

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 1900

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy



QUEENSLAND PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly.

THIRD SESSION OF THE THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT.

APPOINTED TO MEET

AT BRISBANE ON THE SEVENTEENTH DAY OF JULY, IN THE SIXTY-FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN
OF HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA, IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1900.

[VOLUME 2 OF 1900.]

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER, 1900.

The SPEAKER (Hon. Arthur Morgan, *Warwick*) took the chair at half-past 3 o'clock.

PETITION.

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION.

Mr. CALLAN (*Fitzroy*) presented a petition from workers in the Fitzroy electorate, praying for the introduction of a Compulsory Arbitration and Conciliation Bill, similar to the Act now in force in New Zealand.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS.

ROYALTY ON SILVER—MOUNT GARNET FREEHOLD.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) asked the Premier—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to charge a royalty on the silver mined and recovered from the freehold property of the Mount Garnet Freehold Copper and Silver Mining Company, Limited.

2. If so, what is the amount of royalty to be charged?

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*) replied—

Application No. 3066 to purchase mineral land for mining for copper, silver, and nickel was made in October, 1882. Deed of Grant was issued under the provisions of section 21 of the Mineral Lands Act of 1872. Therefore, no royalty is payable.

CLASSIFIED TEACHERS.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*), for Mr. McDonnell (*Fortitude Valley*), asked the Premier—

What is the number of male head teachers at present in each of the three classes into which the Department of Public Instruction has divided the classified teachers of the colony?

The PREMIER replied—

Class I., 17; Class II., 174; Class III., 170.

AFRAY BETWEEN KANAKAS AT INGHAM.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. Is he aware that a serious affray between kanakas took place at Ingham on Saturday, 15th September?

2. Is he further aware that the combatants were armed, shots were fired, and that a number of kanakas were wounded?

3. Furthermore, has he heard that two young ladies and other persons were stopped on the highway by the combatants, and were very much distressed in consequence?

4. Furthermore, has he been informed that a case of empty spirit bottles was found in the vicinity of the affray?

5. Have any of the combatants been arrested, and have any steps been taken to discover the persons who supplied the kanakas with liquor?

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*) replied—

No; but I have directed inquiries to be made. The police authorities in Brisbane have not been informed of any such occurrence.

COMPRESSED FODDER FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

Mr. LESINA asked the Premier—

1. Is it true that the compressed fodder purchased by Colonel Ricardo before leaving Brisbane, and taken to South Africa with the first contingent, was sold at public auction at Capetown?

2. If so, what was the price realised?

3. What was the profit or loss on the transaction?

The PREMIER replied—

1. Of the 1,994 bales (100 tons) of fodder referred to, purchased at a cost of £767 10s., 614 bales were shipped on board the s.s. "Cornwall," which conveyed the first contingent to South Africa; six bales were used as samples, and 1,344 bales were consigned by the Department of Agriculture to a firm in Capetown, by whom the fodder was disposed of privately in the ordinary course of business, being eventually sold at Port Elizabeth.

2. The net return for the fodder consigned to South Africa was £30 8s. 1d.

3. The transaction resulted in a loss of £493 6s. 11d.

TEMPORARY INSPECTORS OF WORKS.

Mr. RYLAND (*Gympie*) asked the Secretary for Public Works—

1. How many applications were received in answer to recent advertisements asking for applications for positions of temporary inspectors of works?

2. How many appointments to such positions were made?

3. The names of such persons, if any.

4. Had persons appointed previously passed the usual examination?

5. What salary is paid inspectors?

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. Murray, *Normanby*) replied—

1. One hundred and forty-five.
2. None yet.
3. None.
4. No examination previously.
5. From £200 to £270 per annum.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

THE PREMIER AND THE INTERSTATE COMMISSION.

Mr. LESINA: I desire to ask the Premier, without notice—In the event of the hon. gentleman accepting a position on the Federal Interstate Commission, will he resign his position as Premier of this colony?

The PREMIER: Yes.

MAREEBA-CHILLAGOE RAILWAY.

On the motion of Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*), it was resolved—

That there be laid on the table of the House, copy of the agreement entered into by the Railway Commissioner and the Chillagoe Railway and Mines, Limited, for the temporary working by the Railway Department of the first section of the Mareeba-Chillagoe private railway.

JUDICATURE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST READING.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) moved—

That leave be given to introduce a Bill to amend the Judicature Act.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, the Bill was read a first time, and its second reading made an Order of the Day for Tuesday next.

LIGHT LINES OF RAILWAY IN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*), in moving—

1. That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government take action at an early date with regard to the construction of light lines of railways to aid in the development of agricultural districts, as recommended by the Chief Engineer for Railways in the special report presented to Parliament in 1897.

2. That one or more suitable districts be selected in which to construct light lines of railway, and that special surveys be made for the purpose of preparing estimates of cost, etc.—

said: I believe, Sir, that the majority of the members of this House are with me in the spirit of this motion. I believe it is essentially necessary. It has been emphasised again and again, especially since the report made by Mr. Stanley, three years ago, and presented to this House, that light lines of railway should be constructed to open up some of the fertile districts of this colony which at present are lying idle, because the means of getting produce to market are utterly inadequate to serve the purposes of the people settled on the land. We have been told by Ministers of the Crown, through the medium of the Governor, and also by themselves, that it is absolutely necessary that these lines should be constructed. That being so, and seeing that it is three years since Mr. Stanley was sent home at a very large expense to the colony, and that no move has yet been made with regard to the construction of these lines, I would like to ask emphatically what are the intentions of the Government with regard to carrying out the proposals that on paper they say they believe in? We can only judge them by their actions, and knowing, as we do, that there are districts in this

colony languishing through want of proper communication with markets, seeing that the Government have introduced line after line in the interests of private companies, we have every reason—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. JENKINSON: Introducing lines of railway that are not being constructed by the State, we have every reason to ask—Do they intend to carry out these proposals at all? Looking, also, to the report presented to the House by the Commissioner, in which there are serious allegations made, it appears to me, taking the two things in conjunction, that a great deal is being done towards discrediting the construction of lines by the State, and throwing it into the hands of other people. That is, I maintain, a very reasonable conclusion to come to from the actions of the Government up to the present. There will hardly be a voice raised in opposition to this remark—that it is necessary that we should open up the agricultural districts by giving them better facilities than they have at the present time. Then we are face to face with this—What is the better way to give those facilities? Are the railways to be constructed on the principle that has been recognised here up to the present, or shall we revert to a system of light lines of railway which will reduce considerably the cost and enable, as far as one can see, a return to be made on the outlay. One of the greatest blunders made in many countries has been the heavy outlay in the construction of heavy lines of railway, making it oftentimes a difficulty to get interest on the money expended. There seems to have been too much regard altogether paid to future and not sufficient to present considerations. Successful enterprises, as a rule, have small beginnings, and are gradually built up. So it would be if we entered into this system of constructing light lines of railway. If we found out afterwards that it was necessary to revert to the heavier system, I maintain that it could be done, because it would naturally pay to do so. I wish to make a few observations with regard to the report made by Mr. Stanley. One of the particular reasons for sending that gentleman home was to acquire information in regard to the particular subject-matter of the motion I have the honour of submitting to the House this afternoon. Mr. Stanley says that it included the subject of light railways, to which it was desired he should direct special attention. Then he goes on to remark on the countries he visited, and the observations he made; and there are certain recommendations he makes to the Government through the Minister for Railways. On page 17 of the report he says—

It is most desirable, with the view to relieve the wants of present as well as to encourage further settlement in such districts, that railway facilities should be extended to them; and, if this object can be attained by means of light narrow-gauge lines, I should not hesitate to recommend their construction.

Then, again, at the end of his report, his final recommendation is that one or more suitable districts should be selected in which to try the experiment of light lines of railway, and that special surveys be made with regard to that particular matter, as is embraced in the second portion of the motion now before the House. This system has been found to work remarkably well in many parts of the world, but particularly on the continent of Europe. We find that in Belgium they have no less than 163 of these light lines of railway built to serve the agricultural districts and enable the farmers, producers, and others to get their produce to market; and in nearly every instance they have proved remunerative.

Mr. ANNEAR: At what cost per mile?

Mr. JENKINSON: According to the estimate made by Mr. Stanley, the cost in this colony would be as follows:—

1st Class—60-lb. rails and 1,760 cubic yards ballast	£1,540 per mile
2nd Class—44-lb. rails and 1,100 cubic yards ballast	£1,135 per mile.

With a 30-lb. rail, which would be capable of sustaining an axle-load of, say, 5 tons, equal to that of our ordinary goods stock, and 880 cubic yards of ballast per mile, the cost would be reduced to £934 per mile, a saving of £200 per mile as compared with our second-class lines.

I claim that I can speak with a particular knowledge of the electorate I have the honour to represent, and I say there are several places in it that would be considerably benefited if such lines as I am advocating this afternoon were constructed. We have, within sixty miles of Brisbane, one of the most fertile spots in the whole of the colony—a district that has been visited by the Minister himself; and I believe he came back highly impressed with what he saw there. It is a district that at the present time is supporting only a handful of a population. They can grow almost anything, but it is impossible for them to get their produce to market. The roads are abominably bad, as, owing to the heavy rainfall and the small amount of endowment that is allowed to divisional boards, it is impossible to keep them in a passable state for traffic. Now, such a system as I advocate this afternoon—particularly with regard to this district—would be an untold blessing, not only to the Backall Range to which I refer, but also to the whole colony. There is room on that plateau on the top of the mountain for hundreds of families where at present they can almost be counted on the one hand. Again, a little bit further away, where they are growing strawberries, supplying not only this colony, but also New South Wales and Victoria, they are hampered by the same difficulties. Then going a little farther up the coast, either to the right or to the left of the line, whether to Kenilworth or to Bollier, the same remark applies. In the Noosa district, you find immense quantities of timber, which is almost locked up for the reason they have no means of communication with the coast at a reasonable rate of transit. Bullock and horse teams are used at the present time, and a good many men manage to make a living there, but nothing like it would be if such lines as I advocate were constructed. Then go a little further up from the Traveston siding, and there are hundreds of acres that are practically lying idle only waiting to be tilled by the hand of man, and that would produce sufficient agricultural products to supply many towns of the size of this city. They are locked up because they are not worth cultivating, for the simple reason that the expense of carting produce to market is altogether too great. I could go on mentioning places for hours, but I do not intend to take up the time of the House, as I am anxious, if possible, to get a division taken this afternoon. I believe the Government have not paid that attention to the matter that they should have done. We find the following passage in the Governor's Speech of last year:—

My advisers are anxious that during the present session action should be taken with a view to providing for the construction by the State of light railway lines in agricultural districts. It is intended to ask you to make provision for the construction of such lines in suitable localities.

That was not carried out, as we had reason to believe it would be. The words themselves were perfectly plain, but no action was taken. True, there was a change of Ministry—

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: How do you know no action has been taken?

Mr. JENKINSON: We have nothing to lead us to believe that any action has been taken. Certainly no action has been taken in regard to the latter part of what I have read, for we have not been asked to "make provision for the construction of such lines in suitable localities." I was going to remark that there was a change of Ministry last year, but that did not take place until the 28th November, and there was ample time before that, if the Government had really been desirous of carrying out their wishes as specified in the Governor's Speech, to have done so. Then, again, on 3rd November last year we find the then Premier and present Chief Secretary, the Hon. J. R. Dickson, stated that he wished that some of the light railways contemplated under Mr. Stanley's recommendations had been proposed. We also find that the Secretary for Agriculture, in speaking on a resolution brought under the notice of this House last session, spoke strongly in favour of the construction of these light lines. He said that one thing that keeps the colony back is the want of proper communication, and the way we can provide proper communication is by means of light railways. Now, that has not been done. We find no mention in the Governor's Speech this year of light railways at all; therefore, presumably, the Government have dropped the proposal in favour of some other that they consider more advantageous to the colony. Of course that is a matter that we differ about; but I maintain that, so far as appears on the surface, the Government have not done their duty with regard to the agricultural districts in the colony in not carrying out the proposals they said would be submitted to us. It may be said, and is said, that this industry and that industry is the most vital one in the colony, but I maintain that the agricultural industry is the backbone of every country. Other industries are ephemeral. They flourish for a time, but they certainly have not the same amount of weight behind them as the agricultural industry. As long as we encourage that industry, we not only provide a living for more people who remain settlers on the land than by means of any other industry, but we also give the country an opportunity of being thoroughly opened up; and it is only by opening up the country that we can hope to attract people from other countries to come and settle on our fertile lands. I maintain that the best means of doing so is to give proper facilities to settlers to get their produce to market, and it is with the intention of doing that that I am moving this resolution. I do not desire to take up time any longer, as I would like to have a division if possible, or to ascertain what the Government propose to do, and see whether they are in earnest in their desire to construct light railways to tap agricultural districts. I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Murray, *Normanby*): I can assure the member that this very important matter has not been lost sight of by the Government. For some time past surveyors have been out in various localities making surveys for light railways. The hon. member knows as well as I do that when you speak of providing railway facilities for agricultural districts, it opens up a very big question indeed. Notwithstanding that, we have surveyors out now—

Mr. STEWART: Where are they?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That will be disclosed in due course. Surveyors are now out, and I hope that before the close of the session certain lines of this description will be submitted for the approval of the House. We shall select the most urgent cases, and we intend to run experimental lines into several

agricultural districts. The hon. member for Wide Bay has referred to the construction of these light railways being delayed in order to give place to what he calls private railways, but those are a different class of railways altogether. None of those so-called private railways run into agricultural districts. They are merely asked for by the owners of certain mineral lands who are prepared to

[4 p.m.] lay down railways to their own properties. I hope before very long I shall be able to table a few proposals such as those advocated by the hon. member. I have seen the country in the vicinity of the Blackall Range to which the hon. member alludes, and to my mind it is a very admirable district for experimenting in the direction desired. I can assure the hon. member that I was very much pleased with what I saw in that district. I believe it has very great potentialities, and all that is required to be done to develop it is to run a line of railway through it. There are now surveyors in the district with the object of some proposal being made for a railway as soon as time will permit. The hon. member accuses the Government of having neglected this important question, but I can assure him that they have not. They have paid very particular attention to it, and I sincerely hope and believe that before this session closes lines of the description which have been talked of for so long will be built. I do not think it necessary to discuss this question much further. I can only state that the matter has not escaped the attention of the Government, and it is their desire, as soon as possible, to carry out some of the suggestions which have been made. With regard to what are termed "light lines," it is a question of some difficulty to decide what are the most beneficial class of lines to construct. The lines must necessarily be of such strength as to carry the existing Government rolling-stock, and as far as cost is concerned, on level country, there is very little difference between the cost of a narrow gauge tramway and a 3 feet 6 inch line. In fact, one is almost as cheap as the other, and in running out branch lines I do not think it would be advisable, if it can be avoided, to have a break in the gauge owing to the cost and delay of unloading and reloading.

Mr. FISHER: Certainly not where connected with the main lines.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: That is what I mean. This question requires a great deal of consideration, but as far as my judgment goes I do not see that there is very much to be gained by laying down lines of 2 feet gauge if they are connected with main lines. Except in special districts where the country is mountainous and difficult of ascent, there is little saving in the narrow gauge. In that case of course mountainous country can be ascended much more cheaply and easily by a narrow-gauge line. I think the Blackall Range is probably a district where a narrow-gauge line might be experimented with. I can assure the House that the Government have not lost sight of this very important question.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Albert): I have very little to say on this question, for it seems from what has fallen from the Secretary for Railways that what we have looked forward to for so long is likely at last to become an accomplished fact. I am quite content to abide by what the hon. gentleman has told us. I think we should be making a very big mistake if we went in for a narrower gauge than the one which we have at present. The handling and forwarding of goods on a narrow-gauge line would be so difficult and troublesome that we should be as well off if we had no railway at all. I am consequently very

much pleased to hear the remarks of the hon. gentleman on that point, and I for one have no more to say on the subject.

Mr. KATES (Cunningham): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FOGARTY (Drayton and Toowoomba): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Mr. Kates.

Mr. FOGARTY: I rose before the hon. member for Albert or the hon. member for Cunningham.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FOGARTY: So I did. It is perfectly true.

The SPEAKER: Order! The hon. member has no right to address remarks of that nature to the Chair.

Mr. FOGARTY: Then I withdraw them.

* Mr. KATES: The hon. member will have ample time to address the House on this subject, as I am not going to make a lengthy speech. I am not altogether satisfied with the reply given by the Secretary for Railways to the hon. member for Wide Bay. The hon. gentleman said that if time permitted these lines would be brought before the House, but that is a very wide term indeed. I think time ought to permit. We are on the eve of federation, and we must do all we can to cheapen production, which can only be done by giving the farmers facilities for bringing their produce into competition with that from the southern colonies. At the present time we are not able to compete with the southern colonies on even terms, and we are behind them in many respects. I think the hon. member for Wide Bay deserves great credit for introducing this motion, at this stage, for we are working at a great disadvantage to the other colonies, as I can easily show. We in this colony have an enormous area of agricultural land compared with what is available in Victoria, but compared with that colony we are simply nowhere with agricultural railways. In Victoria, they have no less than 3,000,000 acres under cultivation, while in this colony we have only 455,000 acres, which includes sugar lands to the extent of 125,000 acres. And what is the reason? It is that previous Governments have utterly neglected our agricultural industry and treated it with indifference. I do not blame the present Government so much. They have done more for the agricultural industry than any previous Government, but not nearly enough, in my opinion. It is not refreshing to see the present state of things when we notice the number of railways which it is proposed to be constructed to mining centres. The agricultural industry is the backbone of any country, and it is time that it received some attention at the hands of those in power. Mining is nothing compared with agriculture, and I was rather surprised at the Secretary for Railways telling us the other night that mining was the most important industry in Queensland. The hon. gentleman has yet to learn that wherever a country has attained a high state of prosperity it has been due to the agricultural industry.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about Great Britain?

Mr. KATES: Great Britain was a very great agricultural country 100 years ago. It achieved its prosperity by means of agriculture, and now it can dispense with it.

Mr. FISHER: It would have been nothing without coal.

Mr. KATES: Look at Spain, where there is no agriculture, and we find it the poorest country in the world. On the other hand, look at Belgium, France, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States; and coming nearer home, look at Victoria, South Australia, New Zealand,

and New South Wales, in all of which agriculture has received close attention and encouragement. At the present time there is an enormous export of agricultural produce from the colony of Victoria. Last year, according to the latest returns I have been able to get, Victoria sent away £2,500,000 worth of agricultural produce, while Queensland had to import to the extent of £841,000 worth. They have exported butter, cheese, and even rabbits. We have spent £200,000 on the extermination of rabbits, while in Victoria they have received £224,000 for rabbits exported. Since 1889 they have received £7,760,000 for butter exported. We are nowhere as compared with the other colonies in agriculture. The construction of light lines of railway in agricultural centres would be a great benefit to us. We have in this colony very large stretches of country, where it would take a farmer a couple of days to bring his produce to a trunk line, and by the construction of light railways he would be saved that time, and be able to devote it to the cultivation of his land with a view to increasing his output of produce. Moreover, in such cases a farmer is so distant from the market that he very likely loses the advantage of any rise there may be in the price of produce in Brisbane and elsewhere, so that in every way the construction of light lines would be a great benefit to the farming industry. New Zealand has shot ahead of all the other colonies in the matter of agriculture. Their revenue last year was £5,700,000, and their expenditure £5,140,000, so that they had a surplus of £560,000. They have been reducing the duties on various articles, such as kerosene, rice, agricultural and dairy machinery, tea (half the duty), currants, matches, candles, and patent medicines, the reductions amounting to £157,000 a year. And they are contemplating a penny postage throughout the British Empire, and are also providing £200,000 for old age pensions. That policy has been supported by the Government of the day, by one Government after another, but here in Queensland previous Governments—Conservative Governments—have done nothing for the farmers.

MR. MAXWELL: Why do you support them?

MR. KATES: Their consideration has been all for the squatters, and the miners and farmers come last. The pastoral industry has received great consideration, but when a squatter loses his stock he is done. The mining industry is a valuable one, and I should like to see it prosper, but the persons engaged in that industry are a migratory population, here to-day and gone to-morrow.

MR. MAXWELL: It gets no assistance from the Government.

MR. KATES: If a big mine breaks out at Klondyke or in New Zealand they are gone.

MR. MAXWELL: The mining industry gets no assistance from the Government.

THE SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the hon. member to refrain from interjections.

MR. KATES: I do not mind interjections as long as they are intelligent ones. When a miner has made his pile he retires, and possibly goes elsewhere. In South Australia, where they have a smaller area of agricultural land than we have in Queensland, they have over 3,000,000 acres of land under cultivation, and they have no less than 2,000,000 acres under wheat, while in this colony we have only about 120,000 acres under wheat.

MR. KEOGH: We are only in our infancy yet.

MR. KATES: There is ample room to increase the area under cultivation in Queensland. Only a few nights ago the Secretary for Railways said the mining industry was the salvation of

the colony. I always thought the agricultural industry was becoming the salvation of the colony. The mining industry is a very good one, and I have nothing to say against it, but the agricultural industry is better, and I am very pleased that this motion has been introduced. Now, let me say a few words with reference to Western Australia. That colony also recognises the necessity of what other colonies have done to assist agriculture. The Agricultural Bank established in that colony has assisted agriculturists by advances to clear 53,357 acres of land, to cultivate 43,888 acres, to ring-bark 61,353 acres, and to fence 23,545 chains; also to spend on drainage and water supply a sum of £4,561, and on farm buildings £12,125. I say it is the duty of every member in this House representing an agricultural constituency to rise in his place and insist upon the necessity of reasonable assistance being given to agriculture. Nothing has been done for that industry compared with what ought to have been done for it, and as an agricultural colony we are at the bottom of all the other colonies in consequence. A few weeks ago the hon. gentleman in charge of the Railway Department told us that the branch line from Warwick to Killarney showed a big loss. I see by the Warwick papers that he is now compelled to run special trains every other day to bring the produce of that district from Killarney to Warwick. Those people have to send their stuff 200 miles from Killarney to Brisbane, whereas by rights they should only have to send it ninety-seven miles. It is the most flourishing agricultural district in the colony, and deserves some consideration at the hands of the Government. If this motion goes to a division I shall most heartily support it.

MR. FOGARTY (*Drayton and Toowoomba*): As a member representing an agricultural centre I desire to say a few words on this motion. I understood the Secretary for Railways to say that surveyors were now engaged surveying certain lines in agricultural districts and that immediately their reports were submitted the Government would take action. I do not know how the hon. gentleman can reconcile that statement with a reply he gave a short time ago to a question asked by an hon. member in this House, when he said he had already got the desired information. It is nearly four years now since the Chief Engineer was sent on a tour through Europe and America with the view of collecting information in regard to light agricultural lines, but so far nothing has been done in that direction. If it is correct, as pointed out by the hon. member for Wide Bay, that light lines can be constructed at a cost of £1,000 per mile, then it is the bounden duty of the Government to take immediate action in the matter, but we have reasonable grounds for assuming that the Government are not sincere in this matter. If they were sincere light agricultural lines would have been an accomplished fact long ere this. It is probable they will continue in abeyance until such time as we reach the turmoil of a general election, when they will be placed before the electors of agricultural centres as a bait to secure the return of the Government nominees. The best way to judge the Government is by their actions, and if they had been sincere in this matter, we would have at least two of these light lines on the Darling Downs at the present time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Where?

MR. FOGARTY: I care not where they are. I have as much sympathy with agriculture outside the Downs as on the Downs, because I recognise it is the backbone of the country. When mining has come to the end of its days, agriculture will still flourish and will continue

producing from year to year, probably to the end of time. That is a fact recognised by all political economists. I have still a very friendly feeling for the mining industry, which I believe is in this colony only as yet in its infancy. We had all the necessary information on this subject here, before the Chief Engineer went to visit Europe and America at all, and if the present Government, or the Governments that preceded it, had any sympathy with the construction of these lines they would have been constructed long ago. I would like very much that the Secretary for Railways would say where the surveyors are engaged at the present time, and when their reports will probably be laid before the House. I shall be agreeably surprised if we have any agricultural lines submitted this session. The private and so-called "mineral lines" before us are sufficient to engage our attention for the whole of the present year, and if that is the case we cannot consider any further railway policy. If the Government were to submit their public railway policy and allow the private one to remain until we had time at our disposal to deal with it, it would be much better for the country. Instead of that we find that a railway policy which completely overthrows the settled railway policy of the country is submitted.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. FOGARTY: I may have been digressing, but I will not continue to do so. I point out that the comparison between Queensland and Victoria is hardly a fair one. Victoria is a small territory with a large population, and is highly developed, and with a network of railways no doubt their production is very large, but when we have equal railway facilities in proportion to our territory, our output will be at least ten times greater than that of the sister colony.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: The cabbage garden.

Mr. FOGARTY: Victoria may be termed a "cabbage garden," but it is a very prosperous cabbage garden. It is a matter of history that we were told that Toowoomba and the Darling Downs would not grow a cabbage, but with a continuance of the present favourable season to harvest time our wheat farmers will be able to supply our own consumption. Last year, in spite of a partial failure through frosts, we supplied within a third of what we needed, and this year, with a good season and a larger area under cultivation, our farmers will in a short time have to look for a market outside the colony. Wheat is a very heavy article, and many hon. members know that travelling over black soil when it is wet is almost impossible. The hon. member for Cunningham spoke of farmers in some places taking two days to get their produce to market, but I know portions of the Downs where, when the soil has been thoroughly saturated, it is a fortnight before you can turn a wheel on it. It is well known that the local authorities are not in a position to macadamise the roads in those districts, and if a rise takes place in the only market we have—Brisbane—our farmers cannot take advantage of it. The mills here must keep going, and they have to send south for their supplies; and by the time the Darling Downs farmers are able to reach the market the mills are fully supplied, and there is a considerable fall in prices. If these light lines were constructed, our farmers could take advantage of a rising market. They would then be in a position to increase or improve their holdings, and a man by increasing his individual wealth adds to the wealth of the colony. I say it is the bounden duty of this or any other Government of Queensland to take immediate

action for the construction of lines to agricultural centres. The subject is a very wide one, and I am sorry the hon. member did not approach the Minister with a view of having a whole day set apart for so important a discussion. Acting on the suggestion of the hon. member for Cunningham—that every hon. member representing an agricultural district should express his opinion upon this motion—I will not say more; but if it is pressed to a division I shall cheerfully vote for the motion introduced by the hon. member for Wide Bay.

* Mr. ANNEAR (*Maryborough*): I was glad to see this very important motion of the hon. member for Wide Bay, and at some inconvenience I was determined to be present this afternoon to take part in the discussion of it. But I have been very much disappointed indeed with the speech of the hon. member in introducing it.

Mr. JENKINSON: I did not expect anything else from you. You are disappointed with everything I do.

Mr. ANNEAR: Why?

Mr. JENKINSON: I do not know why; it is a mystery to me.

Mr. ANNEAR: I never had an angry word with the hon. member in my life.

Mr. JENKINSON: And never will!

Mr. ANNEAR: I trust I never will. I do not wish to be disrespectful to the hon. member in any way whatever, but I am sure I express the opinion of a large majority of hon. members of this House when I say that we are very much disappointed with the hon. gentleman's speech in introducing this motion. I expected some information from an hon. member who has lately visited Europe, America, and Canada. He went to that great country, America, where there are more miles of railway than in the whole of Europe. I read in a paper, with much pleasure, the speech the hon. gentleman delivered at Montreal, in the presence of some of the most distinguished men there, and I will say the most distinguished servants of the British Empire—Sir Wilfred Laurier and Mr. Mackenzie Bowell.

Mr. JENKINSON: Sir Mackenzie Bowell.

Mr. ANNEAR: If the hon. member had met Mr. Bowell, as I did, he would know that he would be just as well pleased to have the "Sir" left out, and be called "Mister," because he is a pure Canadian.

Mr. JENKINSON: I was his guest the same as you were.

Mr. ANNEAR: I trust the hon. member for Wide Bay will not draw me from the thread of my argument.

Mr. JENKINSON: What is your argument? (Laughter.)

Mr. ANNEAR: This motion to construct light railways. I was saying I was very pleased to read the speech that hon. member delivered in that great assembly. The hon. member said he came from Queensland, and they cheered him. "I came," he said, "from a colony where they are loyal people, and where they are prepared to send, not one or two or three contingents, but as many as may be required to fight the battles, and retain the solidarity of the British Empire in South Africa."

Mr. JENKINSON: Whatever are you driving at? (Laughter.)

Mr. ANNEAR: I did think that the hon. member would tell us this afternoon [4.30 p.m.] that what he wants to introduce has been a success in the countries in which he has travelled. The motion is—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the Government take action at an early date with regard to the construction of light lines of railway to aid in the development of agricultural districts, as recommended by the Chief Engineer for Railways in the special report presented to Parliament in 1897.

Now, I know something of the opinion of the present Chief Engineer for Railways as to these light lines of railway referred to by the hon. member. I believe that if Mr. Stanley were to give us his honest opinion, he would say that he does not believe in them at all. And why? From experience.

Mr. JENKINSON: Do you mean to say that the report is not his honest opinion?

Mr. ANNEAR: Not as applied to this colony. The hon. member asks why the system has not been introduced? It has been introduced, and the hon. member would know that, if he were not a newchum. The hon. member knows very little about railway construction, or about the railway policy of this colony. A light line was constructed from Bundaberg to Mount Perry, and in saying that I have no fault to find with my hon. friend in front of me, the hon. member for Fassifern. I speak with the very greatest kindness of that hon. member, but he was a member of the Government—I think the Premier of the Government—that were greatly responsible for the thousands and tens of thousands of pounds which were spent to remedy the defects of that line. The 35-lb. steel rails, which must have cost £8 or £9 a ton, had all to be taken up and sold. It is all very well to talk about light lines of railway, but whenever you construct lines of that character you create additional traffic, and you generally find that the line is not strong enough to carry it. The railway from Bundaberg to Mount Perry had all to be taken up. The rails were sold for from £4 10s. to £5 a ton, and the 4½-lb. standard rail had to be laid down in their place. In the hon. member's own electorate, I believe, there is a light railway, and now the hon. member asks for £50,000 to be expended to make that railway—the line from Ipswich to Harrisville—workable. I say, as an old friend to the hon. member, and there is no member who has more respect than I have for the hon. member for Fassifern, that by now he must have seen the error of his ways, as a member of that Government. We have had experience of light lines of railway in Queensland, and that has been the result. Now I come to the electorate of the hon. member for Wide Bay, and there is the line there from Maryborough to Gympie. That railway was laid with 35-lb. steel rails, and after they had been worked for twelve and eighteen months, it was found that the width of the sleepers—which were two feet from centre to centre of the sleepers—would not carry the traffic on that railway. The rails had to be taken up, and they were sold to different persons and companies in the colony at a sacrifice, and 4½-lb. rails were laid down in place of the 35-lb. rails.

Mr. JENKINSON: When was this?

Mr. ANNEAR: That is why I say the hon. member is a newchum. When was this? Why does not the hon. member read? As a member of the Press, and I believe he would like himself to be considered a distinguished member of the Press, why does he not read what has taken place in years past, and so fortify himself with information as to be able to answer for himself the statement I have made?

Mr. JENKINSON: You do not know yourself.

Mr. ANNEAR: Well I happened to be one of the partners of the company that constructed that line from Maryborough to Gympie, and I think I ought to know something about it.

Mr. REID: He did the cement part of it.

Mr. ANNEAR: Let me tell the hon. member for Enoggera that myself and the late brother of my worthy friend in front of me were the contractors, and every cask of cement, and every article worth a threepenny bit, were bought and paid for, and every man was paid his wages.

Mr. REID: Of course.

Mr. ANNEAR: We did not do like your friend. We did not go out of the country and leave the men unpaid who fought to keep him on his throne.

Mr. REID: Who was that?

Mr. ANNEAR: Your friend Kruger. (Laughter.) I like interjections.

Mr. REID: You told some of the men that it did not pay to put the cement in.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. ANNEAR: If anyone who came to the hon. member with a tale of that kind he would take it seriously.

Mr. REID: Oh, I heard all about you.

Mr. ANNEAR: I have been in Queensland for thirty-six years, and if the hon. member has no more to answer than I have, as an honourable man, he has not got much to answer, at any rate. Now, since the experience of the Chief Engineer and the Parliament of the country of the Mount Perry line and the railway from Maryborough to Gympie, no more light lines have been attempted. They proved to be a great loss to the country. I am sure that the hon. member for Fassifern will try to explain that, but it will take him a long time to explain away the assertions that I make this afternoon. Now, the hon. member for Wide Bay speaks about two places, Yandina and Traveston, where he thought it was necessary that there should be a light line of railway to meet the great settlement that has taken place, and will take place, in those localities.

Mr. JENKINSON: I said nothing of the sort. I said Kenilworth and Bollier.

Mr. ANNEAR: I understood the hon. member to say that, but if I am misquoting the hon. member I humbly apologise.

Mr. JENKINSON: You constantly do it.

Mr. ANNEAR: I have been in the Wide Bay district for many years, and I know that the railway passes through Traveston, and it passes through Yandina, and if the hon. member did not mention those names then I am greatly mistaken. And if I am mistaken, like the hon. member for Enoggera, I trust I will stand up in my place and apologise to this House or to any person outside. From what the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty, said you would think that they had got something to complain of with regard to railways in his district. Why, there is a perfect network of railways in that district. There is the railway from Toowoomba to Pittsworth, and the railway out to Crow's Nest. Wherever you travel about the Toowoomba district you come across a railway. I think the hon. member for Wide Bay must see that his electorate has not been neglected in the matter of railway construction. The hon. member's predecessor, Sir Horace Tozer, never rested until he got the line to Kilkivan and the main line to Brisbane. He helped to facilitate the construction of railways in the Wide Bay district. A light line from Kilkivan to Nanango would have to be taken up twelve months after it was constructed.

Mr. DAWSON: Why?

Mr. ANNEAR: Because no light line can carry the traffic that this line will have to carry. There must be a line of sufficient stability to carry the heavy traffic.

Mr. JENKINSON: You are setting up "Aunt Sallys" and knocking them down yourself."

Mr. ANNEAR: I am trying to place my ideas on this matter before hon. members clearly. The hon. member spoke about 60-lb. rails. How many of our lines are laid with 60-lb. rails? Only a portion of the Main Range line and the line from Townsville to Charters Towers. As a matter of fact, all through the colony the standard rail is the 4½-lb. rail. I do not wish to waste the time of the House in discussing this matter; but

I do not think such an important motion as this is can be adequately discussed this afternoon. I would like to hear the hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, speak on the subject. I repeat I was very much disappointed with the speech of the hon. member for Wide Bay this afternoon. A distinguished citizen of Brisbane, who was away half the time the hon. member for Wide Bay was, was interviewed by a Press representative, and we saw one or two columns in a Brisbane paper, giving his experiences, which were very interesting. He travelled with his eyes open. Of course I do not mean to insinuate that the hon. member for Wide Bay travelled with his eyes shut.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is more humble in his way than the other gentleman.

Mr. ANNEAR: I refer to Mr. John A. Clark, and I may say that I was pleased to read the interview between that gentleman and the Press representative.

Mr. JENKINSON: I shall be pleased to sell you a copy of my book of travels when it is completed.

Mr. ANNEAR: If that book is as interesting as the hon. member is, I shall be very pleased to buy a copy, and I shall read it with great pleasure. I do think this House is entitled to hear the opinions of hon. members on this matter. We all know that the junior member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, has been travelling a good deal lately, and probably that hon. member can give the House the benefit of his experiences in other countries with regard to railway construction. I take it the question now is: Shall we depart from the settled policy of the country, which is to use 4½-lb. rails, or shall we use a lighter rail? If we use a lighter rail, the sleepers will have to be of less dimensions, and everything in this connection will have to be curtailed. Mr. Stanley, as a railway engineer, cannot be excelled in these colonies. And if Mr. Stanley was asked his experience of these light lines here, he would, I am sure, express the same opinion that I have expressed this afternoon. I say they have been absolute failures.

Mr. BOWMAN: Then why does he suggest them?

Mr. ANNEAR: He does not suggest them.

Mr. JENKINSON: He recommends them.

Mr. ANNEAR: At any rate, I shall vote against this motion, but I think, before a division is taken, the hon. member for Fassifern should give his experience on the subject. That is due to the country and the House. We know the high position the hon. member for Fassifern holds, and how respected he is as an old colonist who would not wilfully do anything against the interests of the colony. The hon. member for Charters Towers, Mr. Dawson, looks at me and says, "You ought not to introduce this question this afternoon." I ask whether it is not in the interests of the country that I should say what has taken place in the past, and that the hon. member, who I may say was the chief participator in what took place, should give an explanation this afternoon. I see the hon. member for Enoggera smile at me. I hope his smile is as genuine as the smile I give to him. (Laughter.) I have no desire to be on bad terms with the hon. member for Enoggera, but the hon. member on railways and other matters has given his opinion of your humble servant to the electors, and I would like to have the largest assemblage of electors that could be brought together, and let the contest be between the hon. member and myself, and see if I should fall at his feet, at any rate. The hon. member might, knowing that I am of a somewhat timid nature—(laughter)—give me an opportunity to express myself this afternoon without interjec-

tions. I never interject while the hon. member is speaking. And that reminds me that we have not heard the hon. members speak much this session. What is the cause? I hope that when business is introduced we shall hear the hon. gentleman, and that he will give me an opportunity of replying to some of the threats I have heard he has made in connection with myself. To come back to the hon. member for Wide Bay, I trust that he will not lead the House to think for one moment that I have any antipathy or feeling of unkindness towards him—

Mr. JENKINSON: Draw it mild?

Mr. ANNEAR: I welcome the hon. gentleman back to this House.

Mr. JENKINSON: You did your best to prevent me from getting here.

Mr. ANNEAR: I welcome him because he comes back as a reformed man if he strictly adheres to that speech delivered by him in the great State of Canada.

Mr. BOLES (*Port Curtis*): I am fully in accord with the spirit of the resolution, and I am pleased to notice that the Government and the Railway Department are fully alive to the importance of the question, because there is no doubt that light lines of railway are badly needed in many districts of the colony. I am rather astonished, however, at the attitude of the hon. member who introduced this motion, and of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, Mr. Fogarty. They know that there are many districts in the colony very much in want of railway communication, and they also know the impossibility of the Government borrowing money and going on with the construction of much-needed railways within a reasonable time; yet when the Government bring forward proposals for the construction of railways for the purpose of developing rich mineral districts, without the expenditure of a single sixpence on the part of the State, we find those hon. members amongst those who are opposing those proposals. I think that by blocking proposals for the construction of railways in mineral districts by private companies for the purpose of developing the resources of those districts, hon. members retard the possibility of the Government being able to go on with the light lines of railway which they themselves advocate. If the Government has to borrow money to build railways to develop our mineral resources—which undoubtedly have led to the wealth and prosperity not only of Queensland, but of the whole of Australia—I say that it will put back the possibility of the scheme advocated by the hon. member for Wide Bay in this motion. With regard to the question of gauge, I think a 2-feet gauge is quite sufficient for the purpose of enabling the people in agricultural districts to get their produce to market—which is the object of these light lines of railway—and I think it would be unfair to the taxpayers of the colony to go to the expense of making these lines with a 3 feet 6 inch gauge.

HON. G. THORN (*Fassifern*): I must commend the hon. member for Wide Bay for having brought this matter forward. With regard to the statement about the Bundaberg and Mount Perry line being a second class line, I may say that I remember when the question of making that railway came on, but I was unaware till this afternoon that it was anything but a first class line. I know that several first class lines have been laid with 4½-lb. rails. For instance, the line between Brisbane and Dalby was laid with 4½-lb. rails, which have since been replaced by 60-lb. rails; and I may inform the hon. member for Maryborough that many other lines in the colony were laid with 4½-lb. rails, and have since been relaid with 60-lb. rails.

The Fassifern line has been called a cheap line, but that is not in consequence of the rails being light, but because of the grades not being cut down and having very little ballast. That line has very stiff gradients—1 in 30 and 1 in 35—so stiff, in fact, that it does not pay to run trains over it at any speed, as they cannot take a big load. Most of the crops grown along that railway are bulky, and the engines can only take light loads, but, provided the trains were run slowly and the grades reduced to 1 in 50, such lines would answer all requirements in agricultural districts. There are two grades between Ipswich and Harrisville at the present time which compel the Commissioner to run extra trains at an unremunerative rate. If the hon. member for Maryborough will go to Mr. Stanley, he will find that he is to blame for having mentioned the Mount Perry line as a second class farming line. It is nothing of the kind. It is a first class line, and is ballasted in the same way as the line between here and Ipswich, and the line between here and Maryborough. I am no advocate of altering the gauge; 3 feet 6 inch lines should be put down on all the main roads in farming districts with little or no ballast. If such a line was put down on the main road between Boonah and Coochin, in my district, it would answer all the requirements of the place, provided the trains did not run at too great a speed; and the requirements of many other farming districts in the colony could be supplied in the same way. I have not forgiven the Secretary for Railways for his inaction in not building lines in farming districts. After the speech which was made by the Chief Secretary at the opening of the railway to Gladstone, I expected to find long before this several of such lines constructed. It will be necessary to have these lines in farming districts, because under federation our farmers will be unable to make farming pay, as produce of all kinds will be brought here from the other colonies at next to nothing. When the Coolabunia Scrub is connected either with Brisbane or Maryborough by rail, it will be necessary to carry the produce from that place to Brisbane for nothing, or next to nothing, because the produce brought by water from the southern colonies can be landed here for as many shillings as it will cost crowns to bring it from the Coolabunia Scrub by rail. The hon. member for Cunningham can make up his mind to the fact that once we get federation there will be no more wheat grown on the Darling Downs, as the farmers there will never be able to compete with the southern farmers, unless the Government are prepared to bring the wheat from the Downs for nothing or next to nothing. I regret to have to make that remark, but it will be found to be true before long. The Downs farmers are only able to grow wheat successfully now by reason of the protective tariff and the low railway rates, and when protection is done away with under federation, the southern farmers will be able to land wheat here at such a low price that it will not pay the farmers on the Downs to grow it.

MR. JENKINSON: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. member for Fassifern in order in discussing the question of federation on this motion?

HON. G. THORN: I am not discussing federation.

THE SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in discussing the question of federation on this motion.

HON. G. THORN: I must apologise. I regret that many of these light railways have not been already built. I am pleased that the hon. member for Wide Bay has brought this motion forward, and I hope the Government will take action at once, if it is not too late to do so. The

only way to thickly populate the farming districts in the Southern portion of the colony is by running these light railways through them. After dairy farming, the bulky crops are the next best paying, and it will be impossible to go in for bulky crops if they have only the main roads to travel over. The strongest argument—in fact, the only argument—in favour of these light railways is that when the Divisional Boards Bill was going through, it would not have passed but for the statement by the Minister who had charge of the Bill that the Government would keep the main roads of the colony in order. But not only have the Government failed to keep those main roads in order, but they have reduced the endowment to an almost infinitesimal amount, and it is utterly impossible for the divisional boards to keep the roads in proper repair. If the Government will not give the old endowment, the least they can do is to work the main roads by means of cheap railway lines instead of the people having to use roads which in rainy weather are nothing but muck. The farmers cannot make these roads themselves to get their bulky crops to market, and in the Rosewood district, which adjoins my own electorate, it is impossible for the farmers to make even dairying pay in consequence of a light railway not being constructed up the valley of the Bremer. The Secretary for Railways should go on with that line at once, as well as the one in my district that I have indicated. I do not say anything about the *via recta*, because that is really a federal matter, and the line will have to be constructed almost immediately. I shall give the motion my hearty support, and I trust it will be passed, and that the Government will construct experimental lines in many districts, because it is impossible to make farming a success otherwise.

MR. KEOGH (*Rosewood*): I claim to represent the oldest agricultural centre in Queensland, and therefore have some right to speak on this question. I not only claim my right to speak on that ground, but I also claim the right to speak because when the late Sir Thomas McIlwraith was Premier of the colony he stated that one of the first places in which one of these light railways would be built was in the district which I have the honour to represent. The Chief Engineer, Mr. Stanley, in his reports some time ago, advocated this particular line. The hon. members who have preceded me, with the exception of the mover of the motion, have not referred to any particular lines that should be constructed, but I think I am justified in mentioning that the late Sir Thomas McIlwraith strongly advocated a line from Lowwood down to Minden, and across the range through Marburg. I have not the least doubt that that line would pay immediately, because the country is thickly populated, and a large amount of produce would be carried by the line. At the present time, as has been stated by some hon. members, the roads in farming districts are so bad at times as to preclude the possibility of the farmers getting their produce to the centres of population; in fact, they are perfect quagmires after rain. I had the pleasure of taking the Secretary for Railways and some other hon. members through that portion of the district some little time ago, and the hon. gentleman expressed his surprise at the large population that was settled there, and said that he had had no idea of it before. For that reason I think the line I have mentioned should be constructed, and also that a line should be built from Rosewood up the Bremer Valley to Rosevale. That is another line which I have no doubt would pay from its inception. Up to now it is the Treasury which has reaped all the advantage from the settlement in the Rosewood district. The whole of the land has been sold

and the money appropriated by the Government, and it is high time that the farmers get something in return. To a certain extent I do not approve of narrow-gauge railways, but rather than have no line at all I would be prepared to accept and to advocate a cheap narrow-gauge line, if it was only a 2 feet gauge line, over one of which I have had the pleasure of travelling in one of the sugar districts of the North. Although portions of my electorate are not so far away from the head of navigation, yet there are times when the roads are impassable from Rosevale to Rosewood, a distance of only eighteen miles. As pointed out by the hon. member for Fassifern, people in the Brisbane market often get the produce which they require from the south, in preference to the farming districts which are so near to them, because of the difficulties and delays in getting what they want to market. Under those circumstances it is but right and just that the struggling farmers should be afforded some better facilities than they now have. Hon. members will hear me out when I say that when a man goes before a constituency, one of the first things he is asked is whether he is prepared to assist the agricultural industry. Now is the time, I maintain, for hon. members to carry out the pledges which they have made in that respect, and I trust not one member will be found to vote against this resolution. There are, of course, other lines which I am prepared to advocate and support. I would not say one word against lines being constructed in mining districts. Indeed I am prepared to give them every possible support, and in return would ask mining members to support agricultural lines which are so much needed. So far as the main lines are concerned, there are certainly some of them for which the Government are prepared to borrow money, so that they may be extended into the outside portions of the colony; and no doubt they are right in taking that view, otherwise there would be no possibility of settlement. I venture to say that had the scheme proposed by Sir Thomas Mcllwraith, for the construction of a railway to the Gulf, been carried into effect, it would have been the means of settling a population in the country a hundred times greater than that which we now have. While I recognise the fact that it is difficult to borrow money on the English money market, yet I think the Government would show their wisdom by borrowing for the purpose of constructing lines to farming centres, and by doing so would not only assist men most deserving of assistance, but do honour to themselves.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*): Representing as I do a district where there is already an agricultural line in existence, I should like to say a word in favour of the motion brought forward by the hon. member for Wide Bay. I am entirely in accord with the motion, and I believe if such lines are constructed in accordance with the recommendation of the Chief Engineer they will be a good thing, not only for the farmers, but for the colony generally. Whether it is better that they should be constructed by the Government or by the local authorities is a matter that requires discussion. For my own part I am inclined to favour local authorities constructing such lines if they are willing to take the risk and are competent to carry out the work. The light agricultural line in my district, the Cairns-Mulgrave tramway, which is to all intents and purposes a railway, has been carried on in an eminently successful manner, and the board carry farmers' produce at a cheaper rate than is charged on Government lines. While on Government lines it costs 1s. 8d. per ton to carry cane ten miles, the divisional board are carrying it on their tramway, the same distance, for 1s. 2d. per ton.

But not only is the tramway an advantage to farmers in that they get their produce carried at a cheaper rate, it is an eminently successful commercial concern. The tramway was opened, although not completed, on the 3rd of May, 1897, and since that date they have paid back to the Government in the shape of interest £5,093 19s. 2d., and £1,305 11s. 3d. for redemption. The total amount borrowed for the construction of the 17½ miles of line open on the 3rd of May, 1897, was £51,133 2s. 6d., and that includes the expenditure on rolling-stock, stations, and everything connected with the line, so that the tramway cost under £3,000 per mile. It is exactly the same gauge as the Government railways, and Government engines and carriages can run over the tramway, and as a matter of fact they do run over it. I shall give a few figures to show the enormous benefit that that line is to the people of the district. It started to pay right away from the jump, and the Government have not incurred one single liability in connection with the line. For the year ending the 30th June, 1899, the revenue per train mile was 4s. 5d., while the working expenses per train mile were 2s. 10½d., leaving a net profit of 1s. 6½d. For the year ending the 30th of June last the revenue per train mile was 5s. 2½d., while working expenses per train mile were 3s. 3d., leaving a net profit per train mile of 1s. 11½d. That works out in the total in this way—that every £100 earned by the tramway from the date of the opening on the 3rd of May, 1897, to the 30th of June last, has cost on an average £63 10s. The percentage of net revenue to the capital expended on the opened line for the twelve months ending 30th June last is £7 8s. 5d., as compared with £6 18s. 1½d. for the previous twelve months, or, in other words, the net revenue last year available for the payment of interest and redemption money and unforeseen expenses was nearly 7½ per cent, as against about 7 per cent. for the previous twelve months. That shows the enormous success that may attend the building of agricultural lines in agricultural districts where there is sufficient traffic.

The PREMIER: They may make it pay too well, and take too much out of the farmer.

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. gentleman interjects that the line is paying too well. That is a curious statement to come from the hon. gentleman, for I am sure that every transaction he goes into he likes to pay well. But they are not taking too much out of the farmers in this instance, for, as I have pointed out, they are carrying a certain class of goods for ten miles at a cheaper rate per ton than the same class of goods are carried on Government lines for the same distance, and I may say that they are prepared to extend that tramway as soon as this House will allow them to do it. Taking it all through, it has been an unqualified and unmitigated blessing to the people of the district.

Mr. BELL: The country is very different from the open country on the Downs.

Mr. GIVENS: The only difference would be that a line could be constructed very much more cheaply in the open country in the Southern agricultural districts.

Mr. BELL: But you do not get the intense cultivation there.

Mr. GIVENS: The Cairns-Mulgrave tramway goes through the scrub lands, and they had in the first place to clear that land. That cost somewhere about £70 or £100 a mile, and that expense would not have to be incurred in the Southern agricultural districts. The hon. member for Maryborough, Mr. Annear, made an uncalculated attack on the Chief Engineer for Railways. At least, he pointed out that the

Chief Engineer had made a report and recommendation to this House and the country which he himself did not believe in. Either the Chief Engineer is unworthy of his high position, because he has issued a report which he does not believe to be true, or else the hon. member for Maryborough was traducing him. I myself am inclined, after having gone into the question fully, and after having seen the working of these systems in America and elsewhere, to believe that the Chief Engineer gave an honest and unbiased report. The hon. member for Maryborough also said that two experiments in light lines had been tried, and had proved a failure, and that one of those was the line from Bundaberg to Mount Perry, and the other the line from Maryborough to Gympie. I am not disposed to dispute whether they were light lines or not. The hon. member says they were built as light lines. If they have proved a failure that does not prove that light lines in all cases will be a failure. It only proves that those light lines were built in places where such railways ought not to have been constructed. The Cairns agricultural line was built without ballast, and run without ballast for the first couple of years, and there has never been an accident on it. They are ballasting it now out of revenue. The line was built at far less cost than Government lines, although it is of the same gauge, and is ample for all requirements. When we have such a successful example of a light railway in that district it appears to me that there is no reason whatever to prevent equally successful experiments being made in other portions of the colony where the conditions are equally suitable. But I do not advocate that light lines should be constructed haphazard in places which are not suitable for such railways. I hope the Government will be careful where they build such lines, but at the same time, I think, they should give the system a trial, or allow the local authorities who are willing to undertake the experiment to do so. I do not care which method is adopted, but I certainly think that one of them should be adopted, and where the conditions are suitable, and the local authorities are willing to take the risk, it seems to me that they might be allowed to construct light railways. It should be only after careful inquiry as to whether the probable traffic will [5:30 p.m.] provide the necessary funds for the working of the line and for the payment of interest and redemption of the money borrowed to construct the lines. Where the Government have satisfied themselves on those points it will be in the interests of the farmers and of the colony generally that they should not hesitate a single moment in giving effect to the principle embodied in the motion moved by the hon. member for Wide Bay.

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*): I do not wish to speak at length on this question, but it is a very important question, and should not, I think, be decided in one afternoon's debate. We do not know all about railway building in Queensland. We have a great deal yet to learn, but I am satisfied that unless we can build cheaper railways to agricultural centres than we have been doing in the past, a number of the farmers of the colony will have to do without railway communication.

Mr. JENKINSON: They are worth a trial.

The PREMIER: They are worth a trial, and we have made trials of them already. The Government have built light lines, and they have also lent money to divisional boards to build light lines. A great deal of that has been done in North Queensland. We have a light tramway or railway at Cairns, which has been a most

successful undertaking by the divisional board there. At Port Douglas there is also a 2-feet tramway, and one at the Herbert River.

Mr. JENKINSON: Are they successes?

The PREMIER: Well, they are only just finishing them. They are now building a line from Ayr to the six-mile peg on the Townsville line.

Mr. JENKINSON: All in the North.

The PREMIER: The reason for that is that the local authorities there have had the courage to borrow the money, and have the line built for themselves.

Mr. JACKSON: They are very enterprising in the North.

The PREMIER: Perhaps they are more enterprising there. In the South now, down at the Logan, they are borrowing £30,000 to put down twenty miles of tramway, and I believe the local authority there can get the twenty miles of line for £30,000, while the Government estimate for eight miles was £26,000. They are satisfied with a line of the same gauge, but a much lighter line, and, as the people at Cairns did, they will do without ballast for a time until they have made some money out of the line.

Mr. JENKINSON: That will necessitate much lighter rolling-stock.

The PREMIER: No, I think not. All that is required is that they should go at a slow rate of speed. Instead of going thirty miles an hour they can go ten miles an hour. The hon. member for Cunningham says we are far behind the other colonies in giving facilities to the farmers and the people of Queensland in the matter of railway construction. Why, I find that in Queensland we have built within 10½ miles of the number of miles of railway built by a great colony like New South Wales, and we have little more than one-third of the population. Considering our population, I think we have done wonders in Queensland in the way of railway construction. We have more railway mileage, per head of population, than New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, or South Australia.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Or any part of the world.

The PREMIER: I do not say in any part of the world, but certainly in any part of Australia, and the Government are still prepared to schedule more Government railways. At present there is a survey being made in connection with a line to the Blackall Range. I had an opportunity of seeing that district, and I was astonished that the people of Brisbane had not long ago made some effort to develop it. Railway construction would have opened up a new district there for Southern Queensland. I do not agree with the hon. member for Maryborough that a heavy line should be built there. I think a light 2 feet or 2 feet 6 inch tramway or railway would be sufficient to open up the whole of that district.

Mr. JACKSON: For a good many years at any rate.

The PREMIER: For a great many years.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What would be the use of your rolling-stock?

The PREMIER: It would take a line of forty or fifty miles to go through the whole of that district, and it would pay us to have special rolling-stock for the line of that length, but I quite agree with the Secretary for Railways that for little spurs of six or eight miles long from a main line it would not pay to alter the gauge. I would not approve of a narrow gauge either for flat country, because it would be unsafe, but if you want to get over ranges and climb hills with sharp curves, a 2 feet line is far more economical than a 3 feet 6 inch line. There is a book by a man named Mackay, which I think may be got in the library, on narrow-gauge lines in England,

and the millions of tons of stuff and the number of passengers which it is there stated are carried on those lines is almost incredible.

Mr. JENKINSON: The same thing applies to Belgium.

The PREMIER: Even in Queensland, in the sugar districts, 1,500,000 tons of cane were taken over the light tramways connected with the sugar-mills in one year. It is astonishing the enormous quantity of stuff which may be carried on those tramways, and the low rate per ton per mile at which it can be carried. They do not go at a high rate of speed, but they go quite fast enough.

Mr. BROWNE: Mr. George Phillips has always been a great advocate of them.

The PREMIER: They go about ten miles an hour, but they do the work that is wanted. I must impress upon hon. members, and especially farming members, that if they want more railway communication in their districts they should approach the local authorities, and see whether they cannot induce them to borrow the money necessary to build these light lines. They ought to be satisfied with a much lighter line than the Government lines, and with a much lower rate of speed than that run on the Government lines, because after the line is built the demand will be for more trains. I say we are doing wonders in this colony with our small population, and you cannot have a railway to every farmer's back door.

Mr. BRIDGES: Why not?

The PREMIER: If the farmers of the colony want to show their *bona fides* they will come to the Government to borrow money to build lines for themselves.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Under Government supervision?

The PREMIER: Certainly, to a certain extent. If the Government lend the money they will want to see that it is properly spent, but I think the local authorities could manage the lines for themselves better than the Government could manage them for them. They would not run more trains than were wanted, they would not put up elaborate stations, and in the service of the line generally they could run them much more economically than the Government can.

Mr. KEOGH: On the same gauge as at present?

The PREMIER: In some cases. On level country I think the same gauge should be maintained, but on hilly or rangey country a 2 feet or a 2 feet 6 inch line would be ample. I point out also that in the past we laid some of our lines with 32-lb. rails, and later with 40-lb. rails, and now we are relaying them with 60-lb. rails, but if we had started in the same way as the other colonies, and spent from £12,000 to £13,000 a mile on our railways, we would not have half the miles of railway we have now in Queensland.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They spent more than that in New South Wales.

The PREMIER: New South Wales has built 2,811 miles of railway at a cost of £38,000,000, the average cost per mile being £13,687 a mile, whereas Queensland has built her railways at an average of £6,897 a mile, so that in reality for the same money practically we got double the mileage.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Owing to the difference in gauge.

The PREMIER: Yes, and by going in for a cheaper form of construction.

Mr. KERR: They are better made in New South Wales; they are better formed.

The PREMIER: Of course they are much more costly. But I maintain that we have done the best for the people of the colony; and by and by when we have made money out of our lines we can make them better. At the present

time we are relaying 600 miles with 60-lb. rails; and as we go into localities where there is a good deal of traffic we shall have to take up the light rails and put down heavier ones. I maintain that our proper system is that when these lines go further out West we ought to adopt a light system of construction and not lay down 60-lb. or 90 lb. rails at once, otherwise we shall only get half the mileage, and it is better to get over a large area of country even if we have to go back again afterwards to lay heavier rails.

Mr. BROWNE: Open the road first and improve it afterwards.

The PREMIER: That would be my way of doing things. I think the colony has done well in railway construction and I hope we shall go on and do better. We are doing our best. If farmers and farming centres do not demand railways, but are content with tramways, they are very likely to get them, but if they want a first-class railway right away, well the money will only suffice to take the lines a third of the distance.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: What about the Goombungee line?

The PREMIER: I am not going to speak of any individual line. I think we are progressing in our agricultural pursuits very considerably. I understand that last year there were 50,000 acres more under cultivation than in the previous year, and I hope we shall continue to progress in that way. I quite agree with the hon. member for Cunningham, that to have a successful country you must have a large population settled on the soil.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The PREMIER: We have plenty of good land in Queensland. It only wants opening up; and as our population increases I feel certain that we shall have a larger proportion of it settled on the soil. We have only a third of the population of New South Wales, and Victoria has two and a-half times as much population as we have; but I believe that our people are working just as hard as those of Victoria, New South Wales, or New Zealand. I say we are producing as much wealth, perhaps more, but certainly the most permanent settlement that we can have is that which goes on on the agricultural lands of the colony, and we cannot do too much for the farmers of the country, though at the present time I think we have done a fair share. I am glad, notwithstanding that, that hon. members recognise that the Government are doing something for the farmers.

Mr. KATES: There is a great deal more to be done.

The PREMIER: Of course we are never done.

Mr. KEOGH: How many years do they get to pay back money borrowed for tramway construction?

The PREMIER: I think we allow forty years, and we lend them the money at 4 per cent. They have to pay £5 1s. per cent. for the redemption and interest on money borrowed for tramways. Now, if a local authority has got confidence in a district, they could surely repay that amount for building railways of that kind; and I hope that agricultural centres will give a little more consideration to this matter and make up their minds to be satisfied with a line which, instead of costing £3,000 or £4,000 a mile, will only cost £1,000 a mile. If they will avail themselves of this system of construction, it will be far cheaper than maintaining roads. I will only add that, while the Government has every sympathy with the hon. member for Wide Bay, they are doing, and will continue doing, everything in that direction that they can.

Mr. TOOTH (*Burrum*): I would not detain the House on this occasion were it not for the fact that it seems to me that whenever any business is brought before the House favouring the small farmers and selectors, there is a tendency on the part of certain hon. members on this side to throw cold water on it. I need only instance the motion now on the paper by the hon. member, Mr. Kates, who, on the last occasion he moved it, was jammed into the last five minutes of the time available. Surely hon. members can show some slight degree of courtesy in allowing each other to get through with the business they have on the paper. However, it seems to me that it is time for the hon. members representing farming constituencies to assert themselves and insist upon the Government carrying out some of the pledges to small farmers and selectors that have been made every year for the last several years.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. TOOTH: We are throwing open land every week for agriculture and for selection, and, in my opinion, for every acre of land thrown open, a certain responsibility rests on the Government to afford the selectors an opportunity of getting their produce to market. There are two ways of doing that—either by roads or railways; and I think that if the Government cannot build railways, certainly they can act a little more liberally in their subsidies to local authorities in giving them a little more money to open up roads with in newly opened-up districts. If the Government or hon. members are in any doubt as to the utility or the amount of good done by these branch lines to agricultural centres, I need only point to the instance of the Isis Junction line. Fourteen years ago the Isis Scrub consisted of 13,000 acres of virgin scrub. Eleven years ago a railway was run for twelve or thirteen miles into that scrub, and what has been the result? The Isis is now the most flourishing district in the colony. Every acre of the 13,000 is now cleared, and under a high state of cultivation. Over £1,000,000 of capital is invested in machinery alone, and I am not prepared to say the amount that is invested in other improvements. At all events I can say that every year that 13,000 acres of land pays £40,000 to white men in wages alone, besides what is paid to kanakas. The district also supports a central mill, which, I am happy to be able to say, is the one instance where a central mill has been able to keep faith with the Government and religiously pay their interest and redemption. I could instance many more, but I will only refer to that of the Pialbaline. We have not to thank the Government for that. Although we have not built it by private enterprise, we have in a sense built it for ourselves, in that we have guaranteed to pay 4 per cent. on the amount of the outlay. In that district we were tired of waiting, and were tired of living on hope year after year, so we got the Government to build it, and we guaranteed it. No one in that district regrets that we have had to pay in accordance with that guarantee, because that railway has been of great assistance to the farmers in the district, and has been the means of enabling those who have taken up land to get some remuneration from it. This year some of them have gone in for sugar, and they certainly would not have done that if it had not been for this line. I will not detain the House any more; I will simply say I intend to vote for this motion.

Mr. JACKSON: I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Question put and passed.

On the motion of Mr. JENKINSON, the resumption of the debate was made an Order of the Day for Thursday, the 15th November.

PAPERS.

The following papers, laid on the table, were ordered to be printed:—

- (1) Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the administration of the Department of Public Works of Queensland, and into all the matters pertaining thereto.
- (2) Return to an Order, relative to expenditure by the Mines Department for prospecting purposes, made by the House, on motion of Mr. J. Hamilton, on the 12th instant.
- (3) Return to an Order, relative to expenditure of deep sinking fund on gold and mineral fields, made by the House, on motion of Mr. Dawson, on the 12th instant.

MR. J. M. CROSS'S REPORTS TO THE AGENT-GENERAL.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*), in moving—

That there be laid on the table of the House, copies of all correspondence, reports, etc., prepared by J. M. Cross for the Agent-General—
said: I think members of our two Houses of Legislature should be placed in possession of these reports. If these reports are necessary, and if they contain information relating to the industries of this colony, I think hon. members should have an opportunity of reading them, and of discussing them in this Chamber, so that when the Estimates concerned come on we may all have the privilege of commenting on them if we so desire. We desire to get all information with regard to the appointment of Mr. J. M. Cross, as to his salary and the work he does.

Mr. DAWSON: And the reason for his appointment.

Mr. LESINA: Yes, the reason for his appointment as a kind of confidential secretary to Sir Horace Tozer. If all this work done by Mr. Cross is necessary, I say that he should get a bigger salary than he is now receiving. Ten shillings a day is absolutely absurd if all this literature is required. It amounts to this: either the Government are sweating this gentleman, or the work is unnecessary. Of course I do not say the Government have created this billet for political reasons, or that Mr. Cross has been put in his present position on account of his loyalty regarding federation or in connection with the recent patriotic movement in connection with the war in South Africa; but there are many persons who think that this is practically a job on the part of the Government. One of our leading newspapers in Brisbane has said that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LESINA: The *Telegraph* has made that statement; but at the same time I do not say I believe it. If all this work is necessary, we want to see some of it—we want to see these reports prepared by Mr. Cross. The leader of the Government assured me, in answer to a question, that it would cost too much to publish these reports for the information of members. The Government seem determined not to let us have this information. I ask, as a matter of right, that these reports shall be placed on the table of the House.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*): I think several statements that have been made by the hon. member for Clermont deserve to be answered. The hon. gentleman, in the first place, has dwelt strongly on the word "reports." Now I have seen some of these documents, furnished by Mr. Cross, in London.

Mr. DAWSON: Why can't we see them in Queensland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are nothing but cuttings from the Press.

MEMBERS of the Opposition: Oh!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But they are of a very useful nature. This practice of cutting from different newspapers is very serviceable and has been adopted in England. A public man cannot possibly read through all matters in the newspapers. These documents sent to the Agent-General are merely cuttings from different journals—nothing in the shape of reports—with perhaps a note or two on the margin.

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

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) moved that £1,802 be granted for His Excellency the Governor. There was no change in the estimate this year as compared with last year.

Question put and passed.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £869 be granted for the Executive Council. The vote was the same as last year.

Question put and passed.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £1,500 be granted for the Legislative Council. The estimate was £10 less than last year. There were certain increases amounting to £25, and the decreases amounted to £35.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) noticed that some of the messengers had been reduced.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said there had been a redistribution. The principal messenger, Lane, had been increased from £150 to £160; the second messenger, Mooney, from £91 to £100. Mooney was appointed after last year's Estimates were framed, so that he got an increase of £9. Mooney had been increased, but not to the full extent of the salary paid to his predecessor. The third messenger was appointed since last year's Estimates were passed at a salary reduced from £75 to £60; and the contingency vote showed an increase of £15.

Mr. REID: What is the reason for the messenger not getting as much as his predecessor?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was a junior in the service.

Question put and passed.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £2,021 be granted for the Legislative Assembly. The vote last year was £1,911, and the increase was £110. The opinion had been expressed several times in the Committee that the Clerk—to whom they were all under great obligations for his admirable assistance in connection with their parliamentary proceedings—should cease to hold a duality of offices. At present that gentleman occupied the position of Clerk of the Assembly and also secretary to the Board of Waterworks, in both of which he carried out his duties admirably; but it had been felt from time to time that he should not hold the dual position, but should devote the whole of his time to the Assembly. Therefore there had been some correspondence between him and the Government, and it had been proposed that he should

retire on the 1st January from the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks and devote his whole time to his parliamentary duties. He was sure there was not a member of the Committee who would wish that officer's connection with Parliament should be severed. They all recognised Mr. Bernays as one of the ablest Clerks of Parliament to be found in the Australian colonies; and he could say from observation that Mr. Bernays would bear favourable comparison with any gentleman holding a similar position in any part of the British Empire. In consideration of his retiring from the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks, it was intended to increase his salary to £800, thereby giving him the equivalent of the salary he lost by resignation from the Waterworks. He did not consider that even with £800 Mr. Bernays was at all well paid, considering the highly responsible position he held and the efficient manner in which he carried out his duties. As Mr. Bernays would only assume the increased salary on the 1st January, the increase in the Estimate on account of his salary was £100. Then there was a junior messenger increased from £26 to £33, and sessional messengers from £100 to £103, the total increase being £110.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Burke*) did not see why the Committee should be so liberal with money that did not belong to them. He really thought that the Clerk might continue to discharge his other duties till the end of June, as Parliament would not be sitting during the second half of the year. He was bound to say that Mr. Bernays gave satisfaction to hon. members on both sides, and put himself out in order to assist them, and it was in no way with a desire to reflect upon Mr. Bernays that he was speaking.

Mr. BROWNE (*Croydon*) thoroughly agreed with what had been said by the hon. member for Burke with regard to the assistance which every hon. member received from Mr. Bernays. He was a very obliging and a very efficient officer. As to the proposed increase, every year since the Labour party had entered the Assembly in 1893 they had protested against Mr. Bernays holding the dual positions of Clerk of the Assembly and secretary to the Board of Waterworks, and, in order to emphasise their protest, a reduction had on more than one occasion been moved in his salary. He did not call the increase in question, and was very glad that Mr. Bernays was going to sever his connection with the Board of Waterworks.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*) said that in a few years' time, in the natural course of events, Mr. Bernays would feel that he was no longer able to carry out the duties which devolved upon him, and he would then come down to the House and ask for a retiring allowance. Now, if they granted him the additional £200, his retiring allowance would be based on an annual salary of £800. They were frequently told that by their actions they bound future Parliaments, and, as the representative of a large number of people, he did not wish to bind future Parliaments to that increase of salary. The Board of Waterworks were getting rid of their servant without giving him anything in the shape of a retiring allowance, and the country was to be saddled with the extra expense. They wanted some explanation from the Chief Secretary with reference to the retiring allowance, and also with regard to Mr. Bernays's quarters, etc., which were valued at £150 per annum.

Mr. CALLAN: They are not worth it.

Mr. KERR: He presumed that the valuation had been made by some competent authority. They ought to know what they were doing before they passed the vote.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member was clearly under some misconception. He seemed to infer that a retiring allowance accrued to Mr. Bernays by virtue of his office. There was no such retiring allowance contemplated, nor was it in any way provided for. The Committee was merely asked to vote his annual salary, and in future sessions it might reconsider the amount, and say it was too large or too small. If a retiring allowance were granted by some future Parliament, it was a matter for future consideration, but certainly that increase in salary did not carry with it any claim to a retiring allowance, any more than the original £600 did. The position was clear. Mr. Bernays had heretofore occupied dual positions, and that had been annually criticised by the Committee, and he held that it was undesirable that a Government officer should hold dual positions. The additional £200 was only intended to recoup Mr. Bernays for the loss he would sustain through retiring from the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks. With regard to the house that was occupied by the Clerk; in former days it might have been worth £150 a year, but it certainly was not worth that amount now. It was very convenient for Mr. Bernays to occupy a house so near to the scene of his nightly labours.

Mr. REID: What is the matter with the house?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was told that it required renovating, and it certainly was not worth £150 in the shape of rent. He thought he had explained the matter fully. He should have imagined that hon. members would have recognised that it was only a fair arrangement to have made—one which did not give Mr. Bernays any larger salary, and did not entitle him to any claim to a retiring allowance.

HON. G. THORN was astonished at the opposition to the vote. The Committee well knew what an excellent officer Mr. Bernays had been to the Waterworks Board, and when he retired it would take two men to do his work. What he rose particularly to say was that the Council was on an equality with the Assembly and there was a danger of that House insisting that their chief officer should be placed on the same level as the chief officer in the Assembly.

The PREMIER: There is not the slightest fear of that.

HON. G. THORN: Umbrage had been taken more than once by the Council at an Assembly officer receiving more than a Council officer, and it was quite possible that the Council might refuse to pass the Assembly's Estimates if the officers of both Houses were not put on an equality. He did not say the occasion would arise, but it might arise.

Mr. BROWNE: We will rally round the Treasury.

HON. G. THORN: He simply rose to point that out. He was in favour of the increase.

Mr. McDONALD (*Flinders*) objected to hon. members saying that if such and such an officer were to retire it would be impossible to replace him. That was all bunkum. He had as high a regard for Mr. Bernays as any man in that Chamber, but to say that it would take two men to fill his place if he retired was rubbish, and could only come from an hon. member like the hon. member for Fassifern. Personally, he had no objection to the increase, but he was very sorry the Government had taken so many years to find out that it was an inconvenient thing for Mr. Bernays to fill the two positions. It had been pointed out repeatedly in Parliament that such an arrangement was undesirable, but the Government replied that it was absolutely necessary, and that if he retired from the Waterworks it would go to ruin. His opinion was that the

Waterworks Board would get along just as well without Mr. Bernays, although he did not wish to depreciate his services in the slightest degree. He certainly thought it was better for the Clerk of the Assembly to confine his work to the Assembly, and not have divided work.

Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*): The proposal seemed to him to be rather an extraordinary one. Either the House had been taking advantage of Mr. Bernays in the past, and paying him too little for his work, or it was proposed to pay him too much now. The position up to date was, that Mr. Bernays had been receiving £600 a year as Clerk of the Assembly, and in his spare time performed the duties of secretary to the Board of Waterworks.

Mr. GIVENS: And he had plenty of spare time.

Mr. STEWART: And he had plenty of spare time, as the hon. member interjected. He supposed that he now felt that increasing years compelled him to give up one of the positions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, the overtures have come not from him but from the Government.

Mr. STEWART: Well, the Government had considered £600 sufficient payment for Mr. Bernays's services up to the present time. Would the hon. gentleman give the Committee any particular reason why he should now get £800? If that gentleman was worth £800 now, he surely must have been worth £800 at any time during the last ten or twenty years.

HON. D. H. DALRYMPLE: And he got it.

Mr. STEWART: He did not get it as Clerk of the Assembly. He had an income of £800, drawn from two sources. One source was now proposed to be withdrawn, and the salary raised to a figure equal to the amount received for the two positions. That seemed to him a most extraordinary method of conducting business. He did not object to paying Mr. Bernays £800 a year, for, as the hon. gentleman in charge of the estimate had said, he was a most efficient officer. He had had a very long experience in his present position, he knew all the ins-and-outs of parliamentary procedure, and hon. members were indebted to him on many occasions for assistance. But that had nothing to do with the position. Would the hon. gentleman explain to the Committee why the service of the Clerk should suddenly appreciate in value from £600 to £800 a year? He could not give a single reason, except that Mr. Bernays now found that it was necessary for him to give up the secretaryship to the Board of Waterworks, or the Government desired him to do so. He would still be the Clerk of the Assembly as before. He would have no more work than he had had hitherto; he would be no more efficient. Therefore, he asked, why that sudden jump of £200 a year? They were there as trustees of the public funds, and ought to deal with them in a business-like manner. If an office was worth a particular sum, let that sum be paid; but if a man was a pluralist and wished to cease to be a pluralist, he did not see the slightest reason why he should receive the two salaries for the one office.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said it was a common occurrence in the public service that gentlemen were allowed to perform private practice. Gentlemen occupying positions such as that held by Mr. Bernays, had in numerous instances been allowed to hold two offices. He did not think that Mr. Bernays, after his long service in Parliament, should [7.30 p.m.] be penalised because he chose to conform to the expressed desire of Parliament that he should devote his whole time to his parliamentary duties. Considering the manner in which that gentleman had discharged

his duties as Clerk of the Assembly, he unhesitatingly said that he was perfectly entitled to that amount of annual salary, and even at the increased salary he would not be paid as well as gentlemen performing similar duties in Victoria and New South Wales. The hon. member for Fassifern had expressed an apprehension that if Mr. Bernays's salary was increased to £800 they would at once have an appeal from the Clerk of the Council for a similar advance, but if the hon. member would refer to the Estimates for Victoria and New South Wales he would see that the Clerk of the Assembly in each of those colonies, in recognition of the more important duties he had to perform, received a considerably larger salary than the Clerk of the Upper House, and in both those cases the Clerk of the Assembly received a very much larger salary than Mr. Bernays would receive, even with the proposed increase.

Mr. DUNSFORD: The salary is £1,000 in Victoria and £960 in New South Wales.

Mr. DAWSON: We have the best man on the continent.

Mr. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*): It was no doubt a somewhat invidious thing to object to such an increase of salary to an old and valued officer of the House like Mr. Bernays. With all that had been said regarding the long service of that gentleman, and his uniform courtesy to hon. members on both sides of the House, he entirely agreed, but he objected to the proposed increase on the simple ground that he thought Mr. Bernays was being sufficiently well paid at £600 a year for the duties he had to perform. There was not the slightest use of talking about economy in that House, or on platforms in the country at election times, if that kind of thing was allowed to go on. The Government had no justification for increasing that salary by £200, or 33 per cent., in one jump. What had been said about Mr. Bernays giving up the clerkship of the Waterworks Board, for which he received £200 a year, had nothing at all to do with the matter. Mr. Bernays had been paid £600 a year for performing certain duties in connection with the House, and he would still continue to perform those duties, and nothing more. If he deserved £800 a year for performing those duties now, he deserved £800 a year before, even when he was getting another £200 a year from the Waterworks Board. The House had nothing to do with Mr. Bernays receiving £200 a year from the Waterworks Board, so long as the House was willing to permit him to perform those duties.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The House often complained about it.

Mr. KIDSTON: The Chief Secretary would excuse him if he said he thought the hon. gentleman was trying to humbug the House, when he told them that Mr. Bernays had resigned his position as clerk of the Waterworks Board in—

The CHAIRMAN: The expression "humbug" is unparliamentary, and the hon. member should withdraw it.

Mr. KIDSTON: You are certainly becoming—oh, very well—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Chair!

The CHAIRMAN: I must ask the hon. member to withdraw the expression; it is unparliamentary.

Mr. KIDSTON: I do not think it is an unparliamentary expression at all.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Chair!

The CHAIRMAN: I have expressed the opinion that it is unparliamentary, and I ask the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. KIDSTON: While he did not think the ruling was right, he thought it was better, under the circumstances, that he should withdraw the expression, otherwise attention might be dis-

tracted from the question at issue, which was very much more important. He thought that when the Chief Secretary said Mr. Bernays had resigned his position in connection with the Waterworks Board in deference to the wish of the House, the hon. gentleman made a statement which it was extremely difficult for hon. members to believe. The matter had been brought up in the Committee for many years, and very strong opposition had been shown to Mr. Bernays occupying two positions and drawing two salaries, but the Government had persistently defended the dual position he occupied. Now, when it was fairly understood that it suited Mr. Bernays to do so, he resigned the secretaryship of the Waterworks Board, and he got his salary made up to the salary he was receiving for both offices. The fact that Mr. Bernays had resigned that position did not justify the Government in increasing his salary as Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. DAWSON: He was underpaid before.

Mr. KIDSTON: He did not think Mr. Bernays was underpaid. The Clerk of the Assembly received £600 a year and the Assistant Clerk £450, that was £1,050 for the two offices, which was altogether too much money to pay to those two officers, as they did not do work worth that amount. In the interest of the taxpayers it was necessary that some effort should be made to reduce the cost of government in Queensland, and when an increase like that was proposed without any justification at all, he would not be doing his duty if he did not rise up and oppose it. If he thought he had the slightest chance of carrying such a vote against the Government he would move that the item should be reduced by the amount of the proposed increase. The Government were ready to pay the country's money—to an efficient officer no doubt—but to an extent that they would not do if it was their own money they were paying. He entered his protest and regretted that he could not defeat the increase.

Mr. HIGGS did not agree with the hon. member for Rockhampton, because he thought the salary proposed should be paid to a gentleman who had to sit there month after month and listen to the foolish arguments of hon. members on the other side. He pitied Mr. Bernays when he saw him sweltering there under the shower of heated arguments which came from hon. members coming from the warmer districts of the colony—Mackay, for instance. The Government were stealing another plank from the platform of the white labour party—one man one billet—and if they would only drop their private railway schemes most of their legislation might be allowed to go through without much trouble. Mr. Bernays was one of the greatest authorities on parliamentary procedure in the colonies, and it would be a great loss to the Assembly if the services of a gentleman of his life-long experience were to be dispensed with. If they passed that vote, would the Minister in charge of it give them a promise that the Government would consult Mr. Bernays as to the advisability of amending the Standing Orders, with a view to curtailing the speaking powers of hon. members of the Assembly in the way in which he understood it had been decided by a caucus meeting of the Government side to do? There were about 5,000 items in the Estimates, and hon. members could make 5,000 speeches each on each item. They should consult Mr. Bernays, who would be able to point that out to them.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE: Why Mr. Bernays in particular?

Mr. HIGGS: Because he had a lifelong experience of parliamentary procedure, and would be able to show hon. members opposite the inadvisability of trying to gag members who

were opposed to private railways by limiting them to one speech of four or five minutes on each railway Bill. If they were promised that Mr. Bernays would be asked whether it was advisable to apply the gag in that way, there would not be so much opposition to the vote.

Mr. STEPHENS: Will you take his opinion?

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Will you abide by it?

Mr. HIGGS hoped he would not be drawn off his argument by frivolous questions. He had read a very interesting interview with Mr. Bernays, published in the *Observer*, the only discordant note in which was an expression of regret by Mr. Bernays that as he did not happen to hold his office under a certain Act, he would probably be turned adrift in his old age. He was sure Mr. Bernays, from past experience, had no reason to think that when he retired that or any future Assembly would treat him unfairly. He thought it might be well that each item of expenditure should be discussed until the Government gave them some idea as to whether they were going to apply the gag. On matters of public expenditure there should be full discussion of every proposal by hon. members opposite. He hoped the item before the Committee would be passed and that they would find that the same consideration would be shown when they came to discuss the wages of men like those in the railway goods sheds who were getting 5s. a day for ten hours daily work.

Hon. G. THORN: Another reason for passing the vote was that when the Waterworks Board was appointed the secretary was appointed by the Government also, and when they sat in the old buildings in Queen street Mr. Bernays was offered a higher salary than he was receiving at present, if he would sever his connection with the board. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley talked of one man one billet, but he believed the hon. member was looking for the billet of mayor of Brisbane, and if he got that he would have two billets, and would be getting £600 a year as mayor and £300 as a member of Parliament. Perhaps the hon. member did not propose to draw his salary as mayor.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*) said he would like to know whether, in the case of a future holder of this position, this increase to £800 was to be considered a precedent? No one was more glad than he that Mr. Bernays should receive £800. Mr. Bernays occupied a unique position, and he (Mr. Bell) believed that he had a name, not only throughout Queensland, but throughout Australia in regard to his knowledge of parliamentary procedure. He was worthy of £800 a year if any man were worth it, but speaking generally with regard to the position of Clerk of the Assembly, he thought £600 a year was a very fair remuneration. He would like to ask the hon. gentleman if this was to be regarded as a precedent?

The CHIEF SECRETARY said it was solely to meet the wishes of hon. members who in former years had expressed a wish that Mr. Bernays should fill only one position, that he had offered to give up his office as secretary to the Board of Waterworks on the 1st January next, but he expected that he would be recouped the loss of salary which he would sustain. Hon. members knew very well that this salary was voted year by year and there was nothing to bind the House to a continuance of it, even to Mr. Bernays. Hon. members could either reject this increase or they could reduce the salary at any time.

Mr. BELL: Then it attaches to the individual, not the office?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At the present time it attached to the individual, but on the Estimates it attached to the office. If hon. members objected to this increase they were not

bound to continue it, though he could hardly imagine in the case of such an old and efficient officer as Mr. Bernays, there would ever be the slightest objection to continuing it. It in no way followed that it would be voted to any future occupant of the office.

Mr. REID (*Enoggera*) said he was rather pleased that the Government, after a very long struggle, had succeeded in doing what the House desired them to do. Formerly he had merely moved the reduction of Mr. Bernays's salary as a protest against that gentleman holding two offices. He thought that Mr. Bernays would be very foolish now if he did not give up his secretaryship to the Waterworks Board, for which he had been paid £200 a year, for it was proposed that he should now receive the same salary for doing only the work in the Assembly. The Chief Secretary had sought to make out that Mr. Bernays would only get £800, and had objected to Mr. Bernays's house being put down as worth £150. Well, he (Mr. Reid) would put it down at £100, and he did not think anyone could get as good a house in the neighbourhood, with fuel and light, for the same money. Taking everything into consideration, he considered that Mr. Bernays would get at least £900 a year. He objected, not to Mr. Bernays being paid that, but he objected to it being voted to him on personal grounds. They all admitted Mr. Bernays's ability and courtesy, but he would point out that while he had been doing the work of the Assembly and the Waterworks Board he had also been devoting his time to being a director on various other boards, and he would like to ask the Chief Secretary if Mr. Bernays was a director on those boards yet. It seemed to him that the conditions under which it was proposed to give this increase, gave it the form of an old age pension. Mr. Bernays came a great deal in contact with hon. members, and this vote was simply a matter of personal influence and friendship; and that was the reason why he objected to it.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Appreciation of his services.

Mr. REID: No, it was not appreciation of his services, but a result of members coming in contact with him.

The TREASURER: They know his value.

Mr. REID: We all admit his value.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Why do not you vote his salary, then?

Mr. REID: It was on the ground that it was given to him personally that he [8 p.m.] objected to it. If it were given to him in that way, it simply took the shape of an old age pension. Mr. Bernays was getting more than Under Secretaries got.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. REID: What did they get?

The PREMIER: £800.

Mr. REID: But not one of the Under Secretaries was allowed house rent, and some of the Under Secretaries did more work than Mr. Bernays.

Hon. D. H. DALRYMPLE (*Mackay*): He did not think this matter was altogether one of personal friendship. He proposed to vote for the increase, and he did that as a matter of justice. For many years Mr. Bernays had acted as secretary to the Board of Waterworks with the sanction of the House; but it could not be denied that as a servant of the House Mr. Bernays had always performed all his duties faithfully and to the satisfaction of all concerned. The hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. Higgs, held more than one position.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no parallel in that.

HON. D. H. DALRYMPLE held there was a parallel. The hon. member held the position of alderman, as well as a member of Parliament, and he might possibly become mayor of Brisbane. It was admitted that Mr. Bernays was a most efficient officer in every way, and he had always discharged his duties faithfully and with satisfaction to everyone in the House. Without interfering with his duties as Clerk of the Assembly, he had been able to earn more money in other capacities outside. It was quite possible that many persons could fulfil many duties which would not clash with one another. If Mr. Bernays was going to resign the duties referred to, on account of ill-health or on account of his unfitness to perform them, he (Mr. Dalrymple) would oppose the increase. Hon. members must see the equity of the matter. Mr. Bernays was really trying to conform to the wishes of hon. members opposite. He held the increase should be given, not as a matter of friendship, but as a matter of justice. Mr. Bernays's holding another office, besides Clerk of the Assembly, had been sanctioned by the House for many years, and that gentleman should be compensated if he relinquished any outside office. Seeing that it was a kind of abolition of what had been sanctioned by former Parliaments, and that his retirement, which was in deference to opinions expressed in the Committee, meant a loss of the salary attached to the position, it was only justice that reasonable compensation should be made to Mr. Bernays.

Mr. GIVENS asked whether the amount for travelling expenses of members was included in the £190 for contingencies?

The CHIEF SECRETARY said he thought it was included in the vote for contingencies in the Chief Secretary's department or the Treasury department. He would be able to explain that when the vote came before the Committee.

Mr. MAXWELL said that when the session ended Mr. Bernays would not have much to do, and he might as well hold the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks till the end of the financial year, when the £100 that would be saved would be very acceptable to the Treasurer.

Mr. FOGARTY said he felt that £600 was a liberal salary for the Clerk of the House. With regard to Mr. Bernays being such an authority on parliamentary law and practice, he had no hesitation in saying that the Speaker was appealed to more than the Clerk, and the Speaker also had the confidence of the House. Speaking for himself, it was to the Speaker that he went for advice in matters of that kind. It was all very well to say that this £800 was for the present occupant of the office; but they knew from experience that when such an office was filled at a reduced salary it was not long before the new officer received the same salary as the officer he succeeded. Even the Chief Secretary admitted that the proposed salary and emoluments would exceed those of any Under Secretary; and there were at least two Under Secretaries that did four times as much work as the Clerk of the Assembly. He did not know that Mr. Bernays worked longer hours than some members, who spent a good deal of time in the library acquiring information of which they made use for the benefit of the country. They only received £300 a year for their services; and the calls on a member were more numerous than on the Clerk of the Assembly. He thought £600 a year was a very decent salary for the Clerk; and if the question went to a division he would vote accordingly.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): It certainly seemed that £950 a year was a very large salary; at the same time he did not intend to vote against the increase. It was true that the party

on his side had protested against Mr. Bernays holding two offices, but he was not aware that they had said his salary should be increased in the event of his resigning the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks. It seemed that the Government had asked him to give up that position, and it was only fair that the Government should give compensation for the loss of salary. He looked at it from the point of view that Mr. Bernays was a very old servant of the Queensland Government, having occupied the position of Clerk from the establishment of parliamentary government in the colony; and seeing that he was getting on in years—he did not say that Mr. Bernays was in any way unfit to do the work even of both offices—they ought to have a little consideration for him, and relieve him of some of the work that now fell upon him. He thought they might very well in their generosity vote Mr. Bernays the increased salary for the rest of the time, which he would not like to say would not be long—he hoped it would be a long time yet—but still, seeing that he was in advancing years, it was not likely that it would be for a great length of time at any rate; and he thought they might vote the salary from that point of view. Certainly it should not be made a precedent, as he was decidedly against a salary of that sort being given to any man who might be appointed to the position of Clerk of the Assembly in the future. He took it that under federation Mr. Bernays's duties would not be diminished very much. It was true that they would be relieved of certain work under federation, but they would then have time to devote to a large field of domestic legislation which had hitherto been neglected. For the reasons he had given, he had no objection to voting the increase.

* HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON (*Brisbane North*) held that there was no increase being proposed at all to Mr. Bernays. When Mr. Bernays had been appointed secretary to the Board of Waterworks, the Government had taken in hand not only the water supplies of the different towns in the colony, but also the roads and bridges, and it was unquestionably a Government appointment, and the duties of secretary to the Board of Waterworks had been added to the duties that he had to perform as Clerk of the Assembly when there were between only twenty-six members or less. Mr. Bernays had to answer questions put by members on both sides from moment to moment, and hour to hour, and if anyone looked through *Hansard* from the year 1860 up to the present time, they would wonder that Mr. Bernays had any hair on his head, or that he was living at all. It was too bad altogether for newchums in politics and in party warfare to talk about giving a miserable £200 a year to a man who had borne the burden and heat of the day of his important office for something like forty years. Why should hon. members cavil at the emoluments of an old servant being maintained to him? Where was the harm in it? Mr. Bernays was a gentleman who had reared a large family, and had been a wholesome, wise, and loyal citizen, and no one could assert that he had ever performed his duties in a perfunctory manner. Let them fly away from all consideration of parliamentary parties and deal with their Clerk as they would deal with their own private servants. It was no increase in emoluments, because Mr. Bernays's duties had been increased by the increase in the number of members from twenty-six originally to fifty odd, and then to seventy-two. During the whole of his career Mr. Bernays had performed his duties in a way that no one could cavil at.

Mr. KIDSTON quite agreed with the hon. member for North Brisbane that the way in which newchum members put themselves forward and

expressed their opinions, just as if they had as much right there as the old antediluvian members, was obnoxious. That was the more regrettable, because, when they studied the examples which those old antediluvian members set them, they should see that it was their duty to keep quiet, and let the Government do what they pleased. He had no quarrel with those hon. members who thought that £800 a year was not too large a salary to pay to the Clerk of the Assembly, although he disagreed with them and thought that £600 was an ample salary for the position; but, when he heard hon. members say that they were quite willing to vote for the £800 as a personal vote, although they were not prepared to vote the additional £200 as a permanent increase to the salary of the Clerk of the Assembly, he said that they had no business to vote public money for any such reasons. If £800 was a fair salary, let the Committee vote the £800; but, if £600 was a fair salary for the office, then no hon. member had a right to vote one penny more.

MR. JACKSON: Did you never give an increase to an old servant?

MR. KIDSTON: What an individual might do when he was dealing with his own money in regard to an old servant was one matter; what a representative might do with public money was quite another matter. He had always found that those gentlemen who were so very generous with the public funds were exceedingly

[8.30 p.m.] ingly careful with their own. They

had been told that Mr. Bernays resigned the office of secretary to the Board of Waterworks in deference to the wishes of the House. Was that true? Was there any gentleman who believed it? He did not say that that remark came from Mr. Bernays. He had not said so. It was his pretended friends who said so, and it was not true. For seven long years certain members had complained about that gentleman holding two positions, and there had never been the slightest indication that he had any intention of paying any respect to the wishes of the House, although seven years ago the Premier hinted that he might do so. Now, when he was looking forward to retiring, he thought it wise to get his official salary increased in anticipation of a pension being granted. He believed hon. gentlemen knew that that was so, and he had no objection to them saying so and justifying their vote. The Chief Secretary made a promise, which the member for Dalby was inclined to accept, that the payment of that £800 would not be looked upon as the permanent salary of the office.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I said it was not so intended.

MR. KIDSTON: The tendency was, when a salary was increased, to keep it up to that amount, and when a new Clerk was appointed—and he hoped that time was very far distant, because he had every respect for Mr. Bernays, and had the kindest personal feelings towards him—he wished to accentuate that, because Mr. Bernays had always treated him with kindness and deference since he came to the House—

MR. JACKSON: Actual deference?

MR. KIDSTON: He did not know that the Clerk had ever been more deferential to him than the hon. member for Kennedy would be to some person like the Chief Secretary, or anyone that he expected to get a high office from. At all events, what he was saying was that, when the time came to appoint a new Clerk, it would be found that he would be appointed at £600 a year, and in a few years afterwards the salary would be raised to £800. Now, he thought that was too much salary. The Chief Secretary said that that officer ought to have the same salary as an Under Secretary to a department. Why,

there was no comparison between the work of each man! The Clerk had not a title of the work or responsibility of an Under Secretary. If such a salary as £800 was granted, the Clerk of the House would be receiving more salary than any Minister of the Crown, with the exception of the Vice-President of the Council, and more salary than the Speaker.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: That is an argument for raising Ministers' salaries as they have done in New Zealand.

MR. GIVENS: And for raising members' salaries.

MR. KIDSTON: He had no hesitation in saying that if the Clerk of the House received £950 a year a Minister deserved a great deal more than £1,000.

MR. HIGGS: It all depends upon the Minister. You would not give those Ministers more.

MR. KIDSTON: The Clerk of the House occupied a permanent position, whereas the Minister might only occupy his office for a few months, and casual labour was always more highly paid than permanent labour. Of course it might be said that they were making a great deal out of a very little, that the extra expenditure would only be £100 this year and £200 in subsequent years, but he would point out that every year the taxpayers were come upon, and come upon, and come upon in a more shameless manner than in any other civilised portion of the world. The cost of government had grown during the last five or six years to a shameless extent and he said that members of the House who desired to do their duty to the people they represented should make an honest effort to put an end to that sort of thing. If the present method were pursued there was no prospect of economy.

* HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON was very glad to have heard the words "shameless governmental expenditure" coming from the hon. member. He was quite sure that that hon. member, if he did his duty, spent at least £300 a year more than his emoluments as a member.

MR. BROWNE: Where does he get it from?

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON did not know, but the hon. member had touched a keynote when he referred to shameless expenditure, to which he was sure every member of Parliament in Australia would respond. Everyone knew that it was impossible to hold the position of a member of Parliament and get a living out of it.

MR. BROWNE: I have done it ever since I have been here.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: What became of the hon. member's charity?

MR. BROWNE: I give all I can, and what I cannot afford I do not attempt to give.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON would like exceedingly to exchange situations with the hon. member. He was very glad to have an opportunity of saying that he heartily agreed with what the hon. member for Rockhampton said regarding the shameless tax upon members of the Legislative Assembly.

MR. JACKSON: He was referring to the cost of government.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: How could the gentleman whose salary they were discussing live in Brisbane on £600 a year and maintain all the attributes of civilisation and dispense charity on that sum?

MR. BOWMAN: How do thousands do it?

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: There were not thousands who gave to charities. How was all that to be done on £600 a year? Let the hon. member who made that interjection try to live on £50 a month in Brisbane, and maintain the position occupied by Mr. Bernays in a proper manner. The man who humped

his bluey might do a lot in the city on £300 a year, but where was he when the charities were about? Did he throw a penny into the Salvation Army blanket in the street? How much of their £300 a year was given to charity by members of the Legislative Assemblies throughout the whole of the Australian colonies, who improperly, he thought, regard the parliamentary allowance as a living? Let them publish their accounts annually.

Mr. KERR: You forget that you are not to let your left hand know what your right hand does.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He did not care very much for the observation of the last speaker, because no man knew the value of a sovereign better than he did. Although the hon. member was not a veterinary surgeon, he knew the value of the Queen's coin commonly known as "saxpence."

Mr. KERR: I come from the same country as you do.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He came from the Barcoo, and he might say that all the candidates who ever went for that constituency, except himself, talked what was commonly called "Barcoo rot."

Mr. GIVENS: The hon. member who had just sat down had offered as a justification for the increase in that salary the argument that Mr. Bernays had to disburse a large amount in charity. If they were going to make that gentleman the general charity disbursing officer for that House, let them say so by all means, but he did not accept that as a justification for the increase. No one denied that Mr. Bernays was an old and valued servant, or that he was held in the highest estimation on both sides of the House; but there were some hon. members, of whom he was one, who considered that he was amply paid at £600 per annum. Where did the generosity of the hon. member for North Brisbane come in when members on that side proposed that working men in the employ of the Government, some of whom were hardly able to bear the tools they had to wield and were working for 5s. 6d. a day, should get an increase in their wages? The hon. member always religiously voted against such a proposition. When members on that side advocated the minimum wage, hon. members opposite said it would drive men out of employment, as they would not be able to earn the minimum wage, and nobody would employ them; and yet they came down there now and talked in heroic strains about an increase to an old and valued servant. All that talk was pure unadulterated hypocrisy. Let them discuss the matter from a common-sense point of view. Everybody knew that Mr. Bernays had little or nothing to do for one-half the year, and hon. members should remember that they were dealing with the taxpayers' money. The large majority of the taxpayers of the colony had not £100 a year, and out of that they had to pay the salaries of the highly paid Civil servants. When they told hon. members opposite that the wages of manual workers were not high enough, they said they could get other men at existing rates. And no doubt if Mr. Bernays's position were vacated to-morrow, they could get 1,000 applicants for the position. He did not say that any one of them would be as good as Mr. Bernays; he did not believe they would, but that showed that it was a bad principle to apply. There was not the slightest doubt that many members would vote for the proposed increase in the salary of Mr. Bernays as a personal matter, and if that was so the increase was not justified. If the vote was passed, when Mr. Bernays came to retire the inevitable argument would be that, by setting that precedent, they had fixed the salary at £800 for the future. If after his

retirement it was proposed to vote Mr. Bernays a pension that would be the time to talk of rewarding him for long and faithful service, and it would be permissible then to allow the personal feelings of hon. members to influence the vote.

* Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): The position was that Mr. Bernays had for many years been in receipt of a salary of £800, but in deference to the expressed wish of many members of the House, the Government, he understood, had approached Mr. Bernays through the Speaker asking him to retire from the position he held as secretary to the Board of Waterworks, and confine himself to the duties of that Chamber, and it was for that purpose the Estimates had been framed so as to continue to him the full £800 a year which he had previously received. If the vote was not carried Mr. Bernays would still draw the £800 a year, £600 as Clerk of the Assembly, and £200 a year as secretary to the Waterworks Board. Hon. members on both sides had testified to the value of the services rendered to the House, and the hon. member for Charters Towers had interjected that he was the best man for the position on this continent. No one could deny that Mr. Bernays had been, and was still capable of earning £800 per annum, and he trusted he would never see the time when the Clerk of that Assembly would be drawing less, because the duties were of such a nature that their efficient performance was worth that. They could get men to fill the position for less, but the duties would not then be performed to the satisfaction of the House. He believed a man competent to perform the duties should get £800 a year.

Mr. JACKSON: Is there much work in the recess? Some members think there is not.

Mr. COWLEY: There was a great deal, but the performance of the duties of Clerk of the House required a man trained to those duties as well as a man of considerable natural ability. The £800 per annum was only what had been paid to Mr. Bernays in the past, and he was sure that fully 90 per cent. of the members of the Committee, recognising his ability and the value of his services, would not begrudge him that amount.

Mr. GLASSEY: That matter had come before the House in 1894, 1895, and 1896, and during those years the strong objection by members on his side of the Committee was not so much to the sum of money paid Mr. Bernays as to his holding the dual position. As the hon. member for Herbert had said, Mr. Bernays drew the £800 for the two positions, but it appeared now that the Government had opened negotiations with Mr. Bernays with a view to his surrendering the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks, and his getting the combined salary as Clerk of the House. He had never been a lover of high salaries being paid to persons who were not at all overworked, and who, in some instances, were overpaid for the services they performed, but after being thirteen years in the House, he did not think Mr. Bernays was overpaid at £800 at all. The point that weighed most with him was that he thought that previous debates on the subject had left the impression that the only objection was to Mr. Bernays holding the dual position, and that if he surrendered the position of secretary to the Board of Waterworks the House generally would not object to the Clerk of the House receiving £800 for the one position. That being so he was prepared to vote for the increase. Comparisons had been made between the Clerk of the House and the Under Secretaries. He had had a good deal to do with the various Under Secretaries, and notwithstanding his admiration for their capabilities, and

especially those of the Under Secretary to the Chief Secretary, between whom and the other Under Secretaries he made a wide distinction—few members would say that any of them could come into Mr. Bernays's chair and perform the duties of Clerk as that gentleman did. Mr. Bernays was an expert with a lifelong training, and there was no man in the colony who could perform his duties with the same ease, confidence, and ability. But could any hon. member successfully contend that Mr. Bernays could not go into any department of the State, and within the course of a few weeks perform the duties of an Under Secretary admirably and satisfactorily? He thought the dullest member of the Chamber

was able to draw the distinction [9 p.m.] between Mr. Bernays and the Under Secretaries. Mr. Bernays was a man of exceptional ability, splendidly educated, and cultured, and a man of exceptional courtesy and urbanity. He (Mr. Glassey) thought that that gentleman had rendered exceptional services to hon. members on both sides of the House.

Mr. JACKSON: Under Secretaries do not have to work up till 11 and 12 o'clock at night.

Mr. GLASSEY: If some of the Under Secretaries were worth £500, £700, and £750, he would say, without disparaging them, that Mr. Bernays was worth twice as much. He, in common with other members, had objected in years gone by to Mr. Bernays occupying the dual positions, but that objection having been removed, he would vote for the increase.

Mr. FOGARTY: This was simply a matter of the amount of money and the services rendered in proportion to it. He was of opinion that £600 a year was ample; and he would not have risen a second time if it had not been that he had forgotten something that he wanted to say. It had been said that Mr. Bernays would be consulted with a view to curtailing speeches, and probably he would advocate such a course. If giving Mr. Bernays an additional £200 would lead to the curtailing of speeches it would be money well spent. It was absolutely necessary that something should be done, and that there should be a moderate limit to speeches, so that they would be able to go on with the business of the country.

Mr. REID: The hon. member for Bundaberg had said that Mr. Bernays was worth as much as any two Under Secretaries, and had praised his ability and his culture. Now, *Hansard* was a bit of a tell-tale, and if they looked back to 1894 they would find that the hon. member was in a very economical mood, and was for swooping down on everything over £500. When Mr. Bernays's salary was moved at £600, the hon. member said that it was too much. To-night, in the hon. member's opinion, it was not enough. He (Mr. Reid) thought there was no comparison between the services rendered by Mr. Bernays to the Parliament and the country, and the services rendered by the Under Secretaries. Of course, Mr. Bernays had very long hours when the House was in session, but he had a very long holiday when it was in recess. The hon. member for North Brisbane had come there in a bit of a hurricane. Very seldom they saw him there, but when he did come, it was with a bit of a hurricane, right on the top of the Highlands with the wind blowing, the pipes sounding, and his plaid waving in the wind.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. REID: He was simply giving an illustration in connection with the arguments that had been used. The hon. member referred to men with blueys not giving to charities and hospitals. He could say that the majority of the hospitals

there were really kept going by bushmen, some of whom would even borrow a few shillings to give to these hospitals, or give £1 or £2 when they drew their cheques.

Mr. GLASSEY: If the hon. member for Enoggera should refer to *Hansard* for the following years he would find that he did not object to Mr. Bernays's salary, but rather to his holding a dual position.

* HON. A. MORGAN (*Warwick*): When he made his recommendation to the Minister, he thought it would commend itself to the members of the House. Notwithstanding all that had been said, he thought so still. Members on both sides were perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the Clerk had discharged his duties. Mr. Bernays had held his position as Clerk of the Assembly for forty years—since the foundation of representative government in the colony. In addition to his salary as Clerk of the Assembly, Mr. Bernays drew £200 as secretary to the Board of Waterworks; but the Brisbane Board of Waterworks was to all intents and purposes a Government institution. It had borrowed from the Treasury nearly three-quarters of a million of money. In his capacity as clerk of that board, Mr. Bernays was as much a Government officer as he was in his capacity as Clerk of the Assembly. Many hon. members had taken exception to Mr. Bernays holding these two positions, and that objection had been raised year after year on the vote for the salary of the Clerk of the Assembly. Yielding to the feeling expressed by hon. members, or to some other impulse equally worthy, Mr. Bernays had expressed his desire to terminate the present situation, to retire from the position of secretary to the Brisbane Board of Waterworks, to be relieved of the duties of that office; but he had asked at the same time that in being relieved of those duties, he should not be made to suffer in emolument, that he should be allowed to draw the salary of £800 in future for the lesser work that he had been drawing in the years past for the greater work. Having regard to Mr. Bernays's long service—his faithful and efficient service—to the Parliament of this country, it occurred to him to be a fair thing to relieve Mr. Bernays at his own wish of the duties of secretary to the Brisbane Board of Waterworks without making him suffer the loss of emolument to the extent of £200 which he was drawing from that quarter. Mr. Bernays was advancing in years, and his long and faithful service here seemed to him to be a factor in this matter which should commend itself to the Committee, and induce it to agree to the arrangement that was proposed. He thought it was a reasonable arrangement. All it meant was that Mr. Bernays would continue to draw £800 a year for a little less onerous duty in the future than he had been discharging in the past. He thought that the arrangement was one that the Committee, without doing any violence to its desire to economise, or to its duty to the public, might very well agree to sanction.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BOWMAN (*Warrego*) granted that the position of Clerk to the Assembly was an important one, but he thought it was well remunerated at the present salary. There were men in the public service who received salary for the work they did till they reached the age allowed—namely, sixty years; and then they could go to Dunwich if they had got no other home. He agreed with those members who were willing to pay men for the duties performed, but desired that the same generosity should permeate the whole of the public service. He wondered whether the same principle would be carried out later on, when the salaries of other gentlemen holding dual positions came to be discussed—

whether it would be proposed that they should be relieved of one duty and receive the same salary. When a man in any department of the public service had his labours reduced his wages were reduced accordingly; and he thought the rule should apply to the higher salaries as well as to the lower.

Mr. KERR: He would not have risen but for the remarks of the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Macdonald-Paterson, who gave as one of the reasons why the salary should be £800 per annum that Mr. Bernays gave such a large amount in charity. The hon. member also said that he (Mr. Kerr) knew the worth of a pound. That showed that his electors of the Barcoo sent down a man who would look after their interest. The hon. member said how little the men who humped bluey gave in charity; but he would not allow such reflections to be cast on those men. He knew that the men who humped bluey in the Western country gave as liberally to the hospitals and other charitable purposes as any class of people in the colony. As for himself, it was not for him to say what he gave, but those who knew him best knew that he gave all he possibly could. They had been told of the rich persons who entered the synagogue and cast of their abundance into the treasury; also about the widow who cast in her mite; and they were told by the Great Teacher that she gave more than them all. There were men in the West who many times borrowed the money before they earned it, to give towards charitable institutions in that part of the colony; and they gave a great deal more, according to the amount of their wages, than many receiving high salaries in Brisbane. As one of the reasons given for voting this £800 was the great amount given by Mr. Bernays to charitable institutions, it might be said that the Government were subscribing to charitable institutions through Mr. Bernays.

* Mr. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*) said there had been one person who had been overlooked in the discussion, and that was the unfortunate taxpayer. They ought to give some slight consideration to the pocket of that

[9.30 p.m.] individual. They knew that the colony was passing through a severe crisis. There was the drought in the West, all their industries were more or less languishing, numbers of men were out of employment, the revenue was decreasing, and the probability was that at the end of the financial year they would find themselves in a worse position than they had been in for some time. It was essential that they should go in for economy, and abandon the wanton extravagance which had characterised the administration of the departments during the past few years. They ought to remember that Queensland was one of the most heavily taxed colonies in Australasia, and they should also remember that when federation took place their revenue would probably be somewhat shortened. He had not heard a single argument to cause him to alter his opinion. The hon. member for Warwick had made as clear a statement of the position as it was possible for any hon. gentleman to make, but what did it amount to? He simply said that for two offices Mr. Bernays had been drawing £800 per annum, and, at the request of Parliament, he was abandoning one of those offices, but on condition that he still drew the £800. Ever since 1894 a number of members on that side had protested against Mr. Bernays holding two positions, and Sir Thomas McIlwraith, when Premier, had intimated clearly to Mr. Bernays that he ought to resign one of his positions, and he asked the hon. member for Enoggera to bring in a resolution dealing with the question, which he promised he would very likely support. That was a very clear intimation to Mr. Bernays that not only was

it the opinion of the Premier, but that it was the opinion of the Committee that it was against their wish that he should any longer occupy the two positions. The only reason he could find why Mr. Bernays did not at that time resign one of his positions was that he saw that if he did he would lose £200 a year, otherwise he would not have entailed additional labour upon himself for the same salary. But Mr. Bernays now apparently found a more facile Government. The Chief Secretary told them that it was at the request of the Government that Mr. Bernays was giving up his position as secretary to the Board of Waterworks. They were bound to accept the hon. gentleman's word, but his own impression, without being in possession of the information given by the hon. gentleman, was that Mr. Bernays felt the weight of years upon him, and desired to be relieved of the duties of one of his offices. Of course, if he still continued to draw his £800 for one position instead of for two, so much the better for Mr. Bernays, but that appeared to him a most unbusinesslike method of carrying on the affairs of the country. One hon. member on the other side said that it was no increase, but, while hitherto the people of Brisbane had paid him £200 a year, the people of the colony would now have to find the whole £800. There ought to be no confounding of the two positions. They were now dealing with the salary of the Clerk of the Assembly, who had previously been paid £600 a year. It was proposed to increase that salary to £800, and the only reason assigned was that he had previously been getting £200 for an office which he felt constrained to resign. That was not dealing with the country's cash as hon. members would deal with their own. At the present juncture of affairs, to demand an increased expenditure was neither more nor less than an outrage upon the taxpayers, and he hoped hon. members on that side of the Committee would oppose any attempt in that direction. They had heard about Mr. Bernays's good qualities, his capacity for the position, and the faithful manner in which he had discharged his duties. Not one of those assertions had been assailed by hon. members on that side. They were all conscious that Mr. Bernays had been a good servant, but up to the present he had been satisfied with £600 a year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; he has been getting £800 a year.

Mr. STEWART: As Clerk of the Assembly.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: And if you object to this, he will retain the two offices still.

Mr. STEWART: He certainly objected to men holding more than one office. Suppose the hon. gentleman had a coachman—whether white or black did not matter—and he paid him for his full time, and that coachman, after hours, occupied his time with other duties. The hon. gentleman heard of it, and he would probably say, "You cannot give me good service all day if you spend half your night in other work; you have got to choose between one job and the other." He would not be likely to offer that coachman another 10s. a week if he gave up his night work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You might not do it, but others might.

Mr. STEWART: He certainly would not. He did not profess to be a philanthropist, and he did not think the hon. gentleman would do it. He also wished to point out that men in other departments of the service were not allowed to hold two positions. If a lengthman's wife kept a boarder he was given the option of either dismissing the boarder or leaving the service. If a lengthman's wife kept a cow and sold a pint of milk to some other person he was given the option of retaining his 6s. 6d. a day or ceasing to sell milk.

The SECRETARY FOR PUBLIC LANDS: Why, there are a lot of them who have farms in my district.

Mr. STEWART: Yes, but if they entered into competition with the milk-seller or butter-maker they would very soon be pounced upon by the department. He did not see why they should make fish of one and flesh of another. If the rule was a good rule let it be observed by all. If it was a bad rule, then abolish it. He had been very much amused by the hon. member for Brisbane North, Mr. Macdonald-Paterson. That gentleman, when he favoured the House, was generally amusing, but he had been on that occasion more amusing than usual. He gave as a reason why Mr. Bernays should draw £800 a year that he had to contribute largely to charity, and keep up a certain style—keep carriages and that sort of thing. He did not see that they had anything to do with that. If public servants were to be paid on that principle it would be something entirely new. That was a principle upon which the affairs of no community could be conducted. They paid people for their services, and not because they contributed to charity, or withheld charity. They said such and such a position was worth so much money, and they paid it. If some people in Brisbane who had to live on £50 a year had heard the hon. member express surprise at a man being asked to live on £50 a month he thought they would wonder a little. They ought to apply business principles to the conduct of the affairs of the country, and at no time had it been more necessary than at the present.

* Mr. STEPHENSON (*Ipswich*) had no intention of detaining the Committee for any length of time, but did not like to record his vote on the question without explaining his attitude. Some hon. members speaking on that vote had said that £800 a year was by no means a large salary to pay for the duties performed. He was not quite sure that he could give his adhesion to that statement, although he was quite willing to admit that Mr. Bernays performed his duties admirably, and evidently to the entire satisfaction of members of both sides of the House, because they had all testified to that effect. But what he looked at was this: For some very considerable time past Mr. Bernays had unquestionably been receiving £800 a year, and the payment of that sum had been acquiesced in by Parliament. No serious exception had been taken to it, and therefore it seemed to him that it would be a most unjust thing, seeing that Mr. Bernays was to give up the position of the secretary to the Waterworks Board, if he were asked to suffer any pecuniary loss because of his willingness to comply with what had been the largely expressed wish of hon. members. If the position were vacant, and it was put to the vote whether they should grant £800 for the performance of the duties of Clerk to the Legislative Assembly, he did not consider that he would be justified in voting for it, but, taking all the circumstances into consideration, it would be an exceptionally mean thing on the part of the Committee to refuse to continue the payment of £800 a year to Mr. Bernays. A great deal had been said about the £150 a year house allowance, but he thought if members were given the option of living in the residence provided for the Clerk or taking £150 a year and providing their own residence, they would not hesitate long in taking the £150.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is a very nice house.

Mr. STEPHENSON: No doubt it was, but the £150 a year was nicer. But what had struck him about the debate was the solicitude for the unfortunate taxpayer and the poor working man which had been shown by some hon. members

on the other side. The hon. member for Rockhampton North was particularly pathetic on that point, and had shown conclusively, what everyone knew before—that the taxpayer would have to pay that extra sum, and that men receiving less than £100 a year would have to contribute towards the increase. All that was perfectly true. When he entered the House, in 1896, times were none too good, and lengthsmen and other railway officials, about whose remuneration some hon. members were so specially solicitous, had their wages reduced, and employees in the Education Department had also to suffer a serious reduction in their emoluments. But when a measure was brought forward at that time to raise the honorarium of hon. members from £150 to £300 a year, and he moved a reduction of that sum to £225, all the members connected with the party who professed to be so exceedingly solicitous about the wages paid to the working men would not vote for anything less than £300 per annum. Among those hon. members were the hon. member for North Rockhampton and the hon. member for Rockhampton, Mr. Kidston. Some hon. members opposite—notably the hon. member for Cairns and the hon. member for Warrego, who had given expression, that night, to similar views—could not, however, be charged with that inconsistency, because they were not in the House when the question of the increase in the salaries of members was discussed. That inconsistency in the attitude of hon. members struck him so forcibly that he could not help referring to it, more especially as those hon. members were always exceedingly anxious to show inconsistency on the part of other hon. members. With regard to the proposed increase to Mr. Bernays, he thought that, having regard to the fact that that gentleman had for years been receiving £800 per annum, partly as remuneration for the work done as Clerk of the Assembly and partly as secretary of the Board of Waterworks, it would be a most unjust and an absolutely indecent thing if the House were now to refuse to ratify what might be considered a compact between the House, or a considerable number of hon. members, and Mr. Bernays on that matter.

Mr. MAXWELL was rather surprised at the hon. member for Ipswich lecturing members on that side, seeing that the hon. member, besides getting his £300 a year, had received some nice little overcoat pickings, and a sum of £300 as a member of a Royal Commission.

Mr. STEPHENSON did not receive £300 for his services as a member of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Government Printing Office. Though he was chairman of that commission, and received a higher rate of remuneration than the other members of the commission, he only got £136, which was a long way short of £300. As to receiving any pickings, he might say that the Government had received full value for their money in any contract they had entered into with the Queensland Woollen Manufacturing Company, and that up to the present he personally had not benefited by any such contract to the extent of one farthing. It was most unworthy of the hon. member to make insinuations of that kind.

Mr. BRIDGES (*Nundah*) thought it was about time they came to a division on the question of Mr. Bernays's salary, or allowed the matter to go on the voices, as they had now discussed it for three or four hours. The House had on several occasions expressed the opinion that Mr. Bernays should not continue to hold the two positions of Clerk of the Assembly and secretary to the Board of Waterworks. At the same time he did not believe there were five hon. members who wished to see Mr. Bernays paid

less than he was receiving at the present time—namely, £800 per annum. It would have paid the country better to have given that increase to Mr. Bernays straight away than to have the time of the House wasted for a whole evening in its discussion. Hon. members were getting £1 a night, and if they had each contributed that £1, instead of spending the whole evening discussing the question, it would have been sufficient to pay the whole of the increase for nearly six months.

Mr. STEWART: The hon. member for Ipswich had taunted members on [10 p.m.] his side and himself especially, with being inconsistent in voting to increase their own salaries while they opposed increases to other servants of the State. When he first stood as a candidate for Parliament the question had been put to him point blank—whether he would vote for increasing the salaries of members from £150 to £300 if returned, and he had said distinctly that he would. So that in voting for it he had been merely carrying out the wishes of his constituents. He had also been asked if he would insist upon economy in the administration of the affairs of the country. He said he would do that also, and in taking the course he did that night he had been merely again carrying out the desires of his constituents. He failed, therefore, to see where the hon. gentleman's charge of inconsistency came in so far as he was concerned.

Question put and passed.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £7,430 be granted for the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly. He did not move the full amount stated in the Estimates because, as hon. members would see on reference to the vote, an amount of £150, which was the increased sum required under the heading of refreshment-rooms, making the vote £900 instead of £750, the amount voted last year, had in error been again placed in the vote below the £950, the total vote showed an increase from £6,632 to £7,430. The increases were: The junior messenger had been increased from £35 to £70. The vote for the reporting staff had been increased by £138, Mr. Willoughby being increased from £350 to £375, and Messrs. Morris, O'Carroll, Bernays, Hodgen, and Brennan, from £320 to £340, and the messengers for day and night from £39 to £52. The vote for the refreshment-rooms was increased by £150, the amount to which he had referred, and the vote for contingencies was increased by £500, "honorarium to the librarian for new catalogue." That was on the recommendation of the Library Committee for 1896, who, on the 7th October, carried a resolution to the effect that they recognised that the previous catalogue was a serviceable book of reference, and had given great satisfaction to hon. members generally, as a reliable guide to the library, and they agreed that if the additional catalogue proved equally useful they would recommend an honorarium of £500.

Mr. FISHER: That was in 1896.

Mr. COWLEY: Does not that die with the committee who recommended it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The recommendation was for the work done on the condition that the additional catalogue should be as useful as the previous one. He had also a letter on the subject addressed to the committee by Mr. O'Donovan, and setting forth the labour involved in the work.

Mr. BROWNE wished to say a few words on the proposed increase in the salaries of the reporting staff. He would say at once that he

was not going to cavil at those increases, but he thought it should be made perfectly clear what those men had to do; especially at the present juncture when they had it stated all over the colony that, owing to the long-winded speeches of members on his side, those men were being deprived of their rest. The pressmen of Brisbane must know what other work those gentlemen had to do, but people outside, seeing that large sum for the reporting staff, would think it was simply payment for reporting for *Hansard*. As hon. members knew, the arrangement by which the *Hansard* staff were paid the amount as permanent salary was explained by the footnote that their services were to be available to the Government during the parliamentary recess, and they all knew that their services were also available for other work during the time the House was in session as well. On account of the number of Royal Commissions sitting since Parliament had met, he knew from his own personal knowledge that some of the members of the staff had, with their work in the gallery at night, their attendance on commissions, and at the work of transcription, been working from fourteen to sixteen hours a day. It was not *Hansard* that was to blame for that, but their attendance on those Royal Commissions. Let any hon. member take up any of the reports of those commissions which have already been presented, and he would see that they would make in volume more than a year's *Hansard*. The reports of the commissions made very large volumes, and he for one would not like one of them to fall on him from any height. He had heard it remarked that there had been a sort of go-as-you-please challenge between the chairmen of two commissions. He had heard that one had asked 15,000 questions, and the other one reckoned that he would ask more than that or he would burst. He thought it should be understood by members of the House and the public that the *Hansard* staff were not confined to the work of reporting the debates, but had to do a tremendous amount of other work, such as reporting these commissions, while the House was sitting.

Mr. REID said that if Royal Commissions were appointed in the future the Premier should arrange that their work should be done when Parliament was not sitting. When Parliament was sitting the *Hansard* staff had enough to do without attending on Royal Commissions. He trusted that the Premier would arrange that when the House was sitting the *Hansard* staff would be left with their hands free for their gallery and select committee work.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*): He had heard a good deal about the hard work of the *Hansard* staff. He thought it was generally admitted that the *Hansard* staff had worked very hard during the last six or eight months, and in fact twice as hard as any men should have to work. They had been overworked. They had been working night and day constantly; they had been told as long as sixteen hours a day. They knew that the work of the shorthand reporters was very hard mental work, and he would like to see the Government grant an honorarium to the *Hansard* staff for the extra work that had been imposed on them. While they denounced sweating outside they should not encourage sweating in the *Hansard* staff; and he was inclined to think that for some time past the most sweated body of men in Brisbane had been the *Hansard* staff. He thought that some arrangement should be made in future that they should not have to report Royal Commissions when the House was sitting. There was another point he would like to mention, and that was with regard to members of the Press reporting staffs being unable to

obtain refreshments in the building. He suggested that arrangements should be made for them to procure refreshments in the visitors' room. He did not know whether the *Hansard* staff had that privilege, but if they had not it ought to be extended to them.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*) said the Treasurer promised to see into this matter during the last recess. He thought it would not be difficult for the Refreshment Room Committee to arrange that proper conveniences should be given to the Press reporters to obtain refreshments. The Chief Secretary had stated regarding the honorarium of the librarian that it was recommended in consequence of a resolution passed by the previous Library Committee. He thought that the hon. gentleman must know that that catalogue had far exceeded what was anticipated, and he held that it was an incomparable work. He would ask whether any recommendation had been made by the members of the present Library Committee regarding what was considered a fair honorarium for the work which had been done? He thought it would stand as a monument of credit to the colony, and would probably do more for the colony than all the immigration lecturers that they could get.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With regard to the *Hansard* staff he had no further information than had been placed in his hands. He thought all members of the *Hansard* staff were at liberty to get refreshments at the refreshment-room bar.

Mr. FISHER: No, that privilege is limited to two members of the *Hansard* staff.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He fully recognised the ability with which the members of the *Hansard* staff had performed their arduous duties; but they got an honorarium on Royal Commission work in addition to their ordinary salary.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Quite right.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Thought a bell might be put upstairs in the reporters' rooms, so that communication could be had with the refreshment-room. He agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for *Gympie* with regard to Mr. O'Donovan's work. He had been informed that the Speaker and President recommended Mr. O'Donovan an honorarium of £1,000. He would like to know if that was correct.

HON. A. MORGAN: He thought it was just as well to make the matter of obtaining refreshments by the official reporting staff and the newspaper reporters in the gallery clear to hon. members. The Refreshment Room Committee had ordered that the use of the refreshment-room should be confined to the Chief Shorthand Writer and his assistant, Mr. Willoughby. It used to be available to the whole of the *Hansard* staff; but that was no longer so. The members of the Press reporting staffs were not permitted to use the refreshment-room at all, and they could not get refreshments in the visitors' room unless they were accompanied by a member. Of course the matter was entirely in the hands of the House. That was the decision arrived at by the committee. If the House thought it desirable that the privilege should be extended to the whole of the members of the *Hansard* staff now was the opportunity for hon. members to express their opinions on the matter.

Mr. FISHER: How can we get our wishes given effect to?

HON. A. MORGAN: It was a very easy matter for hon. members to express their opinions on the matter. With regard to Press reporters getting refreshments, he thought an extra messenger should be appointed, and if the

House was prepared to vote the necessary funds, the difficulty would be overcome.

Mr. McDONNELL did not know when he spoke that the members of the *Hansard* staff got an honorarium for the work they did on Royal Commissions, but he was quite satisfied on that point now. He held that the same privileges that were allowed to the two principal members of the *Hansard* staff should be extended to the other members of that staff. When men in the gallery were doing harder work than many hon. members—especially during long sittings—it was only fair that they should be able to obtain refreshments in the Parliamentary Building. He hoped the matter would be properly considered by the Refreshment Room Committee.

Mr. LEAHY thought the whole matter should be left to be dealt with by the Refreshment Room Committee. Every hon. member must agree that the reporters should have some means of getting refreshments. There were reasons why the privileges of the refreshment room could not be granted to every person connected with the

House, and he thought the reporters did not mind as long as they had an opportunity of getting refreshments. He had referred on a previous occasion to the manner in which *Hansard* was compiled at present, and he wished to hear the Speaker's view on the question. There was no doubt that *Hansard* was largely read, but very often different statements were made by different hon. members regarding contentious clauses, and those clauses never appeared in *Hansard* at all. He thought hon. members were unanimous in the opinion that where a clause was contentious it should appear in *Hansard* along with the discussion, so that the whole thing might be understood by the public. Another matter he wished to mention was the difficulty of obtaining copies of Bills that had been introduced, but had lapsed. He thought it would be a good thing to include all such Bills in "Votes and Proceedings."

* HON. A. MORGAN: He thought it was on the occasion of the standing committees being appointed last year that the hon. member raised the question of including in *Hansard* the clauses of Bills under discussion in committee. There appeared to be very sound reasons for something being done to make the record more complete in that respect, and without assenting to the proposal to make it a general rule that all clauses should be inserted in *extenso* in the report, the President and himself gave instructions to the chief of the *Hansard* staff that in the committee stage of Bills either the clauses should be inserted in full, or a sufficiently full epitome of the clause inserted to make the record easily understood, not only by hon. members, but also by readers outside. That was the instruction, and if it had not been carried out to the satisfaction of hon. members he regretted it.

Mr. LEAHY: It has not been carried out at all.

HON. A. MORGAN: As the complaint had been made, he would make it his business to mention the matter to the chief of the staff, and give instructions that what seemed to him to be a very reasonable rule should be given effect to. With regard to the inclusion in "Votes and Proceedings" of Bills which failed to pass, he was very much inclined to think with the hon. member for Bulloo that they ought to be included. He did not think it would add much either to the bulk or the cost of "Votes and Proceedings."

Mr. MAXWELL: Some time ago a circular was sent round to hon. members intimating that they could not have more than two months' score hitched up. Personally he never hitched up a bottle of grog in his life, and he took it as an insult. Another matter was the purchase of vegetables for the

refreshment-room from a Chinaman. Considering the number of white people about Brisbane growing vegetables he did not see why they should be purchased from Chinamen.

Mr. J. HAMILTON repeated his question in regard to the statement that the Speaker and President had recommended an honorarium of £1,000 to the Parliamentary Librarian.

The PREMIER thought he could explain the matter. While the Chief Secretary was away in England a recommendation was made by the President and Speaker, on behalf of the Joint Library Committee, that an honorarium of £1,000 should be granted to Mr. O'Donovan. He admitted that the librarian had done a good deal of overtime, and was deserving of the thanks of Parliament for the work he had done, but the Cabinet considered the matter very carefully, and they thought £500 enough.

Mr. GIVENS said that even if the sum of £1,000 had been put on the Estimates as an honorarium to Mr. O'Donovan, he would cheerfully vote that amount. The catalogue was recognised as the most perfect in the world, and it was a credit to the colony that there was such a man employed here. He was certain that if the Government chose to issue a large edition of the catalogue, they could make more than the £1,000 out of it. Several very good offers had been made to him for a copy that was given to him.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Why didn't you take them?

Mr. GIVENS: He was not in the habit of selling a gift. He had given it to the school of arts in the town to which he belonged, and it was an eminently useful work of reference for any public library to have, because if anyone desired to study any particular subject, he had only to refer to the catalogue to find the best works on that subject. He would cheerfully vote the £500, as no money had ever been better or more honestly earned.

HON. E. B. FORREST (*Brisbane North*) quite agreed with the hon. member for Cairns. The catalogue was one of the most satisfactory works of the kind ever published. They all knew that there was an immense amount of labour involved in its compilation. He did not agree with the Premier with regard to the librarian drawing a good salary. No doubt £500 was a good salary, but he would like to know if it was understood that any portion of that salary was to count in connection with the preparation of the catalogue. The catalogue was a work entirely apart from the duties of the librarian. When the first catalogue was published, everyone was delighted with it, and hon. members had been only too pleased to vote Mr. O'Donovan an honorarium of £1,000, and there was no doubt that there was a great deal more work bestowed upon the production of the second. Well, if the first catalogue was worth £1,000, surely the second was worth at least as much. No reason had been given why the Government had disregarded the recommendation of the Library Committee, who ought to be able to judge of the value of the work better than anyone else. He understood they had been unanimous in their recommendation. If Mr. O'Donovan had at any time asked for an increase of salary, he would no doubt have got it, and it would doubtless have amounted to a great deal more by now than even an honorarium of £1,000. He had been seventeen years in the preparation of the catalogue, and supposing he had received an increase of £100 a year, that would have been a total of £1,700. Of course, they could not increase the amount on the Estimates, but he would like to hear an expression

from the Premier that he was not disinclined to put an additional sum of £500 on the Supplementary Estimates.

Mr. LEAHY had gone carefully through the catalogue, and he certainly agreed with those hon. members who had spoken of it as a work which was invaluable to members of Parliament. They had heard a great deal about the high qualifications of officers of the House, but there were very few—if there were any—men in Queensland who had the necessary reading and the necessary faculty for the compilation of the work which had been produced by Mr. O'Donovan. Mr. O'Donovan had undertaken some years ago to keep the catalogue up to date at the request of the Library Committee. There had been no express sum mentioned at the time, but if he had asked for the services of a clerk at £100 a year to give him clerical assistance, it would in all probability have been given him. Well, if he had got £100 a year for clerical assistance, that would have amounted, as the hon. member for Brisbane North had said, to £1,700, and now they wanted to put him off with £500—or about ten “bob” a week for the work he had done in compiling that marvellous catalogue. Having regard to the condition of the Treasury, he was not anxious, if it could be avoided, to part unnecessarily with any money, but that was no reason why they should not reward services which had been so ably and faithfully performed.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) thought the Government had acted in a very paltry manner in refusing to accept the recommendation of the Library Committee, and it would only be doing justice to Mr. O'Donovan to place another £500 on the Supplementary Estimates in recognition of the industry and research he had bestowed upon the catalogue. Competent librarians in all parts of the world spoke of the work as an ideal catalogue. It was constructed on a new scientific principle, and one which would be largely adopted in the course of time. In proposing to give £500 for the work of seventeen years the Government showed that they had no appreciation of talent. They might very well cut down expenditure in other directions in order to give the librarian another £500. He did not suppose it would represent more than £2 10s. a month for the time it had been in course of preparation. Anyone who looked at the catalogue could see that the labour must have been stupendous. In fact, it was worth £500 per annum to hon. members, as if they went into the library during the hurry of a debate they were able to hunt up the information they wanted by a minute's reference to the catalogue.

* Mr. COWLEY: As a former member of the Library Committee, he desired to say a few words on the question. He understood at the time from the librarian that the work of the catalogue was the work he was performing every day. When new books came they were at once entered; but it was practically, so far as he understood, the result of his every day's labour, and not of any special effort on his part at all. It was an essential part of a librarian's duty to compile a catalogue, and keep it as nearly as possible up-to-date. Some hon. members seemed to think that the librarian deliberately sat down, say, twelve months ago and compiled the catalogue, but, as a matter of fact, it was done from day to day.

Mr. LESINA: He got £1,000 for another catalogue not as good as this.

Mr. COWLEY: If a mistake was made years ago that was no reason for repeating it. In order to have some finality on the question the much better course would be to recognise

what were the duties of a librarian, and if compiling a catalogue was not included, then increase the salary on the distinct understanding that it was the librarian's duty to compile a catalogue. He had a very good assistant in the library and he could then devote most of his time to that work.

Mr. FISHER: The hon. member for Herbert had made an extraordinary statement for a man of his ability and general knowledge—that it was a librarian's duty to compile a catalogue. Surely the hon. member knew that there were catalogues and catalogues. There had been any number of supplementary catalogues issued by the librarian for ordinary purposes, but the hon. gentleman could not contend for a moment that the work of the new catalogue had been compiled in the same manner as the ordinary catalogues.

Mr. COWLEY: Yes.

Mr. FISHER: That contention was entirely wrong.

Mr. COWLEY: My informant was the librarian.

Mr. FISHER: What the librarian intended to convey was that he compiled the ordinary catalogue from day to day. If the work was not something out of the ordinary, how did it come about that men competent to judge declared that it was almost impossible to believe that the work was that of one man done in a lifetime. The contention of the hon. member was that if the salary was not enough it should be increased; but he (Mr. Fisher) contended that the compilation of such a catalogue was no part of the librarian's duty. It was not at all likely that such another catalogue as that which had just been issued could be compiled by the present librarian in his lifetime. He did not pretend to be a judge, but from the criticisms he had heard of people who were competent to judge, there was no doubt that the work was absolutely of a unique character, and highly creditable to the librarian.

Mr. HIGGS hoped the Premier would give an expression of opinion as to whether an extra amount should be paid to the librarian, and whether he would place it on the Supplementary Estimates. The work was such that the librarian need not have done if he had chosen to confine himself to the ordinary duties of a librarian. He had before him a list of criticisms on the work which were highly complimentary to Mr. O'Donovan. The parliamentary librarian of Canada wrote: "It stands pre-eminent. I am truly amazed at the result." He did not want to occupy the time of the Committee in reading numerous other highly complimentary references to the catalogue, but he sincerely hoped that the splendid work of Mr. O'Donovan would be recognised in a fitting manner.

Hon. A. MORGAN would not occupy the time of the Committee in giving the reasons which actuated the President and himself in making the recommendation which they did; but it was only because he knew that members were anxious to adjourn that he refrained from doing so. The President and himself thought the reasons ample and sufficient, and he regretted that the Government had not seen their way clear to give effect to the recommendation. Notwithstanding the decision which had been come to, he believed the reasons which were given fully justified the recommendation which had been made.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*) referring to the question of *Hansard*, he would draw attention to the fact that *Hansard* was largely distributed throughout the colony, and he thought members should have an opportunity of correcting their speeches which were published in *Hansard* issued at the end of the week. A slight mistake might alter the whole sense of what a member intended to say.

If it could be arranged that members could see their proofs, and have a chance of

[11 p.m.] correcting them before *Hansard* was published, the reports would be very much more valuable than they were at present. With regard to the library catalogue, he was simply amazed at the amount of work put into it, and at the value of the book, not only to the Parliament, but to every library where the English language was spoken. He believed that, if the volume were distributed over the civilised world and sold it would pay handsomely, and he trusted the Premier would reconsider the amount of the honorarium to be voted to Mr. O'Donovan.

Mr. KERR: The hon. member for Cook had said something about the waitresses in the refreshment-room being paid sweated wages, but no member of the Refreshment Room Committee had replied to his remarks. As to the honorarium to Mr. O'Donovan, that gentleman was paid a salary of £500 per annum, and he had done that work in the meantime, so that he would be very well treated if he got an honorarium of £500 in addition to his salary. There were men going about with the toes out of their boots and the backsides out of their trousers, and as those men had to pay their share of the taxes of the colony, hon. members should consider that fact before they voted to a public servant receiving £500 per annum an honorarium of £1,000.

Mr. J. HAMILTON wished to know what wages the caterer of the refreshment-room got, and if in addition to his wages he received all profits on meals supplied to hon. members and on drinks sold at the bar; also what wages were paid to the waitresses.

Hon. A. MORGAN: The term "sweat" had been used twice in the course of the discussion—once by the hon. member for Cook, and once by the hon. member for Barcoo. He did not understand what the term meant, and before he could undertake to answer the question in which it was used, he would like to have the word defined by either of the hon. members who used it. The wages paid to the servants in the refreshment-room were—cook, £2 10s. per week; head waitress, 15s. per week, in addition to which there was an allowance of 10s. per week for her keep; five waitresses, 12s. a week each; kitchen-maid, 13s. per week; scullery-maid, 12s. per week; laundress, 13s. per week; and a boy, 12s. per week.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Does the State or the caterer pay those wages?

Hon. A. MORGAN: The State paid those wages.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The question he asked was what wages did the caterer get?

Hon. A. MORGAN: If the hon. member desired to obtain any information from the Refreshment Room Committee, he should be glad if the hon. member would ask his questions all together, as it would save the time of the Committee, and he should be glad to give the fullest information.

Mr. J. HAMILTON would ask his questions in his own way, and did not want any dictation from the Speaker as to how he should ask them. He asked what wages were paid to the caterer, and if in addition to his wages he received all profits on meals supplied to hon. members and on drinks sold at the bar; and it was very impertinent for the hon. gentleman to dictate to him and say that the question was not put in a proper manner.

Mr. HIGGS did not think 12s. a week was a fair wage to pay to waitresses in the refreshment-room, especially as it was only paid while the House was sitting.

Mr. LESINA thought the Government should set an example to other employers by paying decent wages. The wages which had been mentioned would be recorded in *Hansard*, and would be quoted on the other side of the world as the wages paid to the very pick of the young ladies to be obtained in Brisbane, who had to work till 12 or 1 o'clock at night. Employers outside would naturally say, why should they pay 15s. a week when employees at Parliament House were only receiving 12s. a week? If they continued to pay such a rate of wages they would injure the credit of the colony, and injure their chance of getting immigrants to come to Queensland.

Mr. HARDACRE was astonished that only 12s. a week was paid to the waitresses in the refreshment-room, who worked very long hours, from morning till midnight, and after sometimes. They must necessarily incur considerable expense in keeping themselves clean and tidy. The present Speaker soon after his election set a very good example by raising the wages of some boys who had previously been underpaid, and he hoped now that the matter had been mentioned the hon. gentleman would undertake to do something for those girls, because, as he understood, the Speaker had control of everything connected with the House; the payment of those girls was practically fixed by him. He thought not less than £1 per week was a fair wage for the work they did.

* Mr. COWLEY would be glad if the Speaker could tell them the total number of applications for the catalogue, how many had been granted, and to whom. He wished, also, to know what had been the cost of renovating the furniture of the Chamber, including the carpet. He would like, also, to know the cost of the bathroom fitted up on the second floor of the Alice street wing, and whether it was for the use of the servants, and the cost of supplying a hot-water apparatus for the bathroom on the ground floor of that wing, and whether the bathroom so fitted was available to all members of the House. He wished, further, to know the total number of photographs of the Parliamentary Buildings, to whom they were supplied, and the cost?

* HON. A. MORGAN: He would answer as many of the questions as he could remember. With regard to the pictures of Parliament House, one had been supplied to each member of each House, and the cost was about 11s. 6d. each. He believed that one or two ex-members who desired to purchase a copy had been allowed to do so at the price paid to the contractor by the committee. The cost of renovating the Chamber, including the carpet, was about £250. Not less than thirty or forty applications had been made for the catalogues, some from as far distant as London, the latter applicants expressing their willingness to pay whatever might be charged for it. Those were supplied through the Agent-General. Each application had been dealt with on its merits; but, except to members and a few learned societies, the only gifts that had been made were to the committees of the Schools of Arts at Brisbane, Rockhampton, and Townsville. The bathroom on the ground floor of the Alice street wing had been supplied with hot water apparatus at a cost of about £8 or £9, was available to all members, and had been supplied at the request of members, and the key was kept on a nail in the fire-hose cabinet. The bathroom on the second floor was available for the *Hansard* and Press reporters, and those whose duties kept them on that floor. Perhaps it would be convenient in answer to the questions raised by the hon. member for Cook, about the refreshment-rooms, if he stated what the present arrangements were. The committee at their July meet-

ing, the first of the present financial year, came to certain resolutions, of which the following was the record in the minute-book:—

A letter was read from the caterer (Charles Baldwin) submitting schedule showing the cost of servants per week during session (£17), and recess (£12 13s.). The letter stated that the meals provided were not attended by a sufficient number of members to make the dining room remunerative, while the rates charged are lower than they were when the caterer was guaranteed payment for a certain number. A renewal of the guarantee was applied for, the caterer alleging that he had lost a considerable sum of money during the last four or five years. The caterer further asked, in the alternative, for a salary at the rate of £200 per annum. The committee, after deliberation, resolved—

1. That, from 1st July, 1900, the caterer be appointed manager, and be paid a salary at the rate of £200 per annum.

2. That, from the 1st July, 1900, the servants' wages be paid by the committee, on vouchers to be rendered monthly by the manager, according to the following scale:—

1 cook, per week, £2 10s.; 1 head waitress, per week, 15s.; 5 waitresses, at 12s. each per week, £3; 1 kitchen maid, per week, 13s.; 1 scullery maid, per week, 12s.; 1 laundress, per week, 13s.; keep for 10 persons at 10s. each, £5.

That wage list for a week was £13 3s. For one month that ran out to £52 12s., and estimating the average duration of the session at six months, to £315 12s. for the session. During the recess the numbers would be the same, except that the waitresses would be reduced from six to three. The weekly cost, therefore, for servants' wages and keep during the recess was £8 15s., or for a month of four weeks £35, and for six months £210, which added to the cost for the session made £525, and with the caterer's salary added the amount was £725. By the old arrangement they were paying £750 per annum. They now made the caterer, who was formerly a contractor, their manager. They paid him a salary of £200, and allowed him a certain staff of servants, whose wages were paid on vouchers rendered monthly. The staff of servants could not be increased nor the wages altered without the consent of the committee.

Mr. FISHER: It is now a State affair.

HON. A. MORGAN: Yes, and for reasons which appeared to be good and sufficient that change was made.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: I think that obtains in the other colonies.

HON. A. MORGAN: It was practically on the same basis as in the other colonies. The charges for meals were to remain as hitherto. The manager was allowed to supply meals to members at the scale of charges provided, and he was allowed to supply drink, and make what profit he could out of it. From the refreshmentables he (Mr. Morgan) thought there was little or no profit—probably there was a loss. As to what the profit might be from the bar, he was not in a position to say. The alternative to the existing system in that respect was for the committee and the House to take charge and purchase stores for the bar, but that was a change he did not think ought to be thought of for a moment. The caterer, he thought it would be admitted, discharged his duties well, and on the whole there was little or no cause for complaint as to the management of affairs at the other end of the establishment. If the wages of the waitresses were thought to be too low, all he could say was that they were the wages that hitherto had been paid, and paid without any complaint reaching the committee from those to whom those wages were paid. He thought if members would consider the situation in all its bearings, they would see that the arrangement the committee had made had brought about a better state of things in many

respects than prevailed before, while it was one that would not involve the public exchequer in larger expenditure than had been incurred in previous years.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The Speaker had just stated that the caterer did not make much profit. He thought that the worst off were the waitresses, who often had to stay up until 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning, and only got 12s. a week. The caterer did not do so badly, for he had £200 a year salary, and in addition to that had the profit on drinks and meals; he had to pay no license; he had a house rent-free, with fuel and gas; and the material used by the refreshment-room and bar were provided by the State. He wished to draw attention to that had been done lately. There could be no objection to the caterer not being compelled to supply meals on Sunday, but it was a ridiculous thing to close the library and to shut country members out of the smoking-room on that day. He was certain that many hon. members felt very strongly upon that; and he maintained that the Refreshment Room Committee had no right to exclude them.

Mr. BROWNE: As a member of the Refreshment Room Committee he had been satisfied from his first connection with that committee that a decided change was required. The committee seemed to have no control over the refreshment-room. They did not know what servants were employed, what they were paid, or anything else. The new arrangement which had been made he thought was far preferable, inasmuch as that it brought the refreshment-room and the servants employed under their control. As to the wages paid, if they were too low, the committee would be only too glad to increase them if the House would provide the money. With regard to the resolutions passed by the committee, he was not present at the meeting, but when he was informed by the Speaker and the President of what had been done he at once endorsed the action that had been taken. He did not think that [11:30 p.m.] the smoking-room should be open on Sunday, but he did not agree with the library being closed. He considered the refreshment-room should be closed on Sunday, if only for the sake of the girls employed as waitresses.

Mr. J. HAMILTON perfectly agreed that the refreshment-room should be closed on Sundays; but, although he was a non-smoker and almost a teetotaler himself, he considered it improper that a member should not be able to get a drink on a Sunday in the refreshment-room, or even sit in the smoking-room on that day. He thought the library should be opened on Sundays as well as the smoking-room.

Mr. FISHER asked who was responsible for the allotment of bedrooms in the Parliamentary Building?

Mr. BELL said he had only lately joined the Building Committee, and he had only attended one meeting of that body, when very few members were present. He had made inquiries as to the matter, and in pursuing his inquiries had come into conflict with the hon. member for Cook.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: How?

Mr. BELL: At this committee meeting he was informed that the bedrooms in the building were for the use of Ministers, the Speaker, and the Chairman of Committees. If any other member could use them there should be no distinction made. He regretted that he had trodden on the toes of any hon. member.

Mr. JACKSON: Do you object to the Government whip having a bedroom in the building?

Mr. BELL: Yes. He thought bedrooms should only be occupied by Ministers, the Speaker, the President, and the Chairman of Committees.

Mr. J. HAMILTON said he remembered the hon. member for Dalby asked him once if he could not have a bedroom in the building. He (Mr. Hamilton) had been specially requested by the then Premier, Mr. Dickson, to occupy a bedroom in the building, as he was required to be in constant communication with Ministers and members of his party. When the hon. member for Dalby asked for the appointment of a select committee he (Mr. Hamilton) thought it was in connection with the stables because the hon. member asked the chief groom on one occasion what would be the lowest sum per week he would charge for looking after his horse. The groom replied that 21s. was the regular charge. The hon. member said he could get this attendance for 14s. 6d. in town, and when the groom stood firm and refused to reduce his price, the hon. member asked him if he would not do it for 16s. 6d. and give his horse one feed a day and let the horse spend the remaining time in an adjoining paddock. The groom said he was not going to starve any horse. Then the hon. member said he was going to get a committee to see about it, and he (Mr. Hamilton) thought the committee was for the purpose of the hon. member getting horse-feed for the hon. member at low rates.

Mr. BELL said that when he spoke to the hon. member about the bedroom he might have used the words quoted by the hon. member, but the hon. member put a wrong interpretation on them, because when he said he would like one too, he said it with the meaning that every member of the Assembly was just as much entitled to a room as the hon. member for Cook. That was exactly what he meant. With regard to the other matter, he admitted that a man ran the risk of being held up to ridicule if he brought forward a small matter like this, but he was so constituted that if he felt that what he conscientiously considered to be an abuse was going on he would not shrink from bringing it forward. The small abuse was that there was a parliamentary groom with £104 a year, with an assistant groom with a free stable and a free house, and if you put up a horse for a term at per week, he charged 5s. or 6s. more than any livery stable in town. The fact was that the groom was in clover, and did not care whether he had any horses or not. If tenders were invited for the post, a competent man would readily be got to take the stable at half the present amount.

Mr. HAMILTON did not see why the country should be put to the expense of providing stables, and paying a groom and an assistant groom, in order that the hon. member might have his horse kept there at a lower rate than he would have to pay elsewhere.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. A. Rutledge, *Maranoa*) said he was glad to hear that Ministers were entitled to bedrooms. He would make inquiries, and see if he could get one.

Mr. COWLEY supposed that, as the caterer was now only manager, the committee would deal with any defaulters if there were any. He trusted there would be no necessity for sending out circulars as had been done lately.

HON. A. MORGAN: One of the reasons for making the change was that the manager might be made to obey the instructions of the committee. He had been instructed not to give more than a certain amount of credit, and he had been given to understand that if he did so it would be at his own risk.

Mr. FISHER: Why two months?

HON. A. MORGAN: The rule of reason guided the committee in coming to a decision.

Mr. COWLEY: If he only gives credit for two months, what then?

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Post them up.

HON. A. MORGAN: The committee were not likely to take the responsibility of posting members, and he hoped there would be no necessity. As to the other aspect of the question, he suggested that the hon. member for Herbert should address himself to the Attorney-General, as it involved questions of law.

The PREMIER said that about an hour and a-half had been wasted in talking over a lot of trifling things that hon. members could have found out for themselves by applying to the chairmen of the different committees. If any abuses were reported to the various committees, they would be corrected. With respect to the honorarium to the librarian, the Government had received recommendations from two committees on that subject, the one recommendation being for £500 and the other for £1,000. He agreed with some other members that it was a part of the librarian's duty to prepare a catalogue, otherwise what work was he paid for? He always went to Mr. Murray when he wanted any book in the library, as he understood that Mr. O'Donovan's time was taken up with the catalogue. It was a splendid work, but Mr. O'Donovan had always enjoyed a good salary, and even in the retrenchment of 1893 his salary had not been reduced, as it had been recognised that he was doing that work. If a majority of the members of the Committee expressed themselves in some way in favour of granting a further honorarium, the Government would consider it when preparing the next Estimates.

Mr. GIVENS asked if it were a fact that the hon. member for Balonne occupied a room which he used as an office in his capacity as manager for Cobb and Co.? If that was true, he did not see why a similar privilege should not be enjoyed by himself.

Mr. STORY (*Balonne*) had never written a letter on Cobb and Co.'s business in that House yet. When he had first come to the House he had looked round for a room to write in, and he went into a room which was used by Mr. Armstrong and Mr. Chataway, but he recognised that he had no more right to that room than any other hon. member. Members of the Labour party had come into the room to hold a meeting when he had been writing there, and he had at once left. He quite recognised that he had no more right to the room than any other hon. member. He might say that the hon. member for Warwick had also used the room before he became Speaker, and the hon. member for Herbert also made use of it. When the hon. member for Cairns said that he used that room as an office in which to transact Messrs. Cobb and Co.'s business, he made a statement that he knew was distinctly false.

Mr. BROWNE rose to a point of order. Was it parliamentary to say that a statement made by an hon. member was distinctly false?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's language is not parliamentary.

Mr. STORY withdrew the statement. If the hon. member had inquired, he could easily have ascertained that he had made no claim to the room. Messrs. Cobb and Co. had offices of their own at the foot of Queen street, and he had an office there.

HON. A. MORGAN said that the Parliamentary Buildings Committee had decided that nobody should be allowed the exclusive right to a room in the building, other than Ministers, the leader of the Opposition, and the officials of

the House, for whom rooms were specially set apart, without a written application, endorsed by the Premier for the time being, which had to be approved of by the committee. With reference to the statement of the hon. member for Cairns, as the hon. member for Balonne had stated, he had no more right to that room than any other hon. member. The rooms that were used for writing-rooms were common to all members. With the exception of the Ministers, the officials, the Government "whip," and the leader of the Opposition, no hon. member had an exclusive right to any room.

Mr. BELL was sorry the hon. member for Balonne had been associated with that matter, because there was no member of the House who showed less of the spirit of the dog-in-the-manger than he did. His humble advice to hon. members was to be very jealous of their privileges. He hoped whenever that vote came up they would show no scruple in asking questions upon it, and as long as he remained upon the Buildings Committee he should see that as few privileges as possible were granted in regard to the occupation of rooms.

Question put and passed.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that this House do now adjourn. The first business on Tuesday will be the resumption of the debate on the Port Norman, Normanton and Cloncurry Railway Bill.

Mr. BROWNE: When will you bring the Estimates on next week.

The PREMIER: I think next Friday will be a convenient time.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at two minutes past 12 o'clock.