite another thing. This puts an employer in a very awkward position. He has not only to take the risk of injury to himself and family, but he has thrown upon him the additional risk of accident to those whom he employs. Seeing that there has been no call for the Bill, and that in case of accident the employee is already protected, except in cases where he has been injured through his own negligence, I am not inclined to support the Bill.

* Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): Before this Bill goes to a division I would like to say a word upon it. When the Bill was before us on a former occasion, I asked the hon. member who introduced it how it was that an appropriation had been asked for.

Mr. FISHER: I was so advised.

Mr. COWLEY: Then whoever advised the hon. member gave him very bad advice, for I cannot see that it requires any appropriation. I think it is very wrong indeed for any hon. member to come down to this House and go into committee to ask the House to address His Excellency the Governor in order that he may recommend the necessary appropriation for a measure which requires no appropriation. Now, one objection to this Bill is that, so far as I can see—I may be wrong, and if so I hope the hon. member, when replying, will correct me—it will apply to the whole colony. If the Bill becomes law there will be no exception. I have very grave objections to it if that is the case. I do not think that a Bill of this nature, even if it is necessary in our manufacturing centres, should be made applicable to the farming industry. Many of our industries combine farming and manufacturing, because the farmers, having to send their produce to market in a marketable state, have to a greater or less degree to employ some kind of machinery, and persons working that machinery will of course come under the provisions of this Bill. We live under quite different conditions in a colony like this to those which prevail in large centres such as are found in Great Britain and the Continent of Europe; and a Bill which may be desirable in a thickly populated country may not be at all applicable where the population is scattered, and where the farmers are compelled, on account of the distance they live apart from each other, to embark to a certain extent in manufacturing.

Mr. DUNS福德: This does not apply to farmers.

Mr. COWLEY: It does not apply to farmers?

Mr. DUNS福德: Not at all.

Mr. COWLEY: The hon. member must either be very dense or I must be utterly incapable of making myself understood. I was trying to explain that our farmers live so far apart that it is necessary for them to manufacture as well as to grow produce, whereas in more thickly-settled countries the raw produce is brought to a common centre, where the whole process of manufacture is gone through. Under those circumstances, I pointed out that it is necessary for farmers and others to engage in manufacturing to a certain extent.

Mr. McDONNELL: Their places would not come under the heading of factories in Queensland. A factory is only a factory within the meaning of the Factories Act.

Mr. COWLEY: What I want to understand is this: The Factories Act is only applicable to certain districts, and can be applied by the Governor in Council.

Mr. McDONNELL: That is right.

Mr. COWLEY: But this Bill is not an amendment of the Factories Act, and therefore it will be applicable to the whole colony. If a man who is working a thrashing machine meets with an accident he will, under this Bill, be able to claim compensation from his employer.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why not?

Mr. COWLEY: Well, of course—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It says—

Machinery driven by electrical, steam, water, or other mechanical power is used.

Mr. FISHER: That is in a factory.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does it include any other work?

Mr. COWLEY: Probably when we go into committee we shall be able to get the opinion of the legal members of this House upon many points of this description. It appears to me that the Bill is very wide in its scope—that it embraces nearly all occupations. If it does not

embrace agriculturists who are employed on outside work, it certainly embraces all those who are employed in butter factories and cheese factories. All these men will be included. The man who works at a cream separator will be included, for instance. The cream separator revolves at a very great speed, and a very slight flaw, when it is travelling at the rate of 2,000 revolutions a minute, will send it to all parts of a building. In doing so, it will be almost impossible for the man—any man—who is attending it to escape serious accident. The employer will be liable, although he has purchased the machine from competent responsible makers, and through no fault of his own, and, practically, through no fault of anyone.

Mr. DUNS福德: Isn't he liable now?

Mr. COWLEY: Then why bring in the Bill?

Mr. DUNS福德: He is liable now.

Mr. COWLEY: If the hon. gentleman is assured of all that he wants by existing legislation, why does he want to cumber our statute-books and give work for the lawyers and legal fraternity?

Mr. DUNS福德: This simplifies the matter.

Mr. COWLEY: It is very questionable whether it does simplify it.

Mr. FISHER: Give me a chance of explaining, after the debate is done.

Mr. COWLEY: I shall be only too happy. I want the hon. gentleman, who has made a study of this Bill, to explain it.

Mr. DUNS福德: Your object is to kill time.

Mr. COWLEY: I have spoken very little on private members' day. I have carefully refrained from speaking on private members' day unless I had something to say.

Mr. DUNS福德: I saw the Minister urging you to get up.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Falseness!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COWLEY: No hon. gentleman urged me to get up.

Mr. DUNS福德: It was apparent to everybody here.

Mr. COWLEY: I am entitled to speak on the Bill. As an employer of labour in the past, I am very much interested in all that affects labour employed in this colony.

Mr. DUNS福德: You should read the Bill before you start.

Mr. COWLEY: I have read it.

Mr. DUNS福德: You did not understand it.

Mr. COWLEY: I do not think that the hon. gentleman is competent to judge my intelligence—whether I understand the Bill or whether I do not.

Mr. LESINA: That will not affect your employees. They are niggers.

Mr. COWLEY: If they are niggers, the hon. gentleman should have a fellow-feeling for them. (Laughter.) Be that as it may, I say that any measure that comes before this House, if I think I am justified in speaking on it, I intend to speak on it. I do not think that a measure of this importance should be allowed to pass this Chamber without ample discussion. I know that the hon. member who is in charge of this Bill does not object to discussion, and, if we cannot finish it to-night, I sincerely trust that the hon. gentleman will have a chance of another night. If hon. members will only allow me to proceed, they will expedite business; but if they continually interject, it is not my fault if I am led off the track which I have laid down for myself, and which I wish to follow. No interjection from the hon. member or any other hon. member will induce me to curtail the remarks which I have to make upon a subject of the magnitude and importance of this. I think I was saying

that this would be applied to the whole colony. In that respect it differs from the Factories Act, which is only applicable by the Governor in Council to certain parts of the colony. Therefore this Bill, if it becomes law, will be a law of a more sweeping character than the Factories Act.

Mr. LESINA : It is a sweep from the mother country.

Mr. COWLEY : I am trying to prove—but the hon. member will not understand, not, I believe, from any want of perspicacity on my part, but through lack of intelligence on his own—that circumstances differ entirely in this country from the mother country. In the old country factories exist in all directions, and farm production is carried on on the one hand and manufacture on the other.

Mr. LESINA : Cannot a man be injured there at all through the negligence of the employer ?

Mr. COWLEY : I have not the slightest doubt that there is the same liability to injury there as anywhere else.

Mr. LESINA : That is what we want to compensate.

Mr. COWLEY : There is the same liability to injury ; but you wish to go beyond that, and I wish to show that this Bill is more far-reaching than hon. members imagine. As this is applicable to the whole colony, I shall, for one, object to it on that point. I think that if it becomes law at all, there should be some limitations.

Mr. FISHER : You can do it in committee.

Mr. COWLEY : If I did not point this out now, when we came into committee hon. members would say, "Why didn't you raise that on the second reading? Why spring it on us now?" The object of a debate of this character is to give the hon. member in charge of the Bill an opportunity of meeting the objections which we now raise, because we shall assuredly raise them in committee. I think the principle of a question like this is well worthy of consideration. Another objection which I have is this : That an Act of a similar character has been in existence in England for a short period, and we have not had an opportunity of judging of the working of that Act to enable us to come to a correct conclusion ; but if we are to judge of the results of the working of the Act, it is all against our adopting it and not at all in favour. In fact, it has been shown conclusively, and, if necessary, when we go into committee, I will be able to give any number of facts and figures—I have got them all.

Mr. FISHER : I have them all.

Mr. COWLEY : If the hon. gentleman has them, I am sorry he withheld them. I think he was in duty bound to the House to give us both sides of the question. The hon. member for Lockyer has studied this, and will give us a very exhaustive speech on the matter. I know that he has made the matter a study, and has all the facts and figures at his finger ends ; and had he risen to give them, I should have refrained from doing so. As far as I can understand the results of the working of the Act in England, two things are shown most clearly—namely, the number of accidents, both fatal and non-fatal, increased to an alarming extent during the first six months the Act was in force above those which occurred during the previous six months the Act was not in existence.

Mr. GLASSEY : In consequence of the Act being passed ?

Mr. COWLEY : Certainly, I think so.

Mr. LESINA : I gave the reason.

Mr. COWLEY : The hon. member gave certain reasons. I do not object to his reasons ; but the reason which I give, and the reason which all intelligent men who have studied the Act in

England, both professional and non-professional, give, is : In the first instance to indemnify himself from any loss, the employer insures his workmen.

Mr. LESINA : They get killed anyhow.

Mr. COWLEY : He has to insure them for his own protection, and when he has done that he says, "Oh, I do not care whether an accident happens or not. I am all right."

Mr. LESINA : He may kill them for the insurance.

Mr. COWLEY : He does not get the insurance. The hon. gentleman has a most extraordinary turn of mind. I cannot imagine how a man sitting in this House can accuse or imply, in any shape or form, that any man for the sake of the gain of the few paltry pounds would murder one of his workmen or cause the death of one of them.

Mr. LESINA : I did not say that.

Mr. COWLEY : The hon. member implied it.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : You did.

Mr. COWLEY : I did not imply it at all. The hon. member implied that the employer killed them for the sake of the money. I said no such thing. But I say that when employers have to insure their employees, I can easily understand that they and their foremen do not take the same precautions as they would take if they had not covered this amount by insurance. That seems to me to be a logical conclusion to arrive at. Another thing, it makes the workmen themselves become more careless. The Act was in force in Great Britain from July to December, 1898, and during those six months the total number of accidents fatal and non-fatal numbered 28,882 as against 18,125 during the corresponding six months of the preceding year—10,000 more in the six months. And men who have given their time and attention, men of a philanthropic turn of mind, men who do their utmost for the amelioration of their fellowmen in Great Britain, have come to the conclusion that the Act is detrimental to the interests and welfare of the employees.

Mr. LESINA : Can you mention one ?

Mr. COWLEY : Yes, I can give the names of several, and the positions they occupy.

Mr. LESINA : They are imaginary.

Mr. COWLEY : No ; they are not.

Mr. FISHER : There was a margin quite as great under the Employers Liability Act in previous years.

Mr. COWLEY : I am only giving the facts which the hon. member will not deny.

Mr. FISHER : I know the facts.

Mr. COWLEY : As the hon. member admits the fact, we must try and ascertain how it is that this result has come about.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : It is a very painful result.

Mr. COWLEY : It is a painful result.

Mr. FISHER : As great a difference appeared in previous years under the Employers Liability Act.

Mr. COWLEY : Whether that is so or not, that will only substantiate the argument I am trying to impress on the mind of the hon. member—that both parties, employers and employees, grow more reckless when an Act of this kind is in force. Another objection I have, and which I believe has been fully substantiated in Great Britain, and that is, that there is actually more litigation since the Act has been in force than there was previously between employers and employees.

Mr. DUNSFORD : And more compensation.

Mr. COWLEY : Yes. If the hon. member likes to play upon words he can do so. I have no objection.

Mr. DUNSFORD: Isn't there more compensation?

Mr. COWLEY: Yes, but there are more deaths, and are not they to be put into the scale against the increased amount of compensation? Would not the widow and orphan rather have the breadwinner than any amount of compensation?

Mr. DUNSFORD: Do you think the Act kills the workmen?

Mr. COWLEY: Yes.

Mr. GIVENS: Are there more fatal accidents in England now than there were before the Act came into force?

Mr. COWLEY: Yes. I have already said that during six months after the Act came into force there were 10,000 more accidents, fatal and non-fatal, than during the corresponding six months of the preceding year.

Mr. GIVENS: It is not fair to generalise after such a short space of time.

Mr. COWLEY: That is the argument I tried to impress on the hon. member in charge of the Bill. As this Act has been in force in Great Britain for such a short period, it behoves us to carefully consider what we are doing before we rush into legislation when we do not know whether it will have the beneficial effect which every hon. member desires, or whether it will have an injurious effect. That is the reason I would rather the hon. member should delay this matter until we can see by the working of the Act in Great Britain what its effect will be. I believe that an Act of this kind has been in force in Germany for a much greater number of years than in Great Britain, and the results have been exactly the same—accidents and litigation have increased. The hon. member sitting opposite shakes his head, but I shall be able to show in committee that this is so—though it is not so much a matter for committee as it is for second reading, because it is a very essential point, affecting the whole principle of the Bill, the principle we have to consider being whether the proposed legislation will have a beneficial effect on our workmen, or whether it will have a very opposite result. In Germany I am led to understand that the result of the Act has not been of that beneficial character which the hon. member would lead us to suppose, because the number of accidents has increased—

Mr. LESINA: What is the percentage of increase?

Mr. COWLEY: In fatal accidents I believe sixty more.

Mr. LESINA: Would that be a natural increase, taking into consideration the increase of population?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. COWLEY: I can give the facts.

Mr. FISHER: I gave them in moving the second reading.

Mr. COWLEY: Did you?

Mr. FISHER: I gave the whole of the facts generalised.

Mr. COWLEY: Then I will leave them now. Another objection I have is the one explained by the hon. member for Oxley, Mr. Grimes, and that is the effect of employers having to insure their workmen. Competition is so keen in Great Britain, and is becoming so in these colonies, that the margin of profit is very small indeed; and if the margin of profit is affected by the employer being compelled to insure his employees, he must pass it on in some way or other; and the result has been in England that, as the employer is liable, he insures his employees, and in consequence of being compelled to do that, and in view of the great competition and the small profits, he must either take the amount of the insurance out of the wages of the workmen or must dispense with many old workmen and keep none but the most active and

the best class of labour. It is shown by various authorities that this is actually taking place in Great Britain at the present time, and that the services of many old and valuable employees have been dispensed with because they have not been able to work up to the capacity of younger men. Many servants who have been kept by their employers out of regard for their long and valuable services have been dispensed with since the introduction of this Act, and therefore, instead of being a benefit to the employees, in many instances it has proved exactly the reverse, and now numbers of men—

Mr. KERR: That state of things exists here.

Mr. COWLEY: Well, if it exists where we have no Act, it exists in a much greater degree where there is an Act. I can give the hon. member instances where the services of men have been dispensed with owing to the introduction of this Act. It seems to be very reasonable, too—

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: And don't they dispense with married men, too?

Mr. COWLEY: Yes; married men go, and unmarried men are kept on. There is another reason why I object to this Bill—that is, that there are no exemptions. A clause making provision for exemptions is badly wanted. The principle of the Bill is that it extends to every employer under clause 3. Now, in this country there are many employers who have come to a mutual understanding with their employees in regard to these matters, and they should not be disturbed by legislation. If they are disturbed by legislation it will not be to the benefit of the employee, but to his detriment. That is a very fatal objection which I have to the Bill, and it is another reason why we should pause before we pass a measure of this description, which has only been in operation for a limited period in the old country.

Mr. LESINA: It is a wonder that Lord Salisbury did not use that argument of yours.

Mr. COWLEY: Although I have a very great respect for Lord Salisbury—especially at the present juncture of affairs—still I do not think that we should be guided entirely by everything Lord Salisbury does. I would be perfectly willing, so far as I am concerned, if the hon. member would be willing to do so, to accept on all points Lord Salisbury's dictum, and I feel sure that in the aggregate I should come out on top, and that the hon. member would be the very first to cry off the bargain. It is really something new for one of the leading lights of the radical Labour party in this colony to quote Lord Salisbury as an authority. On most occasions I feel assured he would do the very reverse; but that hon. member puts any interpretation he likes upon this Bill, and asks us to accept it, and backs up his opinion with the opinion of Lord Salisbury. I say that there are many employers in this community who have funds from which their employees derive very great benefit. As an illustration, I shall just mention one. That is a company which has its ramifications extending over many portions of Queensland—both North and South, and also in every one of the colonies—I refer to the Colonial Sugar Refining Company. They are very large employers of labour in my district. I do not know much about the shareholders in the company, but I know the managers, and I know a great many of the employees, and, so far as I know, they are all on exceptionally good terms. The arrangement which they have for compensating their employees in case of accident seems to me to work admirably, and to be much superior to anything proposed under this Bill. They have an accident fund; they have a life assurance fund; they have a sick fund; and they also have a fund for funeral expenses. During

the time in which the fund has been in operation, they have contributed over £39,000 to the fund, exclusive of interest. And I may say that, in dealing with that fund, they act in the most liberal manner, because they allow 6 per cent. interest—far more than would be derived from any financial institution. They allow 6 per cent. interest on the total balance to the credit of the fund at the end of every six months. They have contributed, in all, about £39,000, and £11,000 as interest. This £39,000 which they have contributed is equal to 3 per cent. per annum upon the total amount of wages paid to all the men who contribute to the various funds. That seems to me to be a far better scheme than anything provided by the hon. member; and if his Bill becomes law that scheme becomes extinct at once, because they will not do both. The hon. member has made no provision whatever for any arrangement of this kind to continue in existence.

MR. LESINA: Are there no arrangements in England like that? There are scores of illustrations like it.

HON. E. B. FORREST: There are not scores of illustrations like that in England or anywhere else.

MR. COWLEY: I do not think that it is absolutely necessary that we should follow the Imperial Parliament in every measure they bring in. If the hon. member for Clermont will only pause for a minute, it must be quite evident to him that circumstances differ—as I have tried to explain. But even if they did not, surely as rational men we are entitled to give every consideration to a measure, and not adopt the legislation of other countries without duly weighing it. Whether benefit societies are inaugurated in Great Britain of a kindred character to the one I have mentioned or not does not affect the argument one way or the other so far as I can see, because, if they have done wrong in Great Britain, and if workmen there have suffered by that wrong, why should we perpetuate the same state of things?

MR. LESINA: We will remember that argument.

MR. COWLEY: I want the hon. member to remember it. I am trying to impress it upon his memory so that he may carry it away with him.

MR. FISHER: Will the hon. member now allow me to move the Bill for a forward date?

MR. COWLEY: If I will not lose my right to speak, I shall be only too happy, but I have not quite finished. I should have finished if it had not been for the interjections.

MR. FISHER: You might be allowed to move the adjournment of the debate.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member can only continue his remarks in that case by permission of the House.

MR. FISHER: I am sure permission will not be refused.

MR. COWLEY: I accept the hon. member's assurance that I will get the permission of the House to continue.

MR. LEAHY: I move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. FISHER, the resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Thursday, 16th November.

At 7 o'clock the House, in accordance with Sessional Order, proceeded with Government business.

UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Hon. members are now in possession of a Bill to incorporate and endow the University of

Queensland. That, Mr. Speaker, is a subject that in one particular phase has been before the House for many years. I think I have no reason to apologise for bringing a Bill of this kind forward. In fact, reasons, I think, might be required if such a Bill was not brought forward. In 1874 a Commission was appointed to report upon the desirability of providing a university in the colony, and their opinion, even at that time was that it was eminently desirable, and that a university should be begun at once. In 1891 another Commission was appointed, composed of some of the most distinguished gentlemen in the colony in literary and intellectual circles, such as Sir S. W. Griffith, the late Sir Charles Lilley, the late T. J. Byrnes, Archbishop Dunne, and many others; and those gentlemen brought up a report also strongly advising that a university should be begun, and pointing out at great length the reasons which existed for such an establishment. It is found, of course, that anyone who is born a native of Queensland is placed at a serious disadvantage as compared with those who are born natives of any of the other colonies. This is the only colony in which no such provision is made, and the result is that to anyone who does not happen to be in affluent circumstances there are certain professions from which they are actually debarred. It is impossible for them to finish their education unless they go to some other colony, which, as I say, persons in indifferent circumstances cannot do. Therefore, looking at the question from the point of view of the disabilities under which natives of Queensland suffer as compared with those of other colonies, I think it is time we should fall into line with them in that respect. If we go to any other part of the world, whether to the United States of America or to the countries on the continent of Europe, we shall find that every State in America has a university, some of them having several universities, and we shall also find that even the poorest countries in Europe are liberally provided with them. The advantage of having some centre of education was pointed out, as I said, in 1891, by the Commission, and I have no doubt that had it not been that the colony fell upon evil times the want would have been long since supplied. We know perfectly well what happened in 1893—the financial crisis. But a couple of years ago, when the colony was showing signs of recovery and returning prosperity, the then Premier, the lamented T. J. Byrnes, spoke of the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to found a university in Queensland. Hon. members will see that the amount which is put down as an endowment for the university—£5,000 per annum—is not a very large one. It may be feared that that sum will be insufficient, but I should like to say that it is the sum, at any rate, which was originally granted to the University of Sydney, and that the University of Sydney is now a very large and flourishing institution.

MR. GIVENS: Sydney was a very poor place when that was done.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I know that. The population of New South Wales was not greater than ours is at the present time. Some may say that the sum of £5,000 is too small, and others may perhaps say that it is too large, but a beginning having been made with an institution of this kind, we may hope that private munificence will do for the University of Queensland what it has done for other colonies in this group. The great thing is to make a start. I may point out that other universities in Australia have been helped, not only by the Government, but also by very great gifts from benevolent persons; in some cases during the donor's lifetime, and in others as bequests; and those

universities have grown up from a comparatively humble beginning. The really important thing is to make a beginning, and I believe that when a beginning is made and a university established, we shall be able in course of time to attract a great deal of money to its funds. I should be unjust were I to suppose that the people of Queensland are more deficient in public spirit than the people of any other colony, and I think we may anticipate that once a university is established here we shall have it assisted by private munificence. The universities in the other colonies have all been fairly progressive, and have advanced until they are very much larger and much more flourishing than they were originally, and we may reasonably anticipate that such a result will follow the foundation of a university in Queensland. In 1850, when the Sydney University was established, the grant to that institution was £5,000. In Victoria, in 1853, at which time gold discoveries were taking place in that colony and considerable hopes were entertained with regard to the future of Victoria, they granted the sum of £9,000 per annum. The Adelaide University, when it was established, received a gift of £20,000 from Mr. W. W. Hughes, and was granted an endowment of 5 per cent. on £20,000 by the Government. That endowment was considerably less, so far as the State is concerned, than the endowment which is proposed in this Bill. To show how great the growth of those universities had been I may mention that in 1897 the expenditure of the Sydney University was £19,994, that the number of students was 450, that the number who passed the examinations and obtained degrees was about the same, and that they had faculties of arts, law, science, medicine, engineering, and I think also a school of mines. They had also the following colleges in connection with the university:—The Roman Catholic College, the Presbyterian College, the Church of England College, and the Women's College. The income of the Melbourne University was £31,076. They have three colleges connected with the university—namely, Trinity College, Queen's College, and Ormond College, besides a Conservatory of Music. They have chairs for mathematics, natural philosophy, biology, botany, chemistry, English history, French and German, logic, philosophy, medicine and surgery, and political economy. In 1894 the income of the Adelaide University was £8,321, consisting of fees £3,728, Government endowment £3,801, interest £3,339, rent £1,117, exhibition £75. With an endowment of rather less than £4,000 the Adelaide University was able not only to exist but to do very good work indeed. What is required in this matter is to establish a university, which has very important functions to discharge. As will be seen from the preamble to the Bill, it has to promote sound learning, and it has to teach either directly or indirectly all subjects of interest that the public may desire to learn. It has also another important function—namely, that of conferring diplomas. There are several reasons why it is desirable that diplomas should be conferred by some school in the colony. Apart from the mere fact of the inconvenience which our students have to suffer by going away, it is desirable that diplomas should be conferred in the colony, partly because the examinations of the Sydney University and the period at which it is desirable to prepare for those examinations do not quite coincide with what is considered suitable by the grammar school institutions in Queensland. There are a good many other reasons, which hon. members will see at once, for getting some imprimatur to the various examinations which take place in this colony, some one which appertains to the colony itself. In other

countries where the greatest interest is taken in institutions of this kind, when money is wanted money is forthcoming, and I have no doubt that if we had a university in this colony contributions from private persons would be given towards it with no stinted hand. In 1884 it was considered desirable in Edinburgh to extend the university there, and in a very short time that town or district raised the sum of £170,000. In Glasgow, in 1870, in a comparatively short time no less a sum than £250,000 was contributed by private liberality to found such an institution in that city as we desire to have established in Queensland. And the gifts in America have been still more liberal. Rockefeller himself gave £1,200,000 to found a university in Chicago, while other capitalists gave a sum of £1,300,000. So that it will be seen that where such institutions are established they are thought well of, and the public are disposed to appreciate their value and to endow them very liberally. I feel sure of the sympathy of hon. members in the matter of establishing a university in order that we may wipe out, as it were, from the colony of Queensland something which we may feel almost as a reproach.

The PREMIER: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If gentlemen who were brought together for the special purpose of dealing with this subject twenty-five years ago concluded that it was then time that a university was established, I think it is pretty evident that we may fairly conclude that the time has now arrived. One remarkable recollection occurs to me in connection with the Puritans of America—and I mention this because no doubt something will be said upon our primary school system—the Puritans of America, singular to say, began their university before they established that great system of primary schools which was afterwards established throughout the whole of America. In America the Puritan Fathers began their university before they began their primary schools. At the present time we would not think of doing anything of that sort.

Mr. KERR: Don't you think that was beginning at the wrong end?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It may be, but I am not going to criticise the Puritan Fathers adversely. Doubtless they were wise in their generation. The only serious objection that I think it is likely any hon. member will have to this proposal is that the whole of the children of the colony do not now receive primary instruction.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am glad I have foreseen the only objection which it seems to me can possibly be urged.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: That is not the only one.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: If no university is to be established until every child in the colony is able to go to a primary school, it is quite certain no university ever will be established.

Mr. McDONALD: Give every child the opportunity.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is impossible. I say every effort has been made to provide the children of the colony with an education, and the only case, I think, where this, unfortunately, has not been done, is where the population is really too sparse. But I do not know that, because of the sparseness of the population, we cannot provide a private tutor or a school for every isolated child in the colony, we shall improve matters at all if we say because of this we will not allow those children who go to our schools, who may perhaps get a very good primary education here, who may

afterwards get a very good secondary education through State liberality—I do not know that we shall improve matters if we say we will debar those children absolutely from completing their education, which we may assume would be to their advantage, and which we may further assume would be to the advantage of the community at large. Therefore I venture to say that while it is the business of the State to do all it can to give an opportunity for every child in the State to receive a primary education, there is yet no justification for not doing more than that and enabling the child who has had a primary education and a secondary education to have a better one, because it is practically impossible to place facilities for education in the hands of people who happen to be so situated or living in such remote parts of the colony that it is impossible in minute detail to carry the system out. If we do all we can to provide primary education, there is a time, and I think probably the time is now, when we may also do something to complete the education the children are given in the schools of the colony, and which if we do not provide it for them they must do without, except those few whose parents are sufficiently well off to enable them to incur the expense of having them educated in Sydney. That, I think, is not considered desirable by the people of this colony any more than it has been considered desirable in any civilised State in the world. The statistics I have given will show that an endeavour has been made in every free and enlightened State to provide something like a university in order that the people of their own country may obtain that education which it is certainly discreditable to them if they are not able to get it in their own land. With regard to the Bill itself, I may say there is practically no departure from the clauses and provisions which will be found in a very great many Acts on the subject. The Bill has been drafted and taken from the Acts which already exist in the various colonies of Australasia. Clause 1 deals with definitions. Clause 6 will probably be considered the most important of the clauses.

Mr. DAWSON : Hear, hear !

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : It deals with the senate—the governing body. It is quite evident a governing body must exist, and the method by which it is proposed this body should be elected, and the powers which it should possess are simply those which experience has shown to be most useful.

Mr. DAWSON : You want to read clause 16 with clause 6.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS : Yes ; clause 16 deals with the powers of the senate ; clause 10 deals with the council, and clause 25 with the statutes the senate may make ; and clause 30 provides what I am quite sure the House will approve of—a condition that there shall be no religious test at all. It would not do to have any limitation by a test which has been done away with in all the other Australian universities. I shall give every consideration to any suggestions which may be made in committee ; but, with regard to the Bill itself, the main question for hon. members to consider is whether they consider it at length desirable to establish a university in the colony, and whether it is proper to vote a sum of £5,000 a year for the purpose of making a beginning in that respect. I think it is our duty to the community to endeavour to see that the necessary instruction shall be obtainable in the colony to enable natives of the colony to prepare themselves for the learned professions. I think it is right that we should endeavour to make knowledge accessible, not only because of its util-

tarian benefit, but because it serves very much to leaven the whole community. I hope hon. members, even though they retain some objections to some of the provisions of the Bill, will be able to see their way to vote for the establishment of a university in the colony. The time has arrived when something of the sort should be done to wipe away what, if we do not do something very shortly, must be considered to be almost a reproach to us. I may, perhaps, point out one circumstance which we may venture to take into account. A citizen who was very well known throughout Australia, and who was considered to be a sort of embodiment of capital, has lately passed away. That gentleman did not leave a will. A good many of us always anticipated that he would leave a will, and that some portion of his vast wealth would be left as a bequest to some benevolent institution, or that at any rate a portion of it would be left to found a university in Queensland. No will has apparently been left, but I point out that nevertheless the State has become heir to a very large amount of wealth under our provisions with regard to succession duty. Owing to our position with regard to legacy and probate duties, I don't know exactly

[7.30 p.m.] how much, but I think a good deal more than £100,000 will fall to the share of the Government, and, I think, we can fairly appropriate a portion of that towards the establishment of a college, which, for all time probably, will be a great boon to the colony. I think we ourselves can make up for that omission—an omission which some of us think has taken place by accident—that is to say, although this money is not actually bequeathed to us to found an institution of this kind, I think we should be justified in devoting a portion of the sum I have mentioned to this purpose. I venture to say that it would be impossible to appropriate the money to any better purpose, if we have the well-being and welfare of the people of the colony at heart. I think this Bill to incorporate and endow the University of Queensland should pass its second reading, and I now beg to move that it be read a second time.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*) : I have not very much to say about this Bill, and I intend to support the second reading.

The PREMIER : Hear, hear !

Mr. DAWSON : I am quite in accord with all the remarks made by the Secretary for Lands as far as the value of higher education is concerned. I contend that we ought to do all we possibly can to educate our people, because the more educated the people are the better citizens they will become. I am only sorry that when I was a young man education was not easily obtained, and I know the loss of that now.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER : What about children who cannot get primary education ?

Mr. DAWSON : Some hon. members have taken the objection that before the establishment of a university in this colony we should give the children of the State every facility for primary education ; but I deny that the two things conflict. There is no reason on earth why every possible facility should not be given to enable every child, whether in the town or in the bush of this colony, to get primary instruction, but that will not necessarily conflict with the establishment of a university for the higher education of the people. At any rate, my position is this : I am willing to do everything in my power to assist any movement or any scheme that can be devised by any hon. member of this Chamber to facilitate primary education being imparted to young children, and higher education being imported to grown-up children.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. DAWSON: It is on account of that holding that I now intend to support the second reading of this Bill. But I may direct the attention of hon. members to the fact that some time ago there was a good practice initiated in this Chamber by the late Premier—the Hon. T. J. Byrnes—that when any Bill of any importance was introduced into this Chamber, and other statutes were followed, some reference should be made at the end of the Bill to these statutes—that a synopsis should be made of the clauses borrowed, and also pointing out where there was any alteration in the existing law. That system was highly commended by hon. members on both sides of the House; and I think that in a Bill of this kind, which borrows largely from other Acts, this practice should have been followed.

The PREMIER: The case you refer to was that of antecedent local legislation.

Mr. DAWSON: Not altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: I can give the hon. gentleman the details as to where the several clauses were borrowed from.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes, no doubt; but I say they should be in the Bill itself. Now that we have a Government draftsman, I think the very least we can expect from him is that what I suggest should be done. It would save hon. members a lot of time and trouble in hunting up references, and enable hon. members to more readily understand the meaning of legislation of this kind. I must say that the amount put down in this Bill is absurd. It is a matter of detail, but still, as the hon. member has mentioned this, I think I am justified in making some reference to it. Fancy £5,000 being put down to establish a university! I think it is one of the most ridiculous things that anyone could imagine. The hon. gentleman said that in establishing the University of Sydney only £5,000 was voted, and that £9,000 was voted for the Melbourne University; but as the hon. member for Woollongabba interjected that was in 1850—nearly fifty years ago, and here we are in 1899. Can hon. members think for a single instant that such a sum is sufficient to establish a university here now?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have done it in Adelaide for that sum.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes; but Adelaide has not half the population nor half the prosperity of Brisbane. I say that where we can afford £1 South Australia can only afford 2s. 6d. This is the most prosperous colony of the whole group, and if there is any colony that can afford to make a liberal allowance for higher education it is Queensland. And yet the Government come along with the miserable, paltry, measly sum of £5,000 for this purpose! I repeat that it is absurd. We, in a light and airy fashion, vote an amount of money to blow men's brains out, and yet we are only asked to vote £5,000 to put brains into men's heads!

The PREMIER: They are both educative.

Mr. DAWSON: Does the hon. member say that the Dum-dum bullet is educative.

The PREMIER: Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON: If the hon. gentleman received one in his head he would not think so—he would not have time to think. At any rate, we are paying any amount of money to blow men's brains out, and only a very small item to cultivate men's brains.

Mr. GIVENS: What is the good of cultivating men's brains if you are going to blow them out afterwards?

Mr. DAWSON: While I agree with the intention of the hon. member who is introducing this Bill—that we should assist higher education—I object entirely to the method, or principle, of managing that institution, if it is established, according to the proposals laid down in this Bill.

The hon. gentleman has stated in his speech that there was nothing in this Bill that could be called a departure from any University Bill passed in any of the other colonies. I would tell the hon. gentleman that the one thing which I object to is a serious departure he has made. According to clause 6 the senate is to consist of—

Twenty male persons, appointed or elected as herein after provided, and the Minister, though in these days of liberal opinions—in these days of young women's christian temperance associations, and grammar schools, and female franchise associations, and equal franchise associations—I fail to see any particular reason why the governing body of this proposed university should be strictly confined to males.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: I fail to see any reason why an intelligent, educated female should not be as well entitled to occupy a position as one of the senators of the proposed university as any man in the colony. As a matter of fact, I think it would be a good thing if we had a few Miss Fewings in this colony to counteract the evil influence of the trustees of grammar schools. The senate is to consist of twenty male persons, and then the measure goes on to define the powers of the senate. They are to have various powers, and according to section 16, they are absolutely independent in the management of this university, in the appointment of the officers, and in the dismissal of the officers of the council. The terms "senate" and "council" seem to me to have been rather loosely chosen.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is the general way.

Mr. DAWSON: The terms "senate" and "council," taken in a governing sense, really mean the same thing. Under the University Acts of South Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales, the body that has absolute control over the university is the council. In this Bill the order is reversed and the body that is going to govern is the senate. Now the senate will be these twenty male persons, but the council, which is the democratic assembly, which should be the body which should dominate and govern, will be nowhere at all. In all other University Acts throughout Australia, the larger body, the Assembly to use an illustration, governs, but in this particular Bill, according to section 16, subsection 2, it is perfectly clear that it is only the twenty senators who are to govern, and the council are to be absolutely ignored.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The council elect the senate.

Mr. DAWSON: The twenty persons I mention, together with the Minister, are to compose the senate, which will do all the governing.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The council is the body to elect them.

Mr. DAWSON: No; the council includes the senate. There are two distinct parties, the senate and the council, and the senate is composed of twenty members, with the Minister. Clause 10 says—

The council shall consist of the members of the senate; of all graduates of the university of the degree of master or doctor, and of all other graduates of the university of three years' standing; of all graduates of other universities of three years' standing who have been admitted to degrees in the university; and of such fellows, members, licentiates, and associates of colleges or institutions duly authorised to grant degrees, diplomas, licenses, or certificates as may under the statutes be admitted to be members of the council.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They hold the franchise.

Mr. DAWSON: Quite so, but what I want the hon. gentleman to understand is that the senate is a limited number of twenty. The

council is the enlarged number mentioned in clause 10, and it may consist of almost any number. The proposal of this Bill is an absolute reversal of the usual practice in the other colonies. In the other colonies the council is absolutely dominant. Nothing can be done by the senate without the concurrence of the council, but in this Bill it is proposed that the senate shall do what it likes without consulting the council at all. That is what I object to.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The senate is the parliament really, and the council are the electors.

Mr. DAWSON: No, I would remind the hon. gentleman that this Assembly cannot do what it likes without the concurrence of the Council, and the Council cannot do what it likes without the concurrence of the Assembly.

The PREMIER: We can act without going back to the electors every time.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman cannot point to a single instance where we can do anything alone.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: This is merely a question of name. One is merely an electoral body. Those who have the franchise call into existence the senate. You can call the senate and council by any other name, and it will not alter their functions.

Mr. DAWSON: I wonder if the hon. gentleman has read his own Bill. Has the hon. gentleman read clause 16? Subsection 2 says—

The council may from time to time make representations to the senate upon any matters concerning the university, and the senate shall have due regard to all such representations.

But there is another following subsection, which says—

But the senate shall not be bound to wait for any representation of the council before exercising any of its powers or to comply with any such representation.

That is in plain terms that these twenty persons, who, after all, are only part of the council, shall have absolute control of the government of this university.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They are the executive, of course.

Mr. DAWSON: They are not the executive.

The PREMIER: Yes, they are.

Mr. DAWSON: I challenge the Premier, who has not already spoken, to point to any one of the University Acts of any of the colonies where any similar provision to this may be found. Can he find a single instance in any one of our University Acts where the senate governs?

The PREMIER: I think so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You can call it what you like.

Mr. DAWSON: I challenge him to produce any single Act in Australia where the senate governs. As a matter of fact, in every University Bill we have in Australia, the council is absolutely master of the senate. What the hon. gentleman does in this Bill is to reverse that order, and make the senate master of the council—that is, to make the senate master of the body that creates it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That is always the case.

The PREMIER: Look at section 16—

The senate shall be the governing body of the university.

Mr. DAWSON: Just so.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Change the name. It does not make any difference if you change the name as long as the functions remain the same.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You have done nothing. Suppose you call it the council what difference will it make? There must be one governing body and one electoral.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAWSON: Suppose you call it the council, that would be two councils.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is one governing body. The other is elective.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DAWSON: How can you possibly call this small elective body "the council" when the body that creates that body is also called "the council"? It would lead to endless confusion. You might call it the larger and the smaller council. Perhaps that would be much more intelligent than to call them senate and council. What I am endeavouring to point out is that the hon. gentleman in this Bill has proposed to reverse the system that has been in practice in the University Bills in Australia—that the smaller body is to govern, despite and independently of the larger body called the council. Of course, this is a matter that will be debated in committee; but I have risen to draw attention to it in order to give hon. members timely warning that the principle proposed in this Bill is going to be opposed by hon. members on this side of the House, so that they will not be taken by surprise.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Section 16, is it?

The PREMIER (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*): From the opening remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, I was very glad to hear that he intended to approve of the passing of this Bill to provide for a university in Queensland. I think all of us—and by that term I include every member of this Chamber—are desirous of seeing the coping stone placed upon what we are all bound to recognise as the great educational system of this colony.

Mr. GIVENS: Wouldn't it be better to have a sure foundation before you put on the coping stone?

The PREMIER: We are all bound to admit that the educational system of Queensland compares favourably with that of any other of the sister colonies. In fact, Queensland has attained a very gratifying position in the world as having a system under which her people are being taught, and have opportunities of education which, perhaps, is not equally obtainable in other parts of Australia or even of the British Empire. It is the very proper ambition and desire of those who have observed the progress of our educational system that, at any rate, we should possess the means of having a university to confer degrees upon our youths who have exhibited great natural abilities, and have advanced so in their educational attainments that they are desirous of entering the learned professions—that they should be able to make that progress in culture without being compelled to have recourse to the southern colonies. I certainly think that Queensland has shown distinctly that she possesses, in her rising population, youths possessed of great brain power which will enable them to meet fairly the youths of the other Australian States; but I have always deemed it a matter of regret that these youths, who are desirous of entering the learned professions, should have been at the disadvantage of having to obtain their degrees at the universities down in the south. I have always deemed it most desirable, if it was at all possible, that we should establish a university in our midst. When expressing that opinion, I do not for one moment wish to convey the idea of a university at one end of the colony. I say distinctly that I look forward to the time when we will have universities established, not in the South, nor in the Centre and in the West, but extensively over our large and increasing population, where, I hope, those who are advancing in education and are desirous of entering the learned professions will be able to

obtain their degrees, not necessarily in Brisbane, but in Rockhampton, Townsville, and, possibly, other towns in different parts of this great territory. Look at what has been attempted elsewhere! Take Canada, for instance—a colonial dependency. There are sixteen universities in that great dominion. Here, in Australia, we have only about three or four, although we boast of our educational progress. Does that show that we are giving the facilities to our rising population to enter the learned professions that are given in other parts of the British dominions? And look at Germany! Why, all the large cities in Germany have universities established in their midst. We must admit, proud as we are of the educational system of the mother country, that Germany has a great lead amongst the cultured countries of Europe, and that it is to her universities that have been attracted our most eminent scientists for the purpose of completing that sound education which has made Huxley, Tyndall, and others whose names are ever memorable. They obtained their education not in Great Britain, but in the universities of Jenner and other cities in Germany, which have for all time had the reputation of imparting sound scientific education.

This, however, is by the way to [8 p.m.] indicate that I consider the time has arrived when our educational facilities should be consummated by the initiation of a university; and though this may be regarded as a day of small things, because £5,000 does not seem a large sum for the purpose, still it is a commencement. It will at any rate provide for the initiation of the institution, and I hope the university system of Queensland will comprise a chair of mining and other matters of practical utility. I can hardly imagine any hon. member who recognises the growing importance of this great country, and the great advantages of scientific and professional education, hesitating for a moment to give his fullest support to a Bill which desires to initiate a system of university education, and keep within our midst the rising culture and intelligence of this colony, and give them the advantage of the highest education obtainable at this end of the nineteenth century. I was therefore somewhat surprised, after the hon. member's preliminary encouraging remarks, to hear him find fault with the Bill. I am not prepared, I confess, to analyse it and compare it with the measures under which institutions of a similar character in the southern colonies have been founded, but it appears to me obvious that there must be some governing body in an institution of this sort, whether it is called a senate or any other name. It seems to me that the vital principle should not be obscured by details of that sort, and I would ask whether we should not rather be proud to have a university established in Queensland, and thus rank with the older colonies of Australasia in providing up-to-date education and culture for our youth, who are intellectually as vigorous and able as any of the rising populations of the British Empire. I consider that it is a cruel thing to deprive them of the opportunity of obtaining in their own colony scientific and professional education which will enable them to make their mark in the world. We are all desirous to see Queensland to the fore in education as well as in other matters, and I believe that my hon. colleague, in introducing this Bill, is doing what is required, and has been long sought for by the people of the colony, and I ask hon. members to divest themselves of the idea that this is in any way a measure to aggrandise one portion of the colony at the expense of another. I regard the establishment of institutions of this kind in different parts of

the colony as necessary corollaries of our educational system, under which I trust that the rising youth of this colony may be enabled to take their stand amongst the cultured peoples of the world. We must recognise that within the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty education has advanced by leaps and bounds. If we look at the statistics of former years we see how many there were unable to read and write, but to-day it is considered a disgrace not to be able to read and write. Science and culture have advanced by such strides that a man who twenty years ago would have been considered fairly well educated would to-day be found lagging behind in the march of intellectual progress. If we want to advance Queensland to the position of one of the great States of Australia we ought certainly to readily concur in providing the advantages of a university education, even in the proposed tentative form which I hope in the near future will develop into a fuller and more efficient system. I am sure we all pride ourselves upon the educational status of this country, and if we were to restrict the movement at the present time we would be doing not only a great injury to the reputation of Queensland, but also to the rising intelligences who are anxious to have the opportunity of advancing in the learned professions without having to expatriate themselves from the country of their birth.

* Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): The hon. gentleman expressed the hope that no member of this Chamber will venture to oppose the establishment of a university in this colony, but I as one member of this House will certainly do so. I shall oppose this fad of a university as a further sop to Brisbane, because of the neglect shown to various parts of the Northern and Central portions of the colony in the matter of education. I will object to it as a further sop to the South until every child is provided with free compulsory and secular education in the Central and Northern districts, where there are hundreds of children with no schools at all. I oppose it as a further sop on the part of the Government who have already spent such enormous sums as sops to the South, and as a further proposal on their part to make themselves right with that part of the country which gives them their majority. I believe that primary education and higher education should be free, compulsory, and secular, and I do not believe in a university, the establishment of which, by the way, might be left to the Federal Government, like some other matters. If we propose that there should be old age pensions, we are asked to leave it to the Federal Government; if we propose a Workmen's Compensation Bill, the suggestion is made to leave it to the Federal Government; if we propose an Early Closing Bill, it is "leave it to the Federal Government"; whenever a proposition comes from this side of the House for the purpose of benefiting the working people of this country, on whose broad backs rests the burden of carrying on the government of the country, and who contribute, according to the Treasurer in his Financial Statement, the burden of the excise and Customs duty—whenever we propose any measure to improve their material condition, it is suggested by members on the other side, with an ill-concealed smile of satire, that we should leave it to the Federal Government. I also meet this proposition for the establishment of a university with the recommendation to leave it to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the Northern and Central Press—the Ministerial Press, as I shall prove by quotations—have been saying that the establishment of a university ought to be left to the Federal Government. Now, where did the Government get this idea from?

Mr. DAWSON : Do you believe in the university of experience?

Mr. LESINA : That is the university the majority of us have been educated in. I find on hunting up the Premier's manifesto to the electors before the last general election this paragraph under the heading "Education"—

Very dear to my immediate predecessor—
it came out of the box you see—

was the cause of higher education. In connection with this subject the new Parliament will, if the Government receive a renewal of public confidence, be asked to give its attention to a measure for the establishment of a university for Queensland, in which a chair of mines will be a conspicuous feature.

What do we want with a chair of mines in Brisbane? We want a chair of mines on the gold-fields, as was pointed out by the *Northern Miner*—an important paper published in the North. That paper—a Ministerial organ, too—on 16th February, 1899, in a leading article on the Government programme, when dealing with this absurd fad, made this recommendation—

For mining nothing is to be done except the establishment of a chair of mines in a Brisbane University. While there are hundreds of children "out back" who have no schools which they can attend, the fad of a Brisbane University is particularly objectionable, and every country member should be refused support who does not promise to stoutly oppose the establishment of another Brisbane white elephant. So far as the mining districts are concerned, they want no metropolitan school of mines; if the Government have any wish to benefit the industry they should establish schools of mines at centres where there are minerals to be won, and where there are people who desire to acquaint themselves with the devices of science for the recovery of metals from refractory ores.

I believe that accounts for the assistance given yesterday on the motion for the establishment of a school of metallurgy. The object is to create a white elephant in Brisbane at the expense of the North and Centre—as well as at the expense of Southern people—and then to establish a school of mines in connection with it. I am not opposed to the establishment of universities generally, or to the spread of education, but I am opposed to it when we find the great majority of the children of the pioneers of this country—of the selectors, the farmers, the miners, the men who go out into the West and into the North, and into the Centre of the colony, and develop its primary industries, who risk heat and rain, and battle with the elements in building up a livelihood for themselves and their families—when we find their children are running about like aborigines. No schools for them. I know a district in the Clermont electorate where there are twenty-five or thirty children, and where they have no school at all. They are not within fifteen or twenty miles of a school. The nearest school, by-the-way, is a ramshackle old building about fifty years old, that wants painting inside and out, that wants refurnishing and adding to. If the money was spent on establishing little schools for the purpose of teaching the three R's to the children of the miner, the fossickers, and others who are living in these districts, the Government of the day would be doing a great deal more to advance the cause of education than they will by taking £5,000 from the public Treasury, and creating another white elephant in Brisbane—another sop to the supporters whom they gather round them from the Southern portion of the colony. The people in the North and Centre want more education. It is a plank of the platform upon which I have been elected, and upon which the majority of hon. members on this side have been elected, that primary as well as higher education shall be free, compulsory, and secular; and we want no faddist university of this description.

Mr. KEOGH : Cannot you get provisional schools up there?

Mr. LEAHY : Did you say the people of the Centre and North want educating?

Mr. LESINA : Here is a Central paper—the *Rockhampton Bulletin* of 12th September, 1899—

The University Bill is simply a sop to Brisbane. Now that the Commonwealth is to be founded, and Queensland is to be one of the States, this ought to be left till an Australian University is founded.

Why should they not wait now till the gigantic intellects of Australia which initiated this Federal Government meet together and establish an Australian university, with branches in the various colonies, wherever the increase in population justifies the establishing of such an institution? What is the use of the universities of Sydney and Melbourne? How many sons of working men get into them? Those universities are not for the children of the men who wear moleskin trousers and blucher boots. Hardly 1 per cent. of them get there. There have been a few instances, but in those cases they have been men of persuading genius—men of remarkable ability, and they forced themselves to the front, and always will, irrespective of education altogether. I am satisfied in my own mind that the son of the tank-sinker out West; of the fossicker in the Clermont district; of the gold-miner of Charters Towers, will have a very poor chance of reaching this university. Nearly all universities in course of time become snobbish, and cater specially for the middle and higher classes—for persons who can well afford to pay for the proper education of their children; and the man who does not particularly care about the tinpot, newly-established, buckram order of university which will be established here will, if he has money, send his boy abroad to Sydney, Melbourne, or to one of the old schools in the United Kingdom.

Mr. DAWSON : Why send him there because their schools have been established for some time? Why should we not make a start?

Mr. LESINA : Furthermore, the hon. gentleman says that we should establish a university so that we might take our place with the other colonies. That is the argument that is brought up here every time some new-fangled proposition is sprung upon the House—"We must take our place among the nations of the world." "We"—and the Premier sticks out his chest—"we must take our place among the nations of the world." "We must have a university because the other colonies have universities." I notice that whenever we, on this side, use that argument, it always falls flat. When we get up and say we should pass a Bill to compensate workmen who are injured through the negligence or parsimony of their employers, and we instance the fact that conservative Great Britain has passed legislation for this purpose, we are met with the remark, "We have not the population." When we say we should take our place among the nations of the world in matters of domestic reform legislation, that argument does not appeal to hon. members on the other side. It is remarkable to me the peculiar standpoint they take up in dealing with a matter upon which there is certainly an allowable difference of opinion, and the remarkable unanimity that always characterises hon. members on that side when it comes to establishing a white elephant that will require an expenditure which will be like pouring water through a sieve. It was a strong argument in favour of spending £32,000 to send our troops abroad—"We must take our place among the nations of the world."

The SPEAKER : Order!

Mr. LESINA : That argument I noticed ran right through the speech of the hon. gentleman. This vote of £5,000 is only one small item which,

in looking through the Treasurer's Statement, I find promised to Brisbane. I find that this is a mere £5,000 out of £116,500. It may reach an even larger sum than that; but I find that there are votes for a public library, a museum, an art gallery, land and survey offices, new post and telegraph buildings, public abattoirs, a new railway station. All these come to something like £116,500 which is to be expended in Brisbane by the hon. gentlemen who have control of those departments.

Mr. McDONALD: But that is only the amount for this year. Goodness knows how much it will be!

Mr. BROWNE: That is owing to the Northern influence in the Cabinet. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: While the hon. gentleman proposes to spend money in this lavish fashion in the South, we can get nothing at all in the Centre or the North. I have my mind's eye on a little school situated at a place called Douglas Creek, in the Clermont electorate. The school is so small that two hon. members standing up with their arms extended could reach the wall on both sides.

The TREASURER: Who is to blame for that?

Mr. LESINA: The Government, who spend money on white elephant universities and will not spend money out there to promote primary education. This building is composed of wood, with an iron roof, and in the middle of summer it is pretty hot there—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is of course entitled to show whether the proposed scheme is sufficient or insufficient, but he is not entitled to enter upon the discussion of purely local questions, such as he is discussing now. The question before the House is the motion for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. LESINA: As a matter of fact I was merely making an incidental reference to point my argument against the establishment of a university altogether. I do not believe in the establishment of this university, for reasons I am trying to set forth. I do not believe it should be established before the primary education of the people has been thoroughly dealt with, and before that primary education is made absolutely free. What advantage will the establishment of this university be to the working people? We are entitled to look at it from the point of view of those who are sent here directly to represent large bodies of working people who are following manifold occupations in various parts of the colony. How is the child of fourteen compelled to slave from ten to sixteen hours a day in a factory to be benefited by the establishment of a university in Brisbane which is to cost so large an amount of money? I do not think the working people will be benefited. The Inspector of Factories, in his last report, speaking of the employment of children under the statutory age of fourteen years says—

The experience of the past two years has shown the literal enforcement of this clause to be extremely harsh in some instances, so much so that I have been constrained to recommend several extreme cases of poverty as fit cases in which to relax the provisions of the section.

Here we have parents who, under the stress of economical conditions, are compelled to send their children to work under the age of fourteen years, because their wages are necessary to assist in maintaining the standard of comfort in the home. How are they going to be benefited by the establishment of a University of Queensland? Poverty is so extreme in various parts of Queensland that the Inspector of Factories deems it advisable, in some instances, to allow children to work in factories at an immature age, stunting

their physical frames and mental abilities, and destroying their lives. Another objection I have to the Bill is that it does not place women on an equality with men. For years past, men belonging to the party of progress have been fighting for the admission of women into universities.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Look at clause 31, and you will find that you are quite wrong.

Mr. LESINA: I want to see women seated on the governing body, and that is a matter in which the Bill can be very much improved. It does not intend to benefit the daughters of working men. There are scores of working women and working girls in this colony, a glimpse of whose sordid workaday lives is given in the factories inspector's report. We find these women completing their education at a very early age, and sweating for 10s. a week—

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member is not dealing with matters connected with the subject before the House. I think he is claiming too wide a latitude in the discussion of this question.

Mr. LESINA: I was going to point my argument that the establishment of this university to encourage the budding genius of Queensland children must absolutely fail if the budding genius is working in a factory at fourteen years of age; and I do not see that that argument can be very well ignored in considering the question of establishing a university at all. They have not the opportunity of getting an ordinary primary education, let alone going to a university. Here is another objection. The teaching of our schools in turning out so many budding lawyers' clerks is going to make potatoes £20 a ton in Queensland before long. Boys and girls get their heads stuffed full of first-class information, filled with Greek and Latin words. Boys and girls who have been instructed in dead philosophies, who can work out the most extraordinary arithmetical problems, will be going to the Labour Bureau seeking assistance. The country is over-run with these professional persons—lawyers, clergymen, clerks, and persons who have been gifted by nature with fairly good intellects, are turned on the labour market in shoals year after year. You can see them everywhere seated at tables in their little offices waiting for something to turn up. They do not take a prominent part in the workaday world. They do not take to politics. There are very few gentlemen with a university education in this House. There is only, in fact, one whom I can readily call to mind, and he is absent when this important measure is under consideration. And we are asked to take this large sum out of an already depleted Treasury to perpetuate this state of thing. I protest against it with my voice and vote, and I hope the Bill will be defeated. It would do far more good to spend the money in establishing little schools in outside spots, where so many children can get no education whatever. That is far better than filling the minds of our youth with dead and gone philosophies, and languages which are never spoken but in the heat of passion, and then only for the purpose of deceiving the public. Provide places where they can learn mineralogy or agriculture; such to my mind are most excellent institutions. Another and a final objection, which I referred to earlier in a brief way, is with regard to the establishment of a chair of mines in connection with the university. I trust that if the university is established a chair of mines will not be established in connection with it. As the *North-eastern Miner* has pointed out, it would be utterly useless to people at Charters Towers, Croydon, Clermont, Gympie, and places like those. They will not send young men down here to study

mineralogy. What they want is practical instruction in the science of extracting the precious metals, and you cannot do that by sending

[8.30 p.m.] them down in tall collars to Brisbane to listen to lectures from a learned professor who does not know a pick-handle from a windlass. I think the establishment of a university with the secondary consideration of this chair of mines will be a mistake, and if the question goes to a division I shall vote against the second reading of this Bill, as I do not think we should establish a university until such time as the people in the Centre and the North get better consideration than they receive now.

Mr. CALLAN (*Fitzroy*): The Premier stated just now that it would be a matter of surprise to him if any man who valued education voted against this Bill. I believe there is no man in this House who values education more highly than I do. I also claim to be a fairly well-educated man, and though I do not say that a university should not be established in Queensland at some time, yet I do say that this is not the proper time to do it. I say that for reasons which I trust will be satisfactory to many members in this House—members who, like myself, know this country, and know what it wants in the way of education. I say that until its wants are supplied in that respect, until our primary education is on a much more elaborate scale than it is at present; and until it is made much more inexpensive to the great mass of population, we should not dream of establishing anything like a university in Queensland. The Secretary for Lands stated that everything had been done that could be done for the primary education of the people of this colony. I do not know if the hon. gentleman goes about blindfolded, or whether his particular district, which is represented by two Ministers in this House, is more highly favoured than other districts, but I say most emphatically that, although a great deal has been done as far as primary education is concerned, yet not half enough has been done in many of the outside districts. The rapidity of the growth of population in my district has caused me to make many calls on the department, and the department has been very good to me. Still I would point out that at the Crocodile, which has now a large population, they have the same school-house as was in existence there thirty-five years ago. It may be said that the people there should subscribe their quota of one-fifth and get a new school, but I would point out that in mining places the people are remarkably poor, and cannot raise the amount required by the department without a great deal of difficulty. I am quite aware that you, Sir, checked an hon. member just now for dealing with a different matter; but I am bringing this forward as an argument why a university should not be established in the colony at the present time, and I trust you will consider that I am entirely in order in doing so. I have a letter here on that particular subject—

The SPEAKER: The hon. member will not be in order in pursuing that subject in detail. He is entitled to refer to it casually in support of his argument; but he will not be in order in discussing local grievances on the motion for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. CALLAN: I do not want to discuss any special grievance in connection with this Bill. I am simply bringing this matter forward in support of my argument, and surely I am entitled to show the House the reason I do not believe in this Bill.

The SPEAKER: The hon. member is entitled to refer in passing to the subject he has just raised in illustration of the objection he has

to the proposed Bill, but to deal at length with a local grievance respecting a primary school will be quite out of order on the motion now before the House. I trust the hon. member will not continue in that course.

Mr. CALLAN: Certainly not; I shall not act contrary to your ruling. At the same time I wish to point out that I know of a certain place where there are 212 children, and there is only a provisional school which has been in existence for the last thirty-five years, and I say it is a scandal for the Government to persist in making those people pay one-fifth of the cost of erecting a new school, and then propose to spend a large sum of money on a university. That, I think, is not out of order. I have not mentioned the place, but my friend, the Secretary for Railways, has often been in the school, and the Treasurer has seen it several times. And that is not a solitary instance. How many places are there in the colony where a similar state of things exists? How many children are there in the colony who are not getting primary education? Scores and scores of them. And yet it is proposed to build a university in Brisbane. I have no objection to a university being built in Brisbane. That is a matter which does not concern me a single straw. But I say it would be a mistake from a pecuniary point of view to build a university in Brisbane at the present time, because it would be of no avail to the people of Queensland generally. It would only be available to the people in Brisbane and west of Brisbane. Would the people of Rockhampton, Townsville, Charters Towers, or Cairns take advantage of such a university? Not a single one of them, unless he was a very foolish man, because he would get better teaching and a much better climate for his children in Sydney and Melbourne. When I lived at Rockhampton I had the advantage of one of the best grammar schools in the colony, but I did not send my boys there. I sent them down to Melbourne, because I knew they would get equally as good education there, if not better, and physical training as well. The people of the North will not make use of this proposed university, because it will cost them no more, or very little more, to send their children to Sydney or Melbourne than it will to send them to Brisbane. The Secretary for Lands told us that £5,000 is all that will be required for this university. Is there a sensible man in the House who thinks that a university can be started for three or four times that amount, and get the first-class teachers they have in the south? We do not want an establishment like those, but we want something like the teachers they have got in those universities. It is not the building, but the teachers that will cost the money. If a university is established here at the present time the fees that will be received will not be a flea-bite of the expenses. The Secretary for Lands stated that in 1870 an enormous sum was subscribed for a university at Glasgow. That city has a larger population now, whatever it had then, than the whole of Queensland, and yet they waited until 1870 before they established a university.

The TREASURER: They had one there centuries ago.

Mr. CALLAN: I am not answering the Treasurer who interjects, but the Secretary for Lands, who made a certain statement. How does the Treasurer know they had one there centuries ago? The hon. gentleman was not there centuries ago.

The TREASURER: I have been there.

Mr. CALLAN: It is a pity the hon. gentleman did not get a better education before he left. The Secretary for Lands pointed out that nearly all the States of America have universities. Possibly they have, but I do not suppose

there is one of them that has a university that has not three times the population of Queensland. The fact is this: That if a university is started here—and the Treasurer knows it as well as I do—the people of Townsville, Rockhampton, Charters Towers, and the people of Queensland generally will not take advantage of it, and it will simply be a university for Brisbane, and the people in the West who may wish to send their children to a better climate.

The TREASURER: Question!

Mr. CALLAN: What does the hon. member do when he gets the chance? Does he not go away south to recuperate?

The TREASURER: No, I go North.

Mr. CALLAN: He does not go North when he gets the chance to go South. Where do hon. members go when they want to get strength and health? This matter of the payment of one-fifth towards the erection of State schools should be done away with before there is talk of a university. That money to make up the one-fifth comes out of the pockets of the fathers and mothers of the children of the district in which the school is to be established, and I say it is a drawback to education. I know a place—I will not name it—where there is a school, the length of which is not more than across the Chamber, and it is not more than 14 feet wide, but there are 212 children on the roll. That is a positive fact. The money has been sent down from that school—£112—and not a single thing has been done by the Government to start the additions to that school, though the money was sent down months ago.

Mr. STEWART: I know the place, too.

The SECRETARY FOR WORKS: Which school is that?

Mr. CALLAN: There is another matter I wish to refer to as a further reason why this university should not be started now. I am frightened to deal with this, Mr. Speaker, as I do not like you to be pulling me up. This House is aware that the Government grants scholarships to the grammar schools to candidates who are successful in obtaining a certain number of marks. I have before me here particulars of a school which gained thirteen scholarships. The children who are ambitious enough to go in for these scholarships, and who have brains enough to win them, would like to go on with them and take advantage of them, but if they live in far outside localities their parents may not be able to send them to a grammar school. That is the case with the school I refer to, and only one out of the thirteen who gained scholarships was able to go down to the grammar school at Rockhampton. It is humbug of the Government to give these facilities for getting a grammar school education when they do not provide facilities for the children who gain them to go down to a grammar school.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member must be aware—in fact, from his remarks in initiating reference to this matter, he showed that he was aware—that he would not be in order in the course he is now taking. The matter he is now discussing is one which ought to be discussed upon the vote for grammar schools, or upon the general vote for education, and not upon a motion for the second reading of the Bill now before the House. I trust the hon. member will not continue to discuss that subject.

Mr. CALLAN: I so very seldom trouble you that with all due respect to you, Sir, I think you are remarkably hard upon me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. CALLAN: I am expressing in every word I have said reasons why I think a university should not be started. With all due respect to

you, I have not said one single word on the subject which in my opinion you should object to.

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. CALLAN: That is all, Sir. I shall say no more.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*): Although I will not support this Bill, I will not vote against it, because I think that would be a rather dog-in-the-manger proceeding—that if I cannot get what I want I will try to prevent anything being got at all. I think the time has come to enter a protest against unnecessary expenditure when it is found that necessary expenditure is not being made. I understand from your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that we cannot go very far afield in this discussion; but the time will come later on, on the Estimates, when more may be said. Still, I would like to say something in contradiction of the remarks made by the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill. He said that up to the present every effort has been made to educate the children, and that if the university was to wait until all the children had an opportunity of being taught we would never have a university at all. The hon. members for Fitzroy and Clermont both deplored the want of schools in certain districts. That is where it seems to me the mistake is; the department and some hon. members seem to have the idea that it is absolutely necessary to have schools on purpose to promote education. My contention has been that it is not so, and that under certain circumstances out West, the cost of schools is unnecessary. There is a much easier way of getting at the children, who, under no circumstances whatever, could be got to attend schools. It does not matter if you dotted the schools about almost as closely as homesteads, you could not possibly, even then, gather in all the children. I understand you will not allow me, Sir, to go into a discussion on a possible way of providing for the teaching of the children in the West, on the matter before the House now. I will have an opportunity later on. I make my contention because on the 26th August, 1897, the following resolution was agreed to by this House:—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. STORY: Can I not go on with that? (Laughter.) I was intending to show that as the House had come to a resolution to do a certain thing that necessitated the spending of money and not having done it the Government are going now to spend money in another direction, it is the duty of members who supported me on that occasion—and there were a great number—to see that that resolution of the House is carried out in that direction before there is any further expenditure in some other direction. That resolution has not been given the slightest effect to.

Mr. LEAHY: A resolution dies with the session.

Mr. STORY: If a resolution dies with a session, we have only to let the session end, and the resolution has no effect. I always understood that a resolution of this House was almost an instruction to the Minister in charge of a department to do certain things.

The TREASURER: What was the resolution?

Mr. STORY: I was going to read the resolution, but the Speaker will object to my doing that. I shall wait for another opportunity of speaking on this matter, because it is necessary that it should be gone into again. I am explaining now why I cannot support this Bill. I explained to the Premier some time ago that I was not going to support it, and the reason I told him was because that effect had not been given to a certain resolution of this House in a direction which was absolutely more necessary than the principle embodied in this Bill.

Mr. SMITH (*Bowen*): I am not much impressed with the arguments used against the establishment of a university here. One argument used in this connection is that, because the children of the colony cannot possess themselves of the advantages of primary school education, therefore the university should not be established; but I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that the two things can go hand in hand. Are we to do without the privileges of a university because all the children of the colony cannot avail themselves of the educational system already established? Are the youths of Queensland who might be capable of taking benefits from a university education to be deprived of that privilege because in some places children are so far removed from centres of population that our educational system cannot reach them? I think that that argument will not hold water. I think a university will be the coping stone to our present educational system. We have been a considerable time now talking about the establishment of a university for Queensland, and it is no argument to say that the boys who are grown up and ready for a university education can go to Sydney, Melbourne, or Adelaide. If we confine the system in that way, we shall be depriving hundreds of our young men in Queensland from having a university education at all. That being the case—and I think my reasoning is quite perfect in that respect—an effort should be made to establish a university here in Brisbane, because Brisbane contains one-quarter of the population of the colony; but it does not follow that if a university is established in Brisbane, similar institutions cannot be established in other centres. I think there is something in the argument, that when federation is an established fact that we should have a federal university, for this reason: That a degree taken in the federal university in the federal capital, will be of more value in the eyes of the world than any degree which is obtained in a university in any of the States. How is it that the degrees of the University of Dublin stand higher in the estimation of the world than a great many others? Because that university has attained that perfection that its degrees are looked upon as more valuable than degrees taken in many other places. It occurred to me when studying the Bill that if a federal university were established, that the universities in the different States would act as feeders to the federal university, and I think that will be the possible result yet. Something has been said about the initial cost of this university, and objection has been raised that £5,000 is not enough.

Mr. DUNSFORD: That is not the limit under the Bill.

Mr. SMITH: I do not think that £5,000 is enough to begin with.

Mr. DUNSFORD: There is nothing to prevent £50,000 being voted.

Mr. SMITH: I think a great deal more than £5,000 will be needed; it is more likely to be £20,000; but I do not object to the establishment of this university because it will cost a little more money. I look at the matter in this light: If this institution is established in Queensland there will be an opportunity for those who feel so disposed to donate some of their money to it; and there are others who would be only too glad to devote part of their riches to assist in establishing some bursary or scholarship if this university is established. Perhaps it might be well that an institution of this kind should be established in Queensland on a small scale. I do not think that the arguments used against the establishment of a univer-

sity here are really worthy of much consideration.

As far as primary education goes, [9 p.m.] my experience has been that the Education Department are doing a great deal to diffuse education in the outside districts of the colony. I know I have never been refused any request that has been made from even the smallest centre of population in my electorate where children could be gathered together. In fact, I believe a provisional school will be established if only twelve children can be got to attend. I have no reason to think that a university would not be of very great benefit to the colony, and therefore I shall have much pleasure in voting for the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): I am very sorry that I feel compelled to vote against the second reading of this Bill; not that I disapprove of the institution of a university in Queensland, because no man is more sensible of the benefits of higher education than I am, but for the reason that I consider the time has not arrived for the establishment of an institution of this description in Queensland. As far as I am able to discover, I do not think we have the means at our disposal for the establishment of a university. If the colony has more money to spend on education, then I say its first duty is to extend the primary school education to every child in the colony. Until that has been done, I do not think we ought to entertain the idea for one moment of establishing a university. The hon. gentleman at the head of the Government said that this university would be the coping stone upon our educational system. Well, as far as I am able to discover, before the builders of a wall put the coping stone on, the wall must have been raised to the intended height, but I contend that so far from our educational system having been raised to its possible height in this colony we have not even yet laid the foundations properly. I find that in a large number of districts it is almost impossible for the children of the settlers to be educated. No doubt the Education Department does all in its power and treats in a most liberal fashion every claim brought before it, but notwithstanding that, there is a residue of children in the colony who have not yet been reached by the present educational system. I maintain also that something further requires to be done beyond even extending our present system to outside localities. We want to deal with the children in the more populous localities. There is a very large number of children at the present moment, even in the large towns, who do not get the benefit of a primary education.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: The compulsory clauses of the Act should be enforced.

Mr. STEWART: Yes, for that very reason. Of course if the compulsory clauses of the Act were enforced in the more populous districts of Queensland the cost of primary education would be very largely increased, but nevertheless I think they ought to be enforced.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Do you recommend that for North Rockhampton?

Mr. STEWART: Yes, certainly, I recommend the enforcement of the compulsory clauses in North Rockhampton.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Then you are the first who has done so.

Mr. STEWART: Then I do it now; and if I may be permitted to incidentally refer to the question, I recommend the extension of the Shops and Factories Act to a certain portion of my electorate. Now, the hon. gentleman who spoke last said that the reasons which had been given against the Bill did not hold water. He said he was not going to object to the institution

of a university simply because it was impossible or difficult for children in some portions of the colony to get a primary education. The hon. gentleman said he was not going to adopt a dog-in-the-manger attitude. I do not see anything dog-in-the-mangerish about this; and I think it is a most excellent reason for objecting to a university that there are some children in the colony who have not even been taught their A B C. Let me put it in this way to hon. members: Suppose we have a thousand children to feed. We find we can give them all bread and beef, but that if some of them are to get fruit a certain proportion must go without bread and beef. We can give 500 bread and beef and fruit, but if we dispense with the fruit we can give 1,000 bread and beef. Which would hon. members choose to do? Bread and beef are absolutely essential to the maintenance of human life, and I say that a primary education is just as necessary to the mental sustenance of the young as bread and beef is necessary for the development of their physical frames. I say that until we can bring a common school education to the door of every child in the colony we should not talk about the institution of a university. What great benefits are the people of Queensland going to derive from a certain proportion of our youth getting a university education? Are we not as a people engaged mostly in the primary industries? The great object of our educational system ought to be to teach our young men and women how to earn their own living. We have thousands of selectors on the soil of this colony, and I say that opportunity should be given to every young man in the colony who is desirous of settling on the land of getting a certain amount of education from an agricultural point of view. And the same thing applies of course to mining.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We have the Agricultural College.

MR. STEWART: Well, the Agricultural College in my opinion is somewhat in the same position that a university in Brisbane would be in. I consider the Agricultural College is altogether before its time, and so I believe a university in Brisbane would be. Experimental farms would be much more useful to the farmers; experts travelling up and down the country would be much more serviceable; and I say if you have technical schools established in the various centres, teaching young men how to use their hands, teaching them the use of tools, and the various branches of mechanics, giving them instruction in fruit-growing and the capacity of soils, and all that sort of thing—teaching them, in short, how to go upon the soil and make their living out of it, you will be doing something which will be of much more benefit to the colony at large than establishing a university in Brisbane. What do the young men who take degrees at universities do? They do not become farmers. They do not enter the ranks of our commercial men. Some may become journalists. A great many of them become lawyers, and doctors, and ministers. Why, all these professions are overcrowded. The lawyers, we know, are simply tripping each other in the streets of Brisbane. We know that the doctors are rushing about with cases of instruments in their hands “seeking whom they may devour.” Why, the profession of the ministry is so overcrowded that the common navvy earns a better living than the majority of our clergymen.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not at all.

MR. LEAHY: What about the profession of the politician?

MR. STEWART: I do not believe that university degree men are, as a rule, the men that are to be found in the profession of politics.

MR. JACKSON: Not many in Parliament, any way.

MR. STEWART: Not many in Parliament. I do not object to a man getting a university education. I think any man is all the better for getting a university education; that is unless he is going to depend on the labour of his hands for a living. But the great majority of the people of this colony must depend upon the labour of their hands for their livelihood, and we ought to consider the majority before we begin to provide for the minority. One reason that the Premier gave for establishing a university in Brisbane was that if we had a university here our young men would not require to go out of our own colony to get their degree.

MR. KERR: That does not show much of the federal spirit.

MR. STEWART: It does not show much of the federal spirit, and it does not show much common sense either. I think that is the very thing that our young men ought to do, young men who propose to take a leading part in our affairs, whether in commerce or in politics, or in law, or in journalism, or in medicine, or in any other profession or art. They ought to travel. They ought to get the wider and larger experience that contact with people of other places will give them. So that, instead of young men who have to leave their own colony and go elsewhere in order to get their degrees being at a disadvantage, it is absolutely an advantage. I think I have given all the principal reasons why I object to this proposal. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is not any feeling of jealousy of Brisbane in this matter as far as I am concerned, and I quite agree with him that some time we will have universities, not only in Brisbane, but in other towns of the colony. I hope that day will come. I believe the day will come when, instead of having half a million people in Queensland there will perhaps be 5,000,000 or 10,000,000. I have not the slightest doubt of that. Then, perhaps, we may have forty or fifty universities, and require everyone of them. But we are not living in that day, and we must just accommodate ourselves to the circumstances which surround us now. As I said at the beginning, until the common, primary education is brought within the reach of every boy and girl in the colony, I shall continually protest against the establishment of a university. There is something else besides. I think that the higher education might be brought within the reach of the great proportion of our young men and young women. I take it that the standard of teaching in many of the principal schools of the colony might be greatly raised, might be greatly heightened; and they might—in some measure at least—be made to do the same service for the common people, if I may so term them, that the grammar schools do for the children of the middle classes. I think that until that is done there should be no talk of a university. After all, as has been so forcibly pointed out by the hon. member for Clermont, only a very small minority of the young men and young women of this colony either require a university education or could take advantage of it if it were placed in their hands. What we have to do here is to legislate for the majority, not for the minority.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: “The greatest good for the greatest number.”

MR. STEWART: Only £5,000 is mentioned in this Bill; but it may be £50,000. We do not know what the expense will be. In another direction I object. I need not reiterate my reasons. It is not a matter of principle with me at all. I should be very glad to see a university in Brisbane, but it is merely a question of whether the time is opportune. Can we afford it? I say

we cannot until, as I have already said, we have provided the common school education for every child in the colony, and also the higher education for a very large proportion of them.

The TREASURER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*): Of course I intend to support the Bill. I remember that the question was brought up in the House ten years ago. At that time I thought the colony was not old enough—that we had not enough population—and for several reasons I opposed the Bill. But I think now, with a population of 500,000 people, and with our educational institutions in a very much better position, we can now afford to establish a university. It has been said by a number of speakers that until primary education is extended all over the colony, and children in the bush outside get an opportunity of going to school, they could not support the proposal. But by comparison I find that we are just as far ahead as New South Wales, or Victoria, or the other colonies. We have as many children going to our schools, in proportion to our population, as New South Wales, and much more than South Australia, but not so much as New Zealand. I find also that in Victoria, where education is compulsory, that the average attendance at school is only a trifle more than it is in Queensland. During the short time I was in the Education Department I found that the outside people, the people in the bush, the poorest people in the colony, were much more anxious to educate their children than the people in the towns.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: At that time they had to do a great deal more than they have now. The State did not subsidise schools unless there was an attendance of sixty; but now a provisional school can be established in any part of the colony if the parents find one-fifth of the cost—and £50 or £100 will build a school in some parts of the colony—and satisfy the Education Department that they can get an average attendance of twelve children. I don't know any other part of the world where such advantages are offered in regard to the education of children as Queensland, and if the hon. member for Clermont has communities in his electorate with twenty-five children and no school for them, it is the fault of the parents, who merely have to subscribe one-fifth of the cost in order to prove their *bona fides*.

Mr. GIVENS: Considerably more than one-half.

The TREASURER: That has been altered. If schools were built all over the colony for the asking, the revenues of two or three years would not be sufficient to build them. It must also be borne in mind that we are sending nine boys to the other colonies for a university education; that is every year we provide three bursaries at a cost of £900, and we might as well provide for their education in our own colony. As to the climate of Brisbane, I think it is just as good as the climate of Sydney or Melbourne, if not better. In fact, I think it is better in some respects, and I am astonished at people running down their own climate. I think they ought to speak well of their climate when they have the opportunity. I have been in Sydney and Melbourne, and I do not think they have a better climate than Brisbane.

Mr. GIVENS: It is always a Britisher's privilege to grumble.

The TREASURER: There are universities in Tasmania, South Australia, Melbourne, and Sydney; Queensland is the only colony outside Western Australia that has no university. I do not think anyone will object to higher education; I think most of us regret that we have not the advantage of having received a higher education, but my strongest reason for supporting this

Bill is because we are promised a mining chair in this university.

Mr. STEWART: In Brisbane.

The TREASURER: It must be in some town, and Brisbane is the largest town in the colony.

Mr. STEWART: Why not have it in Rockhampton?

The TREASURER: Fully half the people of the colony are within 100 miles of Brisbane, and if we want to make a university a success we must have it where there is a large population. When there is a population of something like 10,000,000 in the colony there will probably be universities in Townsville and Rockhampton; but Brisbane is the place where we should make a start, and I hope no Central or Northern member will show the small-mindedness of opposing it because it is to be in Brisbane. It has been said that private individuals should subscribe money for a university, and I am sorry that they have not done so. Only yesterday we had a discussion on the establishment of mining schools at the expense of the State, and I think we may very well establish a university at the expense of the State. We want scores of scientific men in this colony. There is room in Queensland for 100 geologists to find out what we have in the way of mineral wealth, and until we have a university we shall not be able to get a sufficient number.

Mr. GIVENS: I never saw a geologist discover anything yet. It is always the miner that makes discoveries.

The TREASURER: Geologists have helped us very much in Queensland. I think Mr. Jack has done very much, and I don't know any other individual who has done so much for the mineral fields of the colony.

Mr. GIVENS: Did he ever discover anything?

The TREASURER: He often told people that they were wasting their money looking for gold where they were not likely to find it, and he has also told people where they might with advantage employ their money in trying to get minerals. The mining community, at any rate, very much regret that Mr. Jack has left the colony.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The TREASURER: I have not much more to say. I repeat that the children in this colony are just as far ahead in the matter of attending school as the children of New South Wales and Victoria; and the time will never come when every child in the colony will be able to attend school. As settlement advances there will always be some living on the outskirts where there is no school for some time; but I consider that this colony has done as well as any other colony in the group in the matter of primary education.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (*Lockyer*): I believe that we should look at the question of establishing a university in Queensland very carefully. I believe every member of this House is liberal-minded to a degree on the question of providing higher education, and does not, or should not, at any rate, mind the pounds shillings and pence part of it. The establishment of a university has been objected to by hon. members opposite for many reasons which I agree with, but the chief reason advanced seems to be that we are not yet sufficiently advanced for the establishment of a university. Will that not be said in twenty years' time? That argument is always a stock argument.

Mr. McDONALD: That is why you use it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: I am not using it; I am refuting it. Ten or fifteen years ago the same argument was used in connection with the proposal to establish an agricultural college, and the argument that a thing is proposed too soon is an

argument that is always used in connection with any proposal of this sort. My opinion is that if we can afford to establish a university, the sooner it is established the better; at the same time I would rather have a federal university, with colleges established in different parts of Queensland affiliated with that university, very much on the lines of the suggestion made by those who took up the question of university extension in Queensland some years ago, under which the students who passed examinations here could obtain the degrees of the universities in the southern colonies. That might have been done under federation, but

it has proved to be impossible to do [9.30 p.m.] it under our present condition as separate States. Now that we are discussing the question of federation, there is one point that I may be allowed to briefly touch upon. We are proposing to establish a university, but we forget that our primary education—good as it is—is likely to become less efficient in the near future, from a cause which is being overlooked by our authorities. That cause is the absence of a training college for training the teachers who impart primary education in this colony. I hold that the system of training our primary school teachers is to a great extent deficient, and it would be better if the authorities had paved the way for a university at a later time by making some proposal of an extensive nature which would have given us an institution in which we could have supplied training to our primary school teachers. I disagree with the argument of some hon. members that primary education should be absolutely free, because—as the Secretary for Mines has just said—if a community are in earnest in their desire for the establishment of a primary school, it is very little to ask them to contribute one-fifth of the cost of that school in order to show their *bona fides*.

Mr. KERR: That is not the whole cost.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: It is practically the whole of the cost, as every hon. member knows. I am rather disposed to think that we have arrived at that stage when we can take steps towards establishing a university, and, as far as the second reading of this measure is concerned, I shall give it my support and my vote.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): As a member representing a Western district, I intend to oppose this Bill for the establishment of a university. I gave my reasons for my opposition to this proposal when the late Premier, Mr. Byrnes, brought forward his first Governor's Speech. The hon. member for Lockyer says that he is not in favour of free primary education.

Mr. ARMSTRONG: No freer than it is.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member says that primary education is free with the exception of the one-fifth contribution for the schools, but he must not forget that there is a large amount to be provided by the parents every year for books, besides which there is quarter money and several other things. There are some children in this city in the fifth and sixth classes who carry about £22 worth of books in their satchels when they go to school in the morning, and this comes very hard on the parents. I will leave this question of primary education, because it can be discussed on the Education Estimates. The Secretary for Lands, in introducing the Bill, said that the time has arrived when we should wipe out a reproach on our colony. The reproach on the colony is that we have no university. If it is a reproach, who is responsible for it? Is it not the present and past Governments, which have been in power for a number of years? If it is a reproach, it is a reproach that has existed for several years past, because the hon. gentleman informed us

that the question had been discussed, and a committee formed, in 1875. It was then brought under the attention of the Government, and it must have been brought under the attention of several Governments since. I represent a district where a large number of people are living whose children have not the opportunity of getting a primary education. There are two townships in the electorate I represent that have no schools yet. I know steps are being taken to erect schools in those townships; but there are other places that I have been in, throughout the length and breadth of the colony, where the children have no opportunity of getting a primary education. The Premier said to-night that we have built the walls and are about to lay on the copestone; but we must lay the foundations before we put on the copestone. The foundations of the walls have not been laid in many portions of the colony. It appears to me that the Government and the Education Department intend to erect a shed, to have it open round the sides, and to have a roof on the top. That is about the size of this scheme for establishing a university. But there is another thing that ought to be taken into consideration. The Ministers in charge of the various departments are aware of the fact that there are a large number of Civil servants in this colony, and they know very well that when they are about to shift one of these officers from large centres of population into sparsely populated districts an outcry is raised by these officers that their children will have no opportunity of getting the advantage of even a grammar school education. I know very well that there are police magistrates in the Central district who objected very strongly when they were appointed to the positions they now hold. I have in my mind's eye one who left his children attending the grammar school at Ipswich. There are a number of others in other departments of the service in the same position. Now, if we are going to have a university in Brisbane, the heads of departments are going to have great difficulty in removing Civil servants, because these men, with families growing up, and with some of them at the grammar schools, will think that their children should have a university education, and they will naturally object to being removed. Then the other portions of the colony will be neglected because of this university being established in Brisbane. It is a well-known fact that the sons of many Civil servants have passed through the grammar schools, and have qualified themselves for various positions, and it is quite commendable on the part of parents that they should endeavour to give them the best education possible. That difficulty is going to arise in the Government departments. The hon. member for Fitzroy, who spoke as a Central member, has told us that he had to send his sons—not to Brisbane—but to Sydney to be educated. There are many people living in the Central portion of the colony who have to send their children away from home to get a grammar school or a university education, and the expense of sending them to Brisbane is just as great as to send them to Sydney or Melbourne. It is not likely that if a university is established in Queensland it would have the same amount of teaching talent that they have in Sydney and Melbourne; and it is the main object of every parent that their children shall get the best education possible. Therefore, I cannot see that a university, if it is established in Brisbane, is going to be a success. It will only be established in favour of people living in and around Brisbane, and perhaps on the Downs or the neighbourhood. In this matter, I am astonished at the attitude assumed by those champions of federation who, only a few months ago, insisted that

matters of this sort should be left to the Federal Government. My own opinion is that the time has not yet come for establishing a university in Queensland. As the hon. member for Clermont pointed out, it would be far better to follow the advice which the Premier has given us, when we have approached him with regard to certain legislation which we believed would be for the benefit of the colony. He told us to wait until the Federal Parliament dealt with those matters. The Government should set an example in this matter, and wait until the Federal Parliament has dealt with a federal university. Then, if there is any occasion for a Queensland University, it may be proceeded with; but at present I am entirely opposed to any university being established in Brisbane.

Mr. GIVENS: I do not intend to discuss either the details or the principles of this Bill, or at least only to a very slight extent, nor do I intend to occupy the time of the House for very long. I am merely going to give my reasons for voting against the second reading of the Bill. In the first place, I object to establishing a university in one part of the colony which cannot be as freely availed of by every individual in the colony as by the people in that particular part of the colony. But anything that brings grist to the Brisbane mill finds favour with the present Government. Apart from that I object to a university being established while there are not full facilities provided for primary education throughout the colony. There are places in the remote parts of the West, North, and South where parents have extreme difficulty in getting an education for their children of even the simplest and most primary nature. Not long ago I applied for assistance in putting up a teacher's residence for a struggling community of settlers where a provisional school was established, but I failed to get that concession from the Education Department. We are asked to spend a large sum in establishing a university when we cannot afford a reasonable sum to give educational facilities for all the children of the colony.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There is £250,000 spent in education now.

Mr. GIVENS: That may be so, but I do not think that question arises at the present time. The hon. gentleman is asking us to pass a Bill which may involve us in a much greater expenditure on one particular branch of education than has hitherto been contemplated. I do not object to the amount spent on education. I do not think enough has been spent upon it. But so long as there is one single child in the colony, and any struggling communities in the colony, which are not afforded the fullest possible facilities of education, I must protest against giving opportunities to certain privileged people to give their children an education of the high class given by a university. What I should like to see is the spread of technical education. A system of technical education grafted upon our public school system would raise up amongst our young men and women a most useful class of citizens—a class which would be prepared when they left those schools to grapple with the difficulties which will face them in a young community like this, and overcome them, and to work intelligently in developing the resources of the colony.

The TREASURER: We have technical schools now all over the colony.

Mr. GIVENS: The sort of technical schools we have at present, with one or two exceptions, is of very little use, I am sorry to say.

Mr. ANNEAR: You should see the one we have at Maryborough.

Mr. GIVENS: Maryborough is, in some respects, a privileged community. It enjoys the great privilege of having the hon. member, Mr. ANNEAR, to represent it.

Mr. ANNEAR: It gets the same treatment for its technical school as other towns.

Mr. GIVENS: And every considerable town in the colony should have an equally good system of technical education.

The TREASURER: So they can, if they like.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Assistance is given in the shape of a subsidy.

Mr. GIVENS: I am aware of that, and it is usually given in connection with schools of arts. But we want more than that. We want education—and even the highest technical education—to be absolutely free; and when this university is established, I hope the education there will be absolutely free. We want more bursaries and exhibitions from State schools and grammar schools.

The TREASURER: They are given now.

Mr. GIVENS: We want more of them. Coming to the Bill itself, there is one important provision to which I wish to call attention. Clause 27 provides that—

The Governor may, by warrant under his hand addressed to the Treasurer, direct to be paid to the senate out of the consolidated revenue a sum of not less than £5,000 in every year for the purpose of defraying the charges and expenses connected with the establishment, management, and control of the university.

It says the sum shall not be less than £5,000, but it does not make any provision at all as to what the limit shall be. It may be £5,000, or it may be £100,000. In passing that clause we shall practically be committing ourselves to an expenditure over which this House will have no control. This money is to be paid to the university on the Governor issuing a warrant to the Treasurer, and without any reference to the House. It is another instance, of which we have had too many lately, of how this House is losing its grip of the purse, which is the only power the House has got. Under that provision the Executive will have absolute power to vote as much as they like to the university, and I object to any such provision as that being inserted in the Bill.

Mr. McDONNELL: They will have to get the sanction of Parliament.

Mr. GIVENS: They will not have to do anything of the kind under this Bill. If we pass the provision I have quoted we shall give the Governor in Council, which means the Executive, legislative authority to hand over any sum, even up to £250,000, to the university every year. It does not matter what report they have to give to Parliament, so long as we give them legislative authority to do this thing, the House will be in honour bound to sanction it afterwards.

The TREASURER: The House will have to vote the money.

Mr. GIVENS: Certainly the House will have to vote the money, but having given legislative authority to the Governor in Council to issue his warrant to the Treasurer to pay money to the university we will be in honour bound to pass the money to cover that warrant, no matter what the amount may be. If the Bill gets into Committee, I will certainly do my very utmost to get a limit placed on the annual expenditure on the university.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: You cannot limit future Parliaments; they can pay any amount they think fit.

Mr. GIVENS: Yes, but they will have to do it in proper form by amending this Bill; but if such an amendment as I suggest is not made in clause 27 the Government can do what they like without any form at all, and that is the sort

of thing I want to stop. I want to clip the wings of the Government a little if I can. If their wings were clipped we should not have so many jobs as have been perpetrated in the immediate past. I do not want it to be understood that I am opposed to a university altogether, because I am not. When the proper time comes a university will be essential for Queensland, and I hope that one will then be established, but until we have a thorough system of primary and technical education which is available to everyone, no matter in what part of the colony he may live, I object to a university being established in Brisbane, in one corner of the colony, which will only benefit one section, and that a very small section of the people. Therefore, while I approve of the principle of establishing a university, I shall vote against the second reading of this Bill, believing it to be premature at the present time.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON (*Brisbane North*): I wish to compress my observations into as small a compass as possible; not because the hour is late, but because the question of establishing a university in Queensland has been worn threadbare for many years past. I think the whole community, from Carpentaria to Point Danger, are quite prepared that their representatives in Parliament should be in that condition of mind which will enable them to give a vote on this matter one way or the other, without a lengthy discussion. I had considerable hesitation about this matter when it was started many years ago. Those who have paid any attention to the history of this question will know that a good many of those who advocated the establishment of a university years ago are dead and gone, and we have now in this House comparatively newchums—I use the expression in the most respectful form—newchums in the political arena of the country and in the history of our educational developments, and also in the history of the past so far as regards the men who have been the prop of our educational system, of which we are so proud. Having all those things in view, I say right off the leaf that I regard this little humble sum for a university as a contribution to the putting on the edifice of our educational structure that coping stone which is so essential to complete the building and to complete the system. That is my mature opinion after long experience, and a careful consideration of the discussion that has taken place on this matter during the last quarter of a century, and I shall certainly vote for the Bill. And I hope that hon. members representing this “corner” of this colony, as it has been termed, will also be found voting for the Bill. Let me remind the last speaker that it is this “corner” of the colony that has developed all the other parts of the colony that have been referred to by the hon. member for Clermont, the hon. member for Cairns, and other hon. members. The whole expense of the first road from Cooktown and the opening of the roads to the West for the farmers was borne by this “corner” of the colony. This “corner” of the colony has been the founder of all the development that has taken place in the early history of the colony. To whom would a university be of service? To the inhabitants of the colony, and not to the arid regions in the West and North-west, or those sparsely-peopled regions where, as the hon. member for Clermont pitifully depicted, we find little children running about under an iron shed, or a miserable shanty covered with iron that was there fifty years ago. Why, there was not a white man in that part of the country for years after that. That shows that the paucity of knowledge which we have put before this House is complete nonsense. And if that be the quality of the statement falling from the hon. member for

Clermont on that subject, how are we to revise the rest of his speech? The hon. member spoke of the proposed expenditure of £5,000 being put on the broad backs of the workers of the colony. What does 3½ per cent. on £5,000 amount to? We might ask the Government—I would be very pleased to do it—to take £50 off the [10 p.m.] salary we get in this House, which is of use to some but is only a detriment to others, and let us give it with a hearty good will for this purpose. The cry of “this corner of the colony,” and the cry of “Queen street” is dead long ago, but this corner of the colony is more alive than ever it was before. Hon. members who talk of this corner of the colony should remember that the further you go North the smaller the corner is until it is like a cap. The thick end of this colony is at this corner of the colony.

Mr. STEWART: And the thick-headed people.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: Yes; the thick-headed people are in this corner, too—we get them from all parts here. If hon. members will look at the map of the colony they will see that it is a triangle whose base rests on the northern border of New South Wales.

Mr. STEWART: What kind of a triangle?

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I did not interrupt the hon. member for Rockhampton North when he was speaking. I have been guilty of three interjections this session. I am very sorry for them, and I will never be guilty of three more in my life if I can help it, but sometimes my blood gets a little too warm when I hear nonsense talked.

Mr. McDONALD: That is what is making us interject now.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: If you colour the map according to population you will find that the further you go North the fewer the people, and will hon. members advocate the establishment of the university at Townsville, Cairns, the Herbert or Hughenden, or will they begin in the Centre? I am quite sure the sensible electors of the colony desire that the beginning should be made where it ought to be—in the thickly-peopled part of the territory. I used to be as ultra radical a separationist and Northern man as any man in this House, and we had good reason to be dissatisfied, but I am now quite prepared to have the university established in Brisbane. I unhesitatingly say it is not creditable—I respectfully say so—that hon. members who are crying out for free education, national education, and compulsory education to stick at this £5,000 as the foundation of the proper complement of our present system of education. Then we heard a lot more about the “workers.” I have a great respect for the loquacity and diffusiveness of the hon. member for Clermont and a few other hon. members on the other side, but I do trust that a few more years in the House will cure them a little of it. If the hon. member for Clermont would only give us a homœopathic dose of the sense of his speech—and there was a great deal within the compass of it—he would do much to facilitate the business of the country, and would help on the University Bill. “The workers of the country are never to have a university.” I think that if the hon. member for Clermont—

Mr. LESINA: Mercy!

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I am paying the hon. member a great compliment in drawing the eyes of this House, of the readers of *Hansard*, and the readers of the daily Press to this great fact: That the hon. member has told us to-night that the workers of the country are always to be workers, and the middle class are always to be the middle class—forgetting that

the middle class of to-day are the miserable workers of to-morrow in this young country with its many changes, and the workers of to-day will be the great middle class of to-morrow.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: Unquestionably it is so. As the leader of the Labour Opposition said to-night: What about Tommy Byrnes? Is he not an example of the moleskin-trousered blucher-booted father whose son became one of the foremost men—out of the great working class—in the whole of Australia. But for the university education he had, and the facilities he had for getting it, he never would have been the man he was. He was a man of robust mind, and I am sorry he had not the robust constitution which would have carried him through for many more years of life.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I say unhesitatingly that my own education was very much supplemented when, after fourteen years of age, I attended the classes of the university, in the city of Glasgow. But for the facilities I enjoyed there I would not be here to-day. Before I was much out of my teens I was working in this matter with Sir Charles Lilley for the representation of the people and the free education of the children of the people. I am sorry the university has been delayed so long. I trust it will now receive attention, and that this corner of the colony will not be discredited because it is the most thickly peopled part of it. The representatives of sparsely peopled districts are here to-night decrying this edifice we propose to construct. What proportion of this £5,000 will come from each man in the North? I would be ashamed to analyse it. It may come out of loan or out of revenue, and I am reminded that Tyson's estate will pay for it many times over, but that is beside the question. I am sorry we have so few rich men in the colony. Everyone talks about the "workers," but it seems to me that in this country we are all workers. If hon. members will adopt the principles of Newman Hall's article on "The Dignity of Labour," if they will raise that flag, we will have no other party in this House but a Labour party. I would like again to refer to this corner of the colony, which, I remind hon. members, represents the great bulk of the population, the greatest amount of industries, and the largest amount of agriculture, and the largest amount of comfort and wealth, the product of the thrift of the people here—and where else will you put your university? I guarantee that if this question came before a poll of the people of the Centre and the North, and they were asked where will you have your first university established—North, Centre, or South, they would all say in the South. And for many reasons. There are the comfort and advantages and educative influences of the larger population, and there is the climate of Toowoomba to go to in the hot weather if a student be sick. The next thing is this: If the hon. member will take the hint from me and study the United Kingdom a little more closely, he will find that there is a corner there. There is a corner in the south of that great United Kingdom—and that corner is London. The hon. member can see that if he studies the map. And yet hon. members grumble at there being a corner in Queensland. I never heard anyone grumble at there being a corner in South Britain.

MR. STEWART: Oh, yes.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I heard one man—he was a radical, and one of the most intelligent and most sensible men I have ever met—say that if a change was desired in this way, why not take the Parliament to York—

why not go back to York? But there are growths and influences in the career of nations and countries and populations that cannot be shifted. To talk in this manner about there being a corner in Queensland is absurd. Why, Northern people ought to be proud of this corner, as they call it—seeing that their very existence has arisen from the pluck and enterprise of the people in the Southern part of the colony in the early days.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They do not work with their hands.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: Has the hon. member worked with his hands much? Did he contribute to the revenue in 1866, to open up the goldfield he resides on, or to develop the North? I will conclude by saying that I sincerely trust that this matter will be dealt with on its merits and in a serious manner. I say that we are more justified to-day in going for a small vote to establish a university here, than we were justified thirty years ago in rubbing out the then existing law and establishing free State schools. The hon. member knows that in a small place like Aberdeen a university was established generations ago. They have St. Andrews—I am speaking of what I personally know—and they have five or six universities in Scotland, and they have all been in existence for numbers of years. They have all these universities in that country, which is very poor, and has been heavily taxed for a long time to maintain the independence of Great Britain, and has also contributed towards the expense of Britain's wars. Yet, in this colony of Queensland, where we have nothing of that sort—a young country where the people are thriving and prosperous, notwithstanding ticks, and droughts and other disasters—some hon. members grumble at spending £5,000 to establish an embryo university.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is not half enough.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I know it is not half enough; I am ashamed of the amount. But there must be a beginning, and, if the Government are satisfied to begin in this way, I trust that from year to year they will give a larger vote, so that in a few years' time—I trust in a few years—we shall be able to establish universities in Rockhampton, Townsville, and other large centres of population. I say unhesitatingly, on general grounds, and in the interests and welfare of the colony and the credit of our educational institutions, we must have this coping-stone. For that reason I shall support the Bill.

MR. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): During the last few minutes, while I have been listening to the remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken, I was reminded of the times in 1893 and 1894, when the Secretary for Lands got up and poured the vials of his wrath on the heads of the members of this party. The hon. member who has just spoken does need to remind us of diffusiveness, because he is not very often in the House, and he does not speak as often as hon. members on this side would like to hear him.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I rise to a point of order. This is the second time that these fugitive fibs have been thrown at me across the Chamber. I have been in the House all night—

THE SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has stated no point of order. But I understood him to use the word "fibs," and that is not a parliamentary expression.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: I thought the expression was delicately parliamentary.

THE SPEAKER: I feel bound to say that, in my judgment, the word is not parliamentary.

Mr. JACKSON: I was paying the hon. member a compliment. We are always pleased to hear him speak, and we would like him to speak oftener. At the same time, I must take exception to some of his remarks this evening, and particularly with regard to the advice he gave hon. members that we should contribute £250 each from our salaries in order to assist the establishment of a university in North Brisbane, because that is what it means if we pass this Bill. No doubt the hon. member, having a large legal practice in Brisbane, earns a considerable amount of money from that business, and he does not feel the expense of attending this House, as hon. members who represent Northern and other outside districts do. He can come down to the House and attend to his business at the same time, without suffering any inconvenience. He is in a far better position in this respect than hon. members who represent outside districts, and the hon. member knows something about outside districts. He has not always lived in Brisbane; he is an old bushman, and he must know that members from outside districts cannot afford to be so generous with their salaries as he can. At any rate, I take exception to the statement that either Brisbane or the Southern portion of the colony has assisted in the development of the mining industry in the Northern part of the colony. I emphatically deny that they have done so.

Hon. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: Yes, in the initiatory stages of its history.

Mr. JACKSON: No, not even in the initiatory stages of its history. It is only within the last two or three years that any important mining companies have been formed in Brisbane. All the money given to develop mining, especially in the North, has come from the miners themselves, or from England, not from Brisbane. To come to the Bill; this party believe in free, secular, and compulsory education, and also higher education; but we also believe that the higher education should also be free. If it were proposed that the university education should be absolutely free, just as the State school system is, we could not as a body avoid voting for the Bill, because that would be quite in accord with our platform. But I say that the university is for the rich men, in spite of what the Treasurer said when he stated that we have given certain exhibitions to universities—I think three every year—notwithstanding that, it must be conceded that university education is for the rich.

The PREMIER: Why?

Mr. JACKSON: Why? Because it is a very expensive matter to send our young men or our young women to a university.

The PREMIER: It is more expensive to send them outside the colony.

Mr. JACKSON: No doubt it would be for Brisbane people; but it would not be much more expensive for people in the North or Centre or the West to send them to Sydney or Melbourne as to send them to a university in Brisbane. However, I do not agree with some of the arguments used against the Bill. I don't agree with the view taken by some hon. members that we should develop our primary education more. I think we are doing as much as possible in the way of primary education. The minimum number of children required to form a provisional school is, I believe, twelve, and, in addition to that, the department is always willing to establish half-time schools. They have shown every desire to establish a school, even where half-a-dozen children can be got together, so long as the parents are willing to make some slight sacrifice. I cannot agree with the argument that we ought not to establish a

university because we cannot have one as good as that in either Sydney or Melbourne, but I do think it is a good argument that we ought to spend what money we have available in the development of technical education. That is why I do not altogether look upon this Bill with favour. Hon. members have said that it is not logical to oppose the Bill on the ground that we are not ripe for the establishment of a university. We all know very well that the time will come when it will be admitted by everyone that the time is ripe, and of my own part I think it is largely a matter of expediency. It is a question whether we have a sufficient population concentrated in any one portion of the colony to justify this movement. The Premier interjected, when I spoke of the cost, that it would cost less to educate children at a Brisbane university than send them down south. But I would point out, as the Treasurer has referred to the establishment of a chair for mining in the university, that in Sydney the fees for the school of mines course at the university are £125 for a course of three years. That amounts to about 15s. a week, and, adding £1 a week or more for keep, it would cost a parent at least £2 a week to send a son to that school of mines. That is why I said the university was for the rich man's children. I was very thankful to hon. members for having passed yesterday the motion which I brought forward in connection with schools of mines; but my idea was not so much to have them established in connection with a university as to have small schools of mines and metallurgical works established throughout the colony. I think we are not yet quite ripe enough for the establishment of a university, but I do think the other scheme is wise and practicable. I am not going to occupy more time in discussing this question. I know there is a great deal to be said in favour of establishing a university, but I think there is something to be said on the other side that should make us cautious before we pass this Bill. My sympathies, and, I am sure, those of every hon. member, are on the side of higher education. We believe in giving the best possible education that we can to every boy and girl in the colony, and, as I said, if it were proposed to make higher education absolutely free, this side of the House could not oppose it. But, seeing that an extension of the system of technical education would do far more good to the colony, not only mining technical education, but technical education in connection with our other primary industries, I think we ought to consider whether it would not be wiser to spend our money in that direction rather than in the establishment of a Queensland University.

Mr. BROWNE: I may say at once that I am going to vote for the second reading of this Bill. I have listened with interest and pleasure to what has fallen from hon. members, and I agree with a great deal of what has been said by hon. members on both sides in reference to primary education. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have done all I could to help along that cause, and if I thought that the expenditure of this extra £25,000 was going to interfere with our system of primary education, I should oppose it. But with my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, I cannot see that the two schemes run contrary to one another. While doing our best for primary education and endeavouring to give every child in the colony the best possible chance of acquiring knowledge, yet I do not see that the enlargement of higher education is going to do any harm to primary education. Like other hon. members, I only regret that a good education did not come in my way. Since I have been in this House, no

member on either side has ever shown any parsimony when it came to a question of voting money for the educational requirements of the colony. As to the question of locality in the establishment of a university, I do not see what that has to do with it; and although disagreeing with a great deal that has been said by the hon. member for Brisbane North about the Southern corner of the colony, yet, I think, if a university is to be established, it should be in the largest centre of population. At a future time no doubt universities may be established elsewhere in other portions of the colony. The only argument that can be urged against this scheme is its possible interference with primary education, and as far as that goes we know that it is impossible to say definitely that we will give every child in the colony an opportunity of becoming educated. We can try, as we have tried in the past, to do our best for all the children in the colony, and when we have done our best in that direction we can do no more. As one representing a far away locality, and one in which a great number of new schools have been established within a short time, I can bear testimony to the fact that the Education Department has always been willing to do its utmost in the direction of helping the outlying districts, and I am quite ready to admit everything that has been said by the Secretary of Mines in reference to our Education Act being, perhaps, the most liberal of any to be found in any part of the world. There are faults, no doubt. I have found them myself, and perhaps there are faults in the administration sometimes, but this is not a little colony like Victoria, which can be run over in a day or two. Our population is spread over a great area, and where to-day there is no population at all in a couple of years there may be 400 or 500 children attending school. Under those circumstances one cannot but realise the difficulties of administration and admit that under all the circumstances the Department of Public Instruction does the best it can for all parts of the colony. For my own part I shall always be willing to help along the cause of primary education, and so long as I am assured that the expenditure of this additional £5,000 will not affect that cause I shall be willing and ready to support the establishment of a university for Queensland. I know this House will never suffer any curtailment in that direction, and believing that, I intend to vote for the second reading of this Bill.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put; and the House [10:30 p.m.] divided:—

AYES, 29.

Messrs. Dickson, Rutledge, Chataway, Philp, Murray, Dalrymple, Macdonald-Paterson, Ryland, W. Hamilton, Keogh, Finney, Forrest, Browne, Turley, Bartholomew, Maxwell, Dunsford, Stephenson, McDonnell, Dawson, T. B. Cribb, Hanran, Stodart, Lord, J. Hamilton, Annear, Fisher, Armstrong, and O'Connell.

NOES, 7.

Messrs. Lesina, Fitzgerald, Stewart, Kerr, Dibley, Givens, and McDonald.

PAIRS.

Ayes—Messrs. Higgs and Cowley.

Noes—Messrs. Callan and Jackson.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

On the motion of the SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS, the committal of the Bill was made an Order of the Day for Wednesday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I beg to move, without notice, that this House will, at its rising, adjourn until Tuesday next at 7 p.m. The reason I propose to ask the House to accept this motion is simply this: We had expected that the contingent which is going to South Africa would have been able to depart on the afternoon or evening

of Monday next, which has been proclaimed a public holiday; but owing to certain delays, it is not likely the troops will be able to embark before Tuesday. The Government therefore propose that the holiday, which was intended to take place on Monday, shall take place on Tuesday, so as to allow hon. gentlemen the opportunity of witnessing the embarkation, which, I am sure, will attract a large amount of public interest. I may say that the invitations which have been issued to hon. members to attend on the Lucinda on Monday will be available for Tuesday. I have a reluctance to sacrificing the whole of Tuesday because, as hon. members will admit, there is a considerable amount of business to be done. Therefore, I propose that we should meet at 7 o'clock in the evening. By that time the embarkation will be over, and I trust that we shall be able to do some business. While I am speaking I may say it is intended the troops shall parade through the city to-morrow, and hon. members will find accommodation provided for them to witness the review in the Domain in the afternoon. I feel that on an occasion of this sort we should, as far as possible, show our appreciation of the patriotism of the men who have volunteered for service in South Africa. It is a very important event in our annals, and one, I am sure, which will enlist the fullest sympathy and confidence of every man who feels that in his veins tingles the blood of the British race—to the extent that, at any rate, he appreciates the patriotism of these men who have come forward on the present occasion to do service in concert with the British army in South Africa.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: Under the circumstances, and seeing that it will only involve the delay of a few hours in our parliamentary proceedings, I think I am justified in asking the consent of the House to the motion that this House at its rising will adjourn until 7 p.m. on Tuesday next, when we can resume legislation after having witnessed the embarkation of the troops, and wishing them "God speed" and our best wishes for the success of the expedition.

Mr. MAXWELL: What about the papers you promised yesterday about the fodder?

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): I have an objection to this—

The PREMIER: I am very sorry to hear it.

Mr. DAWSON: I am very pleased to announce it. There appears to be only one reason why the Premier should ask us to adjourn until 7 o'clock on Tuesday, and that is because the troops are going to embark for South Africa.

The PREMIER: That is the reason.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: A very good reason.

Mr. DAWSON: A dishonourable reason. I say, as has been pointed out before, that hon. members are here from all parts of the colony engaged on public business almost in the middle of summer, and the hon. gentleman is trying his level best to waste a few hours of time because these troops are going to be embarked. I say that the fact that the House agreed to the contingent going to South Africa is only one incident in the life of this Parliament, and why should we delay public business on the day of embarkation?

Mr. McDONALD: It is part of the show.

Mr. DAWSON: Why should we assist in a show? I enter my protest against any adjournment. We have a lot of business and not much time to do it in. If the hon. gentleman or his friends desire that the public should have a holiday and see the last of the troops when going away, I have no objection, but we are here to do public business, and I think we should avail

ourselves of every hour for public business. The hon. gentleman talks about only two or three hours being sacrificed, but when some important public matter comes on for discussion and the reporters in the gallery stop reporting at 11 o'clock, he will go to bed and authorise those under him to sit up all night to make up for the time wasted by adjourning till 7 o'clock on Tuesday. I object. I would rather go on with public business on Tuesday at the ordinary time, and go home at a reasonable hour when all decent married men ought to be in bed. I am sorry there is not a full House or I would have pressed the matter to a division.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I do not see why I should not enter a protest, too. There have been two reasons advanced by the Premier why the House, at its rising, should adjourn till 7 o'clock on Tuesday. One is that the weather has militated against the troops going away.

The PREMIER: The weather prevented the steamer from being here in time.

Mr. LESINA: If the troops won't take the risk of being struck by a passing shower of rain, they won't maintain the honour of the colony much against a shower of Boer bullets.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: You go and see them.

Mr. LESINA: It is not necessary. I can see them any day of the week in the waxworks. It is a pity that the business of this great country should be delayed four days because the public or the members who sit in this Chamber have a burning desire to see the troops embark, and I can see clearly that the result will be that towards the close of the week, and towards the close of the session, we shall have to sit up till the early hours to get through legislation that could be got through very well at a reasonable hour if time was not wasted by adjourning the House to see the troops go away. My electors sent me here and pay my salary in order that I may assist in legislation and protest against anything which is against their interests. We have not got through any of the business placed on the paper, and to that extent I feel justified in saying that very likely it is merely firing blank cartridge legislation. If we put off this business in order to see the troops off to South Africa, public time and money will be wasted, and the Government will add one more sin to their already long list. Another point: The Premier says he feels pained that we should take this attitude. I would like to know if the hon. gentleman is suffering from real pain or sham pain. It appears to me the hon. gentleman is suffering from pain—

The SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. LESINA: I am anxious to point out that very likely it is pain of mind, caused by the Opposition taking this attitude.

The SPEAKER: The hon. gentlemen forgets the motion before the House. I trust he will confine his attention to it.

Mr. LESINA: I am speaking to the question before the House—which is that this House at its rising adjourn until 7 o'clock on Tuesday next. I object to its meeting at 7 o'clock. We should meet at the ordinary time, and not waste public time and money in galivanting round the country, while we are drawing our screws all the time. The Ministry draw something like £30 a week, and I do not see why members of that excellent Cabinet should draw such an enormous amount of public money without doing some work for it. If they adjourn the House until 7 o'clock on Tuesday, they are drawing salaries for which they do no work, and at the same

time are preventing members of this House from doing work which they are paid to do. Even the members of the Labour party will be blamed for doing nothing, when, as a matter of fact, hon. members on this side want to work. They do not want to go and see a cheap show. Of course we are told that it is the chance of a lifetime; but the Government are running the country into expense, and preventing the passage of legislation merely to go down in the "Lucinda" on a cheap trip. It is scandalous, and I enter my protest against it.

Question put and passed.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. The business on Tuesday, when we meet after tea, will be the Estimates.

Mr. DAWSON: You have got the Electoral Reform Bill on Tuesday.

The PREMIER: The Government conduct the business of the House according to their own judgment.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. DAWSON: You gave notice of the Electoral Reform Bill for Tuesday.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has got those papers prepared that he promised to lay on the table of the House this afternoon in connection with the fodder business?

The PREMIER: I promised to lay the papers on the table of the House if they could be copied in time. The papers are now before one of the departments, and although I gave instructions this morning to endeavour to get them copied, that copying has not yet been completed.

Mr. McDONALD: I could copy them inside of an hour.

The PREMIER: The hon. member speaks from imperfect knowledge of what the papers contain and of their extent. They will be laid on the table of the House with no unnecessary delay.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): If I may be permitted, I would like to interrogate the hon. gentleman. I think it was understood at the commencement of the session that the first serious business of the Government would be the Electoral Reform Bill, and it certainly was introduced among the first batch of Bills and set down for second reading on Tuesday next. Now, however, the hon. gentleman has given notice that the Estimates are to be gone on with. I would like to know when the hon. gentleman intends to take up the Electoral Reform Bill seriously?

After a pause—

Mr. DAWSON: Don't you intend to answer?

Mr. STEWART and Mr. DUNSFORD: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I cannot permit a general discussion to take place on the ordinary motion for the adjournment of the House after the business has been disposed of. There can only be one departure from that practice, and that is conceded to the leader of the Opposition, who is permitted to address a question to the leader of the Government as to the course of business.

Mr. DAWSON: Out of courtesy the Premier might reply.

Mr. LESINA: He is incapable.

Question put and passed.

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