

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 1899

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 17 NOVEMBER, 1899.

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

PETITION.

BOWEN RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Mr. SMITH (*Bowen*) presented a petition from 516 residents in the electorate of Bowen, in favour of the extension of the Bowen railway from Wangaratta to the Reid River.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS.

PURCHASE OF FODDER FROM MRS. D. T. KEOGH.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) asked the Premier--

1. Is it true that the Government has lately purchased a quantity of fodder from Mrs. D. T. Keogh?
2. If so, how much?
3. How much per ton?
4. What date was purchase made?

The PREMIER (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) replied—

1. I understand the police authorities have purchased hay from Agnes M. Keogh.
2. 23 tons 3 cwt. 3 qr. 7 lb. oaten hay.
3. £4 13s. per ton.
4. 19th July, 1899.

APPOINTMENT OF W. KELLETT AS SPECIAL INSPECTOR OF RUNS.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Premier—

1. Who was Minister or Acting Minister for Lands at the time W. Kellett, at present Inspector of Totalisators, was appointed special inspector of runs in the Warrego and Maranoon districts?
2. What were the reasons for this appointment?
3. What was its cost, and what proportion of same did W. Kellett draw?
4. Does not the Lands Department contain a special pastoral expert in the person of Mr. Woodbine and several inspecting commissioners?
5. Why, then, was it necessary to go outside the department to make this appointment?
6. What were W. Kellett's qualifications for the position?

The PREMIER replied—

1. The Hon. J. V. Chataway, Secretary for Public Lands.
2. Counsel to the department advised that it was advisable in all cases of appeals against assessment of rent on runs by the Land Court, as in the present case, that the Crown should call at least one competent witness who had inspected the country, in addition to the commissioner who had inspected in the first instance.
3. Total cost of inspection, £244 10s. 7d.; of which sum Mr. Kellett received £144 18s.
4. Yes.
5. See reply to No 2 above. The ordinary inspecting commissioners, except Mr. Commissioner Gibson, who had originally inspected the country in question, were not available at the time, being engaged in other work in distant parts of the colony, and Mr. Woodbine, who was temporarily employed by the department as a pastoral expert, was away in the Gregory North and South districts inspecting the country in connection with the Pastoral Leases Bill relating to runs in that locality.
6. Over forty years' practical experience in pastoral matters.

LAKE CLARENDON ESTATE AND MESSRS. FOXTON AND HOBBS.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*), in asking the Attorney-General—

1. What was the amount paid to Messrs. Foxton and Hobbs for preparing memorandum of transfer in connection with the Lake Clarendon Estate?
 2. Was any other work in connection with this estate performed by Messrs. Foxton and Hobbs?—If so, what was the nature of such work and the amount paid?—
- said: I ask the questions, but I understand there is some mistake about them.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoon*) replied—

Messrs. Foxton and Hobbs have done no work of any sort for the Government, and neither from the Department of Justice, nor from the Department of Lands, or any other department, as far as I have been able to ascertain, have they ever demanded or been paid any money either in connection with Lake Clarendon Estate or any other matter.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONALD: I am quite satisfied.

KIOSK IN BOTANICAL GARDENS.

Mr. LESINA asked the Secretary for Agriculture—

1. What amount of rent is being paid per annum by the tenant of the kiosk in the Brisbane Botanical Gardens?
2. Who authorised the erection of the kiosk?
3. Is it public or private property?
4. How many garden parties have been held in the Botanic Gardens during the past twelve months from which the general public have been excluded?
5. Does the Government derive any revenue from these parties?
6. Why is it that tenders are not called for the leasing of the kiosk every twelve months, in order that the caterers of Brisbane may be given an opportunity of tendering?

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. J. V. Chataway, *Mackay*) replied—

1. £25 per annum.
2. The Minister in office at the time the erection of the kiosk was approved.
3. The buildings are the property of the tenant of the ground occupied by the kiosk.
4. The public have not been excluded from the Botanic Gardens at any time during the past twelve months when the gates have been open.
5. No.
6. This question is answered by question No. 3.

INSURANCE OF MEMBERS OF TRANSVAAL CONTINGENT.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*), without notice, asked the Premier—If any insurance has been effected on the lives of the men who have gone from Queensland to the Transvaal, and, if so, with what office has it been effected?

The PREMIER replied—Insurances have been arranged for, and are being completed with regard to death for the whole of the contingent who have gone to South Africa. The office is the Mutual Life of Australasia. Insurances to protect their lives for £250 per man in the case of death have been arranged for, and negotiations are being completed; but arrangements for what is termed "accident policies"—that is for temporary or permanent disablement—have not yet been completed, owing to the want of a definite interpretation by the companies as to what may be understood by partial or permanent disablement.

Mr. GIVENS: If a man has his leg shot off will that be an accident?

The PREMIER: Yes, but the question is whether it is temporary or permanent disablement.

THE LATE CROWN SOLICITOR.

On the motion of Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*), for Mr. Groom, it was resolved—

That there be laid upon the table of the House copies of all papers, correspondence, recommendations for pecuniary recognition for services rendered, and all letters, with minutes of Minister, relating to the salary and work of the late Crown Solicitor, from 1893 to the 30th June, 1899.

EDUCATION IN THE INTERIOR.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*), in moving—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that the State Education Act of 1875 should be amended so as to enable children outside the influence of the present Act to receive some education—

said: This is exactly the same motion as I moved on the 26th of August, 1897, and I have put it in exactly the same words for this reason—that no alteration whatever has taken place in the position as far as I know; but I have not done so in any way to force members or persuade them to vote in the same manner as they voted in 1897, when the motion was passed on the voices. I have put it in exactly the same words, so that members can consider it again, and see if any further light can be thrown on it, or whether the Minister has found it in any way impracticable. The House having affirmed this motion two years ago, I was under the impression, I will admit, that it formed a sort of instruction to the Government that some action should be taken in that direction.

Mr. KIDSTON: It would only have been decent for the Government to have taken action.

Mr. STORY: I have not a word to say about the decency or indecency of the Government on this matter. My inexperience led me to allow this matter to lapse to a certain extent. I thought the instruction continued until we were discussing a similar matter the other day, when the hon. member for Bulloo mentioned that a resolution of the House died with the Parliament or the session. Therefore I was not aware

that it was necessary to move it again. I thought that this motion was registered in some way in the Education Department, and that it would receive careful consideration; that probably some action would be taken on it, and later on we should hear something of it. But I understand now that the motion lapsed with the session in which it was moved; but I think it is worth while—very well worth while, indeed—to discuss it again. I should be very sorry for it to be understood by any member of this House that I do not recognise to the full the wonderful and good work that the Education Department has done, and is doing at present. Even in my own district I am under the greatest obligations to them. As far as schools are concerned, my district is in a much better position than in 1896. I think we have, well, not six additional schools, but since 1896 a new school has been erected at Dareel. There has also been a new school erected at Mungindi. There is action being taken for the erection of a new school at Bollon. There are also new schools at Widgegoara, Wyandra, and Cuttaburra. I should like to call the attention of the House to this fact, as it has a considerable bearing on what I am going to say—that there is no township at Dareel; that there is no township at Widgegoara; and that there is no township, or even a public-house, at Cuttaburra. So, certainly, the department have gone one step in the direction of what my motion implies. It was supposed some time ago—it was generally acted upon—that it was necessary to have a township, at any rate, before a school could be instituted.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It has not been so understood by the department.

Mr. STORY: I quite admit that. It was understood by the people because until lately no application, as far as I know—I am only speaking of my own district—has been made for a school outside a township. But, with the help of the department, finding there was a sufficient number of children in certain centres, schools have been established there with utmost advantage to the district. At Dareel there is only a public-house. On the other side of the river—the Moonie—there is a large station, the manager of which is a bachelor; but there is a large number of workmen who are employed at the wool-scour constantly, and teamsters. Their children, and the children from the public-house on the other side of the river, have supplied pupils enough to have secured a school, and it is doing remarkably good work. At Widgegoara the same applies. There is a hotel only there; but there are children enough in the immediate district to supply a school, and it is doing remarkably good work. I had a letter from the secretary last week, on the taking leave of the schoolmaster, asking me to call the attention of the department to the very admirable work he had done during his residence there. At Cuttaburra there is no public-house or township. There is nothing but a few families living on the bank of the river who have children enough to cause the establishment of a school there. The distance from Cunnamulla is far enough to make it necessary. I can assure this House that it is a boon to the people who are there; and I am perfectly sure the department is receiving their gratitude to the fullest extent for what they have done to help these children. Having made it very apparent that it is not necessary to have a township or a village to make a school necessary, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that even beyond the township and beyond the clusters of inhabitants there are an immense number of children who are receiving no education at all, and whom the Act cannot

possibly reach. Out of my own district it has unfortunately been said that this motion of mine is a sort of political fireworks, that I know that what I propose cannot be done, but that I get a certain amount of kudos by trying to get the motion passed and action taken on it. I am disinclined to believe, and I never will believe, that the children to whom I am referring cannot be educated in some way or other, or get a chance of being educated. There is not the slightest reason why they should be deprived of the advantages of education, but the fact remains that nothing is done for them in that direction. And so long as I have a chance of doing whatever I can to get this motion carried and given effect to I shall never leave it or allow it to lapse. If it was possible that I could be unfeeling enough to introduce this motion on purpose to secure some advantage to myself, and talk on it every time, I should consider that I was adding insult to the injury which the people whose cause I am advocating already suffer through the want of education for their children. I thought two years ago, when I introduced this motion, that something would be done in the matter, but nothing has been done, and since then a number of children have passed beyond the range of any possible benefit from the adoption of this motion, even if it is carried into effect. It is not a matter that can be left and discussed from year to year, with the idea that some action may be taken later on, because although there will always, I suppose, be children who will require a certain amount of education, still every year a certain number of children will pass beyond the hope of any assistance from a motion of this kind. It would be infinitely cruel for me to make it appear that I am anxious to get something of the kind I propose done, if I was conscious all the time that I was deceiving the people who are trusting me to get it done, as the thing was impossible. I absolutely deny that it is impossible; it is both possible and practicable, as I hope I shall be able to prove before I finish. The department, by educating a certain number of children, prove that they recognise their obligation as far as those children are concerned, and if they recognise their obligation to two children their obligation to the third child is apparent. If our population were so arranged that all the children in Queensland could go to school, the department would have to supply schools and teachers for them all. And why those children who from their peculiar circumstances are too far from existing schools should be left without any education at all passes my comprehension, because, if there were railways, or those children had facilities to travel to a school, the Government would immediately recognise their obligation and responsibility to teach those children. And surely it is absurd to say that if they are just beyond the possibility of getting to a school the responsibility of the Government ceases—that it is a matter of mileage. The parents of children who are beyond the influence of the present Act contribute towards the education of other children in Queensland—they have to contribute—and that they should have to assist to procure for other children advantages which they are debarred from having for their own, is a manifest injustice. I am quite willing to admit that it is impossible to give those children any chance of education under the present Act, because according to its provisions there must be a certain number of children in a locality before a school can be established. But I should like to know at what distance the responsibility of the department ceases. Is it seven miles, or seven and a-half miles, or ten miles? What distance must children be away from a school in order that they may have no claim on the

Government? If this were a colony different from what it is, and our population were differently settled, I could understand the department not being obliged to go further than they have done in the matter of education, but seeing that our land policy and the education of the children are so intimately connected—that it is impossible for the people to carry out the land policy of the Government without going beyond the sphere of the influence of State schools—I think something more should be done. We are making our land laws liberal, we are advertising our lands in England, in the colony, and elsewhere, by means of maps, charts, pamphlets, and inquiry offices, and we are doing everything we possibly can to get people to settle, not in the towns or townships, or near the townships, but beyond them; and that being so, I think it would be only fair to let those people know, when trying to induce them to take up land, that with all the advantages of good land and low rents that are offered to them, there is the one great disadvantage that their children will grow up in absolute ignorance, unless they can afford to educate them themselves.

Mr. JACKSON: Is there a better system elsewhere?

Mr. STORY: I do not know that there is; but there must be some system which will enable the department to reach those children. If there is no better system elsewhere, it does not follow that we are not able to initiate such a system. Our colony is very different from the other colonies; there is an immense area beyond what you may call the confines of civilisation, which we are trying to induce people to settle upon, and when people go there and endeavour by hard work, by their industry and savings, to make a home for their children, they find that, unless they have sufficient money to educate them at their own expense, their children grow up in dense ignorance. This is more than a fad; it is a serious matter. Speaking about the selectors who go out into the far West, I would remind hon. members that no selector goes out and starts work in the country by himself. In his train go dam-sinkers, well-sinkers, fencers, and others, and in nearly every case a man has a family; and whether he camps in a tent or in a hut, when he goes home from work his children are there, and he has something of home comforts.

These men are our pioneers out [4 p.m.] West, but the effect of our present educational system is that men would rather look for work in the towns and townships than go out. They prefer to come into the towns to seek for irregular work and irregular wages, and if you ask them "Why?" they will tell you it is because they can put their children to school for a year or two. When they have given the children a certain amount of schooling they are content to go out and take their children with them. Can you imagine anything more deplorable than to find a family grouped together and not one of them able to read a book or a paper or anything they get? It is a most serious matter.

Mr. STEWART: They are not as bad as that in the Transvaal.

Mr. STORY: I do not know I am sure, but I suppose there are large areas there, too, where the children are not educated. The worst and cruellest part of it is that in the townships the children are getting a most excellent primary education under the auspices of the department. Not only are they getting a good primary education, but the brightest of them have possibilities of obtaining scholarships and going to any educational length to which their industry and ability may take them. But what are the people getting who really provide the whole of

the money—the producers outside? I am not saying anything about the farmers and men like that who are also producers, but in the farming districts people are more grouped together, and they can have a number of schools, and most of them have the advantages which I am claiming for our bush children. In the larger areas out West this is impossible, and the question is whether we are to have a population out West carrying out the land policy of the Government of the country and growing up in entire ignorance or whether the Government will help them in some way to get an education for their children? If you put the question to any member of the Ministry or any member of Parliament who has children of his own, and some little care for their future: Will you go out into the country where we will guarantee that you will make a living, and by doing so jeopardise the education of your children? he would put the money he would be likely to make against the disadvantage to his children, and, I think, he would decide that as he was a man who had probably reached middle life, the rest of his life would not be a matter of very much account, while the rest of the lives of his five or six children would be a matter of the greatest importance, not only to him and to them, but to the whole State. The hon. member for Musgrave made a quotation the other day which struck me as containing the whole wisdom of the question—that it is the business of every man, and it is to the benefit of every man to get his own children educated, and it is also to his benefit to get the children of everybody else educated. It makes the safeguard for the body politic, it makes possibilities for happy homes, and it makes an intelligent people. All of which we are debarred from through the present system of education not reaching the bush children. When speaking about this before I said it was no use coming to this House with an abstract question, and with abstract ideas without trying to find some way out of the difficulty. Well it seems to me that the way out of this difficulty is so absolutely simple and easy that why it has not been adopted I really do not know. Even when the Secretary for Public Instruction spoke when I introduced this motion last time I do not think he denied, and I do not think any member of this House denied, that the system I foreshadowed was anything but eminently practicable. My idea of reaching these children is this: I have talked upon the matter so frequently that I do not want to inflict a long speech on the House, and the matter is really in a nutshell. We will take, for instance, a family that is fourteen or fifteen miles away from the nearest school or township. The parent notifies to the teacher of the nearest provisional or State school that he has a certain number of children of school age for whom he has a tutor or governess, and he intends to bring them up for examination at the next visit of the inspector. We will imagine that this has been done, and that the inspector has seen these children, and has seen that they are of the proper school age, and has told the parent what books, maps, and so on it is necessary to use. Now, at his next annual visit these children are brought in to the school for examination. They are separated altogether from the children attending the school, and the inspector knowing them and having a list of them, examines those children and finds they have made satisfactory progress during the twelve months. He gives the parent a certificate to the effect that certain children of his—ages, sexes, and names being mentioned—have been examined by him that day, and they have made satisfactory progress since his last visit. That certificate from the inspector should be an order on the Treasury for the same amount per

child as it costs us to educate children in the Normal School. The average rate is £3 10s. per child, and suppose there are seven children, the certificate would be an order on the Treasury for £24 10s., and it would go towards paying the tutor's or governess's salary. You can see what an effect this would have. There would be only a percentage of children, I suppose, who would pass—some parents are careless, some children are lazy, and some teachers are inefficient. The children would see that according to their study and diligence would depend whether they passed or not. The parents would know that on their children passing the examination would depend their getting a certain amount towards the salary of the tutor or governess, and the governess or tutor would know that her or his billet depended on the passing of the children. He or she would do their utmost to pass those children. It would have this effect on the neighbours: They would see that a certain teacher had passed these seven children, and the parent had got the amount due to him from the Treasury at the rate of £3 10s. per head for each child passed, and the successful teacher would take a certain rank in the district. It would be quite possible, I can understand, if there were other places within a reasonable distance that the parents of other children might get them to study under that teacher, and you would have as the result a little school established of eight or ten children, and the total amount which might be received from the Treasury would be sufficient to pay the whole of the tutor's or governess's wages. It would have this other effect: I can imagine the parent going home with his children and saying to the tutor, "Out of six only two have passed. Four have failed, and I only get payment for two. There must be some alteration in your method of teaching, or I must get somebody else." I can understand the tutor replying, "There must be some alteration in your method also. Your children must attend more regularly, or you cannot expect me to pass them." You see that the interest of everybody concerned would be to pass the children. If they passed, well and good; and there would be a certain amount paid towards the salary of the governess or tutor. If not, they must either attend more diligently or get somebody better qualified to teach them. I can imagine every house, under those circumstances, a special provisional school, and I cannot imagine any additional expense to the department, except, perhaps, the salary of one or two more inspectors, which is such a trifle that it is not worth talking about. The only thing that has ever stopped this is the denominational question, and that is a bogey not worth taking into consideration. I can understand that in large towns the Government will not subsidise a school where some special religion is taught; but in this case, where the children are taught at home, everybody—Jews, Gentiles, Protestants, Roman Catholics, Presbyterians—inclined to teach their own children would get encouragement from the State to do so. There is one detail I omitted to mention, which is of great importance. The House must know that there are numbers of boundary riders, fencers, men in charge of rabbit-proof fences, and so on, often with large families, who do not get sufficient wages to pay a person capable of teaching those children. Under this system it would be worth while their getting somebody to teach them, because if there were children enough the teaching would not cost them anything at all. The religious aspect of the question would not present itself in any degree at all in the districts I am thinking of. One condition of course would be that the department would not help any family within a certain distance of a State or provisional school—make it five miles or

four miles or whatever you like. When we were last discussing this question, one hon. member said, "You see what could be done. Some religious persuasion could build a large college at one of those places away from any township, and then you would have all these pupils going in for examination, because they would not be within a certain distance of a State school, and you would have to pay by results." But we do not legislate for lands in Brisbane, and lands on the coast, and lands in agricultural districts, the same as we legislate for lands out there; and I hope we are not going to legislate in this matter the same as we do here. But I do not believe any of my fellow-colonists, or co-religionists, or anybody with common-sense, knowing how absolutely necessary it is to have those children taught, so bigoted and so narrow-minded as to raise a question like this to stand in the way. I am sure there would be no man so lost to reason as to say, "If we cannot get this for our children here, you shall not get it out there." Besides, it would be impossible to build a large college so as to make payments by results extend further than I suggest. If anybody attempted such a thing, all the State would have to do would be to put up a provisional school within a couple of miles, and their energy would be wasted, so far as that is concerned. Now with regard to the cost. If we have a school anywhere with an enrolment of eighteen and an average attendance of eleven, it will cost a certain amount to build the school, to furnish it, and to provide it with teachers, and there would be various other expenses. Under what I suggest there will be no building to be erected by the department, no teachers to provide, no transfers involving long and expensive journeys, and no repairs. The only thing the department will have to pay will be so much per child for the children who pass; nothing else at all. The cost will be less per head than the children attending our State schools cost at the present time. In the State schools there are many children who are admirably taught, and there are others who are either lazy or attend irregularly, but their cost to the State is just the same. There are a certain number of children to a class and a certain number of teachers, and the cost for teaching and maintenance is the same whether the children learn or not. In this scheme of mine there is only the cost of the children who pass the examinations. Take 1,000 children at £3 10s. per head, it would cost £3,500 to give 1,000 children some primary education. But there is another thing we have to consider. Of these 1,000 children probably not more than 50 per cent. would pass, so you may calculate that £3,500 would educate, to a certain extent, 2,000 children. I would like to recall to the recollection of the Secretary for Railways and the Home Secretary a recent trip we had out west. It will at all events be fresh in the mind of the Secretary for Railways. We left Yeulba and went to Surat, fifty miles. The country was occupied on all sides, yet in that fifty miles we never saw one school. Of course there was a school at Surat. The next day we left Surat and went to St. George, eighty miles. The country was occupied everywhere, and we saw any amount of children on selections and at camps at different places; but there was no school in that eighty miles. There is a school at St. George, of course. From St. George we went thirty miles to Nindi Gully, and from Nindi Gully to Goondiwindi, and in all that immense district, with abundant signs of occupation everywhere, we did not see one single school. I do not care how conscientious or how good the Education Department may be, nor how desirous it may be to educate all children under our present State school system, it cannot embrace

those children within its arms. If you put a State school down every ten miles you could not get any attendance, because they would be near no centre. All we want is some help towards their education. A man wrote to me the other day, asking, "Will the Government do anything for us unfortunate wretches in the matter of educating our children?" That was written by a selector who has a large family growing up, and I know of my own knowledge that times have been so absolutely bad with him since he came to Queensland that he could not find the money to pay anybody to teach his children. And yet that man has to find money to educate other people's children. Why should not that man be helped? On the last trip I mentioned, the Minister for Railways visited a selector's house near St. George, where he saw a very fine family of children, and there was a tutor there; and although there has been nothing but drought and tribulation in that district for some years, yet that man was doing his best to educate his children. I ask again: Why should not he be helped, considering that he can be so easily helped? There is no difficulty about the matter at all. Supposing that tutor was there for twelve months, and that that selector took his children fourteen or fifteen miles into St. George, where they would be examined, why should he not be paid something towards the education of these children? In St. George the children are very numerous, and there is a first-class school there, which is conducted in a first-class manner, and the parents of the children only pay towards the education of their children there what we all pay towards the general fund. I do not wish to make a very long speech on this matter, and I will finish by reiterating the statement that, although a great deal has been done by the Education Department—a considerable amount of it having resulted from the motion of the hon. member for Croydon, with regard to helping provisional schools to be built—I say that much as has been done by the department, the conditions of the colony are so peculiar that they can do no more in the way of these schools than they have done. It would be an absolute waste of money to build schools, and the children that I have referred to be unable to go to them. But the department could do an immense amount of good by helping the parents of these children in some manner; then the responsibility would rest on the parents. If they do not get good people to teach their children, or if they are careless about the attendance of their children at school, that is their own fault, and they have no cause of complaint against the department. Where every one is doing his best to educate his children, I say that it is only fair that the Government should help those people, as well as helping those who live within the influence of the Act.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, Mackay): It has been a pleasure for me to listen to the eloquent and earnest address delivered by the hon. member for Balonne on this matter. We all know that his heart is entirely in the resolution that is now before us, which, as he says, is similar to the one he brought before the House last year. It is impossible for anyone who has the interests of the colony at heart not to sympathise with the expressions that hon. gentleman has made. We all agree with him that the children in the bush should have the same means of education as the children more fortunately situated. That it is unfortunate that some children should be left without the means of education, is admitted by everybody, and the only question that I am aware of

that is between the hon. member and myself and the department is not in deploring that a great many children in the bush are not able to enjoy the advantages of education as the children in Brisbane enjoy, but that such a state of things should be brought about that the children of the people in the bush, who enjoy all the advantages of country life, should also enjoy the advantages of education which are only obtainable where population is more dense. The fact that children in the bush have no primary schools is not the only instance of the advantages which they are deprived of. I do not know whether the hon. member would propose for secondary education what he proposes for primary education, but I do know that many persons leave the bush where they are isolated, and take, perhaps, less remuneration in order that they may live in some township where they can get their children educated. There are many people who live in Brisbane only because they desire to obtain the advantages of education for their children here, and I am afraid that under no conceivable circumstances can we suppose that people who live in different parts of the colony are on the same footing in all respects with regard to education. The hon. member said that he understood that last year when the resolution was passed, that it was an instruction to the Government.

Mr. STORY: No, I said that the Government should take notice of it.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, the Government have taken notice of it, but the hon. member not only means that the Government should have taken notice of it—that is that the State Education Act should be amended to enable these children to receive some education, but that the department should have the Act amended so that every child in the colony should receive education. But unless the department is instructed in some way, as to how this is done, I venture to assert that even if examinations suggested by the hon. member were held, that a large number of children would still be without instruction. The department requires to be informed how the Act is to be extended in this way. The hon. member in his very unobjectionable speech—unobjectionable in that he does not blame myself or the department that they have not done what they should or could have done—has admitted that he himself has always been met in a liberal spirit—that the department have done their utmost with the means at their command. He told us that six new schools had been erected in the neighbourhood of his electorate, and he led me to understand that these schools had not been built before because the people in the vicinity had taken a wrong view of the Act, and of the regulations under the Act. But the department is in no way blamable for the wrong view taken by these citizens. It would only be necessary for them to ask the member for the district, or a State school teacher, or the department, and the information would be at once given to them on the subject. The progress of schools in his district has taken place very rapidly, and it is evident that these schools would have been established long ago had the people in the different localities understood the laws of the country. It is only necessary for them to make applications to the department. It would be appropriate now to explain how requests made to the department are dealt with; to point out what the present regulations provide for, and what the practice is. Now, where

[4:30 p.m.] the average attendance is as low as twelve, the department will undertake to supply the cost of a provisional school. It will undertake the payment of the teacher, and even when the attendance falls below twelve

—even when the attendance falls as low as six or seven—if the parents will provide a portion of the money—and the hon. member himself, in his scheme, implies that the parents in the majority of cases must supply a portion of the money—if they will supply a portion of it, either in the way of cash or in some cases in the way of board, it is customary to continue the school. We pay the teacher an amount per head which would represent the entire cost of the school, provided the statutory number of children attend, but if there is a shortage we expect the parents to contribute and make up perhaps £4, or £8, or £10, or do something in the way of providing board for the teacher. So that it is evident that much has been done in the way of providing schools where there is only an attendance of twelve children, and in some cases even less than that. Then there is another regulation that is acted on in a good many cases. Not only do we keep a school going where there are only six or seven pupils, but we have made provision for groups, so that if there are twelve children anywhere within distance of each other the teacher can take one group for one week and another group the succeeding week; that is, we provide for two half-time schools. The average family, it must be remembered, consists of five children, but in cases where there are two or three families with four or five children each, the department makes provision for these half-time schools which may be distant, perhaps, fifteen or twenty miles from each other. Then there is a provision for the appointment of itinerant teachers. That has been attempted two or three times, and has never met with the approval of parents, and, in that respect, I venture to say that the opinion of the parents is quite justifiable. I do not think it is a profitable method of instructing our children. So that although the hon. member seems to think that no notice has been taken of his motion, the department has really done its best under existing circumstances to provide the benefits of education for as many children as possible. Now, the hon. member takes the view that if we teach twelve children, why should we not teach two? He assumes rightly enough that all persons throughout the colony are taxed to provide the education vote, and if the children where they are numerous are able to go to school, the children who are isolated and very few in number should also have a right to a teacher being provided by the State.

Mr. STORY: No; only a portion of the cost.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Well, although that is a good idea enough, yet it is not practicable.

Mr. McDONALD: Why?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am speaking of the principle. The principle is that if any person in any part of the colony contributes—and all are supposed to contribute to the taxation generally—to some institution which is a benefit to a particular district, then all the people in the colony should have the benefits of similar institutions extended to them. I say that is impracticable. Take the case of the botanic gardens. Because the people of Brisbane have a botanic gardens, which are paid for to some extent by the State, therefore, we must establish botanic gardens in all portions of the colony. We might take as similar instances the postal system, the telegraph system, or the railway system. Although the deficit on the railways has to be met by everyone, yet it is impracticable that everyone should have a railway near them. I admit it is desirable. It would be a very nice thing if everyone was provided with the benefits of a railway for the reason that

they have to pay a share of the taxation. But the question in this case is not what is desirable, but what is practicable. All previous Ministers and the department have admitted that it is desirable to place the means of instruction at the command of every child in the colony, but the question is whether it is altogether practicable to do so. Suppose a married couple go twenty, thirty, or forty miles away from a school and by-and-by have children, it is pretty evident to me that for some time at any rate they cannot have a teacher provided by the State. So that there are disabilities which it is impossible for the State to altogether meet, and I am prepared to show that even if we did attempt the scheme propounded by the hon. member we should even then be compelled to admit that a great many children in the State were not reached. I think the hon. member will admit that the motion cannot possibly be carried out so far as to enable all the children in the colony to receive some education at the hands of the State, any more than it is possible for every child in the colony to have a technical school in its immediate neighbourhood. However much we might wish it, we are bound to admit that that is impracticable. The hon. member himself showed one of the difficulties in the way of his scheme, because, while he claims that every child has a claim to education, yet he points out, that while there may be a school in the district, it may be at such a distance as to prevent certain children attending it, and even if we provided schools throughout the colony at a distance of every six miles, we should still be unable to provide for every child in the colony. The hon. member says, with regard to our land system, that we should advertise, or inform the public, that if they go into the back country their children will probably receive no education at the hands of the State. I do not know that it is necessary to tell parents that, because they know perfectly well that if they go far away into the bush they are subjected to a great many disabilities. But I observed also that the hon. member said that when a selector took up land a number of other people followed after him—dam-makers, well-borers, and fencers. I assume that he was referring to grazing selection; and if that is so, then it is quite practicable for those persons to obtain a school for their children.

Mr. STORY: Their occupation is not permanent; they would not stay there always.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It seems to me to be another difficulty, and a very serious one. I do not know whether the hon. member would expect the State to provide for people who were only there twelve months; but if those persons themselves made an application to the department on the ground that they had enough children to provide an average attendance of twelve, we should not ask whether they were likely to be permanent; but if they would subscribe what is necessary under the regulations, we should endeavour to satisfy their requirements as fully as possible. Again, while I sympathise with the hon. member's motion, and while I admit that persons living in the bush have many disadvantages—I lived in the bush myself—and while I lived there I taught my children as far as I could, though I should have preferred sending them to a State school—but admitting that there must necessarily be many children throughout the colony who are not educated in consequence of the absence of a school or in consequence of the inability or the indisposition of their parents to teach them, there is another class of children and a great number who are not educated either who live near enough to school

to attend, that is to say, even in Brisbane, doubtless in Townsville, doubtless in Charters Towers, doubtless in Mackay, there are some children who are not educated.

Mr. JACKSON: There are 1,815 altogether.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There are 1,800 reported as existing in the colony for whom the means of education are provided more or less—

Mr. McDONNELL: Why don't you put the compulsory clauses into force?

Mr. McDONALD: They have the opportunity of attending.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That does not affect the position in the slightest as far as the State is concerned. Assuming that education is what we believe it to be, a beneficial influence, the question for the State is not how the children don't go to school, but the broad fact that they do not or they do go. As to how this happens that is a mere secondary thing. I am pointing out that though the hon. member shows, and shows with great clearness, that there are a great many children who have not the means of going to school, yet from his point of view—and from my point of view as one who believes in education being as universal as possible—the evil to the State is equal in both cases. If there are 100 who do not go to school in the bush, because there are no schools for them, and if there are 100 who don't go in town because their parents won't send them or allow them to stop away, the evil to the State would be about the same in both cases. And I want to point out that the compulsory clauses have not been put in force. Hon. members will probably ask me how that is so, and I can tell them that there are a good many difficulties in putting them in force. But I say this—if any hon. member who represents a constituency will come to me, and say, "I, representing that constituency, ask you that the compulsory clauses should be put in force, and that the children no longer shall be permitted to neglect the opportunities which the liberality of the State and other people gives them"—if any hon. member will come to me, and say, "I represent that district, and I am responsible to the people of that district, and I ask the Education Department to put them in force," I will put them in force.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. McDONALD: You will have a dozen applications next week.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Whatever the enthusiasm which has been displayed for education, I have never until lately heard any member of Parliament come to me and say I want those compulsory clauses put in force; I am responsible for that district, and I voice the opinions of the people of the district. So far I say there has been no monition of that kind.

Mr. JACKSON: It has just been mentioned casually in debate.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There has always been mention of them but nothing further.

Mr. McDONNELL: It has been advocated several times.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I say that if hon. members desire something done, if they will come to me while I retain that office, I will put the clauses in force in any district where it is recommended by its representative. The hon. member has said, very wisely, I think, that it is no use coming to the House with merely abstract questions, but he has brought forward a scheme which he thinks will go some way to solve the difficulties of the question as measured by the Department of Public Instruction.

Mr. STORY: I said the same in 1897.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I admit that; I am not saying this in a critical spirit; I am pointing out that the hon. member recognises that this is a practical question, and he has given us a plan of his own which he thinks will solve the difficulties with which it is surmounted. I am not a convert at all to this scheme, because I do not think that if we did bring it into practice it would be at all successful; it seems to me that even then some other hon. member will be able to come up and say precisely what the hon. member says now—that the Act would still require amending to enable the children outside its influence to receive education. I do not believe that by agreeing to paying so much per head for their children you will in the majority of cases have those children educated at all, and I shall proceed to show hon. members—

Mr. STORY: Then the blame would rest on the parents.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I shall proceed to show the House why I have arrived at that conclusion. In illustrating the position the hon. member assumes that there is a family fourteen or fifteen miles away from a school, and that this family is provided in some way with a schoolmaster or a schoolmistress, or the parents teach the children. At a given time an inspector comes to some town at no great distance, and notifies that he is desirous of examining any children who may be considered by the parent to have received sufficient tuition. He holds an examination, and certifies that since the last time he made an examination those children have made good progress. In this case, which is a hypothetical case, there would be six or seven children. The hon. member assumes six or seven children, and that this would result in the parent obtaining, provided there are seven children, and all of them have made good progress, and all of them were of schoolage—that in this case there would be £24 10s. for the parent to receive for the education of his children. This, I may say, would not represent an average case. If there were seven children and they were all at school, I imagine that family would not number less than twelve; but even assuming that there were seven children in a family of twelve, and all those children had got certificates of having made good progress, it might happen—and the hon. member admits himself that some children are clever and some children are not clever—that some teachers are very active and very successful, and others are not active or successful, but whether the certificate was granted would depend to some extent not on the amount of instruction given, but on the amount of natural ability the children possess, and it might happen that even if the children had been taught twelve months, through no fault of the parent and through no fault of the teacher, the parent would receive no allowance at all for having taught them. The hon. member assumes—and it seems to me an important consideration—the hon. member assumes two things, which do not seem to agree with one another. He assumes that a parent cannot afford to provide a teacher. He assumes that the parent is desirous of having his children educated—a very natural assumption—and, I hope, a perfectly accurate one in the majority of instances. Now I would ask, what kind of teacher would you get if you had three children to educate, and the sum you receive back from the State is £3 10s. per annum for each child, or £10 10s. for the three? If any teacher was paid £10 10s. per annum, hon. members opposite would call it "sweating," and I, as the Minister, would never permit the payment by the department of such an excessively low salary, although the teacher only had two or three children to

teach. The hon. member assumes that the parents cannot afford to pay a teacher; but, under the scheme which he proposes, they will have to find the teacher's salary for twelve months, at any rate, until they are repaid by the department. The hon. member assumes that there are seven children of school age in the family—which would mean a total number of children of about twelve. But could a teacher be obtained for £24 10s. per annum?

Mr. STORY: I never meant you to understand that that was to be the whole of the teacher's salary.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Then all I can say is that this resolution will never carry out what the hon. member desires. It would still leave many children without education. The hon. member admits that this repayment by the department would not pay for a teacher, even in a case where there were seven children of school age. The hon. member is therefore only dealing with those parents who can afford to pay the cost of the education of their seven children, and to pay the teacher twelve months in advance of the repayment by the State. In fact, if we adopted this resolution, it would fail to fulfil its object, inasmuch as it would not meet the case of poor parents at all.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Hear, hear!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: It is only applicable to tolerably well-off people—people who can afford to pay someone to educate their children, and are content to receive only a portion of the cost of that education back, giving the State twelve months' credit. When we come to examine the resolution, we find that it would leave, I should say, four-fifths of the children who at present receive no schooling still without schooling, and would only partially relieve those parents in the bush who have sufficient money to pay for the services of a teacher, but who probably would do so at considerable self-sacrifice. To the great bulk of those who have been depicted by the hon. member as going into the bush to make a living as stock-riders, receiving small salaries, and having large families, I assert that this paltry repayment of £3 10s. per head per annum would be practically no assistance, because, according to the hon. member's own statement, those are the very people who cannot afford to pay for a teacher, and would be unable to pay a teacher for twelve months in order that they might be repaid at the end of that time. Of course, in the case of a family of twelve, seven of whom are at school, £3 10s. a-head would be an appreciable sum—a sum which might pay half the teacher's salary: but it would not pay more than half. But what are we to do with parents who do not indulge in such a wild luxuriance of multiplication as to have twelve children, seven of whom are at school? Suppose we take the average family: according to the statistics of the colony, the average family is five.

Mr. KERR: A very fair average, too.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I think so, too. In all probability, three of those five would be of school age. Even supposing all three make sufficient progress to justify the State paying £3 10s. for each of them, will that anything like pay for their education? While I give the hon. member every credit for his good intentions and for his ingenuity in putting forth this scheme, yet I assert, with very much regret, that it will not do what he desires, and it will not remove the difficulties which the department acknowledges now exist. The great proportion of children who are now not near any State school will still remain without the advantages of education. We have more to hope for from closer settlement and a better

means of communication than from any scheme of this kind. There are not so many places in Queensland where families are so completely isolated that there are no other families within miles.

Mr. STORY: That sort of population stretches for hundreds of miles out West.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The people who go out West, in many cases, are single people. Doubtless they get married, but a great many of those people actually come in and settle near other people who have families. I have heard the hon. member say this himself, and I know it is so. They come and settle in places where there are other families in order to overcome this difficulty. I have pointed out—and I think I am entitled to do so—that, so far as I can judge, even if we carry this scheme into effect, and repay the people who are able to pay a teacher a small portion—and it will only be a very small portion—of their outlay, we will leave nine out of ten of those children who are now without education—a fact that the hon. member deplors, and so do I—still outside the scope of our educational system, and therefore this scheme does not fulfil the promises which were contained in the hon. member's address. The average family in France is one child. Now, I will ask hon. members how far £3 10s. a year will go to pay for the education of one child? It seems to me that if parents are placed in

the position that they are not able to

[5 p.m.] pay for the education of their children, their receiving £3 10s. a year

if they have one child, or £7 a year if they have two, will not enable them to do so. Therefore this scheme cannot possibly be submitted to this House as an expedient which will at all meet the difficulties of the case. I do not think it will do very much more than is done at present, while it will introduce a very embarrassing element into our political system. There is one objection. It may, perhaps, be a minor objection. It is an objection that I would not urge if I could see that this rule—that we should pay parents £3 10s. a year if their children pass the examination, could be generally availed of. But there is certainly this objection: That even if this scheme were successful, as the hon. member hopes—I do not admit it will be—it will delay the creation of State schools and provisional schools in a great many places. People will not endeavour to do what they are doing now—come to a township to live. Carriers will not do what they do now—make their camp at a place where they can all come together and have a State school. Instead of children coming to school, and meeting one another, and learning discipline, and improving their knowledge of social life, which is of the greatest advantage to them subsequently—instead of this occurring as much as it does now, there will be less of this State school education, and the education that will take place will be the education of families—isolated families—where that social action and interaction, which is one of the greatest benefits of school life, will occur. It will delay, even assuming it to be successful, the erection of State and provisional schools. The hon. member thinks it will be a great saving to the State in this way—that no books will be required.

Mr. STORY: Oh, no!

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: That, at any rate, they will want no buildings, no repairs, and so on. If you are going to get a schoolroom and get a teacher, you must provide accommodation for the teacher whether the State does it or not, and it seems to me that in the long run we are quite as certain to have applications from the poor parents for a better schoolroom, as we find we have had from the provisional schools. When the provisional schools were

established, the idea which was entertained by the House was that there were many districts in which a small number of children could be obtained—between twelve and thirty—and in these places, if the State found the teacher the parents would find the school. That was the plan which was adopted. As time rolled on it was found, first of all, necessary to provide for the teacher. The people then said, "We will find the schoolroom rather than that our children should be deprived of the benefits of education; but you cannot expect us to find room for the teacher for our few children." As time went on, parents naturally thought they should get more assistance from the State, and have the schoolroom paid for to the same extent by the State as State schools; and the repairs are now going to be carried out by the State. I do not urge this as any great difficulty. I only urge it as a criticism. But it seems to me that if the hon. member expects to satisfy people in this way he disregards the experience of the past, because we find it has broken down in provisional schools. I submit that if it were shown that many families would be able under this system to educate their children who do not have them educated now because they are in the bush and their means will not allow them to put up a sufficiently good room to accommodate the teacher and the children—that if it could be shown that this system which has been so eloquently proposed by the hon. gentleman would include in our educational system children in the bush who are now outside the benefits of that system, that objection would still be valid. It seems to me that whatever may be the position of parents, their natural affection for their children will impel them to endeavour to get the difficulties which now exist removed, and that they will call on the State—that is on other persons—to contribute to remove any disabilities that they may suffer from. The hon. member, in order to illustrate this matter, told us that, in company with the Secretary for Railways, he had passed over many hundred miles of country, which he said was taken up or settled, and in which he did not see a school from one end to the other. It does not follow that no instruction was given. I know places in the bush where you cannot see a school, but the children are—

Mr. STORY: There were no schools where I stated.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: There may be no schools, but it does not necessarily follow because there are no schools that the children are not instructed.

Mr. STORY: Not by the State.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I may point out that if we adopted this system, and every parent was able to teach his or her own children, and was able to employ a teacher—if teaching was conducted in the houses of citizens of the West, it is quite clear there would not be any schools. Then the hon. gentleman said that on that journey he saw one selector, or settler, and he told him, "The Government should help us unfortunates to teach our children." This settler also told him that they had such bad seasons that he could not afford a teacher. I would point out that this system would not meet such a case as that at all. If a man has a family, and has been very unfortunate—and I am sorry to say very many have been so unfortunate as to have bad seasons—and cannot afford a teacher, he will not be relieved by this scheme. If a settler has a bad season, I can understand he cannot afford to pay a teacher £30 a year—and I can understand that that will be the irreducible minimum—or £60 a year. How can a person who has had no returns from his stock

or from his cultivation afford to employ a teacher at all? Even although the Government nominally says, "If you teach your children we will repay you the money," such an offer is a mere mockery. It seems to me it is adding insult to neglect. You tell him to do something which untoward circumstances prevent him from doing. How can an unfortunate selector who has had bad seasons afford to pay a teacher £30 or £80 a year? The better-off selector—the squatter probably—may be able to have his children taught. He may be able to get sufficient accommodation from the bank to carry him on for, at any rate, a year or two, and pay this £30 or £60 a year, which the State will very handsomely and liberally return to him. But the other person—the particular person the hon. member seems to be desirous of assisting, and whom, I am sure, we are all desirous of assisting as far as we can—is the precise person who, if this scheme was adopted, would receive no benefit. Whatever the hon. member may think of his scheme—and I am quite sure he would not have brought it forward had he not honestly believed that it would enable the department to do more than it is doing at present in the direction he indicates—I venture to say that it would not be effective, and I also venture to say that it would create a great deal of annoyance, and that we should find it described as a sop to the rich, and not an assistance to the poor. The department, in providing, as they have done, that groups of six children shall be instructed at the expense of the State, and in bringing down, as they have done, the number of children to be instructed by one teacher to less than twelve, have done all that it is practicable to do, and have also done not only as much but more than is done in the other colonies. We have erred on the side of liberality and generosity, if we have erred at all. The officers permanently connected with the department are exceedingly zealous, and exceedingly desirous of pushing the advantages of education as far as practicable, and beyond that I venture to say we cannot go, however much the hon. member may desire it. I really must say that while I admire the enthusiasm of the hon. member who has brought forward this motion, and while I give him credit for the most laudable intentions, he has not, so far as I can judge, presented in his scheme any plan which will enable the department to go further than they have gone already. I only wish that the plan was such as would enable me to say that by carrying it out we could have every child in the State instructed. I only regret that it does not offer any hope in that direction. I believe that if we adopted the scheme he suggests we should give serious annoyance to some people, and that in a year or two some hon. members opposite would express their very great dissatisfaction that certain persons got all the advantages of our educational system, and that those who are probably most in need of assistance got none. I do not think the plan suggested would meet whatever difficulties at present exist.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*): I have listened to the hon. gentleman very attentively for a considerable time, and I can come to no other conclusion than that he has very little sympathy with the proposal to give these children any education at all. The whole of the hon. gentleman's speech seems to me to have been made simply to kill time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: What is yours for?

Mr. McDONALD: I will not be long, and I am not speaking to kill time.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I do not think it is fair to make that statement.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman introduced into this discussion a large amount of foreign matter which has no interest in this debate.

The HOME SECRETARY: You make a great mistake.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman in one particular case drew a comparison between the number of children in a family in France and in Queensland. What analogy is there in that comparison? Simply none. Whether the hon. gentleman accepts the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Balonne or not, there is this to be said: that he has admitted that under it probably one-fifth of the children who are now receiving no education would be educated. Therefore, on the hon. gentleman's own showing it is worth while to put the suggested scheme into practice. We are told that there some 1,815 children about the city who are not being educated at the present time. Whose fault is that? It is the fault of the department, because they do not put the compulsory provisions of the Education Act into force. But the hon. gentleman turns round and wants to throw the responsibility on members of Parliament who represent certain districts for not asking him to put those provisions into force.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: They will have very little effect when they are enforced.

Mr. McDONALD: What is the hon. gentleman in that position for? Why should he wait to be asked to put those clauses into force?

Mr. FISHER: I ask it now for Gympie.

Mr. McDONALD: I ask it for Flinders.

Mr. CALLAN: And I ask it for Mount Morgan.

Mr. McDONALD: I told the hon. gentleman at the time that a number of members would be sending in applications to have the clauses enforced in their districts. Now, three members have asked it in this Chamber, and I believe that next week he will have nearly every member of Parliament making the same request.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: I am very glad to hear it personally.

Mr. McDONALD: The hon. gentleman has attempted all through to show that the scheme of the hon. member for Balonne is impracticable. I take a different view of the matter altogether. When trying to show that the scheme is impracticable the hon. gentleman said if there were seven children in a family, and two passed the necessary examination, the subsidy coming from the State would be £7, and that you could not get a tutor or teacher for £7. The hon. member for Balonne did not suggest anything of the kind. As I understand his scheme it is this: that if any selector, or any other person living in an isolated centre, desires to have his children educated, and other persons within easy distance of that selector also desire to have their children educated, they may assist to pay the teacher, and that for all children who pass the standard examination they should receive the subsidy mentioned by the hon. member, that subsidy to go towards paying the salary of the governess or teacher. The hon. gentleman then went on to argue that the whole thing would be unsuccessful. If it was unsuccessful the department would lose nothing by it, while if it was successful it would be a great boon to many families in the outlying districts. The hon. gentleman admits that it is an intolerable state of affairs that a number of children in the back country receive no education, and the fact that this motion was passed on the previous occasion on the voices shows that every member of the House is desirous that some provision should be made to get those children educated. Yet, since the motion was passed—that is two years ago—the Minister has done nothing to solve the difficulty. The hon. member for Balonne, however, has submitted a scheme for

dealing with the matter. So far as I can understand the scheme submitted by the hon. member for Balonne, it is not only practicable, but feasible, and even according to the showing of the Secretary for Lands himself, at least one-fifth of the children who are not educated at the present time would be educated under that scheme. Another argument the hon. gentleman advanced was that because all the children would not be educated under this scheme it would not be a good thing to introduce it, as it would be the means of only a certain section being educated. Even supposing that is so, I remember that there was another very important educational movement introduced into this Assembly about a year ago for the establishment of a university. Last year a Bill was introduced for this purpose, and we have had another introduced this year. Speaking on the University Bill last year, the present Secretary for Lands said, with respect to an objection taken that it was more desirable to try to give all a primary education than to give a section higher education, the hon. gentleman said it was no argument against what all admitted as a necessary thing that all could not take advantage of it, and he went on to show how utterly impossible it was that all children could take advantage of it. We grant that, but when the hon. gentleman tells us that that is no argument why we should not have a university, I say that it is admitted that the scheme proposed by the hon. member for Balonne will result in a certain number of children being educated who cannot now get an education, and it is no argument against the scheme to say that all cannot be educated under it. I can give a case as an illustration that covers the ground stated by the hon. member for Balonne in introducing this motion. I know of a place in Queensland where a man employed at a mail stage left a good billet there to come into town to take up a very inferior billet that he might be able to give his children an education. If this scheme were in force there is a station not far away, and the people there would probably be prepared to get a governess for their two or three children, and as there was no great distance between the two places, the children of the man at the mail stage could have gone there, and seven or eight children could thus have been educated, and if they passed the necessary standard the Government subsidy under this scheme could be gained, and under such circumstances it would have been better for this man to have retained his good billet if he could get his children educated in this manner, and the difference between the wages he would get there and the wages he got in the town would have met his contribution to the tutor's salary. I dare say that if I started to look for cases I could find a number of similar cases. That is only one that occurs to me at the moment. I say the hon. member for Balonne is to be commended for the action he has taken in this matter, for the thought he has given to it, and for the scheme he has brought down. The hon. gentleman has certainly shown that under that scheme it is probable that a certain number of children will be educated who are not being educated now, and I for one will certainly vote in favour of the hon. gentleman's motion.

Mr. SMITH: I think it is desirable that we should do all that we can for education, and all that we can to provide a means of education for the children of people in remote parts of the colony, where the population is very much scattered. I think the motion is worthy of very careful consideration by the department. They should, I think, consider whether something in that direction could not be done, and whether, if it cannot be done exactly on the lines laid

down by the hon. member, some modification of his plan might be adopted, and a trial given to it, to test whether it can be worked or not. To alter the present education system is a question which would deserve very serious consideration. The people are not desirous of doing away with or interfering in any way with the system of education at present adopted throughout the colony. Any interference with it would give rise to a great deal of argument and contention, and I doubt very much whether it would be beneficial in so far as education, which we desire to see sown broadcast throughout the colony, is concerned. I really think some modification of the system proposed by the hon. member for Balonne might be adopted whereby people in parts of the colony remote from centres of population should be entitled to receive some compensation from the State for the expense they are necessarily put to in giving an education to their children. As the hon. member for Balonne has pointed out, it is an advantage not only to each family that they should be educated, but it is an advantage to the people of the colony as a whole. The more the people are educated the better it is from a national point of view for the colony as a whole, and I therefore think the proposal made by the hon. member is well worthy of consideration. With regard to the compulsory clauses of the Education Act, the Minister says he is willing to enforce the compulsory clauses in any hon. member's electorate if he desires it. I made a request of the kind in 1891. I have always been in favour of having the compulsory clauses put into force, because I believe it would be a very good thing for the colony. There are a great many young larrikins growing up in ignorance, who, if they had an education, might become better citizens. I quote from page 1570 of *Hansard* for 1891, when Mr. Hodgkinson was Secretary for Public Instruction. I was speaking on the subject of enforcing the compulsory clauses, and this is what occurred—

As soon as the funds at his disposal would enable the hon. gentleman to do so, it would be well if he would endeavour to enforce the compulsory clauses of the Act. He (Mr. Smith) knew that a great number of young people were going about without the advantages which a school provided, solely because they were not looked after. In the neighbouring colony of New South Wales they had what were called attendance inspectors.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: Our average attendance is higher than that of any of the other colonies.

Mr. SMITH said those inspectors were appointed specially—

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC INSTRUCTION: They have been a failure.

Mr. SMITH said he did not know how they had been a failure. He was speaking to one of those inspectors the other day, and he told him that the system was working remarkably well.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Of course he would.

Mr. SMITH said the gentleman to whom he was speaking gave him figures, but he (Mr. Smith) had not them with him just then. He was informed that the system was working admirably. Those who had the guardianship of boys who were not attending school were brought up before a magistrate, and for a first offence a nominal fine was imposed. If they were brought up a second time the fine was increased, and so on, until the boys were compelled to attend school.

Towards the close of that debate, after the hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. [5:30 p.m.] Annear, had stated that he was instructed by a certain society in Brisbane to ask that the compulsory clauses should be enforced, the then Secretary for Public Instruction said it was not the intention of the Government to take any steps with that view at present, and he proceeded to give his reasons—

In the first place, it was impossible to work with any degree of success in the present condition of the colony, as they required funds for such a purpose—a

very large sum would be required. In the second place, there was not by any means a consensus of opinion with regard to the subject, and many people had a great dislike to the enforcing of the compulsory clauses; and, in the third place, the experience of Sydney was decidedly against the enforcement of those clauses. According to the latest statistics in New South Wales, where the compulsory system was in force the attendance was only 57.81 per cent. of the total number of children. In South Australia it was 63.07 per cent., in Victoria it was 64.16 per cent., and in Queensland, where there was not compulsory education, 64.1 per cent.; so that Queensland had the highest percentage except Victoria, and the difference between the two was infinitesimal.

I desire to call the attention of the present Secretary for Public Instruction to what his predecessor stated on that occasion. I certainly thought that if the numbers of children who were idling about the streets were compelled to attend school it would be a great deal better for themselves and for the colony; and I think so still, notwithstanding the statistics that were then brought forward. I hope the hon. gentleman will adopt the system, which he says he is inclined to do.

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Where there is school accommodation, of course.

Mr. SMITH: And I trust that where there is not school accommodation it will be provided. This question of education is a most important one. Although we hear it said that an educated scoundrel is a great deal worse than one who is not educated so highly, still the education of the people, looking at the matter in its widest aspect, is one of the greatest boons the colony can possibly enjoy. I hope the compulsory clauses will be enforced as suggested, and I hope also that something will be done towards assisting the hon. member for Balonne in the very praiseworthy object he has in view—that of reaching, by our education system, the people who reside in very outlying portions of the colony.

THE HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carmarvon*): I hope I shall not be accused of wasting time, and trying to talk this matter out. I am certain the hon. member for Balonne will not credit or discredit me with any such intention, and I certainly value his opinion upon this subject very much more than I do the opinion of hon. members opposite who are so ready to insinuate that my hon. colleague, the Secretary for Public Lands, merely talked for that purpose.

Mr. McDONALD: You were asleep; you do not know what he was talking about.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I heard all he said, and all that the hon. member said, and certainly the address of the hon. member was not nearly so interesting as that which fell from the Minister he criticised. I cannot help saying that it is a curious fact—

Mr. McDONALD: Look at the time.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I am aware of the time, and I am not going to occupy the House long; but the interjections of the hon. member will not induce me to sit down any sooner. As I was saying, it is a curious fact that whenever anyone rises on private members' day to criticise a question in a manner which is not strictly in accordance with the views of hon. members opposite, they at once accuse him of speaking for the purpose of wasting time. It is about time we had a stop put to that. It is another illustration of the absolute intolerance of hon. members opposite to anything that does not fall in with their view, and it shows what they would do if they had an opportunity of ruling this country.

Mr. KIDSTON: It could not be worse ruled than it is by the present Government.

The HOME SECRETARY : When the other side come into power the people will have an opportunity of seeing how utterly badly the country can be governed. As I said, I do not want to waste time.

Mr. McDONALD : You are wasting it now.

The HOME SECRETARY : I am privileged to reply to the insulting remarks the hon. member for Flinders addressed to the Secretary for Public Lands, and it is his interjections that are delaying me in my speech. The hon. member twitted the Secretary for Public Lands with having delivered a long essay with nothing in it, and which was altogether beside the question, and that it was done for the purpose of wasting time. In my opinion it was a highly interesting speech, and I am sorry I am not in a position to deliver an equally interesting one. But there are one or two points in connection with the question to which I desire to call attention. It is a fact that much has been done with regard to education generally in the colony since the hon. gentleman tabled his motion on the previous occasion; and although perhaps it does not bear directly on the point the hon. member for Balonne wishes to make, still it does indirectly. The Government now contribute four-fifths instead of one-half to provisional schools in outlying districts. I myself, in my own constituency, have had a striking illustration presented to me of the great benefit which that has already conferred upon struggling selectors in the outlying districts. I do not say it is so far-reaching in its effects as the hon. member would, perhaps, desire, but that it has had a distinctly beneficial effect I do not hesitate to say. There is one phase of the question which has not, perhaps, been so fully realised by the hon. member, as I have had an opportunity of realising myself, that is with reference to half-time schools. I will give a concrete instance. In an outlying portion of my constituency there were two families. In fact, there are rather more; there were two selectors' homesteads, and there were more children than those of the selectors, because there were one or two who were the children of a man who was employed by the selector himself. At all events, between these two centres they were able to make up twelve children. They were a considerable distance apart, and of course it was impossible to get a provisional school. What was done was this: A competent young lady was chosen by the department, she was sent to these places, and the half-time school was established. She taught week and week about at these two selectors' houses. And they had this advantage, that owing to what we somewhat erroneously term "our system of free education"—because we all pay for it—there was no objection to this young lady teaching music and singing outside of school hours. That was a matter of arrangement between themselves, because music cannot be taught in the school hours, it is not in the curriculum. This went on for some time, with very satisfactory results, and all that was necessary to be done was that each selector should provide for the teacher some means of locomotion at the end of the week, from his house to the house of the other selector, which was some considerable distance away—whether by riding or driving—and that worked uncommonly well. But in course of time this happened: Other selectors with children came and intervened, and an application was made by them for a provisional school, and it so happened that the teacher had left for some reason that I am not aware of—but I know there was no complaint against her—at any rate she had left during the time the application was made, and these two selectors were notified that the half-time school must

cease and they would have to throw in their lot with the provisional school and send their children to it, although it was some considerable distance away—midway between the two selections. And they were compelled to throw in their lot with the proposed provisional school. There was a desire—and it was only a natural desire—on the part of these two selectors not to do so, because they felt that they had greater advantages under the half-time school system when the teacher was domiciled in their respective homes. They considered they had greater advantages under that system than under the system which would compel their children to travel a considerable distance every morning to attend the provisional school. The department naturally took the view—and I think very properly—that these two selectors should throw in their lot with the provisional school. The disinclination on the part of these two selectors to do this indicates a rather dangerous tendency which the proposition of the hon. member for Balonne has—a tendency to limit the number of schools. Of course it will be to the interests of those people to endeavour to continue the advantages of the isolated system which they have, and not to throw in their lot with the provisional schools that may be established.

Mr. LEAHY : That is not in the motion.

The HOME SECRETARY : I am referring to the speech of the hon. member for Balonne. Perhaps the hon. member for Bulloo was not in the Chamber when that speech was delivered. I was speaking on what the hon. member for Balonne brought forward in support of his scheme.

Mr. KERR : The department could step in.

The HOME SECRETARY : Yes; that is so. I believe there will be a certain amount of danger under the present system, the moment you begin to give rewards in the shape of payment by results alone. In the case I refer to the only test there was, was that the children should be of school age in order to attend the half-time school. In that case the selectors were not so far apart that it was impossible for the children to be driven five or six miles to an established provisional school. But still that was a considerable tax upon them. But in the case of half-time schools it is not too much for a teacher—male or female—to be driven fifty or sixty miles at the end of a week, as long as the conveyance is convenient and comfortable. The system seems to me to be capable of being largely availed of, and I think there is ample provision for placing the advantages under the present system within the reach of children who are located in the sparsely settled districts of the colony. If it is desired to make the advantages more extensive, it can easily be done, with great advantage and at no great increased cost, by reducing the number of children required to establish a half-time school. In the case I refer to the required number was twelve, but under exceptional circumstances it might be possible to reduce the number to eight—four in each family, which is 25 per cent. less than the average of families. Under these circumstances, I hold that the present system should be continued with tenacity, and that it will serve the outlying districts in every way. I do not think the people take advantage of the present half-time system to the extent they should. That is all I have to say on this matter, but I do believe that a further reduction of the numbers with respect to half-time schools would be preferable to what the hon. member has foreshadowed in his speech.

Mr. LEAHY : Are you going to divide on this question?

The HOME SECRETARY: I trust I shall not be accused of wasting time. I have not been able to do the same justice to the matter as the Secretary for Lands has done; but as I represent a constituency very approximate to that represented by the hon. member for Balonne, I cannot be accused of wasting time, and I think I was justified in saying what I have said.

Mr. LEAHY (*Bulloo*): I would have liked to have spoken on this question had I been earlier in the Chamber. I do not intend to discuss the matter except to say that I should like the motion to be carried in such a form that it would have some practical effect. This motion does not commit Parliament or the country to anything.

The HOME SECRETARY: Either this scheme or the one I suggested could be adopted.

Mr. LEAHY: But neither scheme is in the resolution now before the House.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: The passing of this motion would simply be the expression of a pious opinion.

Mr. LEAHY: Exactly; it is not nearly so powerful as a deliberate expression of opinion delivered by the House on a concrete motion. There is no doubt that some definite scheme for the education of the bush children is badly wanted, and what we have to consider is how we can arrive at the best results in the least expensive manner. I admit that the Government have been fairly liberal in the establishment of provisional schools, and then there is the alternate-week system mentioned by the Home Secretary.

The HOME SECRETARY: That has been in existence all along.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes; but it might be extended with advantage, although I do not think it would entirely meet the case as put forward by the hon. member for Balonne. Under it a great many children would still be half their time without any education at all. Now, the people living in the bush are the pioneers of the country; they are some of the best people we have, and are entitled to as much consideration as any other class. Indeed, in my opinion, they are entitled to more, because the children of these people have to start life at a very early age—perhaps twelve or fourteen—and are only sent to school for two or three years altogether. I think, when that is the case, they are certainly entitled to spend the whole of those few years at school, although the half-time system would be infinitely better than not providing them with any education at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: It works very well. They get a great deal more than half the education they would get at a full-time school.

Mr. LEAHY: Yes, I believe they do. I am at all events entirely in accord with the hon. member for Balonne, that the system to be of any use must be stretched a great deal further than anything we have in force at the present time.

Mr. STORY, in reply, said: I wished very much to have the debate adjourned because there are some members on the other side who have a very intimate knowledge of the bush and its requirements who, I am sure, would wish to speak.

Mr. FISHER: I will move the adjournment for you.

Mr. STORY: If I thought that any other member present desired to speak I should be only too glad to sit down. I consider that we have had a most interesting and valuable discussion this afternoon. The speech of the Secretary for Public Lands was very instructive, because it was quite necessary that we should see the objections as well as the advantages of such a system as I propose. Between discussing the two I am absolutely sure we shall

arrive at some method which will be satisfactory to all parties—either that proposed by myself or some of the other schemes that have been suggested.

Mr. LEAHY: It does not matter whose it is if we can get it.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed; and the resumption of the debate made an order of the day for Thursday, 30th November.

ENTERTAINMENT OF VISITORS.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*), in moving—

That there be laid upon the table of the House a full and detailed account of the various disbursements connected with the entertainment of visitors during the twelve months commencing 1st July, 1898, and ending 30th June, 1899—

said: I move this motion because recently it was said by the Premier, in answer to a question, that the amount on the Estimates for the entertainment of visitors was one of the votes which had already been passed, and that last year the money was spent in the entertainment of the Admiral, certain woolbuyers who came to Brisbane for purely commercial and business reasons, and Mr. Lindon Bates, who came here as a business agent for the purpose of selling to the Government of Queensland certain dredges. I think, as the amount expended is so large, and is used in the entertainment of persons who come here for purely business purposes, the matter should be carefully watched, and the public informed of the various items of expenditure, in order that this matter may not grow into a grave abuse. I do not see that any harm can be done by presenting a return of this character, so that the House and the country may be able to form some opinion as to whether the expenditure is justifiable or otherwise. I do not know myself what claim these visitors have upon the public funds. I do not know why Lindon Bates should be specially selected as a fit object for the expenditure of public money. I do not know why woolbuyers who come here for speculative reasons, for the purpose of making money and building up fortunes, should be entertained at the expense of the people of Queensland. I have been told repeatedly that there is no money available for necessary public works in my electorate. In my own district we are suffering from wretched roads and from the disgraceful state of the water supply and school buildings. No money can be found in the Treasury to expend upon these necessities, and yet ample funds appear to be at the disposal of the Government for the purpose of entertaining persons who come here to make fortunes. I move the motion standing in my name.

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

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carmarvon*) moved that £42,088 be granted for Government printing, etc. There was a large increase in the vote. The net increase for salaries was £1,940, and the net increase for contingencies £7,500, making a total net increase of £9,440. The increases to salaries were Government Printer £100, clerk—new appointment—£100, assistant computer £130, readers and so on, £1,333; also a sum of £600 being the anticipated increase required on account of the re-classification of officers of this department in accordance with the recommendations of the

Royal Commission. This £600 was merely a rough estimate of what would be required on that account. Then there was an increase of £10 and another of £20 for two officers. Altogether the increases in salaries amounted to £2,293, against which there was a decrease of one clerk, £165, transferred to the Government Advertising Board; engraver and electrotyper, £188, retired; making a decrease of £353; and deducting that from £2,293 the net increase was £1,940. Then under the head of contingencies the amount voted last year was £12,000, and this year the amount asked for was £19,500, making the increase of £7,500 to which he had referred. That was made up of an increase of £1,500 in the amount required for extra hands and overtime, the vote last year being insufficient, and £6,000 in the amount required for paper, machines, type, and incidentals, for the same reason. Most of those increases, it would be seen by those hon. members who had read the report of the Royal Commission, were the result of recommendations by that commission.

Mr. McDONALD: What about this increase to the Government Printer?

The HOME SECRETARY: He did not know that he was committing any breach of confidence—he understood that it was not given to him in confidence by a member of the commission—in saying that the increase was recommended for the Government Printer, on the understanding—possibly a tacit understanding, possibly also a misunderstanding, on the part of that member and perhaps other members of the commission—that he would retire on receiving this increase of £100. That he was assured by one member of the commission at all events, if not more—that he was an old public servant, that he had done very good work, and they thought—at all events his informant felt pretty certain—that Mr. Gregory would retire upon this increase being placed on the Estimates. From conversations he had had with the Government Printer since then, it seemed that he had been at cross purposes—he could put it in no other way—with the member of the commission who had spoken to him about the matter, because he understood from the Government Printer that he had no intention of retiring.

Mr. GLASSEY: Why should the Government Printer retire? He is a very vigorous man, and a very excellent man.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was a very excellent man, but there was no doubt that he was considerably at variance with the various members of the Royal Commission as to the methods which should be adopted in the Government Printing Office. As a matter of fact, as matters stood this increase was no increase at all except in name, because it would be remembered that the Government Printer occupied a house which under last year's Estimates was valued at £100 a year, but which he had to vacate about the beginning of July last in order that it might be removed because it occupied a portion of the site of the new Lands Office.

Mr. McDONALD: It makes a difference in his retiring allowance?

The HOME SECRETARY: Exactly; and presumably the idea of the member of the commission who mentioned the matter to him was that it would be an inducement to Mr. Gregory to retire. But the members of the commission seemed to have altogether overlooked the fact that he would have to draw the increased salary for three years to receive the full benefit of it in his retiring allowance. So far as his emoluments were concerned, Mr. Gregory had represented to him that it was rather a loss to him to receive the additional £100 a year in lieu of his late residence, inasmuch as he was now occupying a

house of his own for which he had previously received a considerable rental. He did not know whether it was the whole £100, but there were other incidentals connected with it which brought the loss of the house up to more than the £100 increase in salary. He should be very glad to give any further information, as he had merely given a summary of the various facts, and, so far as he had been able to gauge them, the reasons of the commission for recommending them.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*) thought they should have fuller information than the hon. gentleman had given them about the proposed increase to the Government Printer. If he understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he said that the increase was recommended by the Printing Commission on the understanding that Mr. Gregory would retire.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the statement one member of the commission made to me. He made that statement before I had actually seen the report.

Mr. DAWSON: What they wanted to know was what the hon. gentleman was prepared to do, as head of the department? It was not a matter of the opinion of any individual member of the commission. Was the hon. gentleman recommending this increase of salary as a wise thing from the departmental point of view? The point was in reference to the retiring allowance. In the first place, the hon. gentleman said that it was recommended by one member of the commission.

Mr. STEPHENSON: It was the unanimous recommendation of the commission.

Mr. SMITH: It is in the report of the commission.

Mr. DAWSON: Then it was unanimously recommended by the commission that Mr. Gregory should receive this increase, and the Home Secretary accepted that recommendation—for what reason? In order that Mr. Gregory's retiring allowance might be larger.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say so.

Mr. DAWSON: The fact remained that the retiring allowance would be larger owing to that increase in salary. Before they were called upon to pass a vote, they should be given all the information in the possession of the Minister, and, as far as they could glean them, the motives that operated with him when he proposed to increase a salary. Another point was that the hon. gentleman said that the Government Printer was at variance with the other officers of the department.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, you are not fair.

Mr. STEPHENSON: At variance with the commission.

Mr. DAWSON: Well, with the commission. What did the hon. gentleman mean by that? Did he mean that the present Government Printer was not a competent man? If he meant that, it was no reason why his salary should be increased and he should be allowed to retire on an increased salary. If, on the other hand, he was a competent man, then the recommendation of the commission against him should not operate at all, and he should be entitled to hold his position. They were entitled to more information as to the reasons for the increase.

* The HOME SECRETARY: Other hon. members appeared to have gathered the purport of what he said, but, unfortunately, the hon. member for Charters Towers did not. To deal with the two points raised by the hon. member, he did not say at all that the increase was put on the Estimates by the Government for the purpose of obtaining the retirement of Mr. Gregory. He merely said that one member of the commission, before he saw the report, though it was in the hands of the Premier, said that the reason for the commission recommending that increase was, from

his point of view, not from his (Mr. Foxton's), for the purpose of increasing that officer's retiring allowance, and so inducing him to retire.

Mr. DAWSON: Have you accepted that view?

The HOME SECRETARY: He would tell the hon. member—he had already told him once. He said that he did not know whether that was the motive which actuated other members of the commission. He only knew that that was the motive of the member of the commission who informed him.

Mr. McDONALD: They were unanimous, according to the report.

The HOME SECRETARY: They were unanimous in their recommendation, but he did not know whether they were unanimous in the reasons which actuated them in making the recommendation. The other point the hon. member endeavoured to make at his expense was that the Government apparently were not satisfied with Mr. Gregory, because he was at variance—not with the employees of the department, as stated by the hon. member, but with the commission—upon the methods to be adopted in the administration of the department. He was at variance with them upon some points—he did not say upon all; but it was patent to him that Mr. Gregory was at variance with them. He was not prepared to say who was right, but he did know that a commission was appointed, having upon it four gentlemen who were recognised as experts, and three members of that committee who were also more or less experts. They made certain recommendations, and the Government felt—whatever their individual opinions might be—that, as they were not experts themselves, they ought to pay great deference to the recommendations of such a commission. If the hon. member for Charters Towers would read clause 17 of the report he would find it was to this effect—

We are of opinion, from the evidence and information available, and in view of the continued expansion of the department generally, that the methods of management obtaining in the Government Printing Office require modernising. When, therefore, the present Government Printer retires, as in course of time he must, we recommend that he be succeeded by an officer, to be secured by public advertisement, whose fitness for the position should be adjudicated upon by a special board of experts to be appointed for that purpose. Meantime, we recommend that Mr. Gregory's salary be raised to £600 per annum.

He expressed no opinion whatever as to whether Mr. Gregory's methods were antiquated or not. He was not an expert, and he was not competent to give an opinion on the point. All he knew was that the commission, which consisted of experts, were of opinion that the methods wanted modernising. They spoke in this clause of their report of the possibility—and, if one read between the lines, of the probability—of Mr. Gregory retiring, and they were apparently of opinion that a really good man could not be got to take his place for less than £600 a year.

Mr. STEPHENSON: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the way he viewed it; and in view of all the circumstances—that Mr. Gregory had occupied the position for a long time, and that he was receiving a salary of £500 a year, which was considerably less than his predecessor—

Mr. McDONALD: £700.

The HOME SECRETARY: Recommended that he should at once receive £600 a year. In consequence of that, and also in consequence of the fact that he had been deprived of a residence which was valued at £100 a year, the Government considered the least they could do was to follow the recommendation of the commission as to his salary. In fact, it was merely making up to him what he had lost though in a different way. It would have been possible to have made

his salary £500 a year, and to have given him an allowance of £100 a year in lieu of quarters, which would have been an exact equivalent to what he had received previously; but in view of the recommendation with regard to him, and having regard to the information he (the Home Secretary) had received at the hands of one of the members of the commission, the Government thought the proper way out of the difficulty was to increase his salary to £600 a year. In no way was there intended to be a reflection on Mr. Gregory in the slightest degree. His methods might or might not be out of date; but he had undoubtedly worked a very important department up till the present, as far as he was aware, in a very admirable manner.

Mr. STEPHENSON: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Most people would admit that. He had great difficulties, and whoever took the position would have great difficulties, and find it a very difficult department to work. Some of the recommendations of the commission the Government could not see their way to follow; but this was one that they could follow—giving Mr. Gregory an increased salary for the purposes of pension, which was clearly the intention of the commission.

Mr. DAWSON: It had required two speeches for hon. members to discover that this increase was proposed for the purpose of pension. If a man when in active work was only worth £500 a year and then was found to be incompetent—as apparently Mr. Gregory had been by the commission—it was perfectly absurd to increase his salary to £600 a year for the purpose of increasing his retiring allowance, and he objected to it. If Mr. Gregory was not going to retire and was fit and competent to carry out the work, let him go on under the old *regime*; but it appeared, from what the hon. gentleman had said, that he was not fit for his position, and the commission wanted him to retire. They told him in as polite a manner as they could that he was to go out; but before he went out his salary must be increased by £100 a year in order that his retiring allowance might be increased.

The PREMIER: That is not so.

Mr. DAWSON: He took down what the hon. gentleman said, and he distinctly said the increase was for the purpose of pension.

The PREMIER: He did not say anything of the sort.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said it was apparently the intention of clause 17 of the report. That is what I said.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman told them what he heard from a member of the commission. No member of the commission had any more right to make private statements to the hon. gentleman in a friendly way—probably over a glass of beer—than another.

The HOME SECRETARY: You call that fair criticism, do you?

Mr. DAWSON: What right had the hon. gentleman to take information from any one member of that commission? But if he had the right, he had no right to come there and give that information.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have every right.

Mr. DAWSON: As administrator of the department he was only entitled to tell them what the whole commission or a majority of the members of the commission thought, not what one member had told him privately.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have the report.

Mr. DAWSON: If the hon. gentleman thought so much of that individual member's opinion he ought to tell them who that gentleman was.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have no objection.

Mr. DAWSON: It appeared to him that the commission found that the department was carried on in such a manner as was not satisfactory, or, in other words, expressed the opinion that the present head should be sacked. There could be no get away from that position, but before he was sacked it was proposed that he should get an increase of £100 a [7.30 p.m.] year in his salary, so that he might draw a larger retiring allowance.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member said that he was giving the opinion of one member of the commission, whom he had allowed to override all the others. If the hon. member wanted to know what was the opinion of the whole of the commission, he had only to turn to the report, which was a unanimous report. What he (the Home Secretary) had stated to the Committee was the opinion of one member of the commission as to the reason which prompted the recommendation in the report, and that reason was not given in the report. He could have suppressed that opinion, but his desire was to give the Committee information, and when he did that the hon. member railed at him for doing so, and said he had no right to repeat here what had been told him by one individual member of the commission. That was a matter which rested entirely between that member of the commission and himself, and, as he had already said, he did not think he was committing any breach of confidence in the matter. He had no hesitation in giving the gentleman's name, and he was sure that if the gentleman were present he would have no objection to his doing so. It was the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Groom. Perhaps the hon. member would be satisfied now.

The PREMIER: A great deal of warmth had been introduced into the debate, which did not tend to direct their attention to the point at issue, but rather to obscure it. Apart entirely from the recommendation of the Printing Commission, he considered that Mr. Gregory, for the excellent service he had rendered to the State, and for the excellent manner in which he had conducted the printing office, deserved the proposed increase in his salary. He (the Premier) had the conduct of that Estimate last session, and he had then before him an application from Mr. Gregory for an increased emolument, which he deserved, entirely apart from whatever arrangements might be made in the future, but he was reluctantly compelled not to accept the application for this reason, among others: that a commission was about to be appointed to inquire into the working of the Government Printing Office. Had it not been for that, he should have had much pleasure in advocating the increase last session, for as an old officer, and one who had conducted the printing arrangements of the public service of the colony, Mr. Gregory was deserving of an accession to his salary. And if the Committee were generous to vote that increase, he hoped Mr. Gregory would long enjoy the accession to his salary. He did not know what arrangements would be made in the future; but, of course, Mr. Gregory, like themselves, was advancing in years, and would retire in the course of time. It was rather ungenerous on the part of the leader of the Labour Opposition to interpret the words of his colleague, the Home Secretary, as meaning that the increase was merely granted with the view of increasing Mr. Gregory's retiring allowance.

Mr. DAWSON: Your colleague said that himself.

The PREMIER: He did not understand him in that light; but, even if the increase had that effect, he did not think anybody would begrudge Mr. Gregory the substantial advantage he would derive therefrom.

HON. G. THORN (*Fassifern*) was astonished at the leader of the Opposition cavilling over that vote, for if there was one old and valued officer in the public service who deserved an increase, that good old servant was the Government Printer, who had worked his way from a very humble position in the service to the top of the tree. Even with the proposed increase, his salary would not be equal to that of his predecessor; and, as a matter of fact, it was not really an increase at all.

Mr. GLASSEY: There is no increase in reality; but the objection is to the retiring allowance.

HON. G. THORN: He only wished that Mr. Gregory had a larger retiring allowance. The position that gentleman held was a confidential one, more confidential, in fact, than that of the Clerk of the Executive Council. Besides that he might remind hon. members that last year Mr. Gregory might have gone to New South Wales, where the salary was about £1,000 a year, or, at any rate, considerably more than was paid to the Government Printer in this colony, but rather than give up his position here and leave Queensland in the lurch he determined to remain where he was. If he had his way he would give Mr. Gregory a real increase, which he was not getting now.

Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): Hon. members were aware that "Votes and Proceedings" formed a great number of very cumbersome volumes. All the work of the Assembly, including all the papers laid on the table, were printed in the Assembly volumes, and the Legislative Council did exactly the same thing, and the papers again appeared in their volumes; so that it was a very costly work printing "Votes and Proceedings" for the two Houses. Last year Mr. Gregory had made a recommendation to the Printing Committee, that there should be a different arrangement altogether, and his proposal, he estimated, would effect a saving of from £80 to £120 a year. The Printing Committee sifted the whole question thoroughly, and were very pleased with the suggestion, and adopted it. Mr. Gregory had always shown a very great interest in keeping down the expenditure upon printing, and that one change he had recommended would result in a perpetual saving of at least £100 a year. He thought that should stand to Mr. Gregory's credit when they were discussing the vote that evening.

Mr. DAWSON: The last two members who had addressed the Committee apparently misunderstood the discussion. It was not a question as to whether Mr. Gregory had done good or bad work. He was prepared to accept the statement of the hon. member for Herbert, the Premier, and others that Mr. Gregory was a first-class man, that he was competent to do his work, and had done it well in the past, but it was proposed by the Government that he should be shunted.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, no. Not at all.

Mr. DAWSON: On the recommendation of the Printing Commission, according to what the Home Secretary had stated to the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, you have no authority for that at all.

Mr. DAWSON: Mr. Gregory, competent though he was, and who did not want to retire, was to be retired on the recommendation of the Printing Office Commission.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have no authority for saying that at all.

Mr. DAWSON: He was to be retired, but before he retired his salary was to be increased by £100 that he might draw a larger retiring allowance. That was the point they had been discussing since the vote had been proposed, and not Mr. Gregory's capacity to perform his

duties. That question had never been raised at all. If he was fit to carry on his duties, he should be permitted to remain in his position—

Mr. GLASSEY : And get £100 a year in lieu of his house, but—

Mr. DAWSON : Quite so ; but he should not get £100 a year added to his salary in order that he might draw a larger retiring allowance.

The HOME SECRETARY : That was not the intention of the Government at all.

Mr. DAWSON : Then what had the hon. gentleman said so for ?

The HOME SECRETARY : I did not say that at all.

Mr. DAWSON : He would not mind appealing to the shorthand writers about the matter. Otherwise he would not have objected at all.

The HOME SECRETARY : I will tell you again what I said.

Mr. DAWSON : If the hon. gentleman liked to hack down from his first position it was all right.

The HOME SECRETARY : I am not backing down a bit. Everybody else understands it, I believe.

The PREMIER : Certainly.

Mr. DAWSON supposed the Premier did naturally. But the Home Secretary had referred them to clause 17 of the commission's report, and that was a distinct recommendation that Mr. Gregory should retire.

The HOME SECRETARY : That is what I was referring to, and not to my own opinion at all.

Mr. DAWSON : Then the hon. gentleman had elaborated that by referring to information he had obtained from a member of the commission, whose name he had been asked to mention, but whose name he had not divulged up to date.

The HOME SECRETARY : Yes, I did. What is the matter with the hon. member ?

Mr. DAWSON : Oh yes, the hon. gentleman had said it was Mr. Groom. The hon. gentleman said that that hon. member, speaking on behalf of the commission, had explained that the recommendation in clause 17 was that Mr. Gregory should be retired, though out of politeness and kindly feeling what they actually said was that the department must be modernised. According to them Mr. Gregory was not the right man in the right place and should be retired, but he should receive some compensation by having his salary increased just before he retired that he might be able to draw a larger retiring allowance. If Mr. Gregory was competent he had a right to remain in his present position, and ought not to be forced to retire on the adverse report of the commission or the adverse opinion of the head of the department, and his remuneration should remain as it was before. And if he was not fit for his present position he should be discharged, but his salary should not be increased that he might draw a larger retiring allowance. It was a pernicious system to provide that if a man was going to retire from a public position his salary was to be increased just before he did retire, that he might draw a larger retiring allowance. He certainly for one objected to that.

The PREMIER : Nobody said that.

* The HOME SECRETARY said again that the Government did not desire that Mr. Gregory should retire. So far as they knew he was performing his work well, but the commission thought his methods could be modernised. Perhaps Mr. Gregory himself could modernise them. That was quite possible. He had not for a moment said that it was the intention of the Government that Mr. Gregory should retire, or that the increase was proposed to induce him to retire. He had merely quoted clause 17 of the commission's report and the conversation he had had with the hon. member for Toowoomba

to indicate the reasons which prompted the commission in that respect. Now he was prepared to go a little further and say that if he had not understood that Mr. Gregory did intend to retire he would have been prepared to recommend to the Committee, not only that he should get the increase recommended by the commission, but an additional amount to cover the loss of his house. The commission recommended that he should get £600 a year—that was to say, that the Government Printer of the colony for the time being, whoever he was, should get £600 a year, and he entirely concurred in that, as he considered the position one of great responsibility, but if he had understood that Mr. Gregory intended to continue in the service he should have asked the Committee to endorse the recommendation of the commission on the understanding that he should still retain free quarters, and failing free quarters an equivalent in addition to the increase to the salary.

Mr. DAWSON : What is the plain reading of clause 17 of the report ?

The HOME SECRETARY : The hon. member must draw his own conclusion as everyone else must.

Mr. O'CONNELL : The chairman of the commission will tell you.

Mr. STEPHENSON : You will not give him a show.

The HOME SECRETARY : The hon. member for Ipswich would inform the hon. member fully. All he could say was that the Government did not identify themselves with the views of the commission, if the views he had gathered in the way he had mentioned were the views of the commission.

* Mr. STEPHENSON (*Ipswich*) had been waiting some time for an opportunity to give the Committee the information which the hon. member for Charters Towers was anxious to obtain with regard to the interpretation of clause 17 of the commission's report. The member of the commission, Mr. Groom, who gave the Home Secretary the information was strictly correct, and the whole of the other members of the commission were unanimous on the point. The commission had a very high opinion of Mr. Gregory. They believed he had performed his duties in the past admirably, but there was no denying the fact that Mr. Gregory did not take kindly to the idea of modernising the institution. The commission believed that it could be much better and much more satisfactorily worked, although it had been well worked in the past. Mr. Gregory was not in accord with the views of the commission on that point. Naturally the commission were reluctant to say that Mr. Gregory ought to be at once retired ; but in his own evidence, as hon. members would perceive, Mr. Gregory referred to the possibility of his retirement from the position at no distant date, and the commission took precisely the same view of the question. They felt that under ordinary circumstances Mr. Gregory would have to retire before very long, and they suggested means by which that position should then be filled, and in order to show their appreciation of the good work he had done in the past, and was still doing, they made the recommendation referred to. But the Government had done neither one thing nor the other in connection with that recommendation. They ought to have either accepted it or rejected it. He could not understand, from the speech of the Home Secretary, whether the Government approved of the recommendation or not. Certainly an increase of £100 appeared on the Estimates, but the hon. gentleman told them that the extra £100 was being given to him in lieu of the residence he had been occupying up to within the last few months. The Government ought to have said they proposed to increase the Government Printer's salary by £100 a year, or they

ought to have declined to accept the recommendation of the commission, let the salary remain as it was before, and give him £100 a year to compensate him for loss of residence. It might be contended that clause 17 in the report of the commission did more credit to their hearts than to their heads, but they did not want to do anything that could be construed into being in any way harsh towards a public servant who had given such complete satisfaction to the State in the past. They felt—and they felt it more forcibly after the sectional committee had visited the Government Printing Office in Sydney—that the best results were not being obtained here, and they made a number of recommendations which would modernise the institution. Mr. Gregory was more or less antagonistic to those recommendations, while the commission were unanimously of opinion that their ideas ought to be given effect to, and that some gentleman, who was more likely to fall in with the wishes of the commission, should be appointed, rather than that Mr. Gregory should have the carrying out, or the blocking, of the recommendations. One point on which Mr. Gregory was at variance with the commission was as to obtaining linotype machines. No doubt there had been a good deal of objection in the past to the obtaining of those machines. It was thought that some few men would be deprived of their occupation by the introduction of them; and Mr. Gregory, while admitting that a certain amount of saving would be effected by their introduction, said the saving would be only apparent and not real, inasmuch as his opinion was that for nearly six months out of every twelve the machines would be lying idle, and would deteriorate in consequence. That was not found to be so in other offices where they were employed, and all the information the commission could gather, both here and in New South Wales, was entirely at variance with the opinion of Mr. Gregory on that point. Mr. Gregory's contention was that the system of conducting the Government Printing Office in Brisbane was everything that was admirable, and that it was hardly possible to improve upon it. The commission, however, on the occasion of their official visit, had not been in the institution half-an-hour before they saw innumerable directions in which savings could be effected, and the office worked much more satisfactorily. Very naturally, Mr. Gregory, seeing that he had grown up with the institution, and knew what it was capable of doing, would be antagonistic to any proposals to make any alteration in the system of working; but the members of the commission, who, with one exception, were directly connected with the printing business, had no hesitation in making recommendations which, in their opinion, would modernise the office by introducing more up-to-date appliances. As Mr. Gregory did not agree with the commission in that, they felt constrained to give him a gentle hint that it would be no harm if he retired. Meanwhile they recommended, in recognition of the good work he had done in the past, that his salary should be increased by £100 a year, no doubt with the view, as the Home Secretary said, that he should benefit eventually when his retirement came about. The idea of the commission was not that that retirement should take place immediately, but within, say, a couple of years or so. He hoped he had made the intention of the commission clear. He wished to show that the Home Secretary was quite right, and undoubtedly the hon. member at the head of the Labour Opposition had misunderstood that hon. gentleman. He said the hon. gentleman had not fallen in with the views of the commission, and the Home Secretary was

[8 p.m.]

endeavouring to show that he was giving the views of the commission, and not his own, with regard to the possibility of the retirement of Mr. Gregory. He was pleased to see that the Government had adopted the recommendation of the commission that the hands in the institution should be graded. This plan had been adopted in New South Wales, and it had worked, not only satisfactorily to the Government Printer, who was a very capable man, but it had also worked very satisfactorily to those occupying subordinate positions there. The employees were far more satisfied with their present position and salary, than they were before the new order of things came into force; and the commission believed that the same satisfactory results would happen in Queensland if their recommendation in this respect were adopted. He was pleased to know that a scheme would shortly be submitted by some gentlemen who were members of this commission who had been asked by the Home Secretary to undertake this work, and no doubt it would be satisfactory to the Government Printer and to the employees in the office. There was one other gentleman who was in this office who had in the opinion of the commission been very badly treated—and that was Mr. Cray, the computer. The members of the commission recognised that there was no more zealous and hard-working officer than Mr. Cray, and he was pleased to see that one portion of their recommendation with regard to this officer had been given effect to by the appointment of an assistant computer. Mr. Cray was six months behind in his work, and while he was so undermanned as he had been there was no chance of his overtaking the arrears. But he regretted to see that no extra remuneration was proposed to be given to Mr. Cray, who was a man of advanced years, and an officer who had done admirable service in the office for many years. If there was a man in Brisbane who deserved consideration because of his zeal and ability, it was the computer, Mr. Cray. If there was any other question which came within the purview of the commission which hon. members would like to ask, he would be only too glad to furnish the information. He trusted he had explained the position with regard to Mr. Gregory, as far as the commission was concerned, and why clause 17 had been inserted in their report.

Mr. DAWSON was perfectly satisfied with the explanation given by the chairman of the Government Printing Office Commission, and as far as he understood that hon. member he had agreed with his contention. It was a great pity that hon. members had to drag information out of Ministers; it was a great waste of time, and it would be much more satisfactory if they got the straight blunt truth at once. He believed that the hon. member for Ipswich had stated the truth. As a matter of fact hon. members had had an idea for some time as to the meaning of the recommendation contained in clause 17 of the report, and why this extra remuneration for the Government Printer had been put on the Estimates, but the Minister was the responsible party who should have given the information asked for. However, he was quite satisfied with the explanation given by the chairman of the Royal Commission.

Mr. TURLLEY (*Brisbane South*): No member who had read the report submitted by the Royal Commission on this matter could come to any other conclusion than that come to, and explained by the chairman of that commission. While they recognised that Mr. Gregory had done good work—

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TURLEY: Yet they saw that he was opposed to any alteration in the present system, by which the work could be made more effective

in the opinion of the commission; and therefore, with the object, to some extent, of inducing Mr. Gregory to retire, and with the object of getting another man in his place who would modernise the institution, they recommended that his salary should be increased by £100. That was the truth of the matter. Any sensible man who read the report carefully would see that was the object of the commission's recommendation.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did I not say so, and repeat a private conversation to emphasise it?

Mr. TURLEY: But the hon. gentleman went further, and said that because a public officer was to be retired, his salary should be increased.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. TURLEY: That was the natural intention.

Mr. O'CONNELL: That was the commission's intention.

The HOME SECRETARY: I distinctly deny what the hon. member for South Brisbane has said.

Mr. TURLEY: Some notice should be taken of the report of the commission in connection with this matter. Now, the position was this: At the present time there was a retired Government Printer drawing £347 a year, and before he retired it was pointed out that he was a most efficient person. Surely there was no necessity to pay a larger retiring allowance to the present occupant of the office! If he retired at once on his present salary he would be entitled to about £333 a year. That was about a fair thing. They all recognised that he had done good work, but that seemed quite enough to enable him to live decently for the rest of his days. The same old argument that they had heard for years had been trotted out that evening. First the Premier got up and said that he initiated the inquiry into the printing office, and it was carried out by his successor. As a matter of fact the late member for Burke four years ago wanted to know why there should not be a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of that office.

Mr. ANNEAR: Are these things always done at the request of private members?

Mr. TURLEY: At all events the then Home Secretary said he was willing to fall in with the suggestion, and it was on account of the request coming from a member on that side that the inquiry was started. Therefore the inquiry, instead of being initiated by the Premier, was initiated on account of a request made in the House. Then another old wheeze had been trotted out by the member for Fassfern, who said that last year Mr. Gregory could have gone to New South Wales. For two or three years the same old story had been told on the floor of the House. The late Home Secretary, Sir Horace Tozer, said exactly the same thing during the past three years, when it was suggested that the salary should be increased by £100. He said it was necessary to increase the salary of the Government Printer, because he had had an offer from New South Wales at a greatly enhanced salary, and that if it had not been for his patriotic feeling or something of that sort he would have accepted it; yet at the same time they had a statement made by the commission in their report that the salary should be increased with the object of inducing the Government Printer to retire, that applications be then called by advertisement for the position, and that a board of experts be appointed to decide upon the qualifications of the applicants. They were evidently not satisfied with the way in which the office was being worked. The argument of the member for Herbert was that because the Government Printer had saved £100 or £120 a year his salary should be raised. Let them apply that all round and see where they got to. Some

four years ago they had evidence laid before them that a gentleman at that time in the Government employ had saved the colony £90,000 per year through various means. Surely, therefore, it would have been good enough to say that that gentleman's salary should have been raised by £90,000 a year plus his ordinary salary. He did not see the strength of that argument. Every person in the employ of the Government was supposed to give his best services to the Government, and if he was successful in introducing economies it did not follow that his salary should be increased by the amount he had been able to save. That would be monstrous. At that rate they would be paying some Civil servants £50,000 a year instead of the £2,000 a year which perhaps they were receiving. He did not see that there was any particular reason for increasing the Government Printer's salary at the present time, simply because he was about to retire—or rather, they had no evidence that he was about to retire, but they had been told he was at liberty to retire if he chose. Let him apply the same argument to the Department of Justice. They had a gentleman doing the work there for £600 a year. The salary had now been increased to £800. Did the Government propose to recompense the friends of the late occupant of the office by making up the difference between what he received and what he would have received if he had been appointed at the same salary as his successor?

Mr. ANNEAR: Twenty years ago the occupant of that office was paid £1,000 a year.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, and to-day he was paid £800. Eight years ago the Government Printer's salary was £700. It was reduced, and because it was reduced an attempt had been made during several years past to increase it, and no one who read the report of the commission could come to any other conclusion than that it was possible to modernise that office a great deal.

Mr. ANNEAR: I thought you were referring to the Crown Solicitor.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman was quite right. He was referring to him. If the commission recommended that the department should be modernised, with the result of increased efficiency and economy, and if there was a gentleman who stood in the way—

The HOME SECRETARY: He does not.

Mr. TURLEY: He had the authority of the chairman of the commission for saying that Mr. Gregory stood in the way of this being done, and he must leave the Home Secretary to fight it out with the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Stephenson.

The HOME SECRETARY: We quite agree; you are all astray.

Mr. TURLEY: Those two hon. gentlemen might understand how they came to the agreement, but it was impossible for a third person to understand it.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is your distorted version of it.

Mr. TURLEY: He did not distort anything; he simply spoke on the evidence given by the hon. gentleman himself, the report of the Royal Commission, and the evidence just given by the hon. member who was chairman of that commission. Seeing that the late Government Printer retired on £347 a year, he thought that £333, the amount the present Government Printer was at liberty to retire on, was quite sufficient for the country to pay. While he believed the Government Printer had done his best during the time he had been in the service, he had also been paid very well for the work he had done.

Mr. ANNEAR (*Maryborough*): Having been a member of the House for many years, he could not resist saying a few words on this vote. He

believed that the most effective and best managed department of the Government service was the Government Printing Office under Mr. Gregory, who was a very faithful servant of the people, and had at all times earned his money. He had taken scores of gentlemen from New South Wales, from Victoria, and from South Australia to the Government Printing Office here, and they all considered it the most complete Government printing office in any of the colonies.

Mr. STEPHENSON : Absolute nonsense.

Mr. ANNEAR : The salary of the Government Printer in New South Wales was £800 per annum, and it was undeniable that Mr. Gregory could have obtained that position had he chosen.

Mr. McDONALD : Many years ago.

Mr. ANNEAR : Not so many years ago.

Mr. TURLEY : How long ago ?

Mr. ANNEAR : Though an objection was taken to this increase of £100 being granted, he found that even if the Committee voted that amount Mr. Gregory would be no better off than he was before with a salary of £500 and a house worth £100 per annum. In his opinion the Government Printer should receive a salary of £600 a year, and an allowance of £100 a year for house rent, like other heads of departments, and even then he would be receiving £100 a year less than the Government Printer in New South Wales, though quite as much work was turned out in our printing office, with the number of hands employed, as was turned out in the Government Printing Office in New South Wales. He agreed with the hon. member for Brisbane South that there was no need for Mr. Gregory to retire at present, or in two years' time. He was an active man, with another ten or twenty years' good work in him, and he hoped that Mr. Gregory would for many years continue to preside over the department which he had so effectively worked. He thought Mr. Gregory would do all he could to modernise the work.

Mr. STEPHENSON : Read the evidence.

Mr. ANNEAR admitted that he had been too busy to read the evidence, but knowing the competent men who constituted the commission he felt sure that if their recommendations were carried out it would lead to good effect. He trusted that the committee would cheerfully vote this small increase to the Government Printer.

Mr. STORY (*Ba'onne*) did not recollect that the chairman of the commission said that Mr. Gregory had objected to carrying out the proposed reforms, though he was evidently a little bit antagonistic. That could easily be understood, however, when gentlemen from outside criticised and suggested alterations in the working of a department which had been conducted by Mr. Gregory for a number of years with unqualified success.

Mr. Gregory's objection did not go [8.30 p.m.] further than that he did not like the proposed alterations. If he had said distinctly that he would not carry them out, and that he would not retain his position if they were insisted upon, he could quite understand that the commission would have had no alternative but to at once recommend that he should be retired. He could quite understand that Mr. Gregory, with his experience, would be prepared to carry out those modernising views, and he trusted that he would long remain in the office, and that his salary would be increased. There was one other matter that he wished to allude to. The chairman of the late commission spoke of the grading of the employees in the printing office. He understood the hon. member to say that the grading of the employees had given great satisfaction in the Government Printing Office in New South Wales. A body of experts had been appointed

to do the work, but their report had not been received yet, and would not be received until after that vote had been passed. After the salaries were passed, if any of the men felt aggrieved at the grading, if not more, before he got the report of the experts of whom the hon. member spoke. Did he understand that the hon. member desired that their work should be revised by the Public Service Board ?

The HOME SECRETARY : He did not quite catch what the hon. member desired. It might be two or three weeks, if not more, before he got the report of the experts of whom the hon. member spoke. Did he understand that the hon. member desired that their work should be revised by the Public Service Board ?

Mr. STORY : No, but if any officer felt aggrieved at the report, seeing he would then be a classified officer, would the hon. gentleman allow him to appeal to the Public Service Board ?

Mr. TURLEY : See page 161 of the commission's report, question 5920.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*) : He had read that report with some care and with appreciation. The commission had unanimously come to the conclusion that the printing office should be modernised. They had unanimously come to the conclusion that the work done with the present staff, machinery, and material was more efficiently and economically done than it could be done by contract by private firms. A third conclusion which they had also unanimously come to was that, in carrying out the work, the printing office paid higher wages and worked shorter hours than private firms. The inevitable conclusion was that, notwithstanding the fact that the office was not modernised, yet it was possible, under the present inefficient management—as it had been called in that Committee—to do the work much cheaper and better than it could be done by private firms. There was something illogical about those conclusions.

Mr. GLASSEY : While the men are better paid and have shorter hours.

Mr. FISHER : Yes, the work was cheaper and better done, and the men got more wages and worked shorter hours than the men under private employers. Did those three conclusions prove that the present Government Printer was not capable of carrying on the office ? He believed it would be possible to make the Government Printing Office better than it was at present, but he would be very chary about believing that it would not be possible to do that without a large amount of reorganisation. He would like to see every department in the colony investigated in the same way, and he ventured to say that not a single department would come out as well as the Government Printing Office.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS : Hear, hear !

Mr. FISHER : Now that the Government had started with Royal Commissions, they might very well continue the procedure through all the departments, and let them know exactly how matters stood.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) : The commission deserved the acknowledgment of the Committee for the good work it had done. No commission had been appointed for a long time which had done its work more satisfactorily, and deserved their commendation more than the Printing Office Commission. They had made a good report, and the beauty of the whole thing was that the different parties who were on the commission were unanimous in their findings. That must have had a big influence with the Government in putting their recommendations into effect.

Mr. ANNEAR : Half of their recommendations are to be found in the Government Printer's annual report.

Mr. McDONNELL : The recommendations had come from the commission. The position with regard to the Government Printer was this—the chairman of the commission, the hon. member for Ipswich, put the matter very clearly. He told them that the commission had recommended the increase in Mr. Gregory's salary in order that he might retire, and make way for a man who would be more up to date, because, after reading the commission's report, they could come to no other conclusion than that—good servant and all as Mr. Gregory was, and he admitted that he had done good work—his methods were quite out of date, and in a State institution like the Government Printing Office they should have the best possible management. Considering that, in order to receive a larger retiring allowance, Mr. Gregory would need to draw the increased salary for three years, he would prefer to see the Government make some arrangement to retire Mr. Gregory at the present time, even if they had to give him his increased retiring allowance, because they had it on the testimony of the commission that Mr. Gregory was practically blocking the way, and was opposed to the suggested improvements.

The HOME SECRETARY : That is not correct.

Mr. McDONNELL : The hon. gentleman had himself stated that Mr. Gregory had not taken kindly to the suggestions of the commission.

The HOME SECRETARY : He is carrying them out loyally, I can assure you.

Mr. McDONNELL : The hon. gentleman said Mr. Gregory did not agree with the methods which were being adopted in the grading of the men or with the recommendations of the commission.

The HOME SECRETARY : I said in the administration of the office.

Mr. McDONNELL : He thought that the commission had treated Mr. Gregory very considerably, and he was glad of it, because he should not have liked to have seen an old servant treated badly. At the same time he thought it should be the duty of the House and of the Government to see that the best possible management was secured—management something like that which the Government of New South Wales had in its printing office. The hon. member for Maryborough was in error when he referred in the way he did to the New South Wales Government Printing Office. If he would turn to the report of the commission he would see that that office had at its head one of the best men in Australia. Since his appointment he had saved an enormous amount of money to his Government. Anyone who read the report of the evidence taken before the commission must come to the conclusion that there was great room for improvement; in fact, as the chairman of the commission had stated, members were hardly inside the door before they got evidence of the want of good management. The Home Secretary had dealt favourably with a number of the recommendations of the commission, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would recognise that, in the interests of the office, it was absolutely necessary to get a man who was up-to-date to manage it. He should like to ask the hon. gentleman how many of the recommendations of the commission had been given effect to, and how many other recommendations he intended to give effect to. One of the recommendations was that linotype machines should be procured. Had that been adopted? In his opinion it would be premature to purchase linotype machines at present, seeing that there were improved machines, such as the monotype, coming

out. There was one clause in the report of the commission which, he thought, reflected great discredit on the management of the office. That was the one dealing with the state of the retiring rooms, lavatories, etc., for the female employees. He was rather surprised, considering that there were sanitary inspectors, that there should be such a state of things in the Government Printing Office—the only Government establishment where females were employed—as would not be allowed to exist in any private establishment.

The HOME SECRETARY : In reply to the hon. member for Balonne, he would remind hon. members that it was recommended that a number of the officers in the Government Printing Office should be classified. Although that had been endorsed by the Public Service Board, it was never actually carried out because of the appointment of the commission. The employees would be classified, and it would be very desirable that the grading should be endorsed by the Public Service Board, which would, he presumed, be very much in the nature of an appeal from the four gentlemen who were carrying out the grading. It had been asked what recommendations of the commission had been carried out. A good many of them had been carried out; and he might point out that a good many of them were recommendations made by Mr. Gregory himself. The hon. member for Brisbane South had endeavoured to show that there was conflict between the views of the hon. member for Ipswich and himself, but there was none. What he (the Home Secretary) said was that Mr. Gregory had not been entirely in accord with the views of the commission, and the hon. member for Ipswich endorsed that. He (the Home Secretary) also said that Mr. Gregory, whether he agreed with the recommendations of the commission or not, was loyally carrying them out. For instance, Mr. Gregory held different views from the commission with regard to the method of grading; but he (the Home Secretary) felt bound to follow the advice of the commission, it having been appointed at the request of Parliament, and told Mr. Gregory that the grading would have to take place on those lines. Accordingly he made arrangements with the four gentlemen, who were experts, and Mr. Gregory was loyally carrying out the instructions he had given. With regard to linotype machines, for instance, he was perfectly prepared to take the recommendation of the commission, who were experts and had obtained the evidence of experts here and in New South Wales. The increase of £6,000 in the item of contingencies was largely to cover the cost of linotype machines. All the recommendations of the commission which it had been possible to carry out hitherto had been carried out, but the adoption of a good many of the recommendations would depend upon whether hon. members voted the money on that Estimate. As to the increased accommodation mentioned by the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McDonnell, that would necessitate considerable alterations in the buildings, and the Government Architect was now engaged upon designs for that purpose, but hon. members must bear in mind that there was a good deal of work in the Government Architect's office at the present time, so that the work must necessarily take some time. There were very few of the recommendations which would not be carried out by Mr. Gregory, and in that respect he was capable of modernising his ways.

Mr. GLASSEY : Are linotype machines to be introduced?

The HOME SECRETARY : Yes, and they would be ordered as soon as that vote was passed, but he could not order them before.

Mr. HIGGS : What do you propose to do with the men who will be thrown out of employment by the introduction of linotype machines?

The HOME SECRETARY : He had nothing to do with that. The same question was asked many years ago about weavers when machinery was introduced to do their work. He was very sorry for the compositors, but perhaps some other walk of life would be open to them. He hoped hon. members would now allow the vote to pass, as it had been pretty freely and fully discussed, and he had given all the information he could in regard to it.

Mr. FISHER noticed that the assistant engineer was put down for a salary of £90 a year, which was an unreasonable amount, not enough even for a fireman, and he should like to know what duties he had to perform.

The HOME SECRETARY : £90 was not the whole of that officer's salary; he received £78 a year from the Department of Public Works in connection with the lighting of the Houses of Parliament.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*) wished to refer again to the Government Printer. As far as he understood the matter, the commission recommended an increase of £100 in his salary simply to get rid of Mr. Gregory. No one disputed his knowledge of the office, or what he had done in the past, but they could not get over the fact that Mr. Gregory had been in that institution for a number of years, and had never been outside it for the purpose of gaining a practical knowledge of how similar institutions were managed elsewhere. What they wanted at the present time was a man who had some knowledge of the administration of large printing establishments elsewhere, and who was thoroughly up to date. When a change was proposed to be made in the Government Printing Office in Sydney, it was said that the old Government Printer had done excellent work, and that he was wanted by Victoria and South Australia at an increased salary, but eventually a Government came in who thought there should be some alteration in the office, and a man was appointed from outside, well up in the technicalities and the commercial aspect of the printing business, with the result that in two years he saved the country £27,000. It was the same in commercial pursuits; men who had grown up in one institution or business had to give way to men who had had larger and broader experience, as they became narrow in their views. If it was the intention of the Government to entrust Mr. Gregory with the carrying out of the recommendations of the commission, then they should give him a twelve months' holiday, so that he might visit the big printing establishments in England and America, and become acquainted with the working of those institutions, but he (Mr. McDonald) thought it would be better to get a new Government Printer from outside.

The HOME SECRETARY was not going to be a party to dismissing an old public servant because somebody thought he was [9 p.m.] not sufficiently modernised. That would be an iniquitous thing to do. Mr. Gregory had given him to understand that he had no intention of retiring for some time. He felt he had good work in him yet. For his age Mr. Gregory was a vigorous man, and he saw no reason why he should not go on for some years. Possibly it might be desirable for him to take a short holiday during the recess to visit the southern colonies, where things were more modern than they were with us. That was not at all a bad idea.

Mr. JACKSON : Give him six months' spell,

The HOME SECRETARY : During the slack season they might be able to do something in that way, and he would be glad to do it. He would be no party to compulsorily retiring an old public servant, unless he was satisfied he was utterly incompetent, which in Mr. Gregory's case he certainly was not.

Mr. McDONALD : On the question of the increase, he did not object to the £100 being given to Mr. Gregory in lieu of his house, but he objected to its being added to his salary to increase his retiring allowance. He had a lively recollection of a similar case where an officer was receiving £1,000 a year, with £500 for travelling and other expenses, and suddenly on the Estimates they found the travelling expenses disallowed, but the £500 was added to the salary. That was the case of the Chief Engineer for Railways, and he had brought the matter up in the House a few years ago. That was done for a similar purpose to that for which that increase was proposed now, and it was not a fair thing to the fund at all, and hon. members knew the difficulties which had taken place with regard to pensions under the 1863 and other Acts. He suggested that the increase should be given specifically in lieu of the residence which Mr. Gregory had occupied, and which had had to be removed to make room for the Lands Office. That was the fair way to do it.

Mr. GLASSEY (*Bundaberg*) had no wish to prolong the discussion, as he recognised that if they did not proceed more rapidly they would not close their business in a reasonable time at all. But there were one or two little matters connected with the vote on which he did not altogether agree with his friends. He could not agree that Mr. Gregory was incompetent merely because he did not take kindly to some of the recommendations made by the commission by way of improvement in the conduct of the office. He agreed that the commission had done excellent work and had gathered necessary information. He was sure none of his friends desired to do any injustice to Mr. Gregory, but it was the settled policy of the party to prevent that annual everlasting growth of pensions to persons the bulk of whom had been fairly well paid in the past. That was the real bone of contention. If the increase was intended to induce Mr. Gregory to retire early, and that he might draw a larger pension, he should oppose the vote very strongly, but he quite agreed that Mr. Gregory should suffer no loss through losing his free quarters. It was better that Mr. Gregory's salary should remain as it was, and that he should draw the extra £100 in lieu of quarters, so long as he remained in the department. He was glad to hear that it was not his intention to retire, and that the Home Secretary had no intention of retiring him, and he was pleased to know that Mr. Gregory was likely to have an opportunity of visiting the offices in the other colonies. He had before stated that he had himself visited the printing offices in other colonies of Australia and in the United States of America, and that he had seen the Government Printing Office at Washington, the largest perhaps in the world. He was not an expert, but he had stated before that, so far as he was capable of judging, there was no office in the world where work was more expeditiously, economically, or effectively done than in their own Government Printing Office.

The HOME SECRETARY : I dare say you are not far wide of the mark.

Mr. GLASSEY had had something to do with suggesting the appointment of the commission last year. Now they had the information furnished by that commission, and so long as the present Government Printer was competent—and it could not be successfully contended that

he was not—and so long as he was prepared to loyally carry out the recommendations the commission thought necessary, and so long as he was not going to draw a higher pension—which was the real point at issue—they had no desire to do him any injustice. He hoped the Minister would agree that the £100 should be drawn in lieu of quarters, and that when Mr. Gregory came to draw a pension—which he hoped would not be for some time—it would be on a salary of £500 and not £600.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Royal Commission distinctly recommended an increase of £100 a year to the salary of the Government Printer, whether Mr. Gregory or his successor.

Mr. GLASSEY: That is not our point—the retiring allowance.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was justified in taking the opinion of the commission as to the salary which ought to be paid to the office, whoever held it, and their recommendation was made quite irrespective of the loss of residence, which was not contemplated at the time the recommendation was made. He was certainly of opinion that Mr. Gregory should suffer no loss with regard to house allowance, and next year he hoped to see that the recommendation of the Royal Commission would be fully carried out. He did not believe that £600 a year was a penny too much for the office, quite irrespective of the question of pension.

Mr. GLASSEY: "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): From appendix A, attached to the report, he gathered that Mr. Gregory was sixty-seven years of age, and had been in the service thirty-three years. It was generally understood that under the Act an officer should retire at the age of sixty, but it seemed to be understood that Mr. Gregory might stay on for another ten years if he so pleased, in an office thoroughly up to date, so it was said, and capable of turning out work better than any other printing office in the known world—which was a manifest exaggeration. He was not inclined to quarrel with the proposed increase, for the reason that they had already, during the course of the Estimates, recklessly given increases to persons at the head of the various departments without half the discussion that had taken place on that vote. Therefore he could hardly find it in his heart, under those circumstances, to quarrel over that particular increase. He wished to call attention to one or two of the recommendations of the Royal Commission. The first was with regard to letting out Government work by contract. In paragraph 10 the commissioners said—

With regard to that portion of Your Excellency's commission which directs us to inquire into the question of "the initiation, in respect of any particular class of work, of a system of calling for tenders from private firms, and letting out such work by contract," we may state that past experience, both in this colony and elsewhere, has shown the advisableness of having such an institution as a Government Printing Office; and, that being so, we are of opinion that Government work should be as economically and as effectively executed in the Government Printing Office as by outside firms: we therefore do not recommend the initiation of a system of calling for tenders for printing, binding, or lithographic work required by any Government department.

That was a most excellent suggestion, that public work should be done in a public department by publicly paid servants, and that the system of contract should be knocked on the head. It was a step in the direction of a system of government which would be attended with great benefit to the State. It was an enlargement of the functions of the State—

The HOME SECRETARY: Why not say at once, "Socialism in our time"?

Mr. LESINA: He would willingly accept the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and express his pleasure that a Royal Commission had made a recommendation which would tend to bring about "Socialism in our time." He was glad to see that an intelligent commission, composed of members of Parliament and newspapers proprietors, had recommended that the contract system should be done to death, that the State should rely more on its own resources, employ its own servants to do its own work, and pay them in its own way. Another very important recommendation to which he would direct attention was with regard to the wages of those engaged in the Government Printing Office. In paragraph 22 the commission said—

From the evidence before us it is clear that the remuneration paid to the employees is higher on the whole than that paid by private firms carrying on businesses in the city. Yet, to use Mr. Gregory's own words, with regard to many of the compositors, "It is a very low wage," and this remark might still more fittingly be applied to the cases of some of those engaged in other departments—notably, the bookbinders and female workers and the men employed in printing railway tickets, one of whom, a married man, is receiving only 28s. a week. It is very evident to us that not only can no further economy be practised in the direction of reduction of wages, but, on the contrary, we think, in many instances, that the wages should be raised to reasonable amounts. We are aware that the Government Printer has made efforts to effect improvements in this direction, but there yet remains very much to be done.

It appeared from that that there were men working in the Government Printing Office for as little as 28s. per week. To expect a man to pay his rent, feed and clothe his children and rear them respectably, was an utter impossibility. He wanted to see the men with 28s. or 30s. a week and the young girls with three half-crowns a week get a rise, but it was that class of employees who were always overlooked in the framing of the Estimates, while the man with £600 got £700, and the man with £700 got £800, and so on. He would ask the Minister to carry out that recommendation of the commission, so that persons receiving small salaries should be paid larger ones, as was but fitting in a country which, as they were so often told, was so rich and so prosperous. Those at the bottom of the tree should share some portion of that prosperity by having their wages increased.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*) was glad to see that the commission recommended that the cost of printing incurred by different departments should be paid by these departments, and that the amounts in connection with their printing should appear in their accounts. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of this Estimate whether that recommendation would be likely to be given effect to? The Railway Department, for instance, should pay for its printing, and so on, throughout the service.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: That would be a very bad thing.

Mr. STEWART did not think it would. He wanted to see the Government Printing Office worked on business lines. It was an experiment in socialism, and if it failed, all socialistic ideas would be discredited.

The HOME SECRETARY: Perhaps it might be within the recollection of some hon. members, though not within the recollection of the hon. member who had just spoken, that this system had been introduced by Mr. Unmack, when Postmaster-General and Minister for Railways, and though it worked for some little time, it ultimately broke down.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why?

The HOME SECRETARY: Because the circumlocution was so great. He did not know much about it, because it was tried before he became a member of the Government, and it was not a success.

Mr. McDONALD: What about New South Wales?

The HOME SECRETARY: The book-keeping here was much better than in New South Wales. The system might apply to one department, but it would not apply throughout the service. He certainly would not take New South Wales as an example with regard to book-keeping and the keeping of public accounts. The only case in which the principle had been found to be workable was in connection with the carriage of mails, the Post Office paying the Railway Department a fixed subsidy, but that was nothing more than a cash payment. The endless bookkeeping necessary and the transfers from cash credits caused the system he had referred to to break down. That system was tried by a gentleman who had great force of character, who was not likely to give it up if there was any chance of success.

Question put and passed.

ADVERTISING BOARD.

* The HOME SECRETARY moved that £6,825 be granted to defray the expenses in connection with the Advertising Board. There was a considerable increase, rendered necessary in connection with the advertising of the bi-monthly rolls. The amount voted last year was not sufficient. The rolls were now published bi-monthly instead of quarterly, and that accounted for most of the increase of £1,500. As the colony was more prosperous, and there was more business doing, it was only natural more advertising would have to be done.

Mr. McDONALD asked the Home Secretary to give a list of the papers which received these advertisements. With regard to the advertising of the bi-monthly rolls, other papers, such as the *Queenslander*, had a far greater circulation than some local papers. The *Worker* had a circulation ten times greater than some of the local papers, and it never got an advertisement at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: Are the advertising rates the same?

Mr. McDONALD: That was another matter.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is very important.

Mr. McDONALD: If a large number of men were knocked off the rolls in the Western districts they would see that more certainly through the *Worker*, or even the *Sydney Bulletin*, than through the local papers. He did not wish to discredit the local papers, but he would like to know how this money was distributed?

The HOME SECRETARY: It was a long list to go through, but he might say that if the hon. member's argument was of any value, it meant that such papers as the *Queenslander*, the *Worker*, the *Week*, and the *Sydney Bulletin* should have the advertising before the local papers, because they circulated throughout the whole colony and were not purely local. There were sixty electorates, and if the hon. gentleman's argument were carried to its logical conclusion, the advertising should be done solely with these papers, and not with the local papers. In the first place, the law would not permit it, and in any case it would only mean that they would have to pay doubly, because the advertising rates were so high in papers which had a large circulation. Why should they pay large sums of money for the purpose of advertising in papers [9 30 p.m.] in districts which were not interested? Now, with regard to the list the hon. member wanted—

1899—3 w*

	£	s.	d.
Brisbane Courier	530	3	11
Evening Observer	37	19	11
Queenslander	78	0	0
Telegraph	459	6	3
Week	21	0	7
Australian	46	16	0
North-Australische Zeitung	18	7	9
Figaro	33	3	6
Flashes	12	5	0
Age	13	12	0
Worker	12	5	10
Australian Pastoralists' Gazette	10	17	0
Tropiculturist	24	7	6
Queensland Grazier	3	5	0
Queenslander Herald	18	3	6
Queensland Sportsman	13	18	0
Queensland Sporting and Dramatic News	14	14	0
Saturday Night	12	1	6
Street	3	0	0
Sunday Review	0	13	0
Progress	2	13	6
Valley Advocate	3	0	0
Logan and Albert Advocate	61	15	3
Logan and Albert Leader (Beenleigh)	31	1	6
Beaudesert Despatch	16	7	0
Logan and Albert Bulletin (Southport)	32	3	0
Moreton Mail (Nundah)	105	9	4
Queensland Times (Ipswich)	209	7	6
Ipswich Standard	131	10	0
Passifern Chronicle (Ipswich)	28	19	0
Lockyer Star (Laidley)	56	17	9
Toowoomba Chronicle	139	13	9
Settler	12	1	0
Darling Downs Gazette	115	5	0
Pittsworth Herald	10	1	6
Allora Guardian	41	7	9
Warwick Argus	64	13	0
Warwick Examiner and Times	59	3	6
Border Post (Stanthorpe)	68	15	0
McIntyre Herald (Goondiwindi)	37	0	0
St. George Standard	51	13	6
Dalby Herald	48	3	3
Western Star (Roma)	75	12	10
Muramba Advocate (Roma)	92	0	0
Charleville Times	44	4	4
Charleville Courier	60	7	0
Warrego Watchman (Cunnamulla)	40	17	0
Cunnamulla Comet	24	9	6
Thargomindah Herald	77	8	0
Gympie Times	61	6	0
Gympie Miner	49	13	6
Gympie Truth	19	5	6
Maryborough Chronicle	155	4	3
Colonist	28	9	3
Wide Bay and Burnett News	126	15	11
Isis Standard	22	3	0
Bundaberg Mail	97	5	6
Bundaberg Star	84	10	0
Bundaberg Patriot	12	6	6
Gladstone Observer	42	10	6
Gladstone Advocate	39	0	4
Morning Bulletin (Rockhampton)	160	7	6
Capricornian (Rockhampton)	58	15	0
Daily Record (Rockhampton)	143	2	0
People's Newspaper (Rockhampton)	11	2	3
North Rockhampton Times	24	19	3
Mount Morgan Herald	12	3	3
Mount Morgan Chronicle	11	10	0
Mount Morgan Truth	28	14	3
Barcoo Independent	100	7	3
Peak Downs Telegram (Clermont)	83	5	0
Western Champion (Barcaldine)	135	0	3
Longreach Standard	47	0	0
Mackay Mercury	45	3	6
Mackay Standard	49	13	6
Mackay Chronicle	49	10	6
Sugar Journal	1	7	0
Port Denison Times	36	9	3
Bowen Mirror	50	12	0
Ayr Chronicle	18	13	0
Townsville Bulletin	160	16	6
Townsville Star	131	7	6
Townsville Herald	17	0	6
Ravenswood Mining Journal	31	3	0
Northern Miner (Charters Towers)	112	15	2
North Queensland Register (Charters Towers)	14	15	6
Charters Towers Herald	50	17	6
Charters Towers Mining Standard	69	9	0
Hughenden Observer	49	19	6
Winton Herald	37	9	0

	£	s.	d.
Gregory News (Winton)	13	9	0
Ingham Planter	27	12	6
Halifax Age	14	1	6
Cairns Morning Post	73	14	6
Cairns Argus	74	19	9
Cairns Advocate	33	6	4
Port Douglas Gazette... ..	45	11	6
Mareeba Herald	34	17	0
Cooktown Independent	57	10	0
Endeavour Beacon	57	13	0
Torres Straits Pilot	60	9	6
Norman Chronicle (Normanton)	38	16	0
Croydon Mining News	21	14	6
Croydon Golden Age	36	6	0
Croydon Independent	1	11	0
Mundic Miner (Georgetown)	40	7	6
Cloncurry Advocate	27	14	0
Burke Telegraph	21	10	0

£2,278 6 2

Mr. LESINA: How many Labour papers?

Mr. KERR: Did the *Eagle* get any?

The HOME SECRETARY: I have read all.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): The Home Secretary talked about the different prices charged for advertising by the various papers. Could the hon. gentleman tell him the difference between the price charged by the *Barcoo Independent* and the *Western Champion*? They were both papers that circulated in the Barcoo electorate, and he was certain that the *Western Champion* had six or seven times the circulation of the *Barcoo Independent*. If they were both paid at the same rate it was very unfair. He did not know that the *Barcoo Independent* had a circulation of 150 in the whole electorate.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): The last time that vote was before the Committee they had a somewhat interesting and energetic debate upon it. It was pointed out then that the methods adopted by the Advertising Board were very unfair to Labour papers. He particularly mentioned a paper circulating in Charters Towers that was receiving no consideration at all, and he was promised that that matter would be remedied. He might say that he had been to Mr. Ryder on more than one occasion about the matter, and he had said that it would be duly considered. According to the list read out by the Home Secretary, that *Eagle* newspaper had not been considered. If it was desired that people should really know whether their names had been struck off the roll there was no paper, local or otherwise, circulating in the district that had anything like the circulation of the Charters Towers *Eagle*. It was a paper with a circulation of over 4,000, and that it represented the political opinion of the people of Charters Towers was evidenced by the return of Mr. Dunsford and himself. It was the paper to which the resident voters of Charters Towers looked for information upon all subjects, and yet year after year its rights to a share of Government advertisements had been overlooked. There appeared to be a certain amount of bias or injustice in the matter. He did not know whether the Advertising Board acted on their own motion, or whether they received instructions, but it appeared that notwithstanding the complaints that had been made the injustice still continued. The thing was grossly unfair, and he did not think it could be defended. The hon. member had read out a list of papers that received Government advertisements, and amongst them was one paper which received £50 and which had not got a circulation of 200. That was the *Herald*, and there was another, the *Charters Towers Standard*, which he did not suppose had a circulation of more than 400 in the district. The best read paper in the district was the *Eagle*, and next to that the *Northern Miner*. He felt so strongly on the matter that he moved that the item "Advertis-

ing generally for all departments of the Public Service (excepting railways), £6,500," be reduced by £1,000.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) thought it would be conceded by all fair-minded persons that every public institution should be run apart from political bias, but the Advertising Board was subject to a good deal of political influence against one political party. It was proved last night that the same political influence was at work in connection with appointments to the commission of the peace, and now they had papers representing one political party boycotted by the Advertising Board, in spite of their circulation and their influence which were so great as to secure the return of Labour men to Parliament, notwithstanding the efforts of three or four Ministerial organs in some cases. Those papers were deliberately boycotted year after year by the Advertising Board, which was expected to spend money in making the public aware of certain matters that required to be generally advertised, and this board picked out certain political organs and inserted advertisements in them year after year, the amounts paid reaching as much as £150 and £160 in some cases. That was a direct subsidy to some of those papers, and though the space paid for was given, of what value was it as far as making public announcements was concerned? During the three or four years he was in Charters Towers he noticed that the *Eagle* had a circulation of considerably over 5,000, employed men at union rates of wages, and exercised a considerable amount of political influence in the district. It was the official organ of the associated workers; it was closely connected with the accident association; it also circulated outside the field in the Ravenswood district more than the *Ravenswood Mining Journal*, which received a considerable sum. The *Standard* had not a circulation of more than 300 or 400 at the outside; and the *Herald*, which was called "The Midnight Herald," came out at all hours—which was set up by girls at from 2s. 6d. to 7s. 6d. a week—a rag issued from a sweating den, with a circulation of 200, was subsidised to the extent of £50, because every time a Government candidate put up it backed him. The *Standard*, the *Miner*, and the *Register*, did the same; but the *Eagle*, which was of a different brand of politics, which paid him £6 5s. a week while he was there—which amount he gave up when he was elected a member—which paid its printers' devil more than the *Herald* paid to any three of its employees—did not receive a solitary copper from the Advertising Board. It was true that the *Ipswich Standard* received a share of the Government advertising, but that was a paper of rather doubtful politics, to his mind. The *Mariana Advocate* also got something; but it might be said in extenuation that that paper was responsible for presenting the Government with their present Attorney-General, and probably the advertisements were given out of gratitude for distinguished services rendered to the Government at a trying moment. If the *Eagle* would turn its politics and make ferocious attacks on the present representatives of Charters Towers, which would lead to the defeat of one of them, no doubt its funds would be largely assisted in course of time by the Government Advertising Board. Until that event took place it was very unlikely that the *Eagle* would receive any kind of assistance—not that it required assistance; all it required was fair play—at the hands of the Advertising Board. For the reasons given, he would support the reduction.

The HOME SECRETARY: The object hon. members had in view would not be attained by reducing the vote. He protested against the imputation that the Government, or any member of the Government, exercised the slightest

influence with regard to the Advertising Board. It was in order to prevent the Minister for the time being from bringing political pressure to bear that the Advertising Board was instituted.

Mr. McDONALD: Who are they?

The HOME SECRETARY could not say. The Under Secretary to the Home Department was only one of some half-dozen. Hon. members were not as good judges as the board, because they were not altogether unbiased. He did not know the reasons of the board for distributing the advertising as they did, and he did not know that it was his duty to inquire. The board had been created by Parliament to take the place of the Minister and his patronage. Fair criticism would be taken into account by the board.

Mr. DAWSON: We criticised it last year, and the same thing occurs again.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members were pleading before a tribunal, and apparently that tribunal did not think they had a good case. He said advisedly that he did not know and he did not care what reasons the board had for their action. To show how little he had to do with it, he understood for the first time that evening that the *Eagle* was a weekly paper; he did not know the paper, but that fact might have something to do with it.

Mr. DUNSFORD: About half of those you read out are weeklies.

The HOME SECRETARY: He knew nothing about nine-tenths of them. No member of the Government had anything to do with the patronage of the board, and he knew very little about their proceedings. In fact he thought it would be most improper for him to interfere in any way. He would be exceeding his duty in interfering with a board which had been placed there for the purpose of preventing political patronage. Hon. members had their opportunity of placing their views before the board, and he had no doubt they would be read by every member of the board. The Under Secretary to the Home Department—who was the only member of the board present—was only one of several, and it was difficult to fix the blame upon any particular member.

Mr. McDONALD: I suppose they are pestered by agents.

The HOME SECRETARY: From what he had heard, he believed there was a good deal in that, and he believed the board exercised a great deal of discrimination of a good sort.

Mr. LESINA: They advertise in four Ministerial papers on Charters Towers, and leave the Labour paper out.

The HOME SECRETARY did not think it was his duty to interfere. The board had been created to remove what had been a scandal in the past, and he could not inquire into their motives.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman appeared to be labouring under the impression that he was being personally blamed.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Clermont blamed me distinctly.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. gentleman misunderstood the hon. member. Personally, he was not blaming the hon. gentleman at all, but the hon. gentleman must recognise that he was the representative of the Advertising Board in that Chamber, and it was to him they looked for information. In the absence of the Advertising Board, they questioned the hon. gentleman, and the hon. gentleman ought to be furnished with the necessary information. He supposed the Advertising Board had a representative in the lobby, to whom the hon. gentleman could apply for information, and before they were called upon to pass any vote they should be furnished with all the available information.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have given you all the information I possess.

Mr. DAWSON: They had asked the hon. gentleman why the *Eagle* had been singled out for punishment—because it was nothing else. The hon. gentleman stated that apparently the board considered they had a bad case, and that was the reason the paper had been ignored. He pointed out last year that the case was a good one. The *Eagle* represented their political party on Charters Towers. So far as the publication of the electoral rolls was concerned, there could be no doubt—as evidenced by the tremendous majority by which he and his colleague had been returned—that the paper had some influence in the district. He saw Mr. Ryder immediately after the discussion last year, and Mr. Ryder pointed out to him that there were two reasons why the *Eagle* was not favoured. One was that it was a weekly paper, and they wanted to be sure that the paper was really established in the district before they gave it any advertising—that it might be a little mushroom growth, not worth taking into consideration.

He pointed out that it was a paper [10 p.m.] that had been established for years, that it had a large circulation, and that they were already advertising in weekly newspapers. The very week afterwards there was a little mushroom paper printed in Brisbane called the *Beenleigh Economist*, which was run by a gentleman named Macnamara. He thought it ran for only two issues. But in the very first issue of that paper there were nine or ten Government advertisements. It was a weekly paper. He should like the hon. gentleman in charge of the Estimates to explain why Mr. Drake's paper, *Progress*, received £2 last year.

The HOME SECRETARY: All that he could do was to officially ask the board if they had any reason for advertising in one paper and not in another, and they could tell him or not just as they pleased. He had asked his own Under Secretary, and his reply was, "I am only one of many"; and he respected Mr. Ryder's loyalty to his colleagues. He himself had given all the information he had been supplied with by the board. He might just as well ask why the *Telegraph*, which was notoriously opposed to the Government, should receive something like £400 or £500.

Mr. DAWSON: It has a large circulation.

Mr. McDONALD: We do not object to the *Telegraph* or *Courier* getting advertisements.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members said there was political bias; but here was a paper, which was certainly as strongly opposed to the Government as almost any paper in the colony, and it had received that amount. He did not think it would be fair to ask the board as a board for its reasons. It was an irresponsible body; but unless the House entrusted the duty back to the Government, he did not see what alternative could be supplied.

Mr. DAWSON: I would sooner give it back to the Government. Then it would be responsible.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then the Government would come in for all these complaints.

Mr. McDONALD: They get them all the same. (Laughter.)

Mr. LESINA: The board is a kind of buffer.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was nothing of the sort. The Government had nothing to do with it.

Mr. McDONALD: Who appoints the board?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Executive.

Mr. McDONALD: Then what is the use of saying the Government has nothing to do with it then?

The HOME SECRETARY: The appointment of the board was not the question. If hon. members said improper appointments were made

that was a different thing. The under secretaries were the best men that could be got. They had the experience, and he believed they had the ability.

Mr. DAWSON: They have a lot of bias, too.

Mr. McDONNELL: The Hon. the Home Secretary was the one they had to look to for information.

The HOME SECRETARY: He is the only one you have to abuse.

Mr. McDONNELL: Not at all. Hon. members quite understood it was not in the hon. gentleman's province to give advertisements or keep them back; but the board was in his department, and it was natural hon. members should question him. What he (Mr. McDonnell) took exception to was the hon. gentleman saying he thought the board had shown a wise discrimination.

The HOME SECRETARY: I did not say wise. I said they discriminated. That is what they are there for.

Mr. McDONNELL: He thought they had shown a very unwise discrimination. There was a wretched little rag printed in the Valley at the time of the election—a miserable thing that no one would take. In fact, people were wrapping up bottles of beer in it to this day. It was a most scurrilous thing brought out to oppose his hon. colleague and himself. It was only run for a couple of weeks, yet it received half as much as the *Worker*, which had a circulation in Brisbane of 10,000; twice as much as *Progress*, and about twice as much as the *Street*, which, he believed, also had a big circulation in Brisbane. The board were a body of intelligent men; but they had not shown business ability in the matter of distributing advertisements. The Valley paper he had mentioned had about a page and a-half of Government advertisements, while the *Eagle* did not get a single penny, and the *Worker*—one issue of which was worth about half-a-dozen of it—got a miserable £12. He hoped the members of the board would take notice of this discussion, and show a wiser discretion and greater business ability than they had shown in the past. Hon. members on this side of the House did not think that the papers which represented their views should have a monopoly; but they thought that papers of respectability, which had large circulations, should receive some consideration.

Mr. CALLAN (*Fitroy*): He quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member who had just sat down. In his electorate there were four papers, and the one which was not read by really one-fourth of the population was the one that got the most advertising. The paper that got the most Government advertisements in his electorate was a paper called *Truth*, which opposed him most virulently. There were three papers in his electorate, the *Mount Morgan Chronicle*, the *Mount Morgan Herald*, *Truth*, and another which he had not seen, and *Truth*, which had always run him down, and which might possibly run him down more after the remarks he now made, was the one which got the most advertisements from the Government. He went to the Home Secretary to try to get the matter arranged, but could not get it done.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*): It was marvellous the number of coincidences they found in the administration of the present Government. They had been told by the Home Secretary that no political influence was used in the distribution of that money for advertising.

The HOME SECRETARY: By the Government, I said.

Mr. GIVENS: By the rules of the House he was expected to accept that statement, and he accepted it; but he was forced back to the conclusion that the administration of affairs in this

colony disclosed an enormous number of coincidences, because all the favours that were given by the Advertising Board were generally given to papers which supported the Ministry at present in power.

The HOME SECRETARY: The last speaker gave an instance to the contrary.

Mr. GIVENS: If anybody looked over the list read out by the hon. gentleman he must be convinced that an overwhelming number of the papers which received the largest amount of money from the Advertising Board were papers which supported the present Government. During the past twelve months there were three papers published in his electorate, and the paper which had the largest circulation, and which was not a Labour paper, but a democratic paper which gave the best and fullest reports of the proceedings of public bodies, got less than half of what the other papers received for Government advertising. The other papers were strong supporters of the Government, and the one which got £74 as against £73 paid to the other had less than one-third of the circulation of the other paper. That was grossly unfair. The hon. gentleman said all that he could do was to ask for information, and the board could give it or not as they chose. He objected to that altogether, because the members of the board were public servants, and hon. members, as representatives of the people of the colony, had a perfect right to demand information.

The HOME SECRETARY: Well, bring them to the bar of the House. That is the way to do it.

Mr. GIVENS: They could deal with the board in another way, and that was by refusing to give them any money to spend. It was a peculiar position of affairs if public servants of the colony could flout their masters and refuse to give them any information as to how they spend the money that was entrusted to them by their masters. He did not blame the Minister for the maladministration which had been charged against the board, because he had not been a very long time at the head of the department; but it had been clearly and conclusively proved that maladministration had been going on for a long time, and it was not a true position to take up that the board were independent of the Committee, and could refuse to give hon. members information. If they were independent of the people who paid them their salaries, and gave them the money to spend, the sooner hon. members gave up coming there and allowed the colony to be governed by a board the better, and he protested against it most emphatically. There were a number of ephemeral rags in Brisbane, which had no circulation outside Queen's street, that were largely subsidised by the Advertising Board. It was disgraceful maladministration that those papers should be subsidised as they were with Government advertisements which the people for whom they were intended would never have a chance of seeing. He did not object to the amount of the vote for advertising, as he thought the Government might do well to spend even a larger amount, as it was good business to advertise largely. The Government might save money by advertising more extensively than they did tenders required, lands open to selection, and other matters of that kind. But he objected to any money being spent by a board that had displayed such disgraceful maladministration of the funds placed at its disposal as the Advertising Board had done. He noticed hon. members were very chary about criticising the vile rags to which he had referred, and that was probably because they thought those rags would get at them. They might get at him as much as they chose, but it would not prevent him standing up there to perform his public duty. Those papers had no news in them, and were not newspapers in any

sense at all; they did not reach one-fiftieth of the people of the capital, let alone anyone at all outside it. It was a waste of public money to put Government advertisements in them, because they did not reach the people they were intended to reach. The *Courier* and *Telegraph* reached almost everyone in the city, and there were reputable weekly papers published in Brisbane that circulated almost all over the colony, and while they had reputable papers of that kind they would do much better for the country to publish their advertisements in those papers. He had said it was a coincidence that the papers supporting the Government should receive most of the advertisements, but while he accepted the statement of the Home Secretary that that was not due to political influence, it appeared to him that the explanation of the whole thing was that the members of the board knew what would please the Government, and that accounted for the way in which they distributed Government advertisements.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) was in a position to correct the statement made by the leader of the Opposition in connection with the *Economist*. That paper was never published in Beenleigh at all. The hon. gentleman also mentioned the large number of Government advertisements that paper got, but, in fair play, it should be stated that that paper was not a Government paper at all, or a supporter of the Government. With regard to the board, mistakes were certainly made in the distribution of advertisements, whether they were intentional or not, and some papers did not get fair play. But he did not blame the board for it, and far less the Government. He believed that those who canvassed the board most, and bothered them most for advertisements, got most advertisements; and he did not believe the Government had in any one way tried to influence the board in giving advertisements.

Mr. CALLAN: The hon. member for Cairns had put it down that the Government papers got all the Government advertisements, but he had given an illustration from his own electorate. After his election a large number of men got on the roll, and the editor of one of the papers that had strongly supported him wrote down to him and asked him to secure the advertisement of those names for him. He saw the Home Secretary and his Under Secretary about it, and he was told the thing went from one to the other of three papers in that electorate, and it was time for the other man to get that advertisement. If the Government were looking for support in that way they would have given the advertisement to the paper that had supported him, and he thought he had been treated badly by the Government in the matter.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB (*Ipswich*) was not surprised at so much discussion on that vote, when they had so many representatives of the Press in the Committee. He knew of a case in Ipswich where, when the Government advertisements were withdrawn from a paper, the next issue of the paper contained an article against Ministers of the Crown, and complained of their cruelty. A list of all the employees on the paper was published, and it was stated that the proprietor, editor, and employees of the paper would be reduced to starvation by the withdrawal of the Government advertisements. Some years ago it used to be complained that there were too many lawyers in that House, but now they had not so many lawyers, but they had a great many newspaper proprietors. If it was an [10.30 p.m.] evil to have too many lawyers in the House, it was quite as great an evil to have too many newspaper representatives in it.

Mr. STORY said that in the matter of advertising the Government should consider something more than whether a paper supported or opposed them. It was absolutely necessary, first of all, that a paper should be truthful in its reports and honest in its criticisms. Why the Advertising Board should be used for the support of papers which were manifestly untruthful he did not know. Why the *Worker*, for instance, should get one advertisement from the Government he failed to see. Let anyone take up the last issue of the *Worker* and compare its contents with what really happened, and he would defy them to say that it contained anything like a truthful report of what occurred. The Government were not justified in supporting an organ of that kind. They only kept it alive to the discredit of the Press and the misleading of the public.

Mr. LESINA said it was ridiculous to say that the pittance of £12 received by the *Worker* for Government advertisements last year was necessary to keep a paper alive which had a circulation of 16,000. There were no doubt papers that were kept in existence by means of Government advertisements. There was a weekly paper in the North, called the *Cooktown Independent*, and if there was on the face of the earth a more utterly unscrupulous rag, he should like to have it pointed out.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The *Cooktown Independent* has never been had up for slander.

Mr. LESINA: It had never made the assertion that the hon. member for Cook was a gentleman. If it had, no doubt the hon. member would have had the proprietor arrested immediately for slander, and got damages out of him. That disreputable paper, of which the hon. member was the correspondent down here—

Mr. J. HAMILTON: That is utterly untrue.

Mr. LESINA: He accepted the denial. It was reported generally in the North that the hon. member was the Brisbane correspondent for that paper.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: I have stated that that is utterly untrue, and yet the hon. member reiterates his assertion.

Mr. LESINA: He had said he accepted the denial, but he had heard it from a person who came from Cooktown.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member for Cooktown denies the statement, the hon. member for Clermont must accept the denial.

Mr. LESINA said he accepted the denial. He merely stated, for the information of the Committee, that he had heard it. That wretched rag last year received £50 or £59 from the Government. Its circulation was wretchedly small; its staff consisted of the editor and a small boy; but it was the Government organ, and it had sufficient influence to return the hon. member. It lived largely because of the subsidy it received from the Advertising Board. To compare a paper with a circulation of 150 with that of the *Worker*, with its 16,000, and to give one £50 or £60 worth of advertisements and the other only £12 worth was a manifest absurdity.

Mr. J. HAMILTON said it was hardly worth while to answer the hon. member for Clermont, but he might inform the Committee that the *Cooktown Independent* was never had up for slander, and that its editor's oath had never been disbelieved by a jury of his fellow-countrymen, and he himself punished. As to his corresponding with that paper, it was not the fact. He had no time to correspond with that or any other paper, and did not do so. He remembered seeing in the *Cooktown Independent*

some not very complimentary remarks about the hon. member. That hon. member, who, outside the Chamber, was—

The mildest manner'd man
That ever scuttled ship or cut a throat—

was making use of his position in the House to libel that paper because of some comments made upon himself in its columns.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. member for Balonne had said that these advertisements should be given to truthful, honest, and respectable papers; but, if there was any object in advertising at all, it was that the information should reach the people. The sole object of all advertising was publicity. What would be the good of advertising in papers—probably most estimable papers in many ways—which had only a limited circulation, and which were only read by a certain class of people—students for instance? Apart from the merits of any particular paper, the object of the Advertising Board should be to advertise in papers which had the largest circulation in the districts concerned. Their only object should be to reach the public, apart from the character of the politics which any particular paper advocated.

Mr. DAWSON: He had moved his amendment as a protest, and he would like to amend it, because if carried as it stood it might impair the efficiency of the Advertising Board. He begged to move a reduction of £1 instead of £1,000.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. gentleman had better withdraw his first amendment.

Mr. DAWSON: Yes, I withdraw that. Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Mr. DAWSON moved a reduction of £1 on the vote.

Question—That £6,824 only be granted—put; and the Committee divided:—

AYES, 17.

Messrs. Glassey, Givens, Lesina, Kerr, Jackson, Hardacre, McDonnell, Maxwell, Dibley, Stewart, Ryland, Fitzgerald, Browne, McDonald, Turley, Dunsford, and Dawson.

NOES, 19.

Messrs. Dickson, Rutledge, Dalrymple, Philp, Murray, Chataway, Foxton, Moore, Newell, T. B. Cribb, Lord, J. C. Cribb, Campbell, Annear, Story, Callan, Hanran, Bartholomew, and Stephenson.

PAUL.

Aye—Mr. Fogarty. No—Mr. Smith.

Question resolved in the negative.

Question—That £6,825 be granted for the Advertising Board—put and passed.

INSANITY.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £45,259 be granted in connection with insanity. There was a total increase of £2,922 under this vote. It was made up of an increase of £100 to Dr. Hegg; one extra attendant at £270; the assistant superintendent an extra £50; and increases, according to regulation, to the male and female attendants. At Sandy Gallop there was an increase of only £20, and at Toowoomba an increase of £234—an additional appointment of engineer at £122 being the principal item. There was a total increase in the contingency vote of £1,310.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): Under this vote he wished to offer a protest against the inhuman and barbarous treatment meted out to lunatics who were brought down from the Central and Northern districts. He knew of two cases in which lunatics on the road to Brisbane had met their deaths by jumping overboard. He noticed that the lunatic asylums were all located in the South within eighty miles of Brisbane, and there was none in the Central division at all. If the relatives of unfortunate persons in the back blocks who went insane wished to see them, there was nothing for it but for them to come to the metropolis, and then travel to Goodna, Toowoomba, or Sandy Gallop. That was a great hardship, because those relatives were often poor people, and when once the unfortunate insane person was taken in charge by the police and conveyed South there was a strong probability that his relatives would not see him again for years. That was a grave abuse that ought to be rectified. How it could be rectified he did not know unless by building an asylum in the Central district. No doubt the head of the department would remember the two cases of suicide to which he referred. One was the case of a man named Davis, and the other that of a woman whose name he did not know. Of course those unfortunate creatures might be better off where they were, but he thought it was incumbent upon the Government to extend more humane consideration to unfortunate people afflicted with lunacy. Some provision should, at all events, be made to prevent the possibility of their committing suicide. If in this nineteenth century a better method of conveying lunatics from one part of the colony to the other could not be devised, it was time that the people raised their voices and resented the present treatment extended to persons afflicted in this way. Another thing to which he objected was the retention of the Sandy Gallop Asylum, the Petrie Terrace Reception-house, and the Diamantina Orphanage Asylum, which were simply maintained to find billets for needy persons. He thought it would be preferable to close up those places altogether, and establish asylums in Rockhampton and Townsville. Those were the two protests he had to make. Whether they would be effective or not he could not say, but he hoped the matter would be taken up by the persons interested, and that some improvement would take place in the departmental administration.

woomba, or Sandy Gallop. That was a great hardship, because those relatives were often poor people, and when once the unfortunate insane person was taken in charge by the police and conveyed South there was a strong probability that his relatives would not see him again for years. That was a grave abuse that ought to be rectified. How it could be rectified he did not know unless by building an asylum in the Central district. No doubt the head of the department would remember the two cases of suicide to which he referred. One was the case of a man named Davis, and the other that of a woman whose name he did not know. Of course those unfortunate creatures might be better off where they were, but he thought it was incumbent upon the Government to extend more humane consideration to unfortunate people afflicted with lunacy. Some provision should, at all events, be made to prevent the possibility of their committing suicide. If in this nineteenth century a better method of conveying lunatics from one part of the colony to the other could not be devised, it was time that the people raised their voices and resented the present treatment extended to persons afflicted in this way. Another thing to which he objected was the retention of the Sandy Gallop Asylum, the Petrie Terrace Reception-house, and the Diamantina Orphanage Asylum, which were simply maintained to find billets for needy persons. He thought it would be preferable to close up those places altogether, and establish asylums in Rockhampton and Townsville. Those were the two protests he had to make. Whether they would be effective or not he could not say, but he hoped the matter would be taken up by the persons interested, and that some improvement would take place in the departmental administration.

Question put and passed.

RECEPTION-HOUSES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved £3,082 be granted for reception-houses. [11 p.m.] There was an increase of £120 resulting from a new appointment and some small additions to salaries; otherwise the provision was exactly the same as last year.

Question put and passed.

PRISONS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £25,579 be granted for prisons. The increase on the amount voted last year was £473. The increase for the chief office was £54. The increase for the Brisbane gaol was £150, including £70 for a clerk, which was a new appointment, the clerical work having been previously done by the chief warden with prison assistance—a practice that had been found objectionable, because he had to spend time in the office which should be spent in the work of supervision outside the office. At Rockhampton there was an increase of £120 for an additional warden; at Roma there was an increase of £20, and at Townsville an increase of £30. And there was £30 for a police gaol at Camooweal. There was a decrease of £10 for St. Helena. The amount asked for contingencies was £69 more than last year, made up in this way: £250 for provisions, stores, and incidentals; and £19 for extra allowance for living, making £269; against which there was a decrease of £200 in the amount required as gratuities to discharged prisoners, the number of long-sentenced prisoners to be discharged this year not being so great as last year.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*) asked whether the construction of a gaol in Brisbane for females was to be proceeded with at once.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. McDONNELL was very glad to hear it, because he had been advocating for a long time the removal of the present gaol from Fortitude Valley. He hoped also that when the Valley gaol was done away with, the land would be devoted to school purposes. He wished to know, also, whether it was the intention of the Government to erect a gaol inland in place of the present penal establishment at St. Helena, in accordance with the recommendation made year after year by the Comptroller of Prisons. In his report for the present year that officer said—

With regard to St. Helena in particular, I have for years past pointed out its unsuitability and the need for the erection of a new penal establishment in its place. At present money has to be continually spent in repairs, and still more will have to be expended as the buildings grow older and older.

During the past year repairs have been made to the stockade buildings, stockade wall, officers' quarters, barracks, schoolhouse (which has been almost rebuilt), shops, etc., while an addition was made to the boat-house, a silo pit made, and a tramcar built. A stone haysled was also commenced.

Further accommodation in the shape of sleeping quarters for warders coming off night duty is required. The construction and plan of the present buildings do not permit of a proper system of separation and classification, and while on the subject I would respectfully point out here the necessity which exists for providing for a considerable sum of money for prison buildings at different places.

The place was all built of wood, and there was the possibility of fire breaking out at any time. He thought the only thing that would bring the Government to their senses in this matter would be some unfortunate accident of that kind, which might occur at any time, because the comptroller had pointed out again and again that if a fire occurred there would be no possibility of escape. Another matter was the salary paid to the present superintendent. He understood that Mr. Ryan's predecessors received £500 per annum, while Mr. Ryan was only getting £375 after thirty years' service.

Mr. GIVENS: Quite enough, too.

Mr. McDONNELL: He believed in paying a man according to his work and responsibility. A handsome profit was being made through the work of the prisoners, and much of the credit must be due to the superintendent. On that side of the Committee they did not, as a rule, advocate increases to highly paid officers, but Mr. Ryan was certainly one of those who were deserving of an increase.

The HOME SECRETARY: The plans of the new gaol for females were in an advanced state. They would be fine buildings, most suitable for the purpose, and so far as he knew, they would be pushed on with expedition by the Works Department.

At 11 13 p.m.,

Mr. GIVENS called attention to the state of the Committee. An important question like this should be discussed in a fuller House.

The HOME SECRETARY: You ask for an explanation, and immediately call attention to the state of the Committee so that you cannot get it.

Quorum formed.

Mr. McDONNELL: Did the hon. gentleman decline to give the information he asked for? He had nothing to do with the hon. member for Cairns calling attention to the state of the Committee.

Mr. GIVENS: I had a perfect right to do it.

Mr. McDONNELL: He simply wished the hon. member for Barcoo to go out and bring in the hon. member for Croydon, who had something to say about Mr. Ryan. He put reasonable questions to the hon. gentleman, and he did not think that any other hon. member desired to speak on the vote, so that there was no use the hon. gentleman declining to give information,

because the hon. member for Cairns exercised his right to call attention to the state of the Committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have asked me some questions, and if you stop lecturing I will answer.

Mr. McDONNELL: The hon. gentleman declined to answer, and that was his reason for getting up.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was misquoting him. He had done nothing of the sort. If those tactics were to be pursued, he said it would be unnecessary for him to give any further information. Immediately he rose to reply one of the hon. members on the other side—as he thought—a signal from the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, rose and called attention to the state of the Committee.

Mr. McDONNELL: I gave no signal at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was prepared to accept the statement of the hon. member that it was not done with his connivance. The gaol for females would be proceeded with shortly. As to St. Helena, that was a big question, involving a great deal of money, and there were other buildings that were more urgently needed. St. Helena was a model penal establishment, but it was generally admitted that at some future date it should be removed to the mainland. Of course the danger from fire was a strong reason why the institution should be removed, but things could go on as they were for some little time longer. It was not such a crying need, for instance, as the new gaol for females.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) asked for some information about a young man who had been confined in Blackall Gaol, and, being apparently out of his mind, was put in a straight jacket? He managed to get out of the straight jacket and hang himself with a strap which he fixed over the door of his cell. He did not know whether there had been any inquiry, but it showed a lack of discipline when such a thing could occur.

The HOME SECRETARY: I suppose the strap belonged to the straight jacket.

Mr. KERR: It seemed a strange thing that he could have got out of the jacket if it had been properly put round. When such a thing as that took place it looked as if there was something radically wrong. He should like to know if any inquiry had been made into that death, and what was the result of it.

The HOME SECRETARY: There had been an inquiry, and it was found that no blame could be attached to anybody.

Mr. HANRAN (*Townsville*): He had been asked by the hon. member for Herbert, who had been compelled to leave through illness, to call attention to the fact that while the superintendent of the gaol at Rockhampton received £300 a year, the superintendent of the gaol at Stewart's Creek, Townsville, than whom there was no more competent man, received only £290.

The HOME SECRETARY: He would reply to the question of the hon. member for Fortitude Valley at the same time as he was replying to the question of the hon. member for Townsville. The reason those officers had not received increases this year was because they were granted increases last year. No increases were recommended by the Public Service Board this year.

Mr. McDONNELL: The Hon. the Home Secretary's reply with regard to St. Helena was disappointing. He admitted that the erection of the new establishment would mean the expenditure of a large amount of money; but there was no getting away from the fact that it was absolutely necessary something should be done.

The HOME SECRETARY: The building is in very good order.

Mr. McDONNELL: The Comptroller of Prisons in his report said—

The general condition of the buildings of this establishment is bad.

The roofing and the timber in all of them is more or less decayed or decaying, and require constant repair, and as the buildings become older and more dilapidated the risk of fire increases.

It is absolutely necessary that provision should be made for the erection of a new penal establishment.

He was milder in his report this year than he had been in years past. In the past he had been very strong in his recommendation as to the necessity for new buildings, and, although the expenditure might be great, it was an expenditure that would have to be faced. He was rather disappointed that the Home Secretary had not said he was prepared to recommend that Mr. Ryan's salary should be increased, as he was deserving of it. But he hoped that next year he would give him an increase.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): He thought that every one of the superintendents of prisons was too highly paid. The superintendent of a local prison got as much as a member of Parliament. (Laughter.) It was not a laughing matter at all. If his services were not worth more to the community than those of the superintendent of St. Helena, the sooner he retired the better. Imagine the Comptroller of Prisons getting £600 a year. Why, he was better paid than even a Cabinet Minister. Then there was another who got £375 a year. What was he paid for?

Mr. McDONNELL: He has more work.

Mr. STEWART: How did the hon. gentleman know? Had he had any practical experience? Someone had been piping into his ear.

Mr. McDONNELL: I never spoke to them.

Mr. STEWART: Any official who got the ear of a member of Parliament got his screw increased; and any official who did not get the ear of a member of Parliament was left in the mud. All these superintendents were too highly paid. He would reduce their salaries 20 to 25 per cent. While the colony was overloaded with highly-paid servants they had members coming forward—members representing the working classes, many of whom got from 30s. a week downward, and very few of them over that—and clamouring for increases. He would never be a party to that. Looking over the list he found that those who had professional knowledge were paid a much lower wage than warders. For instance, dispensers and dentists were paid £30 a year less than warders. Again, the schoolmaster got only £110 per annum, while the clerk and storekeeper received £230. Surely a schoolmaster was worth more than a clerk and storekeeper, whom [11.30 p.m.] they could get anywhere. Those anomalies were to be found right through the Estimate. While he would always advocate increases to low paid officials, he would oppose with all the strength of which he was capable, increases to those men whom he considered were too highly paid already.

Mr. GIVENS had a strong idea that it would not be a difficult matter to make their prisons entirely self-supporting, because the criminals incarcerated there were generally able-bodied men. Could the Minister give them an approximate idea of the total value of the several classes of goods produced in the several prisons of the colony, and of the net loss annually of keeping our criminal population?

Mr. McDONNELL took exception to the remarks of the hon. member for North Rockhampton regarding his advocacy of an increase in the salary of the superintendent of St. Helena. As to that officer having approached him on the subject he could only say that he had

never spoken to Mr. Ryan, and had only met him on one occasion, and that was when he visited St. Helena with other members of Parliament. Members on that side did not always denounce the payment of high salaries, and as far as he was concerned, he believed that a man who occupied a high position and rendered valuable services to the country should be highly paid, and the superintendent of St. Helena occupied the next most responsible position to that of the Comptroller of Prisons. With regard to the erection of a new gaol to take the place of St. Helena, he would point out that in 1896 Sir Horace Tozer said—

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

The colony was in a better position financially now than it was in 1896, and he hoped that before the vote passed the Home Secretary would be able to tell the Committee that the Government intended at an early date to erect a gaol on the mainland to take the place of St. Helena.

The HOME SECRETARY: All the argument with regard to the removal of the prisoners from St. Helena to the mainland was not on one side. There was a great deal to be said in favour of keeping the gaol where it was at present. There would be advantages in moving the gaol to the mainland, as for instance economy in some respects, and facilities for permitting warders to reside with their families.

Mr. McDONNELL: And a better system of classification.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was a great deal to be said in favour of the system which existed at St. Helena, because, as he understood, certain liberty—perhaps unexampled in any other similar establishment—could be given there to prisoners who behaved well. The hon. member had quoted the late Home Secretary; and it was amusing to hear hon. members opposite quoting that hon. gentleman, when, if anyone on the Government side presumed to quote him, his opinions were received with laughter and derision. Hon. members opposite so often spoke ill of the late Home Secretary, especially behind his back, that it was amusing to find how ready they were to quote him when it suited their purpose.

Mr. McDONNELL took great exception to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. They said nothing of the late Home Secretary behind his back that they would not say to his face. They admitted that that hon. gentleman had shown himself, in connection with institutions like Dunwich and St. Helena, possessed of a good deal of good nature and a humane spirit. As head of the department for several years, he probably knew more of the condition of St. Helena than the present Home Secretary; and, though they might in many things have been bitterly opposed to the late Home Secretary, he

was doing nothing inconsistent in quoting that hon. gentleman's remarks in support of what he was advocating.

Mr. TURLEY had been informed that the hours of warders in the prisons were very long. The information he had was that the hours for the first day were from 6'30 a.m. to midnight—seventeen and a-half hours; the second day, 6'30 a.m. to 5'15 p.m.—ten and three-quarter hours; third day, 6'30 a.m. to 6'30 p.m.—twelve hours; and the fourth day, 12 midnight to 7 a.m. That was for what was termed active duty, and apart from that they were away from their homes for a still longer period on what was called reserve duty. The actual time on duty for four days was forty-five hours' active and ten and a-half hours' reserve duty, or a total of fifty-five and a-half hours in four days. That was very nearly fourteen hours per day. Those appeared to be excessively long hours, and he understood that the police had eight hours' duty and sixteen hours off. He asked if his information was correct?

The HOME SECRETARY: The figures quoted by the hon. member were, he understood, correct, and the warders worked on an average from ten and a-half to ten and three-quarter hours per day, and they served the seventeen hours in one day in order to enable them to get twenty-four hours off together in each week. The hon. member was quoting Brisbane Gaol?

Mr. TURLEY: Yes.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the system in the Brisbane Gaol.

Mr. TURLEY: Is that ten and three-quarter hours a day for six or seven days a week?

The HOME SECRETARY: For six days. They got one day off as a result of having put in seventeen hours at one time.

Mr. TURLEY: That would be over sixty-three hours a week?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, about that.

Mr. TURLEY: Those were rather long hours, he should imagine, but of course he did not know what the duties were. It must be admitted that sixty-three hours a week was a fairly long time for a man to work. He understood that the police had eight hours on duty, and sixteen hours off, and their duties were certainly not more arduous than those of warders in prisons.

The HOME SECRETARY: A very large proportion of it is not work.

Mr. TURLEY: They had to be there, and they had certain duties to perform. If they were superintending a gang of men they had to put in the same number of hours as the men who were doing the manual work.

The HOME SECRETARY said that in his opinion if eight hours was a fair day's work at manual labour, ten and a-half hours did not appear to be very excessive for men who were doing labour which was neither physically nor mentally exhausting, and which was very largely done under cover. That was not the case with police constables, who had to be on their feet all the time they were patrolling.

Mr. NEWELL said he knew hundreds of men who were working more than ten and a-half hours a day, and for less money than the warders in gaols. They were working in gullies often up to their knees in water, from daylight till dark.

Mr. FISHER: But they are their own bosses, and that makes all the difference.

Mr. NEWELL: There were any number of men in the country who would be only too glad to get the billet of prison warden, notwithstanding the long hours they had to work.

Mr. TURLEY: That was not the point with regard to employment by the State. There was not a man whose salary they had been voting, whose place could not be filled to-morrow at a

lower figure. It was no argument to say that men had good times because there were persons outside who were prepared to do their work at the same rate.

The HOME SECRETARY: You said at a lower rate.

Mr. TURLEY: The Committee had just increased a certain salary by £100. [12 o'clock] There were no doubt dozens of men who would gladly have that officer's billet at 50 per cent. reduction; but all that was entirely beside the question. It had been laid down by men who had just as much ability and intelligence as any hon. member sitting on the Treasury bench, that the duty of the State was to pay slightly higher wages than were paid outside, so that the State should set a good example to outside employers in this way. The argument that other men were willing to fill these positions at the same salary was a miserable pettifoggery one that would not be backed up by anyone who understood the position.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. gentleman had gone entirely off the track in speaking on the question of wages. The hon. member raised the question of hours, and the hon. member for Woothakata pointed out that there were other men who were willing to do the same work at the same wage, indicating that the hours were not excessive. The point was that no complaint had been made by the men doing this work, and that there were other men willing to do the work at the same wage. Let a vacancy occur, and the department would be overwhelmed with applications.

Mr. TURLEY: Two or three years ago the same argument was used by members with regard to the men in the Railway Department, some of whom were only receiving 5s. or 5s. 6d. a day—that other men could be found to fill their vacant positions at the same salary. He had certain information, and he submitted it to the Minister, who said that it was substantially correct. Then he asked the Minister if he did not think these warriors worked rather long hours, and the hon. member for Woothakata said that plenty of other men could be found who would be willing to fill any vacancies that might occur at less wages. All this meant that the condition of the country was not so glorious as it had been made out to be. If the argument was followed out to its logical conclusion, the result would be that these positions should be tendered for, and the lowest tenderer should get the jobs. The result would be that they would have Under Secretaries working for £150 a year.

Mr. T. B. CRIBB (*Ipswich*): The hon. member for South Brisbane had displayed a large amount of virtuous indignation, but he would remind that hon. member that a similar expression to which he took so much objection had been made on a previous occasion by numbers of hon. members on the same side as himself. In a discussion last session an hon. member on the front Opposition bench took exception to the proposed increase in some salaries, and stated that there would be no difficulty in replacing those officials at much lower salaries. To this he (Mr. Cribb) replied in somewhat similar terms to that employed by the hon. member for South Brisbane to-night, but neither he nor any one else on his side took any exception to the remarks he now objected to when made by his own side.

The CHAIRMAN: I think hon. members are rather digressing from the vote before the Committee, and I ask them to confine their remarks strictly to the vote.

Mr. GIVENS: He had asked the Minister for certain information, but the hon. gentleman had not had the courtesy to reply—perhaps he had forgotten it.

The HOME SECRETARY: What information does the hon. gentleman want?

Mr. GIVENS: He had asked what was the approximate value of the goods manufactured in the gaols.

The HOME SECRETARY referred the hon. member to page 14 of the Comptroller-General's report, where he would obtain all the information he asked for.

Mr. LESINA: Some time ago he asked a question with respect to the number of coloured aliens in the gaols of the colony, and he was informed that the total number for five years was 1,611, and that there were 105 in the gaols to-day who cost 2s. 5³/₄d. per week to keep. He found by the Comptroller-General's report that the number really was 356, and at, say, 2s. 6d. per head they were costing the colony the enormous sum of £12,000 per annum to keep. That was a nice little bill to pay for the coloured alien curse. He drew attention to that, because it was an important factor in determining of what value to the colony alien labour really was. Another point upon which he had not been satisfied was with regard to the condition of the gaol at St. Helena. The hon. member for Woothakata said it was a comfortable institution, and that there was practically no danger from fire; but he found, on reference to the comptroller's report, that the building was in a state of decay, and the risk of fire daily increased. He also pointed out that it would be necessary to face the question of building a new gaol, if their gaol system was to be kept up to date. The statements of the hon. member for Woothakata were, therefore, not borne out by fact.

The HOME SECRETARY: The figures relating to coloured aliens in the gaols of the colony which the hon. member had quoted referred to the whole year. There may have been a number in for a week or fortnight, and the hon. member would have to average them for the whole year. He could not take a man with a fortnight's sentence and set him down as costing a certain sum per week for the whole year. Then he would point out that the cost which the hon. member quoted was the total cost, but as against that he would find in the table to which the hon. member for Cairns had been referred, that against the cost of £23,000, there was the value of work done to the extent of £17,977 as a set off. If that work were not done by the prisoners it would have to be done by outside labour.

Mr. GIVENS: If there were no prisoners there it would not want to be done at all.

The HOME SECRETARY: An effort had been made to saddle a certain class of prisoners with the cost, but the gaols would require to be carried on if there were no such class of prisoner. There was a credit of something like 60 or 70 per cent. to be taken off the hon. member's figures, even on the reduced scale.

Mr. LESINA noticed that there were several cases reported in which breaches of prison discipline had been punished by confinement in dark cells for periods of from one to three days, and from one to seven and ten days. Did that mean that there was a total deprivation of light?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. The superintendent had power to sentence prisoners to dark cells up to three days, and anything over that was done by the visiting justice. There had been no case during the year in which the punishment had been inflicted for more than three days.

Mr. GIVENS: During the discussion on the Criminal Code Bill the Attorney-General admitted that solitary confinement in a dark cell should not be inflicted for such a trivial offence as a breach of prison discipline. It was the

most cruel and brutal form of punishment which could be inflicted, and individuals like the superintendent of a gaol or the visiting justice should not have power to sentence a prisoner to such a cruel punishment, practically without trial, because the unfortunate prisoner dare not open his mouth. That brutal punishment had been inflicted on one female last year. In connection with flogging, when the subject was previously under discussion, they had been assured by the medical superintendent that flogging had never been inflicted with such severity as to draw blood, and yet immediately after that statement was made, both the *Courier* and *Telegraph* stated that blood freely flowed, and that the flogging was of a most dreadful nature.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member is digressing from the subject before the Committee.

Mr. GIVENS took the liberty of disagreeing with that ruling.

The CHAIRMAN: If the hon. member disagrees with my ruling, there is only one course open to him.

Mr. GIVENS moved that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*): If flogging was mentioned in the report, and formed a part of the prison regulations, he submitted that the hon. member for Cairns was in order in discussing it under this vote. If the Chairman's ruling was correct, he could rule every reference to any report out of order. He trusted the Chairman would not press his ruling, and he would like to hear those who were responsible for the guidance of the Committee give some reasons why the ruling should be sustained.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Chairman had given his ruling, and the hon. [12:30 a.m.] member for *Gympie* and the hon. member for Cairns were questioning it. If the hon. member chose to get up and talk about it, nobody could prevent him.

Mr. FISHER: Keep to the point of order.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was not discussing the point of order. He was replying to the hon. member. The hon. gentleman called on the Ministerial benches to support his motion. Why should they?

Mr. FISHER: Has a ruling been given?

The HOME SECRETARY: We are going to support the Chair anyhow.

Mr. LESINA: He should certainly support the motion that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to because he found that in table 9 reference was made to corporal punishment, which of course, meant flogging.

The CHAIRMAN: I wish to mention before it goes to the vote that the reason I called the hon. member to order was that he was proceeding to bring forward a case referred to in the papers years ago. That could not be relevant to the question before the Committee.

Mr. FISHER: What he desired to get from the front Government bench was a clear definite statement regarding the point of order. He should like to hear the opinion of the leader of the House.

The PREMIER: He did not see that he was called upon to express an opinion. It was his duty to support the Chair, unless he was in the wrong. It would have been far better for the hon. gentleman not to have moved the motion, but now that it had been moved it had better be decided by a vote. He intended to support the Chair.

Mr. STEWART: He was very much astonished at the ruling given by the Chairman. The hon. member for Cairns was discussing the question of flogging, and as that question was

referred to in the report he held in his hand, it was quite within the power of the hon. gentleman to discuss it, and to refer to previous cases of flogging, in order to back up or illustrate his argument. That being the case, he could not do otherwise than support the motion that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

Question—That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to—put and negatived.

* Mr. GIVENS: He noticed from the report that corporal punishment was inflicted on a prisoner in Brisbane Gaol for a breach of prison discipline—namely, insubordinate conduct and language. He supposed the prisoner disobeyed some warder or somebody else, which was not a very brutal offence. Yet for that he was sentenced to the brutal and degrading punishment of flogging, practically without any trial at all. The Hon. the Attorney-General had assured the House on a recent occasion that he did not approve of that punishment being inflicted for breaches of prison discipline; but hon. members found from the report that it had been inflicted in some cases for very slight breaches.

The HOME SECRETARY: There were only eleven cases in the whole year in all the prisons of the colony.

Mr. GIVENS: Earlier in the session they were assured by the medical superintendent, through the Attorney-General, that flogging was not nearly so brutal a punishment as people generally imagined, and that blood was never drawn, and yet hon. members had conclusive proof at that time that blood was drawn, and that the punishment was most degrading and brutalising. If prisoners were properly managed there should be no need for such a brutal form of punishment. Another point to which he wished to direct attention was that the amount of work performed for prison purposes last year was £9,832 8s. 8d., and the amount they were now asked to vote was £25,579, so that the total cost of their prisons for the year would be £35,411, and as against that they had only a little over £7,800 for work performed for the various Government departments, and actual cash received for stock, produce, etc. If a proper system were pursued, the large number of able-bodied men whom they had in their gaols should be able to support themselves. Why should they not be made to clear and improve land belonging to the State, and to grow the produce which was required by different departments?

The HOME SECRETARY: What about competing against the farmer?

Mr. GIVENS: When the Government were producing produce for their own use, they were not competing against farmers or anybody else, and if that were done the farmers who were now taxed for the support of prisoners would not have to contribute towards their support. He should like also to direct attention to what had frequently occurred at Stewart's Creek Gaol in 1895. He did not know whether it was done now, but at that time he knew, from his own personal knowledge, that visitors, both male and female, ladies generally of the "toff" variety—some of them barmaids—were brought round the establishment three or four days a month, and marched round the gaol, all the doors being thrown open and every prisoner being required to stand at attention while those people stared at them through their eyeglasses. A man might be in there for a very trivial offence, but he would be for ever branded by those people, who might be his inferiors, as a gaolbird. He should like to know from the Home Secretary whether he intended to make such an alteration in the system of punishments as would do away with

flogging, the dark cell, and solitary confinement for breaches of prison discipline, as promised some time ago by the Attorney-General.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) thought the hon. member made rather a broad assertion in saying that he had promised that the punishment of flogging should be abolished for breaches of prison discipline. What he stated was that he would represent strongly to his hon. colleague, the Home Secretary, that flogging should not be resorted to except as a *dernier ressort*. He had taken the trouble to make inquiries of the visiting justice of the Brisbane and St. Helena establishments—a man whom he had known for many years, and who was as humane a man as any in the colony, and who would hold such a thing as the chaperoning of idlers to view prisoners in abhorrence. Mr. Morston had told him that flogging could not be ordered by a visiting justice on his own authority. It had to receive the sanction of the Home Secretary, to whom the depositions were sent, that he might see whether such a punishment as that should take place. He had found out, also, that in serious cases of that sort the visiting justice was always accompanied by one of the police magistrates of Brisbane; and the only case he could find in which a punishment of the kind had been inflicted was that of a man who was absolutely incorrigible. He strongly reprobated the use of the lash in any but the most extreme cases, and he was quite sure the Home Secretary, who had as much human sympathy as himself, would not sanction such a punishment, except in such cases. He had not undertaken to answer for his colleague that no such punishment would be inflicted, but that he would represent to him what his own opinions were, and that if it was found necessary in any extreme case to sanction such a punishment, the instrument used should be of a less formidable character than that which had been referred to in the debate. He should also say that he had seen the Comptroller of Prisons, who, he was sure, was not in that position when the occurrence to which the hon. member for Cairns referred took place, and Captain Pennefather assured him that since he had had anything to do with the gaol as Comptroller he had never seen blood drawn.

Mr. GIVENS: I thought it was the medical officer who said that.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: No; Dr. Wray said he had never seen the true skin cut.

The HOME SECRETARY: Flogging was only resorted to in very extreme cases. There was one case where the man's record was as bad as anything that could be imagined in the gaol. Kindness and everything else had been tried with him, and he was absolutely incorrigible. Before he had taken office as Home Secretary that man had been punished by flogging, and subsequently—in the way described by the Attorney-General—the man was ordered a flogging by the visiting justice accompanied by a police magistrate, and he had himself stopped that flogging, because he was not satisfied of the man's sanity. The man knew very well what he was about, but he was of so violent a temperament that when he was excited he became beside himself. He had caused him to be examined, and while some said he was sane others had their doubts, and he had decided that the man should not be flogged. The only alternative was to send him to the asylum, where a specially prepared cell, costing £60, was provided for him. The medical officers of the asylum had grave doubts whether he was insane or not, but his term of incarceration there had not expired, and he was doing much less harm there to himself and to other people.

Mr. GIVENS would like an assurance that the practice of allowing the visiting justices to take friends with them to view the prisoners would be stopped.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was not judicious to stop all visiting. Public men, for instance, from the other colonies who desired to compare notes on such establishments, might be allowed to visit our prisons, but he deprecated the visiting by mere sight-seers and curiosity-mongers, and he was informed that that had been stopped.

Mr. FISHER asked what offences involved [1 a.m.] confinement in a dark cell for a number of days?

The HOME SECRETARY said they were disobedience of orders and acts of disobedience against prison discipline; but all the items were set out in the prison rules and regulations.

Mr. FISHER: It was generally recognised that confinement in a dark cell was conducive to insanity. Was such confinement the cause of the insanity of the prisoner to whom the hon. gentleman had alluded?

The HOME SECRETARY: No. That man was no worse when he left the gaol than when he entered it.

Mr. GIVENS wished to point out, before the question was put, that instead of there having been only eleven cases of punishment in a dark cell for breaches of prison discipline, last year there were no less than twenty-three, and three of those were females. It was a severe reflection on their system of prison discipline that they could not keep order without having recourse to such a barbarous form of punishment.

The HOME SECRETARY said it was only resorted to in extreme cases, and they must have some punishment for breaches of prison discipline.

Question put and passed.

REFORMATORIES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £4,201 be granted for reformatories. The vote showed a total increase of £1,796, made up as follows: Westbrook, £436; Deebing Creek, £270; River View, £450; and Yeronga, £700; against which there was to be set off a decrease of £60 at Toowoomba. The buildings at Westbrook were being proceeded with. Mr. Richmond, the new superintendent, he believed to be a very excellent man for the position, and he had every hope that he would maintain the same good tone in the reformatory as had always been the case under Mr. Wassall—and that was saying a good deal.

Mr. McDONNELL suggested that they should now adjourn, as a very good night's work had been done.

The HOME SECRETARY said it was understood last night that they should get through the Home Secretary's Estimates to-night, and he saw no reason to go back on that understanding. Very little progress had been made, and he was surprised at the long speeches some hon. members had made on comparatively small matters.

Mr. FISHER urged the hon. gentleman in charge of the Estimates to adjourn, as there were important items coming on—charitable allowances and other matters—which should be fully discussed.

Mr. McDONNELL: Do you intend to go right through the vote?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the announcement made last night. It would be impossible to get through the session before Christmas if long speeches were indulged in. Hon. members could take their choice—either to curtail their speeches or sit up until the early

hours of the morning to get through the business. Either one or the other must be done.

Mr. KERR noticed that the sum voted for Riverview last year was £250, and this year £700 was asked, and £700 for Yeronga. The increase seemed a very high one. If so many boys and girls were now destitute, they would probably be asked to vote thousands next year.

The HOME SECRETARY: The reason for the increase was that last year the vote proved quite inadequate.

Mr. KERR: What is the number of boys at Riverview?

The HOME SECRETARY explained that these reformatories were only started last year, and it was impossible to give a correct estimate of what the cost would be. The number of boys there was about twenty-eight.

Mr. McDONNELL asked who was in charge of these schools?

The HOME SECRETARY: They were in charge of the Salvation Army officers, and only 8d. per day per head was paid by the Government. The institutions were very well managed.

Mr. STEPHENSON (*Ipswich*) asked if the Government could get anyone to act as matron and superintendent at Deebing Creek at £10 a year?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the amount given by the Government, but there were local contributions, and the institution was managed by a committee. So much per head per diem was paid for these coloured children.

Mr. LESINA referred to a previous question asked by him in reference to the employment of the young aboriginals at Deebing Creek in the work of ringbarking. The Home Secretary had replied that it was not proposed to interfere. A large sum of money was now being spent yearly in endeavouring to stave off the ultimate fate of the aboriginals of the colony, who must of necessity die out, and he thought that money could be much more profitably spent in other directions. The employment of the aboriginals in question was causing some dissatisfaction in the district, because they entered into competition with white people. He entered his protest against any such thing being allowed.

The HOME SECRETARY was quite sure that the hon. member's views in reference to the aboriginals would not meet with much sympathy. He had no intention of interfering in the direction the hon. member indicated. He thought they had, as a race, a great deal of leeway to make up in their treatment of the aboriginals. The Deebing Creek Station was a very bright example of what might be done with the aboriginals. They had, out of their own earnings, become possessed of a farm, and it was ultimately hoped that they would make the station self-supporting.

Mr. STEPHENSON understood that when the Government medical officer at Ipswich was appointed, the Deebing Creek Aboriginal Mission Station did not exist. That officer had now to attend any cases of sickness at the station. Did the Home Secretary not think it would be a fair thing to make him some extra allowance for that work?

The HOME SECRETARY: The Government medical officers had to attend [1.30 a.m.] to the aboriginals, but it was not severe on the medical officer at Ipswich, as another medical man did a great deal of gratuitous attendance on the aboriginals, in addition to which the station was not far away.

The CHAIRMAN: Under Standing Order 171, I call upon the hon. member for Ipswich, Mr. Stephenson, to relieve me in the chair.

Mr. STEPHENSON thereupon took the chair.

Mr. FISHER wished to know how it was that while in places of not half the importance of Gympie the Government medical officers received £100 per annum, the officer at Gympie only received £50, although he had to attend to the aboriginals?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was quite a different question. They had all to attend to the aboriginals. The proper place to ask the question with regard to the remuneration of the Government medical officers was on the vote for Government medical officers.

Mr. KERR said that the Government medical officer at Isisford was given a certain fee to examine the aboriginals.

The HOME SECRETARY: He does not get a salary. He is paid by fees.

Mr. KERR asked if his report had been received yet?

The HOME SECRETARY: The report had not come to hand yet.

Mr. McDONNELL asked what education did the girls in the reformatory at Toowoomba receive, and from whom? He also wished to know whether inquiries were made as to the respectability of the persons to whom those girls were sent to work.

The HOME SECRETARY replied that the instruction was given by Miss Blaney. The superintendent was responsible for the characters of the persons to whom licenses were issued, and on his recommendation licenses were issued by the Governor in Council. Occasionally mistakes might be made, but the superintendent had power to cancel an agreement at any time.

Mr. McDONNELL supposed that the girls could be visited like the orphans?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. It was proposed that Mr. Wassall, the late superintendent at Lytton Reformatory, should undertake the duties of visiting magistrate all over the colony. It was a labour of love on his part. He kept up a correspondence with all the boys who had been under his care, with very excellent effect.

At 1.38—

Mr. FITZGERALD called attention to the state of the Committee.

Quorum formed.

Mr. STEWART did not agree with the hon. member for Clermont with regard to the treatment of aboriginals. If they could do anything to improve their condition it was their duty to do it. From being a happy and contented people they had reduced them to a state of degradation. The indictment made by the Home Secretary that contact with the white race had degraded the blacks, was one of the most serious that could be raised, and something ought to be attempted to raise the black race in this colony. He was glad to hear from the Home Secretary that some of the blacks had started to cultivate the soil and own little farms of their own. He trusted that that sort of thing, instead of decreasing, would increase; but he had very little hope of it.

Question put and passed.

DUNWICH BENEVOLENT ASYLUM.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £15,534 be granted for the Dunwich Benevolent Asylum. There was an increase here of £1,637, principally in contingencies, owing mainly to the increased number of allowances at the rate of 5s. per week in lieu of going to Dunwich. There was also an increase in the salary of the assistant superintendent to £50; boatman, from £39 to £52; and head attendant, £80 to £90. The provision was made for two male nurses at £52 each; but it was intended instead to appoint, in place of one of these, a female nurse. Hon. members were familiar with the method adopted of allowing

old age allowances instead of going to Dunwich; but if they wished for more information he should be glad to give it.

Mr. STEWART asked if it was true, as reported in the Press, that a man named Andrew McDermott was not visited by the doctor at Dunwich until after his death, although the wardsmen and head wardsmen reported some days before that the man was sick?

The HOME SECRETARY: The statements contained in the report referred to by the hon. member were denied by the medical superintendent.

Mr. STEWART asked if the medical superintendent kept a record of his visits to patients?

The HOME SECRETARY: A record was kept of all those who were sick in a ward, and also a record of the doctor's visits to the ward, but he was doubtful if entries were made of visits in individual cases.

Mr. STEWART: Another statement made in the Press was that a black man was admitted as a leper at the station, and that the doctor told a man named Beaver, who undertook to look after the leper, that he could sleep at the institution where the rest of the inmates slept, without any arrangements being made for disinfecting him.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not correct.

Mr. STEWART: It was further stated that a few days before the leper was going at large on the jetty, looking out for a steamer to take him back to Brisbane to his mates, and that a warder enticed him back to the station again, also that the man in charge of the patient had his breakfast in the mess-room without undergoing any process of fumigation whatever.

The HOME SECRETARY: The black leper referred to was sent to the station temporarily prior to being removed to Friday Island. He was not right in his head, and though harmless, he caused a great deal of trouble, sometimes getting on to the beach notwithstanding the efforts made to keep him under control. Although he did get on to the jetty on one occasion, he did not come into contact with anybody. Dr. Smith gave a general denial to the statements contained in the report, but he had asked the doctor to give more detailed information dealing with each statement categorically. That report had not yet been received.

Mr. STEWART: Another statement was with regard to a urine tank, but he understood that that had been removed out of sight. Then there was a statement that the storekeeper got his goods from Brisbane free of carriage, and charged the inmates an advance of 50 per cent. on town prices.

The HOME SECRETARY: That I know to be false, and I explained the whole matter in reply to questions asked in the House.

Mr. STEWART: He believed that a notice had been put up in the asylum to the effect that any inmate who wrote to the newspapers, or gave information to any person outside the institution before making a complaint to the doctor, would be expelled. Did the hon. gentleman think that was a proper thing to do?

The HOME SECRETARY was not aware that any such notice had been put up in the institution, but really it seemed to him that, irrespective of the penalty which it was said would be incurred, it was undesirable that inmates should write to the Press, whether their complaints were well founded or not, without first taking the proper steps to get redress. If they could not get redress from the medical superintendent, they should write to the Home

Secretary or his Under Secretary, [2 a.m.] and if they were not satisfied, then it would be time enough to ventilate their grievances through the Press. He thought

anyone who wished the institution well would deprecate, as he did, the encouragement of those complaints by a section of the Press for sensational purposes.

Mr. STEWART asked how it came about that the medical superintendent made no mention whatever of the lepers in his report?

The HOME SECRETARY explained that it was not as medical superintendent of Dunwich that Dr. Smith had charge of the lepers. It was a separate office, for which he got £100 a year extra, and he made quarterly reports to the Minister, which were sent on to the Board of Health.

Mr. LESINA asked for information with respect to the death of a lunatic named Chappel, who had fallen off the jetty and had been drowned. In answer to a question he had asked on the subject in the House, the Home Secretary had said that there had been no verdict in the case; but that the evidence had been forwarded to the Department of Justice. He wished to know if there was any further information available, as it appeared that the man had lost his life through lack of attention on the part of those who should have looked after him.

The HOME SECRETARY: The man was not a lunatic, but a person of weak intellect. A man had been told off to look after him, and while he was for a short time in one of the wards on some other urgent duty Chappel, who at the time he was left was at some considerable distance from the jetty, disappeared, and it was subsequently discovered that he had fallen off the jetty. There had, perhaps, technically been some neglect, but there was no suspicion of suicide in the case, and the man might have gone on to the jetty a hundred times without falling off it.

Mr. LESINA: The facts of the case had recently been stated in a newspaper substantially as the hon. gentleman had stated them. The man's death might be laid at the door of the medical superintendent, as it had evidently been due to a lack of proper attention to a man of weak intellect; and with the number of persons there someone might well have been told off to look after that man all the time. He thought there should be more about it, and the evidence in the case should be laid on the table.

The HOME SECRETARY: I will be very glad to show it to the hon. member if he wants to see it.

Mr. LESINA noticed by the report that a number of the people at Dunwich had to be accommodated in tents which, as they had been occupied since 1892, were worn out. He wished to know whether it was intended to provide more accommodation.

The HOME SECRETARY: A new ward was opened the other day.

Question put and passed.

STEAMER "OTTER."

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £3,339 be granted for the steamer "Otter." There was no alteration in the vote.

Mr. LESINA asked if it was customary to lend that steamer to members of Parliament to go picnicking down the bay with their friends.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. LESINA: Was it true that Mr. Macdonald-Peterson, one of the members for Brisbane North, had had the use of the boat some months ago for a schnapper fishing excursion.

The HOME SECRETARY: Very probably. Many on both sides have had it. No distinction is drawn.

Mr. KERR asked who were the hon. members sitting on his side of the Chamber referred to.

The HOME SECRETARY explained that the steamer had been placed at the disposal of members on both sides of the House, but he could not give the names of the hon. members who had used the vessel.

Mr. KERR thought the members on his side who used the steamer were members of friendly societies.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was probably correct.

Question put and passed.

CHARITABLE ALLOWANCES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £72,400 be granted for charitable allowances. There was a considerable increase in this vote. The amount of £250 for the Brodribb Home, Toowoomba, appeared on the Estimates for the first time. For hospitals generally, there was an increase of £5,000, the vote last year having been found insufficient.

Mr. KERR: What about the £800 for an inspector?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was a new appointment, but it would not be filled until the vote was passed. That officer, it was thought, would relieve the Minister of a great deal of work in connection with the hospitals throughout the colony, and he would probably investigate the applications for the 5s. a week allowance. He thought this officer would be able to effect a great saving to the colony.

Mr. LESINA asked whether this officer would visit charitable institutions?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. LESINA asked whether he would investigate private charitable institutions?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, if they received Government endowment.

Mr. LESINA asked if the Brisbane City Mission received any endowment?

The HOME SECRETARY did not think so.

Mr. LESINA thought the appointment of this officer would be an excellent thing. Amongst other things, he should step in and investigate the affairs of the Brisbane City Mission, as that mission collected large sums from the public.

Mr. STEWART had no objection to the appointment of this officer, but he thought the salary out of all proportion to the duties he would be called upon to perform. He asked what this officer's duties would be? Was any provision made for that officer travelling? He would be no use if he did not.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course when he travelled he would receive the usual allowance for an officer of his grade. The officer would be a medical man of high standing, and of large experience in charitable and hospital work. Every charitable institution which received Government aid would be under his inspection, and he was satisfied the officer would save three or four times his salary in the first year.

Mr. STEWART was quite satisfied with the explanation. He had no idea the officer was to be a medical man. He would like to know how much money was spent on inebriate asylums?

The HOME SECRETARY: Nothing had been spent. It was intended to convert the Diamantina Orphanage buildings into an asylum, but that was temporarily occupied by the reformatory boys. He had received considerable gratuitous assistance from a number of gentlemen in reference to reporting upon the suitability of the building and making suggestions, and the investigations were being continued by Dr. Wray. He hoped to see the institution started when the building was vacated.

Mr. McDONNELL: In answer to a question he had asked on the 8th November in reference to the number of inebriate institutions in existence the Home Secretary had replied "two." He would like to know where they were.

The HOME SECRETARY: One at the Brisbane hospital and one at Dunwich.

Mr. KERR: From what he had seen of the inebriate patients at Dunwich, the only treatment they seemed subject to was washing. What was to prevent those patients from getting grog? He thought they should not be mixed up with the Dunwich inmates, but should have a separate institute.

Mr. McDONNELL: According to a further answer he had obtained from the Home Secretary, only thirteen people had been treated under the Inebriates Institutions Act. He considered the treatment of inebriates a most vital question, and the Act should be put into force seriously. He understood that a gentleman who conducted a private institution near Brisbane had offered to the Home Secretary to take in some of the worst drunkards in Brisbane. He guaranteed to treat them, and if he could not cure them he asked for no reward. He knew that gentleman had made some most remarkable cures.

The offer which was reported to [2:30 a.m.] have been made to the Government appeared reasonable, but they really required a State institution where inebriates could be systematically treated. There were hundreds of inebriates who were sent to prison at great expense to the country, and, seeing they had passed an Act for the reformation of those people, it should be put into effective operation.

The HOME SECRETARY was quite alive to the desirability of such an institution. When the Act was passed Sir Horace Tozer had expected that a number of private retreats would be established, but that had not come about, unfortunately. Arrangements had been just about completed for the utilisation of the Diamantina buildings as an Inebriates' Home when the buildings were required for another purpose. At the same time he was not satisfied that those buildings or their situation were at all suitable for the purpose, and that was why he had not sanctioned any expenditure. With regard to Mr. Caulfield, the hon. member's information was not correct. Mr. Caulfield had written a great many letters to himself and to his colleagues. He asked £25 for three weeks' treatment in each case; but he, in his capacity as Home Secretary, did not feel justified in accepting that offer, and had made a sporting offer that he should pick out four hard cases, paying Mr. Caulfield £12 10s. at the end of six months, the remaining £12 10s. to be paid at the end of twelve months, provided there was no lapse in the meantime. However, Mr. Caulfield wanted cash down, as he contended that he had bought the secret of the cure for the purpose of making money.

Mr. FISHER said that Mr. Caulfield, on a visit to Gympie, offered to take away three of the hardest cases to prove the efficacy of his treatment, and his terms were "No cure, no pay." According to the Press reports, he accused the Home Secretary of being a most inhumane man, who would give no consideration to the question. A more energetic advertiser of his own cure he never knew than Mr. Caulfield.

The HOME SECRETARY: He is pretty good at that.

Mr. FISHER: He understood Mr. Caulfield had had personal experience. There were many people who thought the Government ought to have given Mr. Caulfield more encouragement.

The HOME SECRETARY: He did not disparage Mr. Caulfield or his system. On the contrary, he had sent persons who had means to pay for their own treatment to that gentleman; but he did not see how he could recommend the payment of £25 for the treatment for three weeks of all the drunkards in the colony. They could not test the efficacy of the cure without

the lapse of time, and without dealing with a number of cases; but to pay £25 for three weeks' treatment was excessive, no matter what the cure was.

Mr. McDONNELL: He knew of many citizens of Brisbane who had been cured by Mr. Caulfield.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, I know some of them pretty well.

Mr. McDONNELL: They were in this position: They were supposed to have an institution that they had not, and as they were not treating the inebriates themselves they might give this system a trial. The conditions offered by the Home Secretary were not reasonable. They were not such as Mr. Caulfield could accept. Let the hon. gentleman offer that gentleman something near his own terms.

The HOME SECRETARY: It was for Mr. Caulfield to demonstrate the value of his cure, and to satisfy the public that it was good for a long period of years, in order to justify the payment of anything like such a sum as £25 for three weeks' treatment in each case. All he asked was that Mr. Caulfield should show by statistics that his cure was good for twelve months; but he would not abate his terms. If the man was a philanthropist and desired to do good to his fellows, he would be very well content to disclose the secret he had purchased, and take an appointment under the Government to manage an institution, though he did not say that he was going to offer Mr. Caulfield such a position. Mr. Caulfield, however, looked at the matter in a very different light; he said he had a perfect goldmine in his secret; that it was a speculation, and that there was a lot of money in it, and he was going to make it out of the Government. He certainly was not prepared to deal with Mr. Caulfield on his own terms, especially in the absence of any statistics proving the permanency of his cure.

Mr. STEWART regretted very much that he was on that matter compelled to support the Home Secretary. They had no evidence before them that Mr. Caulfield's cure would reform a drunkard, and it would be a waste of public money to give him his terms. If a drunkard desired to be reformed he could effect that by abandoning his evil habits of drinking, and showing some moral stamina. On the subject of drunkenness in Australia, he could

[3 a.m.] say he had seen more drunkenness in one day in the old country than he had seen in Australia since he had come to it, and his observation led him to consider the Australian people a sober people.

Mr. LESINA understood that Mr. Caulfield had made a proposition to the Premier, the Attorney-General, and the Home Secretary, and from the statements which had appeared in the Press, the Premier and the Attorney-General favoured the proposition, and the Home Secretary was unsympathetic. Mr. Caulfield proposed to take twenty diseased drunkards into his institute for twenty-five guineas each successfully treated, and he stipulated that they should be persons who were not tainted with crime, but should not be in a position to pay for their own treatment. The cost was to be borne by Mr. Caulfield himself if the cases were not successful, and medical men had to report on them. It would be a wise thing if these experiments were undertaken, as they must be made some time or other, and the Melbourne *Ace* recommended that such experiments be made. If they could cure drunkards, and turn them out as respectable citizens, it would be a great deal better than bringing immigrants here at the public expense. The report of the Comptroller of Prisons showed that last year there were 960 persons confined for drunkenness, but after

these drunkards, or most of them, were punished and came out of prison, they only went on the spree again. And again, these men might marry, and their wives might also be drunkards, and they would breed drunkards. £500,000 was received last year from all sources connected with the liquor traffic, and a portion of that amount should be devoted to making these experiments. He did not know whether Mr. Caulfield was possessed of a successful cure or not, but at all events his system was worth a trial, because if he cured twenty drunkards he conferred a lasting benefit on the community. It was far preferable to spend money in that way than to keep drunkards in goal. A parliamentary committee in Victoria had recently recommended the adoption of a system somewhat similar to Mr. Caulfield's, and he thought it would be a very good plan if the Government were to appoint a similar committee to consider the whole matter of the treatment of drunkards.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) objected to granting the Caulfield Institute any sum of money. "No cure no pay" was the eternal cry of the ubiquitous quack. What guarantee was there that the institute was conducted on scientific principles, or that Mr. Caulfield was not a quack? He objected to the time of the Committee being wasted in advertising Mr. Caulfield. They had no guarantee that he possessed a cure that was worth anything at all. He commended the Home Secretary for having nothing to do with the proposal which had been made.

Question put and passed.

ITEM POSTPONED.

The HOME SECRETARY understood that there was a desire to adjourn, some hon. members wishing to say something upon the next item, shops and factories. On the understanding that hon. members would pass through the remaining votes without unreasonable discussion, he would move the postponement of the vote for the Chief Inspector of Shops and Factories.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: He therefore moved that the vote be postponed until after the vote for roads and bridges.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT MEDICAL OFFICERS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £3,625 be granted for Government [3.30 a.m.] medical officers. The items of £200 for Rockhampton, £450 for Thursday Island, and £200 for Townsville were new, having previously appeared under the heading "Quarantine." There was a new item of £100 for incidentals for the Medical Board. There were new appointments at Burketown and Port Douglas, £50, and there was an increase of £50 at Cairns. The total increase in the vote was £1,075.

Mr. FISHER pointed out that the Government medical officer at Gympie only received £50, while the officers in far less important towns received £100. He asked the hon. gentleman to promise that Gympie should be as liberally dealt with as these places.

The HOME SECRETARY said that the matter had not previously come under his notice.

Mr. FISHER: I brought the question up four years ago.

The HOME SECRETARY: At first sight it did appear as if Gympie was entitled to a larger sum, and the matter would have his favourable consideration.

Mr. FISHER said that Dr. Ryan was the last man to solicit a penny for himself. In that respect he was incomparable.

Mr. KERR asked how it was that an important town like Barcaldine had no medical officer?

The HOME SECRETARY was under the impression that there was a medical officer at Barcaldine. In many places they were paid by fees, in which case they did not appear in that list.

Mr. FITZGERALD noticed that important places like Longreach, Charleville, Hughenden, Croydon, and Herberton were only down for £30, whilst in places of less importance the Government medical officers received £50. He would like to know the reason for the difference.

The HOME SECRETARY: The great body of these items stood as they were. They had not been brought under his notice before; but he would look into them and see if he could adjust them.

Mr. LESINA: He did not see any vote for a health officer at Clermont, which had a population of about 2,000, and which, owing to its water supply, should have stationed in it one of the best medical officers in the colony.

The HOME SECRETARY: He was paid by fees.

Question put and passed.

MISCELLANEOUS SERVICES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £18,940 be granted for miscellaneous services. There was a considerable decrease in the vote, principally due to the fact that there was no provision for a general election. There was a decrease of £1,000 for the Queensland Art Gallery, which appeared in the Chief Secretary's Estimates, and of £50 for the Queensland Art Society, which had also been transferred to the Chief Secretary's Department. This made up a total of £7,050. Against that there were certain increases. There was an increase of £1,500 in incidental and miscellaneous expenses.

Mr. FISHER: What does that item of £5,000 include?

The HOME SECRETARY: It was impossible to say. It practically included everything right through the several departments which could not be charged to anything else. There was an increase of £200 for cemeteries, and of £500 for fire brigades. Then for the relief of aborigines he asked for £2,500 more. He was not certain that it would all be required; but whatever was done would have to be done quickly. He had most distressing tales of men actually rotting in the West for want of attention. There was an increase of £200 for the erection of pounds, and a grant of £50 to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals at Townsville.

Mr. BARTHOLOMEW thought the amount for the relief of aborigines was a very large one, and that they should have some report as to how it was expended. There was an aboriginal settlement at Fraser Island, but from what he had heard from persons who had visited the island the blacks did not do enough to supply themselves.

The HOME SECRETARY had visited Fraser Island, and could say that there was very little for the aborigines to do there. They gathered gum, and that was practically the only industry on the island; the fishing was not good, and the forestry was a failure. He had suggested to various denominations that they should take over the settlement as a mission station, and the only one that was game to tackle it seemed to be the Church of England, which had no mission station in the southern part of Queensland. If that were done it would relieve Mr. Meston, and enable him to devote a great deal more time going about the country as chief protector of aborigines in the Southern part of the colony.

Mr. FISHER wished to have a little more information regarding the item of £5,000 for contingencies, which was a large amount, seeing that there was provision made for contingencies on every vote throughout the Estimates.

The HOME SECRETARY said that last year there was expended from that vote £1,000 for expenses of police magistrates visiting in their own districts, £400 for travelling expenses of relieving police magistrates, over £200 for fire-wood, gas, furniture, and cleaning of police courts, £350 clerical assistance for police courts throughout the colony, £1,000 for stamps for police magistrates and clerks of petty sessions, £600 for expenses of removal of police magistrates and clerks of petty sessions. Departmental clerical assistance, telephones,

subscriptions to newspapers, petty [4 a.m.] cash, telegrams, amounted to £650; salaries of typewriters, £150; *Queensland Law Journal*, £100; and the expense of sending those twenty-seven Chinese to Port Darwin was paid out of that vote also, £150.

Mr. KERR mentioned that an application had been made from Isisford for a new pound, and the sum offered by the department had been found to be too little. Had the hon. gentleman any information about that?

The HOME SECRETARY: We are giving £200 more, and I think we can manage Isisford with that.

Mr. LESINA asked if the hon. gentleman had any information with respect to the formation of a fire brigade at Clermont. He understood the secretary had some £90 in hand for the establishment of a brigade, and as he had wanted some information he (Mr. Lesina) had advised him to communicate with the department, and he said he had done so.

The HOME SECRETARY: Possibly he had done so, but he did not remember it, nor did the Under Secretary.

Mr. MAXWELL brought under the notice of the Home Secretary, when the Amending Bill was going through, the administration of the Aborigines Protection Act in the Etheridge district especially. He would like a definite promise that an inquiry would be made into the matter.

The HOME SECRETARY admitted that the case the hon. gentleman had previously referred to was an extraordinary one. He had brought it under the notice of the Commissioner of Police, who would promptly inquire into it.

Mr. LESINA pointed out that the vote for the relief of aborigines was constantly growing, and they had no means of knowing how the money was spent.

The HOME SECRETARY said the protectors reported to him periodically, but made no annual report. He thought an annual report should be received from each of the principal protectors, that hon. members might know what was going on as they had to vote the money.

Question put and passed.

GRANTS IN AID OF ROADS AND BRIDGES.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £11,000 be granted for grants in aid of roads and bridges. There was an increase of £1,000 this year, and the vote, he thought, would enable them to deal with all applications which should be granted, and make a clean start the following year. The system on which the money was granted for bridges was half for bridges over tidal rivers, and one-third for bridges crossing non-tidal streams.

Mr. KERR: In what districts was the money expended last time?

The HOME SECRETARY said that the list was a long one. It comprised: Barron, Charleville, Daintree, Douglas, Einasleigh, Glengallan,

Goondiwindi, Hann, Herberton, Highfields, Hinchinbrook, Indooroopilly, Johnstone, Lamington Bridge Board, Mackay Bridge Board, Maroochy, Middle Ridge Shire Council, Murilla, Nanango, Nerang, Nundah, Pine, Purga, Ravenswood, Rosalie, Tinaroo, Walsh, Rosenthal, Stanthorpe, Tambourine, Tarampa, Tingalpa, Wangaratta, Widgee, Woothakata, Wynnum, and Yeerongpilly; so the money was pretty well distributed.

Mr. FISHER thought that, if a little money were spent by the department in putting bridges across certain gullies, it would save the Education Department a considerable amount of money.

The HOME SECRETARY pointed out that the responsibility in this respect rested with the local authorities.

Question put and passed.

The House resumed; the ACTING CHAIRMAN reported progress, and leave was given to sit again on Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 4:15 a.m.