

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

FRIDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER 1900

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

FRIDAY, 28 SEPTEMBER, 1900.

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

PETITION.

WESTBROOK HOMESTEAD AREA.

Mr. MACKINTOSH (*Cambooya*) presented a petition from residents on the Westbrook Homestead Area praying for the construction of a light line of railway through that area.

Petition read and received.

QUESTIONS.

CONTRAVENTION OF THE GAMBLING ACT.

Mr. FISHER (*Gympie*) asked the Premier—

1. Is it true that a number of copies of the *Dalby Record* newspaper were recently seized while going through the post, the reason for such seizure being that that newspaper contained an advertisement in contravention of the Suppression of Gambling Act?

2. Is it the intention of the Postmaster-General to see that proceedings be taken against the *Dalby Record*, or any other newspaper breaking the law, as intimated in the circular to newspapers issued by the Postal Department on 13th August?

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

1. It is true that a number of copies of the newspaper referred to were stopped in transmission through the post, because they contained advertisements which were considered to be in contravention of the Suppression of Gambling Act.

2. It is the intention of the Postmaster-General to see that any newspaper breaking the law is dealt with in accordance with the intimation contained in the circular to newspapers issued on the 13th of August.

Mr. LESINA: Hear, hear! The same promise was made last year, but nothing has been done since.

KHAKI UNIFORMS FOR THE POLICE.

Mr. REID (*Enoggera*) asked the Home Secretary—

1. Is it the intention of the Government to allow the members of the police in Brisbane to wear a khaki uniform during the summer months, as recommended by the late Police Commission, and worn by all the country police and sub-inspectors in Brisbane?

2. If not, why not?

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

1. No.

2. The public should be able to know a policeman at a glance, and in the multitude of khaki uniforms now worn by all sorts and conditions of men in the metropolis this would be most difficult. There would be the likelihood of mistaking police for Defence Force men, and *vice versa*, and many complications might arise that it would be wise to guard against. It is no hardship for strong men to wear blue serge of light texture in the summer months in Brisbane. Many civilians never wear duck or other similar material. No objection would be made to white trousers being worn if the men wished it.

QUESTION WITHOUT NOTICE.

AFFRAY AT INGHAM.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I would like to ask, without notice—if the Home Secretary has received any information about the affray at Ingham, about which I asked him previously. I can give him copies of the newspapers containing reports of the outrage.

The HOME SECRETARY replied: The hon. member is under a mistake. He did not ask me any question.

Mr. LESINA: The Premier, then.

The HOME SECRETARY: The only information I have is contained in the answer that I gave—no such affray took place.

Mr. LESINA: It is reported in the Northern papers—in a Ministerial organ.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have only the information that the police gave me.

Mr. FISHER: The police say the 16th—it might have occurred on the 15th or the 17th.

Mr. LESINA: It is only a quibble about the date.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member fixed his own date.

TOTALISATOR RESTRICTION ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Mr. JENKINSON: In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I would ask the indulgence of hon. members of this House, because we all know the difficulty there is for a private member to get his legislation through, owing to the limited time at his disposal. I shall therefore endeavour to make my points as brief and as clear as possible, and so that hon. members will probably grasp them readily. When I got permission to introduce this Bill, I had no idea that so much interest was taken in the matter, not only here, but throughout the country. I have received letters from many persons on this matter in all parts of the colony—most of them directed to me—stating that the writers are pleased that some effort is being made with regard to a restriction being placed on the permits that are granted for the use of the totalisator. I referred to this matter on the Financial Statement last year, and I then drew the attention of the Home Secretary to what I considered the flagrant misuse of the permits granted for the use of the totalisator. I hoped that the hon. gentleman would have seen his way clear to introduce an amendment in the Totalisator Restriction Act which would strike at the evil which exists, and so do away with the necessity of a private member moving in the matter. The amendments in the Bill which has just been distributed are three. The main amendment is in the Totalisator Restriction Bill. When that Bill was introduced, Mr. Unmack, who piloted it through the House, said—

Sir, I have one motive only, and that is a sincere and earnest desire to protect the youths of this colony from being corrupted by the many inducements to gamble which are held out to them in this city.

I maintain that that would be a legitimate thing to do, but the difficulty in the way of stopping this corruption is that proprietary clubs are growing. At first there was only one; now there are three within the precincts of Brisbane, and there is another one in the course of formation. Hon. members may have seen the correspondence which has appeared in one of the morning Brisbane papers, under the signature of Mr. R. Newton, the hon. treasurer of the Queensland Turf Club. Now, Mr. Newton appears to be under the impression that my desire is to interfere with legitimate horse-racing in this colony. That is not so.

Although I am not a frequenter of racecourses, I realise that a great number of people are anxious to witness horse-racing, and there is no use in attempting to legislate against them going to races. I recognise that we must take things as they are. But I wish to limit the amount of gambling that is going on through the means of these proprietary clubs, and also the amount of money that it throws into the pockets of these syndicates. If racing is carried on to improve the breed of horses and furthering sport, it is quite legitimate. If that is the desire of the Queensland Turf Club and Tattersall's, and the racing clubs in other towns—if that is their aim, and not for putting funds into the pockets of syndicates, I see no objection. I think Mr. Newton's letter was ably replied to by Mr. Peter Murphy, who is almost unknown to me. There is another point I would like to refer to. Mr. Newton says that since the introduction of what is termed the "Albion Park" or Breakfast Creek syndicate, racing has increased in the colony. It has increased as a business for the syndicate. It is lining their pockets. But it is not increasing sport, and that should be the legitimate object of every true lover of sport. We find that the syndicate gives a considerable amount in prizes for horses which have not won more than £25 or £50, or what are known by the fraternity as "Creek" horses—horses that have raced only at the Creek. But for weight-for-age racing, which I contend tends more to improve the breed of horses, this Creek syndicate only gives about half of what they give for horses racing short distances, such as five or six furlongs. There are many sportsmen here who know that such proceedings as now take place at Breakfast Creek were not known in the days of the honoured and respected father of the hon. member for Dalby, who, I understand, will have something to say on this Bill, and will probably adduce further reasons why this Bill should become law. Then we find that these city racing syndicates have broken up many of the country racing clubs. Hitherto it was the practice of country clubs to hold occasional meetings, give good prizes, and enable people to enjoy a good day's sport. But the syndicate holds 120 race meetings in the year, and it does not pay country clubs to get up races simply because they will clash with the meetings at Albion Park. We are also told that horse-owners are very much in favour of these Albion Park meetings; but I very much doubt this. I have it on good authority, that if a ballot were taken amongst horse-owners, they would vote against racing so many days in the year, as is customary now. It is simply because money can be made out of it that the races are held at the present time. Hon. members will see, on referring to section 2, that I purpose amending the principal Act so that it will provide that a permit shall not be granted to any club to use the totalisator for more than twelve days in any one year. The fact of my having chosen twelve days—which I thought was a liberal allowance, seeing that in South Australia it is restricted to eight days in the year—has been used as a peg on which to say that I am attempting to cripple the principal club of this colony. I am not wedded to that twelve; and if it is thought that legitimate racing is likely to be hampered by confining it to twelve days, I am willing to accept an amendment in committee so as to make it eighteen or twenty. I am only anxious that it should apply to those proprietary clubs which have permits to use the totalisator. I do not think it was intended when the Act was passed that they should come within the term of a racing club, and I will back up that opinion—

Mr. ANNEAR: Do they conduct their meetings properly?

Mr. JENKINSON: Hon. members who have visited the meetings will be able to tell you better than I can.

Mr. BELL: I am told they do. They have the reputation of being well conducted.

Mr. JENKINSON: Permits were refused to a syndicate to use the totalisator because an adverse report had been received from the then Commissioner of Police on the ground that it was not only the rendezvous of all the worst characters in Brisbane, but further, that it was run in the interests of a few people, and was therefore a purely proprietary business. He said from what he could ascertain it appeared that the so-called club was a mere name without a body, and he had good reason to believe that it was purely a commercial speculation, and not formed for the purpose of improving the breed of horses. He also threw out the suggestion to the then Home Secretary, Sir Horace Tozer, whether it would not be necessary to stipulate when a permit was issued that there should be a minimum of added money, which he put down as £200 per day, within fifty miles of Brisbane, and in the case of Rockhampton, Townsville, and Charters Towers respectively, and outside that radius, £100; and he made these pregnant remarks, which I maintain are just as applicable to-day as they were in 1894, when he sent in that report to his superior officer—

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Whose report is that?

Mr. JENKINSON: The report was signed by D. T. Seymour, then Commissioner of Police. He said these meetings were not conducive to the encouragement of legitimate racing, or to an improvement in the breeding of horses; and these remarks are just as applicable to-day as on the day that report was penned. If further confirmation were needed, we have it in a report submitted to the Home Secretary by Mr. Seymour's successor, the present Commissioner, on the 18th July, 1895, in which he says—

I do not consider the association or syndicate styled the "Brisbane Racing Club," a "racing club" or "association" formed for the purpose of promoting horse-racing within the meaning of the Totalisator Restriction Act of 1889, though I believe the five persons who have leased the grounds now called "Albion Park" for two years are endeavouring to form a club, which I regard in the light of a proprietary association, and although ostensibly formed for the management of horse-racing meetings, and to that extent coming within the language used in section 5 of the Totalisator Restriction Act is, undoubtedly, so far as the "executive of the club" are concerned, a purely speculative venture for the purpose of making money. . . . I attended the race meeting held at Albion Park on the 6th instant, and can say the proceedings were orderly and well conducted, but gambling was the order of the day.

Now, I maintain that these are very strong words to come from the officer in the Home Secretary's Department who has to report on the advisability of granting permits or not to such clubs as these. In spite of that we find that permits were granted, and they continue to be granted and used every week in the year. That is, fifty-two times a year this particular club races. But other meetings are held by other clubs; and I am told that in the aggregate there are race meetings held in and around Brisbane amounting to nearly 120 race days in the year. What is the result? Parliament in its wisdom some years ago thought it was necessary to take steps to suppress gambling. An institution that was carrying on business in this colony was closed with the object of preventing gambling, and particular stress was then laid upon preventing the youths of this colony from getting tainted with the gambling mania. We stopped it in one form, and it has come out in another. I am led to believe that you cannot go out to any of these courses now without seeing

a crowd of boys, youths, and also, I am sorry to say, women, who constantly congregate there for the purpose of speculating on horse-racing. That could not be done if the permits were not allowed. It has become a cankering sore with the community of this city; and, as one of the correspondents in the paper says, he doubts if it would be allowed anywhere outside Brisbane. We find young people go there and it is not like it is on Eagle Farm or any big clubs, where the totalisator tickets are £1 or 10s.; but they are reduced to 5s., and it is comparatively easy for a young fellow to speculate in the totalisator. We hardly know what would be the result; we can only be guided by past experience; and I maintain that if it was necessary in the interests of the morals of the community to suppress gambling by means of Tattersalls, it is equally necessary that gambling by means of totalisators which are allowed to be run two and a-half days a week—it is equally necessary that the issuing of these permits should be stopped.

Mr. DAWSON: Hasn't a man as much right to bet on a horse as you have to speculate on a mine?

Mr. JENKINSON: I am not talking about that. I say it is inadvisable in the interests of the morals of the colony that inducements should be offered to young people to bet; and we know that if we have two or three days'

[4 p.m.] racing a week there is a greater inducement to people to go out and spend their money than if meetings were held only once a month. The interjection of the hon. member for Charters Towers is quite pertinent, but I am sure the hon. member does not wish us to believe that he is of opinion that it is good for the morality of this community that extra inducements should be given to young people to waste their substance in riotous living, for that is what it means. We know where many of our young people have been landed through having those inducements held out to them.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: Do you wish to suppress it altogether?

Mr. JENKINSON: No. If the hon. member had followed my arguments he would have seen that such was not my intention.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: I am following your Bill.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Bill does not propose to suppress it altogether, and if it will interfere with legitimate racing, I have no objection to enlarge the number of days for which permits may be granted to a legitimate racing club.

Mr. LESINA: What about bookmakers?

Mr. JENKINSON: I am not concerned about bookmakers at all. I know nothing about them, and have never betted in my life. Clause 2 does not deal with bookmakers. Clause 3 provides that section 5 of the principal Act shall be amended, the principal amendment being that—

Such club or association shall consist of not less than twenty persons, and the total income thereof from all sources, including all net receipts derived from the working of the totalisator, shall, after payment of the reasonable expenses of the maintenance and management of such club or association and its property, be *bonâ fide* devoted towards prizes in connection with its horse-racing meetings.

I believe that when a racing club is first started it is purely in the interest of providing prizes for horse-racing meetings, but we find that a coach and four has practically been driven through the existing Act, hence my proposal to amend it. The amendment proposed in clause 4 is that females shall be practically prohibited from purchasing tickets on a totalisator. On further consideration of that matter, I am not inclined to press that amendment. I realise that there are

many things in which woman is on an equality with man, and, looking at this question from a broad standpoint, I cannot see why we should prohibit them from purchasing tickets. At all events, there would be no use in doing so, because if they were anxious to take a ticket on the totalisator, they would get their husbands, brothers, sweethearts, or friends to do it for them. There is one other matter I should like to refer to, though it is not dealt with in the Bill, and that is with reference to the tax that is collected on the totalisator. At the time the present Act was passed it was intended that 10 per cent. should cover all expenses, and that 10 per cent. only should be deducted from the amount placed on the totalisator. But instead of that we find that clubs using the totalisator deduct 10 per cent. for themselves, and 2½ per cent. for the Government, and that they also appropriate to themselves the fractions of shillings which would in some time amount to a considerable sum.

Mr. DAWSON: Most clubs give those to the hospitals.

Mr. JENKINSON: If they were devoted to charitable institutions, or disposed of in some way which would benefit the public, I should not object. I will quote one day's racing to show hon. members how the thing works out. On one day, at 5s. tickets, there went through the totalisator £1,072 10s.

Mr. DAWSON: Where was that?

Mr. JENKINSON: At Albion Park, Brisbane. The 12½ per cent. which was deducted came to £138, leaving £939 10s., which should have legitimately have been paid to investors. But we find that owing to fractions, which probably came to 9d., 10d., or 11d., only £905 was paid.

Mr. ANNEAR: When it comes to 9d. they give 1s.

Hon. E. B. FORREST: It is the other way about.

Mr. JENKINSON: I am dealing with facts. Only £905 was paid to legitimate investors, leaving £34 10s., which was appropriated by the syndicate, in addition to their 10s.

Mr. SMITH: All fractions should go to charitable institutions.

Mr. JENKINSON: I agree that they should go to charitable institutions. I have not provided for that in the Bill, but I am quite willing to move, or accept, an amendment to that effect, if the Bill goes as far as Committee. I do not think it was ever intended that the practices which are carried on at the present time should be allowed.

Mr. SMITH: Is there a provision prohibiting betting?

Mr. JENKINSON: The hon. member is a little bit facetious. Probably he is a member of this club, and that accounts for his interjection.

Mr. SMITH: How do you know?

Mr. ANNEAR: Be temperate in all things.

Mr. JENKINSON: Before I resume my seat I should like to state an argument in favour of the Bill, which may not appeal to the majority of hon. members as strongly as it does to myself, and that is that the Bill is desirable on purely moral grounds. The encouragement of racing by proprietary clubs takes many people out to the racing grounds. That is a waste of time which this community can ill afford. The time given to such amusement would probably be devoted to other purposes, were these terms not held out to the people. When a race meeting is held on a Wednesday, we notice that only about one-half the amount of money is invested on the totalisator that is invested when a meeting is held on a Saturday. What deduction can we legitimately draw from that fact? It is this, that

on a Saturday, which is the pay day of the people, there is greater encouragement for them to go and spend their weekly wages, and unfortunately, in many cases, that means that the wives and families of those men have to suffer. That argument appeals very strongly to me on moral grounds. As I said at the outset, I do not desire to make a long speech on this matter, because I realise that the time for private business is limited, and I should like, if possible, to get a division on the second reading of the Bill to-day. If we go into committee on the Bill I am willing to treat the matter fairly, and to accept amendments such as I have suggested to improve the measure, and make it more workable. I have no intention of cutting the ground from legitimate racing clubs. I do not desire to do that at all. There are plenty of people in the community who are anxious to witness the sport, and I am not going to be one who would place a bar in their way. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carnarvon*): It falls to my lot to follow the hon. member, not so much with a view of in any way opposing the Bill, but for the purpose of offering a few remarks which I think may be of value to the House, in enabling it to come to some decision as to whether it is desirable that the Bill, in its present form, should be passed or not. I say it falls to my lot, but I am in this difficult position: that although as Home Secretary it is my duty to issue permits to clubs for the use of the totalisator, under certain restrictions and safeguards, nevertheless when once a permit is issued everything connected with the administration of the Totalisator Tax Act of 1892 passes to another department. That is one matter which I think should be dealt with in a Bill which proposes to amend the law relating to totalisators.

Mr. JENKINSON: You have the power of revoking a permit if you like.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have the power of revoking it, but I have nothing further to do with it except that. That is the anomaly. It passes under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Stamps, oddly enough. There is therefore in connection with the totalisator a distinct want in the machinery provided by the existing law for the purpose. I am bound to say that I approach this question with a very great deal of doubt, because so much has been said both for and against the principles involved in the Bill, and it has been said, moreover, by people who are probably very much better able to give an opinion upon the subject than myself, or perhaps most members of this Chamber. I am told on the one hand that the existence of the proprietary clubs in Brisbane has had a tendency, as the hon. member has said, to discourage racing in the country districts, almost to the extinction of racing clubs in the various country towns. On the other hand, I am assured by gentlemen whose word I can take—I am satisfied they are perfectly conscientious in the matter, because they are disinterested—that such is not the case; and that, take it all round, in their opinion the tendency is rather to encourage racing in those districts where encouragement is given in the way of support by local residents. What is one to gather from these conflicting statements, either of which may or may not be true? We must only endeavour to do the best we can with the information at our command. I am bound to say that the arguments which have been adduced as showing that these proprietary clubs, or rather I should perhaps say, the existence of a system under which racing takes place weekly in the metropolis—

Mr. JENKINSON: Twice a week now.

The HOME SECRETARY: Has a tendency to discourage racing in the country districts. But one must realise that that possibly may not be true. We must also approach the question in this way: There are certain people who would desire to discourage racing altogether. I do not suppose any of these will refuse their support to the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Wide Bay. Anything that will have a tendency in that direction will meet with their approval, and from the hon. gentleman's remarks I should say that whether it would lead to the stopping of racing altogether or not—and I am sure it would not—it would to a certain extent discourage racing as a pastime.

Mr. JENKINSON: I think it would tend to purify the pastime.

The HOME SECRETARY: Of course, I am coming to that, and the question put by the hon. member for Maryborough was a very pertinent one in that respect. Surely everyone must recognise that it is useless to try to put a stop to horse-racing in Australia.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: It is also absolutely useless to attempt to stop betting in some shape or form.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: Whether on horse-racing or something else; if people cannot do it legally, they will do it illegally.

Mr. JENKINSON: Though you cannot stop it, you may limit it.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is as impossible to stop betting altogether, just as it is impossible to absolutely stop the drinking of alcoholic drinks.

Mr. LESINA: How does the syndicate manage to get hold of the Woolloongabba Sports Ground?

The HOME SECRETARY: I believe that where we have a sentiment such as that which exists, not only throughout Queensland, but throughout Australia, in favour of a sport such as this, it is advisable not to raise objections or protests—

Mr. JENKINSON: What do you mean by "a sport such as this"? Do you mean legitimate horse-racing?

The HOME SECRETARY: I am speaking of horse-racing generally. I cannot follow the distinction which the hon. gentleman draws between legitimate and illegitimate horse-racing.

Mr. JENKINSON: You understand what it is to run a horse "stiff" don't you? That is not legitimate horse-racing.

The HOME SECRETARY: That distinction is scarcely one which is pertinent to this Bill, because as I understand it it is quite possible to run horses "stiff" on the most respectable racecourses in the colony. It is not in that case a question of the management of the course, but of the individual proprietor of the horses, and you will find scoundrels running horses on either, what the hon. gentleman is pleased to call "legitimate" or illegitimate racecourses. While commending the object the hon. member has in view, and I think we all commend that, I think that the Bill, if passed as it stands, will not attain that object. Things will go on exactly as they are going on at this moment.

Mr. JENKINSON: Did you ever know a Bill pass exactly as it was introduced?

The HOME SECRETARY: I know what it is, as a private member, to introduce a Bill, and I have every sympathy with the hon. member. I am anxious to give the hon. member a hand so long as I think he is going in the right direction, and that the means he is taking for that end will attain the object. I am going to endeavour to show that the object the hon. member has will not be attained by this Bill.

Mr. JENKINSON: It can be improved in committee.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member asked just now if I ever knew a Bill which came out of Committee as it went into it? Yes, I have, but I do not think this Bill will. It may be improved, but there are so many things to be improved in it that I doubt very much whether the Bill can, under any circumstances, be made to deal with all of the requirements which are, so far as my information goes, generally recognised by the racing community as being desirable to be carried out. For instance, the hon. member proposes to limit the use of the totalisator upon any racecourse to twelve days in any one year.

Mr. KEOGH: He is quite right there.

The HOME SECRETARY: By any club, I should have said. I point out to the hon. member that all that it is necessary to do in order to have the totalisator used every Saturday during the year, on any legitimate course, is for four clubs to be formed, and they can run it on forty-eight Saturdays out of the fifty-two. That is a very simple way of evading the hon. member's provision in the Bill. There is something very much more drastic wanted than that, and when we come to much more drastic measures it is questionable whether you would not be creating greater evils than you propose to remedy. I am pointing out the difficulties which lie before anybody who attempts to grapple with this question.

Mr. JENKINSON: Particularly a private member.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is another point. Supposing, for the sake of argument, that twelve, or eighteen, or twenty-four days—as the Bill may emerge from committee—is the limit for the number of days in any one year on which to use the totalisator, it does not prevent racing going on on all the other Saturdays in the year on that course. And having excluded the totalisator you give the bookmaker a free hand. That is the difficulty, and that club will have to levy a tax on the bookmakers, which it would be worth their while to pay.

Mr. KEOGH: We do not want them.

The HOME SECRETARY: I know we do not, but I am showing how the exclusion of the totalisator will introduce a very much less desirable form of gambling.

Mr. JENKINSON: They would not attempt to race but for the profits they derive from the totalisator.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member quoted certain figures. He said £1,000 passed through the totalisator on a particular racecourse in one day. Does the hon. member suppose that that money would not have been invested under any circumstances, totalisator or not, provided there were bookmakers there to take the investments up? Of course it would. That money would have been invested, and bookmakers, plying their calling on the course, would do the business which is now done by the totalisator.

Mr. BELL: The totalisator offers facilities which the bookmaker does not.

The HOME SECRETARY: In my opinion the bookmaker offers facilities which the totalisator does not.

Mr. KEOGH: Do you approve of bookmakers?

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not. I am pointing out that the bookmaker is a less desirable evil than the totalisator.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Why not exclude him also?

The HOME SECRETARY: It will be generally admitted that the totalisator is the most legitimate form of betting, and also the fairest, which we know of now practised on a racecourse. What I would rather see would be, instead of an attempt to curtail the use of the

totalisator, and going back a step really in the direction from which we emerged many years ago when we legalised the totalisator in this colony with the very best results, would be to give greater facilities for the totalisator and the suppression of the bookmakers. Let me take the case of proprietary clubs. I have shown how it would be possible for a group of men in one club to constitute themselves four different clubs under different names, and could run the totalisator on forty-eight Saturdays during the year under the Bill as it stands.

Mr. JENKINSON: You might enlarge the number necessary to form a club.

The HOME SECRETARY: If you made it a hundred they would get the members. The hon. member's complaint, I understand, with regard to proprietary clubs, is that they pocket certain profits which ought to go, and would go, it is alleged, if the club were an ordinary racing club, in prizes, or in improvements to the course, and so forth.

Mr. JENKINSON: I maintain they should go there.

The HOME SECRETARY: And to a certain extent so do I, taking it as a general principle. But let us apply that to ordinary business. Take the case of a mutual insurance society. There it is now, *mutatis mutandis*, on the lines of an ordinary racing club. That is to say, there are mutual benefits all round so far as the membership is concerned, and presumably that would be regarded as *prima facie* as being the best form of investment for anyone who proposes to insure his life, as distinguished from a proprietary insurance company. But when you come to the actual business of every-day life you find that side by side with the mutual insurance companies are proprietary insurance companies, and they pay their dividends. Those dividends come out of the premiums. According to the contention of the hon. member they ought really to be divided amongst the whole of the members of the association. That is a fair analogy for the purpose for which I am going to apply it, and that is that if it may be argued that it is undesirable that certain profits should be taken by proprietors of racing clubs, because those profits ought to go elsewhere, it might be argued that it is undesirable that the profits of insurance companies should go into the pockets of the shareholders as distinguished from the policy-holders. But the whole thing is a question of business after all. If it becomes known—and it is pretty well known what those profits are—that the proprietors of such a club were taking as dividends more than a legitimate share of the contributions of the public towards that sport they would necessarily cease to do business. It is purely a question of business. If the horse-owners are of opinion that they get [4.30 p.m.] a fair thing in the shape of prizes, they will go there; but if, on the other hand, they are of opinion that the proprietors are not dealing fairly with them, they will go elsewhere.

Mr. JENKINSON: There is nowhere else to go.

The HOME SECRETARY: The racecourses all over the colony are open to them. They can go to these country clubs, which the hon. member says, and which many others say, have been more or less broken up.

Mr. JENKINSON: They have to be registered by the Queensland Turf Club, and the dominant factor in the Queensland Turf Club is a syndicate.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not want to criticise individuals.

Mr. JENKINSON: That is the whole cause of the trouble.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think we ought to introduce the personality of members of clubs into the question at all. I desire to discuss it on abstract lines and on general principles. But, the interjection having been made, I wish to point out that, so far as my information goes—and for it I rely upon the letters which have appeared in the Press—out of twelve members of the committee of the Queensland Turf Club, there are only three members who have anything to do with a proprietary club, and, as somebody very pertinently put it in the paper this morning, what are the other nine doing? They are elected annually by the members of the Queensland Turf Club, and what are they about if they are allowing these reprehensible practices to continue?

Mr. JENKINSON: These three members can gather all the proxies, and put in their own men.

Mr. DAWSON: Then they are awfully smart.

Mr. STEPHENS: Ask the racing men.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not know what the hon. member means when he refers to a racing man; whether he means a horse-owner or not—

Mr. STEPHENS: You ask the horse-owners whether the same crowd do not run both places. If you own a horse you will soon find out.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am thankful to say I do not own a horse. For years I was a steward and a member of the committee of the Queensland Turf Club, and, for reasons which seemed to me to be excellent at the time, I ceased to be a member. There are many other matters which ought to be dealt with in this Bill. For instance, the Bill does not deal with the question of licenses at all. Now, these licenses should be annual, and should be on a totally different footing altogether.

Mr. STEPHENS: Will you bring in a Bill?

The HOME SECRETARY: I should be very glad to do so, but I have something like fifteen Bills in print now, either on the business paper or ready to be put there, and if this is going to be a sixteenth or seventeenth I do not see much prospect of dealing with it.

Mr. JENKINSON: You ought to have a parliamentary under secretary, then.

Mr. BELL: Hear, hear! That is what is wanted.

The HOME SECRETARY: A parliamentary under secretary would not stop the constant flow of talk in this Chamber, and he could only represent a department in the other House to that in which the Minister sat. A great deal has been said about the propriety or otherwise of having an inspector of totalisators. I believe that there should be a Government inspector at almost every race meeting, and there should be a liability to inspection at every meeting, because—whether it be fact or not—we hear it openly stated that it is a constant practice to add another ticket on a particular horse on the totalisator in order to increase the fraction to very near a shilling, and so increase the profits.

Mr. JENKINSON: Thank you for pointing that out.

The HOME SECRETARY: I am very desirous of doing all that the hon. member desires to do—the only thing is that I doubt whether this Bill will attain what the hon. member wishes. I should be very sorry to say that such a thing is a practice—I do not know. Of course I know that it is not practised by respectable clubs, and it is probably not practised in regard to any of the clubs to which reference has been made to-day.

Mr. DAWSON: You have no proof of that, you know.

The HOME SECRETARY: I say I have no proof of it.

Mr. DAWSON: Well, it is only fair to say so.

The HOME SECRETARY: I like that, coming from a member of the Labour party. We are constantly having charges levelled at unfortunate individuals, by name, by hon. members on the other side of the House, under cover of the privilege of Parliament.

Mr. DAWSON: We are always "game" enough to name them.

The HOME SECRETARY: No—not always. Hon. members opposite make use of rumours here in the most unblushing way, and I have frequently protested against it myself. I merely said that this is stated, and the hon. member must know that it is stated.

Mr. DAWSON: I know it is stated, but you said you believed it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg the hon. member's pardon. I said I should be very sorry to believe it.

Mr. COWLEY: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member misrepresents me. My reason for mentioning it is, that whether it be true or not, it is not desirable that the business of the turf should be so conducted as to allow of such a suspicion existing in the minds of the public. Of course we have heard a great deal about the management of private clubs. I do not express an opinion one way or the other. I have never been on the Breakfast Creek course, or on any other course run by a proprietary club, and therefore I cannot speak from personal experience.

Mr. DAWSON: I can.

The HOME SECRETARY: But the question which was put by the hon. member for Maryborough does seem to be a very pertinent one, and it is this: Are the meetings conducted in a fair and proper way? I say that we ought not to assume that they are not so conducted without proof, and I am anxiously waiting for proof. I am told that it is forthcoming, if asked for, and so on, but the hon. member who has introduced this Bill has not ventured to state that malpractices with regard to turf club management and the running of horses have existed on these proprietary courses. He merely bases his arguments, so far as I have been able to follow him, on the fact that too much public money goes into the pockets of certain proprietors. I have endeavoured to show that that is purely a matter of business between them and the owners of horses, and that if the horse-owners are satisfied with the prizes that are offered—and I presume they are, otherwise they would not be there—then the public has really nothing to do with the matter. Of course the hon. member for South Brisbane says that the horse-owners as a body, protest against the existence of proprietary clubs and their methods, and perhaps he will be able to give us some information. I am desirous of obtaining information of that sort, and, if it can be shown that abuses exist in the management of proprietary clubs, other than those which were mentioned by the hon. member for Wide Bay, I shall be only too glad to see them suppressed altogether. I want to point out the fallacy into which the hon. member was led when he drew a comparison between the amount of the takings on Wednesdays and on Saturdays. He assumed from that that the hard-earned wages of the workers of the community were invested on the Saturday, and therefore it was not desirable that these meetings should take place on the Saturday.

Mr. JENKINSON: No, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it was the frequent racing I referred to. It is practically every Saturday.

The HOME SECRETARY: But this repeats the real question—whether there is not more money invested simply because there are

more people present on Saturdays. The hon. member's argument falls to the ground unless he is able to show that there is more money invested on the Saturday by the same number of people as are present on the Wednesday. The fact is that Saturday is a half-holiday, and probably twice as many people are able to attend races on the Saturday as are able to attend on the Wednesday, and consequently more money is invested. A Bill dealing with this question should provide for some system of inspection of totalisators. Of course, I am aware that the Commissioner for Stamps has reported that an inspector is not necessary, but—quite irrespective of who might be appointed inspector, or whether the work should be done by members of the police force or by other public officials—I certainly think it would be a step in the right direction to have a check on the working of totalisators. There are also a number of other matters which have been suggested to me from time to time by people who are well up in these matters, which it is desirable should be dealt with in any legislation which takes place tending to the regulation of totalisators. These, however, I do not think I need trouble the House with. I have already occupied more time than I intended to do, but perhaps I have been drawn to some extent by interjections. Of course, I shall support the second reading, but I think the hon. member will find that there are so many questions which will arise in committee that I really do not think he will be able to deal with them all.

Mr. JENKINSON: It will give an opportunity for those who desire to bring them forward to be dealt with afterwards.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. Speaking for myself, I shall certainly support it, because I think it has a tendency in the right direction. The tendency is an excellent one.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The HOME SECRETARY: And in anything which I have said, the hon. member must not imagine that there is any want of sympathy. I only desired to put before the hon. member, so far as possible, some of the difficulties which lie in the direction of legislation upon the subject, unless it is comprehensive.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*): I may say at the very outset of my remarks, which will be very brief, that so far as the scope of this measure is concerned, I am sure it must be commended. I think the Bill might go considerably further than it does, but I have no doubt that if the hon. member gets it into committee we may be able to introduce the other suggestions that have been made, and also the suggestions which I shall make myself, before we conclude this discussion this afternoon. The question has been asked why is there any need of legislation of this kind? My impression has been that there has been a necessity for it ever since the wretchedly drafted Totalisator Act came into existence. It was evidently drafted in a very hurried manner, and without proper attention to the sport or its requirements, and in consequence, certain obvious abuses have crept in, which it is the business of this Parliament, and I think it is the duty of the Government, to step in and rectify. Now, as I said before, the question has been asked where is the need for legislation of this kind? Mr. Peter Murphy, at the close of his letter in yesterday's paper, states very succinctly the need that there is for legislation of this kind. He puts it in this way—

1. The abolition as members of the executive of the Queensland Turf Club of all persons who are concerned in private racing enterprises such as he is.

2. The government of the Queensland Turf Club by men who will not permit the true interests of the sport to be subservient to private gain and profit.

3. The extermination of proprietary clubs, such as Breakfast Creek, or their careful regulation within limits, so that their operations will not (as at present) unduly press upon the true interests of the sport; and

4. The complete diversion of all profits made by the totalisator from the private pockets of individuals to the source to which it was always properly intended—that is, to the revenues of genuine racing clubs formed for the purpose of carrying on the sport of racing and improving the breed of horses.

Now, take the first of these—the abolition, as members of the executive of the Queensland Turf Club, of all persons who are interested in private racing enterprise. What is this Albion Park syndicate—this Breakfast Creek syndicate, that we have heard so much about? It consists of six persons—namely, A. Hyde, Geo. Byrnes, W. Richardson, R. Newton, D. T. Seymour, and J. B. Arthur. Messrs. Byrnes, Arthur, and Seymour are members of the Queensland Turf Club committee. Mr. Hyde is the paid secretary of the Queensland Turf Club, and Mr. W. Richardson is the paid handicapper of the Queensland Turf Club. Another objection is that this company races at least fifty times a year, and now they have possession of the Woolloongabba Ground, and an unregistered club is racing there too.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; they have not.

Mr. LESINA: I say that the persons interested in those meetings are, more or less, remotely connected with this Breakfast Creek syndicate, and are persons who use a good deal of influence.

The HOME SECRETARY: No; they have no connection at all.

Mr. LESINA: Well, I have heard the statement made.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is run in opposition.

Mr. LESINA: It may be in opposition; but we will let that point go for the moment. As I was saying, this syndicate races fifty times a year to the detriment of *bona fide* constituted racing clubs, inasmuch as from the peculiar formation of the syndicate, they exercise and influence the Queensland Turf Club to grant them every available Saturday and holiday. They are practically carrying on in contravention of the Totalisator Restriction Act, whose provisions it is unnecessary for me to refer to; but they imply that no private persons can obtain a totalisator permit.

The HOME SECRETARY: Where do you find that—where is that?

Mr. LESINA: That is my impression from glancing at the Act.

The HOME SECRETARY: No.

Mr. LESINA: Well, it is not in accordance with the spirit of the Act. When that Act was drafted, the members of this Chamber did not contemplate that a proprietary club would be allowed to exploit racing for its own peculiar purposes.

The HOME SECRETARY: There is nothing in the Act against it.

Mr. LESINA: That is the unfortunate part of it, and that is why I say the Act has been badly drafted, if it does not make provision to guard against the abuses which have crept into racing, one of the chiefest of which is, that a syndicate of half-a-dozen persons may exploit racing in their own interests, and I want to prove that. I can prove that from the figures which I have in my possession of the amount of money these persons make out of running these Breakfast Creek racing meetings. Comparing the number which they hold every year with the meetings held by genuine clubs like the Queensland Turf Club, we find that the Queensland Turf Club only hold about eighteen meetings at

Eagle Farm, to fifty held by the proprietary syndicate at Breakfast Creek. There are no charges specified in the Totalisator Act for using the totalisator, but it could not have been in the minds of the legislators who drafted the Act that such an exorbitant charge as 12½ per cent. would be levied upon the public—and this syndicate levy upon the public sometimes as high as 17½ per cent., as I shall show. For instance, if the dividend is £1 9s. 11d. the 11d. is retained by the syndicate in addition to the 12½ per cent. The way that will work out is this: I will take one day's racing, and take each event, the name of the race, the value of the race, the amount on the machine, the amount paid out, and the commissions and the fractions, and you will see that sometimes it works out as high as 17½ per cent. Take the first event—the Trial Handicap—value of the race, £15; amount on machine, £125 15s.; amount paid out, £103 4s.; and charges, commissions, and fractions, £22 11s. That is 17½ per cent. Then the Flying Handicap—value of the race, £20; amount on machine, £164; amount paid out, £141 18s.; and charges, commissions, and fractions, £22 2s. That is 13½ per cent. Then the Handicap Trot—value of race, £15; amount on machine, £52 15s.; amount paid out, £46; and commissions, charges, and fractions, £6 15s. That is 15 per cent. Then the Welter Handicap—value of the race, £20; amount on machine, £191 5s.; amount paid out, £161 14s.; and charges, commissions, and fractions, £29 11s. That is 12½ per cent. The Novice Handicap—value of race, £15; amount on machine, £210; amount paid out, £182 9s.; and charges, commissions, and fractions, £27 11s. That is 14½ per cent. Then we have the Park Handicap, the value of which is £35, the amount on the machine £221, amount paid out £191 10s., commission £32 10s., or a charge of 14½ per cent. The total prize money is £120 for six races, the total amount invested on the machine is £964 15s., the amount paid to the public is £823 15s., and the amount of profit derived by the syndicate £148. My contention is this: It will be seen how very small the amount of the prize money really is. For the biggest race the prize is only £35, the first horse receiving £30 and the amount charged to investors being 14½ per cent. Surely that is a very high charge indeed—altogether too high a charge I think to impose upon such a sport as racing. At distant intervals they of course increase the prizes. For instance, on days on which the Queensland Turf Club is holding a meeting they offer higher prizes as an inducement to the betting public to patronise their course. I think the law should be amended in such a way as to place some restriction upon the charges made by these clubs in the shape of commission, while all fractional parts should be handed over to the State and distributed amongst the charities of the colony. In Charters Towers, as many hon. members know, the racing club hand over all fractions to the hospital, and to that extent they of course assist in doing a great deal of good and to some extent racing under such conditions becomes a national good instead of a national evil. One of the evils connected with the dual representation on two racing bodies is this, and to a large extent it operates very unfavourably on the two rival bodies, that the syndicate which runs this club comprises within its numbers some very heavy bettors. Certain members of the Creek syndicate are well known as heavy bettors, and when you have a syndicate in charge of a racing club, and conducting all operations in connection therewith, it is quite evident to any person who thinks about it at all, that they must in a great measure run races of what is known as the "cut and dried" order. They use all sorts of influences which tend to make the sport dishonest.

Mr. McDONALD: Run "stiff."

Mr. BELL: What evidence have you of that?

Mr. LESINA: Because certain newspapers from time to time have contained articles commenting in a very unfavourable manner on some of the influences which are brought to bear. It is not a new thing by any means. People who have taken any interest in sport have been familiar with that kind of thing for many years, and so much of an evil has it become that the *Daily Telegraph* thought it necessary on one occasion to write a leading article on the subject, pointing out what it considered were infringements of the etiquette of racing law. Not to give to a member of the syndicate information as to the capabilities of horses, is to become a marked man. I have heard men speak of this as a fact, and it extends not only to the owners, but to the jockeys also. If they give the information well and good, but if they do not they immediately become marked men, and have to suffer in some way or other? There are papers published in Brisbane that have frequently made similar statements to that, and no action has been taken against them by the syndicate. If those statements are libellous, you would think these gentlemen would take action in order to vindicate their characters in the eyes of the public; but they have preferred to remain silent under the imputations which have been cast upon them. Under such circumstances the running of horses honestly and squarely becomes practically impossible, and more often than not leads to the disqualification of both man and horse. In conclusion, I have some few suggestions to make which I believe would be a great improvement if embodied in this Bill, and would tend to vastly improve the condition of things as they exist at present in reference to horse-racing in Queensland. In the first place I think that all proprietary course totalisator permits should be withdrawn, and a demand should be made that clubs using the totalisator should have a membership list of 100 members. 2. That the totalisator charges shall be 10 per cent. 3. That all fractions should be handed to charitable institutions as apporportioned by the Government officials. 4. That the whole of the profits resulting from holding race meetings shall be spent in improvements to the course on which the races take place, and increasing the prize moneys. 5. That no race meeting shall take place in Brisbane on the same date as any other country racing club meeting within a radius of 101 miles of Brisbane.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That could not be done.

Mr. LESINA: Yes. By that means you would encourage racing in the country districts, and you would give the country clubs a chance of issuing a programme which would attract the best racehorses from the metropolis whilst offering opportunities to owners to dispose of their high-class stock without having to send them to Brisbane for sale. I think if the Bill is drawn on those lines a great improvement would result. I know the suggestion that no race meeting shall take place in Brisbane on the same date as any other country racing club within a 101 miles radius will not meet with the approval of many of the racing men in Brisbane, but I think there are really few people who love racing for the sport which it affords who would not be willing to travel 101 miles for the purpose of attending a race meeting. With the measure generally I am in agreement, and I will vote for the second reading. I think in committee we may be able to greatly improve it. We will be able to some extent to purify horse-racing, we will be able to make it contribute something towards the charities of the colony, and, generally speaking, we will be able with such amendments as have been sug-

gested to make it more attractive to the people and have it conducted in a better manner than has hitherto been the case in Queensland.

Mr. COWLEY (*Herbert*): In speaking on this motion I wish to make myself quite clear to the hon. member for Wide Bay.

[5 p.m.] I am under the impression that this Bill has been introduced for the special purpose of abolishing proprietary racing clubs. I am at one with the hon. member on that, and therefore I am prepared to vote for the second reading of this Bill; but I am not in favour of some of the other provisions embodied in it. For instance, if there is a genuine *bona fide* club for the legitimate object of sport, I am prepared to limit the number of days on which they shall hold race meetings. The Home Secretary dealt with the matter pretty fully; but he omitted to draw attention to one serious defect in the Bill. Clause 4 says—

In Part IV. of the Suppression of Gambling Act of 1895, after the word "infant," wherever that word occurs in the several enactments thereof, the words "or female" are inserted, and the said enactments shall be read and construed accordingly.

The HOME SECRETARY: I forgot that.

Mr. COWLEY: I wish the hon. gentleman had dealt with it, because then it would be unnecessary for me to do so.

Mr. SMITH: The hon. member for Wide Bay said he will not go on with that.

Mr. COWLEY: Oh! If the hon. member has seen the error of his ways in that respect, I shall not detain the House any further. It is bordering on the absurd to provide that a man cannot bet a pair of gloves or take a ticket on the totalisator for a lady friend of his. But if the hon. member does not press the clause, I shall say no more.

Mr. KENT (*Burnett*): I have not the slightest objection to assist any legislation that will reform and improve horse-racing, and I am quite willing to support an amendment of the Totalisator Act. But this Bill, to my mind, has two objects: one, to deal a blow on racing generally, and another to knock out "the Creek."

Mr. JENKINSON: I don't know how you can say that.

Mr. KENT: Last year the Queensland Turf Club gave away £1,200 for racing for eighteen days, and £80,000 was put through the totalisator. "Albion Park" has given £6,000, and £40,000 has been put through the "tote" there. The Queensland Turf Club property is vested in trustees, but Albion Park is the property of the Royal Bank, and is leased by a syndicate. Now, when the bank took the race-course over it was one of the greatest dens of iniquity in Queensland in connection with pony racing. Nearly all the running was "cronk"; it was a bar to honest racing. This syndicate took it over to try and alter that state of things, and because it has turned out a good speck we hear all the strong opposition to it. As hon. members know, this land is useless for any other purposes but racing, being below flood mark, and if this Bill is passed it will simply go back to what it was before.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Royal Bank will get a better rent for it than they do now.

Mr. KENT: I think the "Tote" Bill may be amended with regard to fractions. I believe the present proprietary clubs, if they have a dividend of 3s. 9d. or 3s. 10d., that they make it even money. It has been said that the "Creek" racing is detrimental to racing in Queensland. I think it has quite the opposite effect. Take the country clubs—they only hold race meetings two or three times a year. Would it pay men to train their horses for two or three country meetings? I should say not. But as there is racing at Albion Park every Saturday, country

horse-owners can run their horses there and get home again—that is, where they live within a reasonable distance of Brisbane. Therefore, this club has been a tremendous assistance to country clubs. In my own electorate, for the last two years, I know of a number of horses which have been kept in training because the owners have known that they had something in front of them, but they would not keep their horses in training if it were not for the Creek racing. One of the best horses in Brisbane, which brought £100, would probably never have been heard of if he had not been proved at the Creek. I think I know something about country racing, and we now see ten or fifteen or twenty hacks starting in country races principally for the purpose of trying them for races at the Creek. Before there was racing at the Creek you would only find four or five horses starting in a country race. This is the result of the Albion Park racing. Then as to the cost of racing horses. In most country places there is a qualification fee; then there is 5 per cent. nomination, and another 5 per cent. acceptance; but at the Creek you can run horses for any prize on payment of 15s.

Mr. JENKINSON: No one has raised that point. Mr. KENT: With regard to the question of prizes, there is no doubt that the bigger the prizes the more people can afford to improve horses. At the present there are something like 300 horses in training, whereas seven years ago you could not find anything approaching 100 horses in training in Brisbane. And what does that increase in the number mean to the farmer? The hon. member for Rosewood is in favour of this Bill, but I think when he goes back to that district he will find that he is making a mistake.

Mr. KEOGH: Are you a member of the club? Mr. KENT: I am not a member of that club. As far as the farmers are concerned, I think it certainly means £10,000 a year to them on account of the corn those horses eat; and that is a considerable item. If I thought the Bill would have the desired effect, I would support it.

Mr. JENKINSON: Amend it in committee. Mr. KENT: It is so absolutely rotten that it is impossible to amend it. It is said that the Creek does not encourage sport, but the fact is that whereas the prizes in 1896 amounted to £6,345, the prizes in this year's programme amount to over £12,000; and there is no doubt that the increased number of meetings has been the means of bringing this about. If the hon. member wants to get a little proprietary club of his own, I will tell him a simple way.

Mr. JENKINSON: I don't want instruction from the syndicate advocate, thank you.

Mr. KENT: I am not a syndicate advocate. An HONOURABLE MEMBER: Never mind. Give us the information.

Mr. KENT: It is a very simple thing. It is said that the syndicate are making a very large return. I believe they are, and I would like to be one of them; but if the hon. member wants to knock the syndicate out, why not form a limited liability company and take it over from the Royal Bank? It would be a very good spec, and it would knock the syndicate out. I may say that the present proprietors, or syndicate, took the place up with no other object than improving horses and encouraging sport, and because they are making a profit they are stigmatised. With regard to the letters that have appeared in the Press, and the statement that the Queensland Turf Club would not remove the disqualification referred to, it is a funny thing that the writer of one of those letters was the owner of three horses, two of which were disqualified—one by Tattersall's Club

and the other by Albion Park. He appealed to the executive of the Queensland Turf Club, and the disqualification by Tattersall's they declined to remove, because they considered it was justifiable, but the disqualification by Albion Park they removed, because they thought the Creek had erred. Is that consistent with the statement that one backs the other up? I know personally the members of the syndicate, and I know they are men who are doing all they can to encourage sport in a proper manner, and I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill. If the Home Secretary can at any time see his way to introduce a Bill that will improve the law as regards the working of the totalisator and purifying racing generally I shall be happy to assist him in every way I can.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): I think with reference to the concluding remarks of the hon. member for Burnett, if we endeavour to discover the motives of those individuals who advocate a certain course of a public nature, we shall be entering upon an inquiry that will be so vast and far-reaching that we are not likely to arrive at any satisfactory termination. I think that for all the purposes of legislation in this House, we shall probably find that the most impracticable way is to assume that all suggestions are prompted by the worthiest of motives. I think the correspondence in the daily papers—though I do not think it is a very good practice to allude to what appears in the papers—I am prepared to believe that the correspondence appearing in the papers in reference to this matter is prompted by very excellent impulses indeed, and I will say in regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Burnett that they come from a man who, in regard to anything in connection with racing—if I may be allowed to say so without appearing to patronise in any way—bears a most excellent reputation indeed, and who indulges a taste for horses and for horse-racing in a way which, as far as I know and believe, is entirely creditable.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. BELL: And I will say this also—that as far as I know, as far as I believe, the gentlemen who compose the proprietary at Albion Park are men of the very highest probity. And though I am not in sympathy with those who believe that the constitution of that proprietary should continue as it is now, I hold my opinion not as a result of any disbelief in the individuals themselves or from any belief that their conduct of racing is open to censure. I believe they are playing their part in connection with that race-course in the way honourable men should do it; but I support this Bill chiefly for two reasons, and they are briefly these: I consider that it is unwise in the interests of the community of Brisbane, it is undesirable in the general public interest, that more facilities should be given to racing than can be helped. I think it is desirable, so far from encouraging the number of days on which racing is held in Brisbane and the large centres of population throughout Queensland, it is preferable to restrict them; and this Bill will undoubtedly have the effect of restricting them. The other reason is because the centralising of racing in Brisbane which it encourages has a detrimental effect on country racing; and I differ entirely from the hon. member for Burnett when he says that country racing was never more prosperous than it is now. On the contrary, I say that country racing in Queensland was, so far as I recollect, never at a lower ebb than it is now, and the reason for that is that race meetings are centred in Brisbane, and horseowners find that they can have their desires in regard to racing satisfied by metropolitan clubs, and, save in a comparatively few instances, it is unnecessary for them to go to the country in order to earn money. I recollect the

period when for a great many years the chief race meetings, in the Southern part of Queensland at all events, began in Brisbane under the auspices of the Queensland Turf Club. I think at first they had a two days' meeting; later on it grew to a three days' meeting, but for many years it was a two days' meeting. That was followed in a regular series by meetings of importance at Ipswich, Toowoomba, Dalby, and, I think, later on at Roma. Then there were meetings at Maryborough, Gympie, and Rockhampton. There may have been one or two other places, but those which I have mentioned were the chief towns. At none of those centres of population, not even at Brisbane, were there more than two meetings a year. I can remember the time when for years the Brisbane races consisted of two days in May, a meeting in November, and then a meeting on Boxing Day or New Year's Day. The other clubs generally held their two days' meeting at a time conveniently following Brisbane's most important meeting, and they perhaps held a meeting which was of interest to purely local horseowners, either on Boxing Day or New Year's Day. I hold the opinion that we had a much happier state of things on the Queensland turf under that condition of things than we have to-day when we have the Queensland Turf Club holding eighteen meetings a year, and another club in the city holding a meeting one day in every week of the year. We have not heard so much in the debate this afternoon the stock remark that racing is essential in order to improve the breed of thoroughbred horses. I say you have to accept that remark with very great reservations indeed. If the deduction intended to be made from that reasoning is that the more racing you have the higher in a proportionate ratio will be the quality of our horses, you have a deduction which is absolutely absurd. I contend that under the condition of things which I have described as prevailing here years ago we had a higher of average, or at all events as high an average excellence among our thoroughbred horses as we have to-day. Personally, I am disposed to think that the average of excellence of our thoroughbred stock was better then than it is to-day. But in order to put what seems to be a nail in the coffin of the argument that racing is essential to the maintenance of the quality of thoroughbred horses, I need only point to the races of Great Britain. There for many years a prize was offered known as the Queen's Plate. I forget whether the money for that prize came out of Crown money, but the Queen's Plate was undoubtedly of great antiquity, and probably it was originally a royal gift. It was a weight-for-age race of two or three miles. I think it came to an end about the beginning of the decade of the eighties, when you saw the spectacle of one or two horses, or three at the outside, competing for that prize, and the race was really a walk over. The effect of the discontinuance of that prize on the standard of the breed of horses was absolutely nil. The Queen's Plate was therefore very wisely discontinued, and the money has since been expended in a direction which I recommended this House to adopt at the time I brought in the measure known as the Stallions Bill. In that measure I copied the example of England, where the money for the Queen's Plate has now for a period of at least ten or twelve years been distributed as premiums for stallions, and undoubtedly its effect in the maintenance of the quality of thoroughbred horses is very marked indeed. No member in this Chamber can in my opinion vote for the encouragement of horse-racing simply on the ground that it is essential to the maintenance of the stamp of our horses. It is nothing of the sort. We have

now got a recognised type of thoroughbred horses, and that type would be maintained, in at all events many of its most deserving features, if the amount of racing in Queensland was brought down almost to a minimum. Now, I want to go back to the first reason I gave for supporting this Bill—that is, the undesirability of having a multiplicity of race meetings. This Bill proposes to amend the Totalisator Act of 1889. Those hon. members who will take the trouble to read the debate on that measure will find that it was accompanied by a great many absurd forebodings—absurd as we look upon them in the light of the experience we have had as to the effects of passing that measure. That Bill was brought in to check the undesirable condition of things which prevailed at that time, when almost every tobacconist shop had a totalisator of its own. It was found quite unnecessary then to go to a race meeting. If you wished to gamble, or put money on the totalisator, you had merely to go to one of the numerous tobacconist shops in the street, and you had a totalisator ready to your hand. It was very properly recognised that such a condition of things was entirely detrimental to the people of the town, and the Totalisator Bill was brought in to put an end to that state of affairs. Following the example of New Zealand, and at the instigation of Sir Samuel Griffith, the Bill was amended so as to provide that permits should be issued by the Home Department, and that they should be issued only to recognised and respectable racing clubs. That is briefly the history of the measure which this Bill proposes to amend. We find from experience of the working of that Act of 1889 that instead of permits being restricted to clubs composed of a number of members whose object is to promote race meetings, and indirectly to improve the quality of our horses, in the case of one particular institution, that is the Albion Park Racing Club, a permit is issued to a body of men very restricted in their numbers, though perfectly honourable, as I believe, in their dealings, and that they use the totalisator, not so much in the spirit of a large number of men who meet together to hold an occasional day's racing for pleasure, but rather as men who hold race meetings regularly once a week, and sometimes twice a week, for the purpose of making a profit out of the undertaking. So far from the profits going in any way towards improving the breed of horses, they are simply going into the pockets of a handful of

[5.30 p.m.] men. I have no objection whatever to the gentlemen concerned making money. I believe they are doing it in a perfectly honest and upright way. But I object to the system under which, at Albion Park, we have race meetings held once, and sometimes twice, a week throughout the year, and the undoubted effect of which is not to have any beneficial effect upon the breed of horses, but is a mere medium for indulging the gambling instincts of the community. It is said that we cannot suppress gambling; that if we place an embargo upon it in one direction it will break out in another. But gambling is like the rest of our vices, in that we indulge them according to the opportunity offered. If the opportunity is restricted, as I suppose most of us find out with regard to our own pet vices, if we are not encouraged, if the opportunity is not presented, in other words, if we are not tempted we are much less likely to fall into error than we are where the invitation is held out to us. Undoubtedly in such an institution as the Albion Park there is a distinct inducement held out to the gambling instincts of the people of the city of Brisbane. Recognising the measures that this House has passed for the benefit of the community, and

remembering the views that have been expressed from both sides, not merely in this Parliament, but in other Parliaments in regard to the morals and the general tone of the community, I cannot understand this House being indifferent to a measure that will have the effect of restricting the operations of the syndicate that I have been alluding to. I am very sorry that my remarks should have dwelt so much upon the Albion Park syndicate, because I have the greatest respect for the men who compose that syndicate, but it was inevitable in the discussion of this measure that that reference should be made, because the syndicate, in carrying out its operations, does so in such a way as undoubtedly affects what I believe to be the best interests of the community. It has been urged by those who are against this Bill that it will not have much effect in clipping the wings of the Albion Park proprietary. It is said that while it may restrict the number of days in the year upon which they may use the totalisator, they may still race on other days and have betting by bookmakers. No doubt they can. I have not that antipathy to bookmakers that some other people have. I am disposed to think that I prefer to bet if I bet at all with a bookmaker than on the totalisator. I rather prefer the old-fashioned method, but undoubtedly bookmakers are not the source of revenue to a racing association that totalisators are. I am disposed to think that we should find that these racing clubs would not often hold race meetings upon those days on which the use of the totalisator was forbidden.

MR. SMITH: There is no totalisator on the Melbourne course.

MR. BELL: The conditions there, as the hon. member must admit, are very peculiar indeed, and he must also admit that the agitation is growing there in favour of the totalisator. I think the clubs would not race on the days on which the totalisator was forbidden because they would find that their profits would be so restricted that it would scarcely be worth while. I am disposed to think that if this Bill was passed and this proprietary club or any kindred club was restricted to the use of the totalisator only on a limited number of days in the year, we should find that the number of days in the year on which they held races would correspond pretty closely to the number of days on which they were permitted to use the totalisator. In a sentence, one of my chief reasons for supporting this Bill is that I believe it to be a very bad thing indeed to have so many days' racing throughout the year in the metropolis. I would be glad to see, not merely the Albion Park proprietary, but the Queensland Turf Club as well, reduce the number of days on which they race. In regard to country horses, I do not agree with the hon. member for Burnett in saying that country breeders are benefited to any great extent by the multiplicity of races in Brisbane. If the number of days on which races are held were restricted I think we should find that those who breed good horses would be able to command better prices for them than they can now. Under the present system, with a multiplicity of races, a scope is offered to inferior horses which would not present itself if the number of race days and races were restricted, because a filtering process would then be going on in the quality of the horses, and only those animals would be trained to race that were really of the best kind. It would be more satisfactory no doubt if a measure of this kind had emanated from the Treasury bench, and I should be very glad to think that the Home Secretary seriously entertained the idea of bringing in a comprehensive measure upon the subject. So far as my experience goes, it is not a very pleasant thing for a private member to

introduce a Bill. It is, in fact, I should say, amongst the most disagreeable incidents of parliamentary life, and I should not think it was a pleasant thing to bring in a Bill of this kind, which may tread on the corns of a number of people. As I think the Home Secretary has no very serious idea of introducing in the immediate future a comprehensive measure of this kind, and as half a loaf is better than no bread, I support a Bill that goes a part of the way at all events towards the goal which many of us desire to reach. The hon. gentleman announced his intention to amend clause 4 by omitting the word "female," and though I should think feminine ingenuity would probably be able to compass such a correction of the clause, I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in his endeavour to have such an enactment included in the measure, because, although it may not be a wise thing to say, I at all events believe that one of the most unlovely spectacles one can witness is a betting female.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*): I may say I am in favour of the spirit and intention of this Bill, although there are some provisions in it, and one clause especially, with which I do not agree. I am not in favour of restricting *bona fide* racing clubs, such as the Queensland Turf Club, from using the totalisator as often as they like for purely racing purposes. Only one speaker has attempted to touch the sore spot, which has been the cause of all the controversy that has taken place lately with regard to racing in Brisbane. That is the dual position occupied by members of the Queensland Turf Club committee, who are also proprietors of the Albion Park or Brisbane Jockey Club. It is believed by most people interested in racing that these gentlemen subordinate the interests of other clubs to those of their own, which places horse-owners and trainers and jockeys in this peculiar position: That in the event of their being disqualified at Albion Park they have virtually no appeal. Certainly they can appeal to the Queensland Turf Club, but they are appealing to some of the same body who have sat in judgment on them previously.

THE HOME SECRETARY: They appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober.

MR. W. HAMILTON: In appealing from the decisions of the Albion Park stewards, they are appealing to the same identical persons; and that is the great cause of the grievance. If those people had good taste—and I suppose it is a matter of good taste—when they became interested in the Brisbane Jockey Club they should have resigned their positions on the committee of the Queensland Turf Club. None of those complaints of which we have heard so much would then have been made against them. Queensland is the only colony in which a proprietary club is allowed to use the totalisator.

MR. DAWSON: No.

MR. W. HAMILTON: It is allowed in New Zealand, where it was carried by only one vote. In Tasmania, where the totalisator was permitted to be used at athletic sports as well as horse races, it was abused to such an extent that it was found necessary to introduce fresh legislation in the shape of a Lottery Act, and now no racing club is allowed to use the totalisator at more than twelve meetings in a year, and the Commissioner of Police has power to forbid the use of the machine to any club which he considers is not a *bona fide* sporting institution with a certain number of paid-up members. In Western Australia a proprietary racing club used the totalisator, and were prosecuted for

doing so. The magistrates refused to commit, and an appeal against their decision was made to the Full Court, which ruled that the magistrates' decision was wrong and referred the case back again to them. Brisbane is about the only place outside New Zealand where proprietary clubs are allowed to come in. I object to the money paid into the totalisator being taxed to any higher amount than 10 per cent. I think that is quite high enough, and I hope the hon. member will accept an amendment to that effect when the Bill gets into committee. With regard to fractions of 1s., I have never been able to see that a proprietary club has a right to the fractions in addition to the 10 per cent. allowed by the law. They claim and take fractions up to 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. In my opinion investors in the totalisators should be paid up to the odd 6d., and any fraction of 1s. over that should be devoted to charitable purposes or something of that sort. I suppose there are some hon. members who recollect the row there was some time ago between the Tattersalls Club and the Queensland Turf Club. Tattersalls applied for a certain day for racing, and the Queensland Turf Club refused to give it, but they held their meeting on the day applied for in spite of the Queensland Turf Club, and it gave them the power to disqualify any horse that ran at that meeting from running at any meeting of the Queensland Turf Club. It is said that Abel Hyde and two or three of the stewards run the whole show of the Queensland Turf Club, and also constitute the syndicate at Breakfast Creek with one or two others; and that is where the great grievance comes in. The hon. member for Burnett says that racing here is more flourishing now than it ever was before through the racing at Albion Park. I do not think so. In the other colonies, where they have no club like the Albion Park Club, racing is in just as flourishing a position as it is in Queensland. The hon. member for Dalby says that racing here was in as flourishing a condition as it is now many years before there was any totalisator, and that is my opinion too; and there were not then the disagreements between North, Centre, and South which so greatly hampers racing in the colony. Those disagreements between clubs have done more to retard the progress of racing than anything else. I shall be glad to support the hon. member for Wide Bay in getting this Bill read a second time.

Mr. DAWSON (*Charters Towers*): I may say, at the very outset, that I object absolutely to this Bill. I have listened very carefully to hon. members who have spoken, and I have gathered from their remarks that they also object to the Bill, but agree, at the same time, to allow the second reading to pass.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: That is because we can improve it in committee.

Mr. DAWSON: The hon. member for Gregory says we can improve the Bill in committee. My opinion is that the whole tenor of the Bill, from the 1st clause to the 5th and last, is entirely wrong. If I understand the intention of the hon. member who has introduced the Bill, it is to amend the existing Act legalising the totalisator so as to check the abuses that are now caused by the proprietary clubs. I understand the hon. member has no objection whatever to a properly constituted jockey club, but that his whole aim and object is to check the abuses of the proprietary clubs. I would be only too willing to assist him in such a laudable object as checking the abuses of proprietary clubs, but the hon. member in this Bill does not propose to do anything of the kind. Let me suggest to hon. members of this Chamber one thing that will happen under this Bill. If I may be permitted a passing reference to it, the 1st subsection of

clause 3 provides that the amount of profit from the totalisator at a race meeting must be put into a fund for prize money for future race meetings.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The profits of a *bona fide* club go to that object now—at least they are supposed to.

Mr. DAWSON: That is exactly where I differ from the hon. member for Gregory. The profits do not go in that way, and that is one of the great objections I have to the Bill. Outside of Albion Park—which apparently this Bill is brought forward to squelch—

Mr. JENKINSON: No.

Mr. DAWSON: There are other proprietary clubs in this colony. I may mention the case of the Miners' Union Racing Club on Charters Towers.

Mr. McDONALD: The Friendly Societies too.

Mr. DAWSON: I am not very well acquainted with that, but with the Miners' Union Racing Club I am very well acquainted. Now, what happens in connection with that club? The Miners' Union do not hold their annual demonstration on May Day, the same as the unions do in Brisbane. They generally hold it some time in September, when they can get the racecourse, and their annual celebration takes the form of a race meeting, and two-thirds of the profit of the meeting—which is mostly from the totalisator—go to a library, and the other one-third goes to the accident fund to relieve those who are injured in mining.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is a very common practice throughout the colony. It is done in my electorate.

Mr. BROWNE: Hear, hear! It is also done at Croydon.

Mr. DAWSON: As to the fractions that have been so much talked about this afternoon, the fractions in the case of the meetings of the Charters Towers Jockey Club, the Friendly Societies Club, and the Miners' Union Racing Club, all go to the hospital. I submit that the passing of this Bill would be a most disastrous thing to people of Charters Towers.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Bill can easily be amended in committee to meet your views. I am quite with you in what you say.

Mr. DAWSON: My opinion is that the only way the Bill can be amended to meet the views I have expressed, is by abolishing it altogether. The real idea of the hon. member appears to me to be, not to abolish the proprietary club altogether, but to prevent the proprietary club from using the totalisator every time it holds a meeting. The real idea, I think, is to prevent the Albion Park proprietary from holding fifty race meetings a year. That is the sole object of this Bill. I ask the hon. member for Wide Bay if that is not so?

Mr. JENKINSON: No.

Mr. DAWSON: Is not the object of the Bill to prevent this proprietary syndicate—who are apparently making a fortune out of their lease—from holding fifty race meetings in the year?

Mr. JENKINSON: No; it is to prevent any proprietary club doing it.

Mr. DAWSON: I sympathise with the hon. member if it is his desire to abolish the proprietary club. I believe in the properly constituted turf club—not in a syndicate club. I am not in favour of syndicates, even in horse-racing; but, instead of bringing in a Bill, what the hon. member should have done was to bring pressure to bear upon the Home Secretary. The Home Secretary has it in his power now to refuse to grant a permit for the use of the totalisator by any club, so why encumber the statute-book with a measure of this kind? I would draw the hon. member's attention to a section in the Totalisator Restriction Act of 1889—

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Don't talk it out. Mr. DAWSON: Well, I shall not read the section I refer to, but merely direct the attention of the hon. member to subsection 2 of section 3 of that Act, to see that it is absolutely unnecessary to pass a Bill to restrict proprietary clubs, and that the Home Secretary has already got the power in his own hands. If he does not use that power, then it is the duty of the hon. member to bring pressure to bear upon the hon. gentleman. I am sorry that I cannot finish.

Mr. BOLES: 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, 29th November.

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

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. R. Dickson, *Bulimba*) moved that £2,345 be granted for the department. This estimate showed an increase of £60 upon the estimate of the preceding year, which was explained by the fact that there were four clerks and two messengers, to whom an increase each of £10 had been granted, under the approval of the Public Service Board.

Question put and passed.

AGENT-GENERAL FOR THE COLONY.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £4,848 be granted for the Agent-General. The estimate showed an increase of £210, which was explained as follows:—The clerk in charge of indents and accountant, Mr. Clay, had been relieved of his duties and had retired from the service. He had been granted six months' leave, and there was provision on the Estimates for two months' salary. Mr. Grant, who was previously correspondence clerk, had been appointed chief clerk at a salary of £350. There was no difference in the salary, but the designation of the office had been changed. In place of Mr. Clay, Mr. Woolnough had been appointed. This officer was formerly connected with the London office, but in the 1893 retrenchment his services were dispensed with. The salary he then received was £350, and he had now been appointed at £300. Mr. Payne, an officer who had previously been paid £250, had been appointed to the position of clerk in charge of indents at an increase of £50 a year. There were two clerks who each had received £10 increase, and there was an additional inspector at £3 a week.

Mr. JENKINSON: What are the duties of the inspectors?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They were employed in inspecting orders from the colony and attending to indents. Various things, such as railway material and general matters required by the colony, had to be inspected by these officers before shipment.

Mr. MAXWELL: Do they inspect immigrants?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, there was nothing of that kind under this vote. The Agent-General's report, which he had no doubt hon. members had read, contained a great deal of useful information as to the work that was being done in London. Often he was inclined to think at this distance from England they did not really recognise the work that was done there. He had had a late opportunity of seeing the amount of work done, and he could testify that the clerks worked very hard, so far as he could see. What he wished to call special attention to was that the salaries they received, which he

thought were moderate, were subject to a heavy income tax, which none of the Civil servants in this colony had to pay. Owing to the war, that tax had been increased from 8d. in the £1 to 1s., and all salaries down to £150 a year were subject to that tax. The other colonies whose officers were also subject to the tax paid it, and he thought he was fully justified in asking the Committee to relieve these officers of it.

Mr. REID: Why do not the Imperial Government let all the colonies off paying the tax?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He could not say. He had had a conversation with Sir Horace Tozer in London, in which he mentioned incidentally that he himself had to pay £75 a year income tax. On that subject he said in his report—

The increases voted by Parliament to other members of the staff of this office have been gratefully appreciated as a recognition of faithful service rendered by them, and will be a stimulus to further efforts. This liberality is somewhat discounted by the increase of the income tax by 50 per cent. In several of the other agencies this tax is defrayed by the colony, and certainly, in view of the system of classification provided by your Public Service Act, there exists an equally valid reason for the same course being followed in the case of Queensland. This tax is now 5 per cent. of the voted salary.

Mr. REID: Have you any idea which of the other colonies pay the tax?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, he had not, but several of the colonial banks doing business in London paid that tax for their employees.

Mr. BROWNE: That was one of those departments about which there was generally a good deal of discussion, and the vote was specially worthy of discussion this year on account of the interesting pamphlet issued by the Agent-General. He could not altogether agree with the hon. gentleman about the income tax, for it must be remembered that the officers in London did not contribute anything towards Queensland taxation. There were duties on some articles consumed in Queensland considerably higher than they were in England, the duty on tobacco for instance, and as those officers had the privilege of living in London he thought it was but fair that they should pay something towards the taxation of the country. With regard to the Agent-General's office, he could not speak from personal knowledge, but he had met many mining men who spoke in high praise of the amount of information they had been able to get there. The report of the Agent-General contained a great deal of useful information, and it formed very interesting light reading. It bore evidence of the possession by Sir Horace Tozer of one quality which no one would deny him—the quality of industry. Everyone would give him credit for that, no matter what work he took in hand. A very large part of the report was taken up with the question of immigration, into which he would not go at length, because he thought it could be much better discussed under the vote for immigration, but he must say that there were statements in Sir Horace Tozer's report which did not coincide with the statements of the Chief Secretary in Parliament. All the different agents' reports referred to the fact that there was great difficulty in obtaining the right class of men to come to this colony, and yet a letter was sent by the Immigration Department to those agents stating that they would be paid 10s. 6d. a head for all immigrants, and that age, occupation, or sex was no bar.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is provided they are accepted.

Mr. BROWNE: There was no bar to their acceptance. He might refer the hon. gentleman to many papers published in this colony, notably one of the principal Government organs in the North, the *Townsville Bulletin*, which contained

recently a very scathing article upon the class of people who were being sent out. It said distinctly that they were not the class required, and some of them shortly after landing were receiving charity. The Agent-General said himself in his report—

It is extremely difficult to get agents in the different countries to take any interest in the work. They accept the agency for the sake of the bonus, but do not care to work for it.

As he had pointed out previously, it was simply head money. Reckoning up the number of immigrants imported last year and the total amount expended, he found they cost £24 per head. He did not think any hon. gentleman could say that the taxpayers could afford to pay that much for additional persons to come here and compete in the labour market. He observed that amongst other classes of persons who were being hunted for were "roadmakers." He would appeal to hon. members to say whether there were not enough pick and shovel men in this colony already. Why, they were walking about in numbers and able to get no regular work. He did not think they could afford to bring that class of people out here. Sir Horace Tozer's denial in reference to the immorality which was said to exist in the colony was very admirable indeed, and he intimated pretty strongly that he never heard of such a thing. He thought it was the view of most members on that side that instead of having an Agent-General in London—a sort of ambassador—it would be desirable to have a well-trained commercial man to act as a general business agent and look after the interest of the colony. He would like to call attention to the altered condition of the colony which would come about very shortly. Next year Queensland would be part of the Commonwealth, and he would like to hear the opinions of hon. members as to whether they thought it desirable under the circumstances that an Agent-General and a costly staff should be kept in London after federation. It would be much better under federation if the different States had a commercial agent to look after each colony's interests. It would be absurd to have five or six separate ambassadors, so to speak, and this would mean a great expense to the Commonwealth. He was very pleased to see Appendix B in the Agent-General's report. Ever since he came into the House, in 1893, he had contended that this table should be given in the Agent-General's report, because sums from £70,000 to £80,000 were put down as general disbursements, and hon. members had to move for returns to get the details. But Appendix B, on page 25 of the report, showed every farthing which had been spent in London in connection with the Agent-General's office. That was a great improvement, and he was very pleased to see it.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*) endorsed the remarks of the hon. member for Croydon with regard to the Agent-General's office. That office would be practically abolished next year, and probably a high commissioner would be substituted by the Commonwealth of Australia. There would then be a reduction in the salary paid to the Agent-General, and he would be very pleased to see that carried out. South Australia had already a commercial agent representing that colony in the United Kingdom, and, if the resources of Queensland were to be properly advertised in Great Britain, it was absolutely necessary that this colony should have a commercial agent in London, and also in order that a desirable class of immigrants should be induced to come here.

Mr. REID: Who do you call desirable immigrants?

Mr. JENKINSON: Those the colony most needed. It would take Queensland a long time

before it could compete with Canada. According to the Agent-General's report, hon. members would see that Canada was Queensland's greatest competitor. They had better positions at the agricultural shows, and, generally, ran their business on better lines than the Queensland business was conducted. They had better and larger samples of their produce than we had.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Canada is closer to England than Queensland is.

Mr. JENKINSON: He admitted that. If it was decided to have a commercial agent to represent the colony, it would be necessary to remove the Queensland Agent-General's office to the business portion of London, as South Australia had done. He was considerably struck with the quality and quantity of the products of South Australia that were displayed in the London Exhibition. It was an eye-opener to him, and he looked in vain for such a display from Queensland.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are quite dissimilar.

Mr. JENKINSON: Queensland was not having its resources run on the same commercial lines as South Australia, and it would pay Queensland to do that. There were many branches of industry in Queensland, and, if the Agent-General's office was to be reformed, it would be necessary to get someone from this colony who was up to date and who had a good knowledge of the principal industries in the colony. There were plenty of energetic young men who could fill that position. Let a man from one of our mining fields, or with an intimate knowledge of that industry, be one of the clerks in the London office; also a man who was conversant with the pastoral, and one fully conversant with the agricultural industry, so that people there would be able to get the information they required. There was no one in the Agent-General's office who was up to date, except the Agent-General himself, as to the resources of the colony. In order to compete successfully with the other colonies, that should be done. Another point was that no results had been seen from the efforts of many of the men Queensland had sent home to advertise the colony. Mr. Lyons's efforts had been a complete failure. Mr. Garraway was sent to lecture in Ireland on the resources of Queensland; but his efforts also proved a disastrous failure; and that appeared to be taken as a recommendation, for his term was extended another three months. Scotland was likewise tapped with a view to getting immigrants; but again we drew a blank. He would like to know why the report in connection with the International Commercial Congress at Philadelphia, as mentioned on page 21 of the Agent-General's report, was not added as an addendum to that report? He noticed that the Queensland specimens were valued at £35,752 1s. 6d., and when they were sold there was a debit balance of nearly £2,500. He believed a great proportion of them were gold specimens weighed by competent persons, and they ought to have realised the value of gold said to be contained in them.

[7.30 p.m.]

HON. G. THORN (*Fassifern*) said one thing that struck him in connection with this estimate was the very low salaries paid to the inspectors. They were entrusted with great responsibility, and if they were not paid as well as they ought to be it was possible that they might be squared by contractors. The hon. member for Wide Bay complained about Sir Horace Tozer not looking after the department.

Mr. JENKINSON: I said nothing of the sort.

HON. G. THORN : The hon. member insinuated it by his reference to Canada. He ought to know that Canada embraced a number of colonies.

MR. JENKINSON : The hon. member need not tell me about Canada. I have just come from there.

HON. G. THORN : With respect to the hon. member's suggestion that there should be in the Agent-General's office men representing the different industries of the colony, he might point out that Sir Horace Tozer understood all those industries. He was a host in himself, and so long as he was there he would look after all the interests of the colony.

MR. KIDSTON (*Rockhampton*) : With regard to what the hon. member for Fassifern said about public officers being squared, he thought it would be more to their credit if hon. members opposite would take a lesson from members on the opposite side, and never make charges of that kind unless they were true. Though he did not always agree with Sir Horace Tozer while he was here, he thought the colony was to be congratulated on having that gentleman as Agent-General. He very much agreed with the hon. member for Croydon that it would perhaps be well for Queensland if the Agent-General in London was less of an ambassador and more of a commercial agent. With regard to the care exercised in sending immigrants to this country, the hon. member spoke of the method of bribing agents throughout the various districts in the old country to collect immigrants at so much a head, very much in the same way as in the old days they used to bribe the sponging-houses to collect men for the navy. There was not the slightest care taken that the immigrants were suitable. The only interest of those agents was to get so much a head for all they could send out. Another thing was the sending out of undesirable foreign immigrants, as was the case with the Finns sent out in the middle of this year, and he thought it was eminently desirable that specific instructions should be given that immigrants of that kind were undesirable. He had a clipping from the *Brisbane Courier* of the 29th June, which stated that a large number of Finnish immigrants were brought here in a helpless condition, being unacquainted with our language, and were taken to Mr. Rogers, the city engineer, Brisbane, to see if he would provide them with work. Mr. Rogers could not say, but there had always been plenty of labour available for all requirements, but he evidently thought that as the Finns had been brought here they should be looked after by someone. He thought that if they were brought here the Government should see that they were employed, but he did not think they should be brought here at all. Another matter was the despatch of the "Duke of Norfolk" from London with 458 persons, of whom only thirty-four were full-paying, the remaining 424 being brought out either partially or wholly at the expense of the colony. Of the total number 215 were single girls and domestic servants; and he would like to know what were the single girls who were not domestic servants, and what they were brought out for? According to the paper from which those figures were taken there was certainly no occasion for the introduction of single girls who were not domestic servants, for there was no demand for their services, nor were they needed in the marriage market. But apart altogether from the character of the immigrants he thought it was time, considering the present state of the labour market of the colony and its immediate future prospects, that the Chief Secretary took immediate steps to stop immigrants being brought to the colony. The Barcaldine correspondent of

the *Rockhampton Daily Record*, in a telegram to that journal on the 5th of June last, said—

The business on the railway line is principally confined to the receipt of maize and lucerne hay, while vast numbers of sheep continue to be forwarded to relief country. No wool has been despatched. As illustrating the effect of the drought, Wellshot, which generally employs 150 men (exclusive of a similar number on the Coombemartin outstation) is advertising for twenty handshears and fifteen shed hands for the present season. None at all are wanted for Coombemartin. Business is generally stagnant.

If that was an isolated case he would not insist upon the matter so much, but it was a matter of such close and immediate importance to the well-being of a very large class of taxpayers in the colony that he was justified in forcing it upon the attention of the Chief Secretary. He knew that the hon. gentleman disagreed with members on that side on the general question of immigration, but he was not raising that question just now. He was simply dealing with the present circumstances of the colony, as testified to on every hand by members on the Ministerial side of the House—by the Secretary for Railways, and by every man who knew anything about the condition of the Western country.

The CHAIRMAN : I think the hon. member is out of order in discussing that question on this vote. The vote for immigration will come on later, and there is nothing in this vote referring to immigration.

The CHIEF SECRETARY : I understood that the discussion on immigration would be taken on the vote for that service.

The CHAIRMAN : If it is the wish of the Committee that it should be taken on this vote, of course I have nothing to say, but there is nothing in this vote referring to immigration.

The CHIEF SECRETARY had no objection to take the discussion on this vote if the hon. member wished it, but it would certainly be more convenient, if, as suggested by the leader of the Opposition, they took the discussion on the immigration vote. The hon. member for Rockhampton was, possibly unintentionally, opening up a very large subject for discussion, and he (the Chief Secretary) would be compelled to reply *in extenso* if the hon. member continued on that line. He would much prefer that the discussion should be confined to the vote before the Committee.

MR. KIDSTON had just stated that he was not raising a discussion on the general policy of immigration. Why he called attention to that particular matter just now was because he did not think they were justified in waiting until the immigration vote came on.

The CHAIRMAN : Order ! The hon. member is out of order in discussing that question on this vote. He can discuss the question of the suitability of immigrants when we come to the vote on page 23.

MR. KIDSTON : He wanted to refer to the matter now while they were dealing with the Agent-General, because it was an urgent matter, and he wished the Chief Secretary to communicate with the Agent-General, and give him a correct idea as to the condition of the colony, not only in regard to the class of immigrants, but also in regard to the whole question of the treatment of immigrants.

The CHAIRMAN : My duty as Chairman is to keep hon. members to the vote under consideration, and I must ask the hon. member to direct his attention to the vote for the Agent-General, and not to immigration.

MR. KIDSTON : He was just saying that if the Chief Secretary preferred it he would leave the general question of immigration alone at the present time. He simply wished to call attention now to the way in which immigrants were used at home and in the colony, so that the

Chief Secretary might instruct the Agent-General to be more considerate with the people who were invited out to the colony. When he was up at Rockhampton the other day he came across an immigrant, a man from the north of Ireland, who had been in the colony some five months, and who had practically been a year out of employment. With a view to show the want of consideration with which many immigrants were treated before they left home and when they got here, he would read a letter written by that person to the Immigration Agent at Rockhampton and the Immigration Agent in Brisbane.

I have the honour to inform you that on the 6th November, 1899, I made application for a free passage to Queensland, and was accepted by Mr. Samuel Brown, the agent for Queensland.—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member be seated? I again call the hon. member's attention to the fact that he is now debating in an irregular manner. It is evident that the matter the hon. member is discussing is connected with the immigration vote on page 23 of the Estimates. The letter the hon. gentleman is reading has no reference to the Agent-General or the salaries connected with his department.

Mr. KIDSTON: No, but it referred to the duties of the Agent-General. If the Chairman ruled that he could not refer to the duties of the Agent-General on that vote he would sit down, but in discussing the vote for the Agent-General he thought it quite proper to refer to the way in which the Agent-General performed his duties.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member was reading a letter addressed to the Immigration Agent at Rockhampton, and proposed to read another addressed to the Immigration Agent in Brisbane. I have maintained that that has nothing whatever to do with the vote we have under discussion. I ask the hon. member not to do what he is proposing to do.

Mr. KIDSTON: It would have been better to allow him to continue to read the letter. He would give the Committee the whole of his extracts when they came to the other vote, but he did not think the Chief Secretary would benefit by it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The hon. member is not in order in making threats.

Mr. KIDSTON: I do not think the hon. member should have been interrupted, and you won't make anything by it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. member is not in order in making remarks of that kind to the Chair.

Mr. KIDSTON: All right.

The CHAIRMAN: I have a duty to perform as Chairman, and I must do it.

Mr. JENKINSON asked if the Chief Secretary would be good enough to reply to the question he had put to him?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He should be sorry that anything should occur to annoy hon. members; but he had told the leader of the Opposition that he was prepared to discuss immigration then or later on, and it was really the leader of the Opposition who had suggested that they should discuss the question on the vote, which came later on in the Estimates. If the hon. member for Rockhampton had continued, he should have been compelled to reply at length, and it was not fair to the Committee to take the discussion of the question in instalments. Hon. members opposite might very well conform to the views of their leader. With regard to the matter to which the hon. member for Wide Bay referred, it had rather amused him to reflect that he had for some years advocated exactly what the hon. member suggested. He had felt that with a view to the exhibition of the material products of the colony the city was the proper place for

their office. For the purposes for which their Agent-General was primarily appointed, to deal in a somewhat diplomatic sense with the Imperial authorities, the office of the Agent-General in London could not be better situated than it was. The hon. member would be aware that it was adjacent to the offices occupied by the Agents-General for the other colonies, and in that sense it was most conveniently situated. No doubt under federation the status of the respective Agents-General for the different States would be considerably altered. It was impossible to forecast what the Federal Executive would decide upon, but it was possible that a high commissioner would be appointed to much the same position as Lord Strathcona occupied on behalf of the Dominion of Canada. There would, of course, require to be representatives of the different States in communication with their respective Governments, but the Agents-General would cease to hold their present status as representatives of the different States of Australia in direct communication with the Imperial authorities. He took it there would be some responsible agent there who could well understand the requirements and products of the colony, and be able to advise the high commissioner upon all matters concerning the State he represented.

Mr. JENKINSON: You will not want any such highly paid officer as you have now.

The CHIEF SECRETARY did not know that £1,500 a year was a large salary in London, when they considered the income tax and other charges and the status the Agent-General had to occupy. He was sure their respected Agent-General, Sir Horace Tozer, was out of pocket by occupying the position just now. If such an officer as a high commissioner was appointed, he took it that the different States would consider the desirability of having their business transacted more in the heart of the city than at present. He must say that the South Australian Agent-General was able to bring people more in touch with the commercial and material products of his colony, through having his office in the city, than our Agent-General could with his offices in Westminster, where there was not the same opportunity for the exhibition of the products of the colony. That was a matter for future consideration, but

South Australia held out a good [8 p.m.] object lesson for their consideration.

With regard to the discrepancy in the sale of the gold specimens he understood that a certain number of them were retained for the exhibition at Glasgow. That would account for the discrepancy.

Mr. STEWART said it appeared to him that an attempt was being made to discuss two questions, which were entirely separate and distinct, as one. What the hon. member, Mr. Kidston, was attempting to do, was to discuss the conduct of the immigration office in London. He submitted that it would not be permissible to discuss the conduct of that office on page 23, which referred solely to the immigration office in Queensland.

The CHAIRMAN: I would remind the hon. member that that matter has been disposed of.

Mr. STEWART: With all deference to the Chairman's ruling, he must call it in question. That was the proper place to discuss the conduct of the immigration office in London, the Agent-General being the responsible officer for Mr. Randall.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the hon. member rising to a point of order?

Mr. STEWART: He would formally move that the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to.

Mr. BELL rose to a point of order. The Chairman had given his ruling some time ago, and discussion had ensued. Was it not necessary

that a motion to disagree to the Chairman's ruling should be made immediately after the ruling was given?

The CHAIRMAN: There have been two or three speeches made since I gave my ruling, and I think it is too late now to raise the point of order.

Mr. TURLEY held that if an hon. member had been ruled out of order he was quite entitled, although two or three speeches might have been made subsequently on other matters, to dispute the ruling. If not, it simply meant that when a department covering a great deal of ground was under discussion, if an hon. member who spoke on one particular section of it was ruled out of order and the Chairman held that the question was disposed of, no other hon. member would be allowed to speak on that portion of the department under discussion. He contended, therefore, that the hon. member was perfectly right in challenging the Chairman's ruling, because they were dealing with a question raised in the Agent-General's report.

Mr. BELL said the difficulty that had arisen was the natural outcome of the very bad practice followed in Committee of Supply in recent years of discussing every matter relating to a department on the first vote. He believed it would tend to the furtherance of business if they confined their criticisms and remarks to the particular vote before the Committee. He believed he had risen in his place to object to the practice; at all events, he had silently protested against it.

Mr. BROWNE said there seemed to have been a little misunderstanding about the discussion. The question was simply one of convenience, and if it was considered most convenient to take it on the immigration vote—although that only referred to the department in Brisbane—they might just as well take it then.

Mr. KIDSTON: It was not so much a matter of order as a matter of convenience, and it was for that reason that he felt aggrieved at being ruled out of order. If the Chief Secretary preferred to take the discussion on the vote for the immigration department in Queensland, he was quite willing to defer it until then, if it was more convenient to the Committee, but he claimed that when he was dealing with the way in which the subordinates of the Agent-General in England performed their duties, it was proper to do so on the vote for the Agent-General's office. There was no other vote on which he could have spoken upon the question and be in order. It would not be in order on either the vote for the immigration department in Queensland, or on the vote for immigration on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. BELL: Have you looked at page 110?

Mr. STEWART: That is the general policy of the country.

Mr. KIDSTON said that he had distinctly stated that he refrained from introducing a discussion on the general immigration policy of the country, and that he wanted to deal with the one aspect of the matter—namely, the way in which the subordinates of the Agent-General performed their duty in the old country. The vote on page 110, which was referred to by the hon. member for Dalby, was the vote for the passage money and other expenses connected with the bringing of immigrants from home, which was a totally different matter. If the Chief Secretary preferred to discuss the matter on the departmental vote, he was quite willing to wait till that vote came on.

The CHAIRMAN: With regard to my ruling, I would like to point out that there is not a single item in the vote now under consideration which is paid to the agents who are selecting

immigrants. The whole of the payment to them comes out of the vote for £50,000 that will be discussed later on.

Mr. KIDSTON pointed out that £1,500 of the vote now under discussion was paid to the superior officer of those agents—the man who gave them their instructions. If the Chief Secretary could not reach those agents, he could reach their superior, who, in turn, could reach those agents.

* HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON (*Brisbane North*) was not inclined to let the matter go. He came into the Chamber just as the hon. member for Rockhampton was quoting from a letter having reference to the administration of the immigration department in London.

Mr. KIDSTON: That is perfectly right—the treatment which an immigrant received in London.

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: And, strange to say, before the hon. member got through the letter, the Chairman determined to rule him out of order.

Mr. KIDSTON: Before I got through two lines of the letter.

HON. MACDONALD-PATERSON: How was it that the Chairman was able to do that? Had he heard of the letter before? He contended that anything that appertained to the administration of the Agent-General's Department in the old country must come under that vote, and under no other. One of the other votes was purely a local vote, and the other was in connection with the general policy of immigration or no immigration. The conduct of every subordinate of the Agent-General in the old country, and the system or absence of system, as the case might be, came under that vote. He would take that opportunity of asking the Chief Secretary what were the duties of the inspecting engineer at a salary of £600 a year? He did not know of any other colony which had an inspecting engineer. They got their locomotives built in the colony, or were going to have them built, there was very little to do in connection with indents, and he did not think that the inspecting engineer had anything to do with supervising the construction of the dredges. His colleague, Mr. Forrest, thought that he had nothing to do with the dredges. When he (Mr. Macdonald-Paterson) had been in the old country, he had gone to see the builders of the "Premier"—the steamer which was now running the mails through the Narrows from Gladstone to Broadmount—and he had been informed that the inspecting engineer employed another engineer to supervise the work, and that the inspecting engineer rarely inspected.

Mr. BROWNE: He was not on full salary at that time, I think.

Mr. REID: Who paid the sub-inspector?

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He had found that he was paid by the Agent-General's office. He had seen a plate on the door of the Agent-General's office saying that this gentleman was a consulting engineer, which reminded him to ask the Chief Secretary whether he was allowed to do private work.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Not now, but he used to be allowed private practice. Referring to the first remarks of the hon. member, he admitted that it had been the practice to take the general discussion on the first vote, but he had mentioned the matter to the leader of the Opposition, who was quite willing that they should take the discussion on a subsequent vote.

Mr. KIDSTON: That was a matter of agreement.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He quite admitted that formerly they had always taken the discussion on immigration on the vote for the Agent-General's office, but for the last three or four years, by mutual consent, it had been taken on the vote for immigration on the Loan Estimates.

Mr. TURLEY: But it was never ruled out of order before.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He did not think they had ever come to that stage, but he assumed that the Chairman had thought, after the arrangement that had been made, that the question might very well be discussed on the other vote. There was no need to import warmth into the debate. He was entirely in the hands of hon. members, and, if they agreed to proceed with the discussion, he had no objection. With regard to the inspecting engineer, Mr. Gemmell Dick was consulting engineer. His work was to superintend material ordered by the Government in connection with public works. Some years ago he was getting £300 a year, with the right of private practice, and possibly it was during the time that the hon. member for North Brisbane visited Paisley that he found that this sub-inspector was employed. Last year he was asked to devote his whole time to the requirements of the colony, and consequently he gave up the right of private practice, and devoted himself to the inspection of the material required by the colony at the salary provided on the Estimates. During the time he (the Chief Secretary) was in London, he found him continuously employed—in going from one manufactory to another, in inspecting material, and seeing that it was properly prepared for shipment. He did not think that so long as we required material to be manufactured in England, or any other country, an officer of this kind could be dispensed with.

Mr. KERR: Did he inspect the dredges?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There is a special foreman for the dredges who reports to the Agent-General. He knew that Mr. Dick was continuously employed, and, so far as he understood, that officer had given every satisfaction.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) said he would like to draw attention, if he might on this vote, to the appointment of Mr. J. M. Cross, at a salary of 10s. a day, to compile certain reports on the industries and politics of this country, to be sent to the Agent-General in London. He regarded this as a serious matter, because it established a precedent for every candidate for Parliament, who might be defeated, and for ex-members of this Chamber to approach the Government and ask for an appointment of some kind, where he would perform certain more or less ornamental duties. He understood from the replies of the Chief Secretary and the leader of the Government, when he brought this matter up before, that Mr. Cross's duties consisted of sitting in a room reading newspapers, and when a paragraph struck him as likely to be interesting to the Agent-General, Sir Horace Tozer, he cut it out and gummed it on a piece of paper—sometimes adding marginal notes. This matter was subsequently handed to the Under Secretary of the department, and forwarded to the Agent-General every week. He wanted to know what justification there was for this appointment? How could Mr. Cross know what kind of newspaper paragraphs would interest Sir Horace Tozer? By what process could he get into Sir Horace Tozer's mind and discover precisely what kind of literature Sir Horace Tozer wanted for his leisure moments?

Mr. FORSYTH: Is Cross's salary included in this vote?

Mr. LESINA: He did not know. He wanted to find out.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It does not come under this vote?

Mr. LESINA: He did not think a man should be employed to do literary work at 10s. a day. If the work was worth doing, it was worth at least £1 a day. The Government had no need to sweat a man simply because he was out of a billet. If Mr. Cross was justly employed in this work, he should be properly paid for it, and if he was doing work that was not necessary, the billet should be closed, and he be given his walking ticket. If he (Mr. Lesina) were out of a billet, he had no doubt the hon. gentleman would create one for him.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: Of course.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Premier offered to send you to South Africa. (Laughter.)

Mr. REID: He wanted to get rid of him.

Mr. LESINA: The appointment had been commented on in a respectable paper that usually supported the Government. Were the Government going to fly in the face of public opinion and create billets for necessitous persons who might be out of employment, and give no justification for it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member was certainly out of order in discussing this item which was in no way connected with this vote, but as he had introduced the matter, he (the Chief Secretary) rose with pleasure to defend what had been done concerning Mr. Cross. Everything had been open and straightforward. Mr. Cross had been connected with the Press, and he was well able to deal with newspaper literature; and he (the Chief Secretary) was sure there was no reason to be dissatisfied with the way in which he had performed his duties.

Mr. KIDSTON rose to a point of order. Was the hon. gentleman in order in [8.30 p.m.] discussing that matter on the Agent-General's Estimates?

The CHAIRMAN: I allowed the hon. member for Clermont to proceed with his remarks, thinking he was merely asking a question. He made a very long speech, and was somewhat out of order. Strictly speaking, the Chief Secretary is out of order, but if it is the wish of the Committee that a reply should be given to the question put, I thought I might very well allow a reply to be given.

Mr. LESINA: He would like to know upon what vote this matter could be discussed.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: You have a motion on the subject before the House.

Mr. LESINA: Would the hon. gentleman reply to his question? Why was the appointment made? What was the work performed, and why was it members of that Chamber could not get copies of those reports?

Mr. KIDSTON said he would not press his point of order. He had no objection to the Chief Secretary replying.

Mr. SMITH asked what were the duties of the three inspectors?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They were employed in looking after various work required in the colony. All the requirements of the colony were not manufactured in one place, and the inspectors had to reside continuously in a variety of places to watch work being carried out. There was no new appointment, but one inspector was placed on the Estimates, whereas he has previously been paid from contingencies.

Mr. LESINA would ask once more what reason the Government had for the appointment of Mr. Cross as confidential correspondent to Sir Horace Tozer? What was the work he

performed, and what reason was there that members of both Houses should not see the reports which he sent to England?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If he was not out of order he had no hesitation in replying. Mr. Cross had been appointed on account of his fitness to cull newspaper intelligence in relation to political, industrial, and social affairs of the colony and forward it to the Agent-General. Everything that was likely to be of interest to the public in England was extracted from the newspapers. That information could be obtained in a much clearer and more concise form by making clippings from the various periodicals. Mr. Cross had performed his work very satisfactorily, and he (the Chief Secretary) had no objection whatever to any hon. members coming to the office and seeing the forms of the reports, if they could be called reports, which were sent home.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. gentleman said that Mr. Cross had been appointed because of his fitness. He did not question his fitness. If the Government saw fit to fill a necessary appointment with a competent man, he had no objection to voting his salary; but the question was whether there was any necessity for such an appointment.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. LESINA: The hon. member for Gympie, Mr. Ryland, told him that when he visited the Agent-General's office in England recently, he was permitted to see some of those reports, and that they chiefly consisted of mining matter. Was there any necessity for paying 10s. a day to have that kind of news clipped from public journals when the Government issued a *Mining Journal*, containing all the up-to-date mining information that was available?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not issued weekly.

Mr. LESINA: That argument, therefore, was exploded. All that was necessary in order to keep the Agent-General up to date in regard to mining matters was to put a ½d. stamp on the *Mining Journal* and post it to England, and that could be done by an office boy. Was it in regard to agricultural matters that the Agent-General required to be informed? The same argument applied again. The Government issued a costly *Agricultural Journal* containing the fullest information regarding agriculture as carried on in the colony, and that could be carried to England for a 1d. stamp. Did the Agent-General require information about pastoral matters? Several large firms throughout Australia issued reports regularly; in addition to which there were two or three splendid pastoral journals. On none of those grounds was the appointment justified.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is sheer personal vindictiveness.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: He did not care a hang what any member on either side might think. He did not care a tinker's curse whether members agreed with him or not. He strongly objected to the Government finding jobs for erstwhile political opponents, for political adventurers, persons who had been unable to serve their constituents and had been thrown out upon a cold, callous, and uncharitable world. The *Telegraph*, speaking on this subject since he had raised it in the House, had thought fit to speak in very strong terms about the action of the Government in that matter, and had condemned the appointment as unnecessary and unjustifiable. The questions he had asked required answers, and he should persist with them until he got satisfactory information. He strongly objected to persons, whom the accident of fortune had placed on the Government benches, creating jobs for either their political friends or their erst-

while political enemies. He characterised the appointment as a gross job. A billet had been deliberately created for Mr. Cross, and members of that Chamber had no opportunity of judging of the value of the work which he performed. That was really political corruption, and it might extend. If he knew in what vote this 10s. per diem to Mr. Cross was included, he would vote against it. This was an appointment which hon. members and persons throughout the colony condemned. Yet the Chief Secretary defended in a most unblushing manner this paltry, miserable little job. It was scandalous that hon. members opposite should sit behind a Government that did such a thing.

Mr. HIGGS (*Fortitude Valley*) said Sir Horace Tozer's appointment as Agent-General needed a great deal more explanation than Mr. Cross's appointment. He was not in the House when this appointment was made, and therefore he was not, probably, as well seized of the facts as the Chief Secretary was, who was present in the House at the time Sir Horace was appointed to that position.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL: Surely it is too late to discuss that now?

Mr. HIGGS: He did not think so. It was never too late to remedy what appeared to be a political wrong. Possibly the Government might prevail on Sir Horace to give up that position, out of deference to the wishes of hon. members on this side of the House. When Sir Horace was in this House he did not distinguish himself as a friend of the people of Queensland. He was at the head of the Police Department, and he issued the most bloodthirsty manual to the police of Queensland that had ever been issued in Australia. Instructions were given in that manual to the police in regard to certain strikers out West—in regard to bushmen, some of whom had distinguished themselves in South Africa in defending the Empire—there was a clause in that manual instructing the police to shoot to kill. Sir Horace was not even as merciful as Colonel Price. Sir Horace was a gentleman who had an overweening idea of his own importance, and he sat in this Chamber and contemplated himself as the responsible protector of the people of Queensland, and he issued instructions to the police to deal with these wild bushmen who were supposed to be armed to the teeth, and who he thought were contemplating a revolution in Queensland. Sir Horace did wrong in endeavouring to incite the police to commit bloodshed. Then, instead of allowing Sir Horace to battle for himself in this colony, they have found him a warm seat in the very nap of society in the old country, as a reward for something. His appointment was a political job—a far greater political job than the appointment of Mr. Cross. His salary of £1,500 was a great waste of money, because the Chief Secretary knew that Mr. Dicken, who acted as Agent-General for some time, performed his duties in a most exemplary manner. The appointment of Sir Horace was only made to get him out of the way. The Chief Secretary should give some explanation of this appointment. He had been informed that Sir Horace was to come back here to be the first Governor of the State of Queensland under federation. He trusted that one of the objects of the Chief Secretary's visit to London had not been to arrange that. The colony might survive if the Chief Secretary was appointed State Governor of Queensland, but never if Sir Horace was. If so, they would have a military caste at once, and they might see Sir Horace coming down to Parliament House at the head of a force and dissolving Parliament. In view of Mr. Dicken's capabilities, Sir Horace Tozer's appointment was unnecessary, and this £1,500 might very

well be struck off the sheet. In some respects Sir Horace, as Agent-General, might do some good from an advertising point of view; for he was most eloquent, and could paint most vivid pictures of life in Queensland. But when the Queensland National Bank discussion was on his vote was challenged on the ground that he had an interest in that institution, and he said he had none—that he was absolutely free from any personal interest in the institution—but soon after that he went to Gympie or Maryborough, and there stated that he was able to speak with regard to that institution with as much authority as anyone, because he held a considerable number of shares in it. A gentleman who could deal so carelessly with beautiful truth ought not to occupy the high position of Agent-General; and his very vivid imagination and voluble tongue were calculated to get the colony into trouble. He thought it would be a wise act on the part of the Government to withdraw him, even if they had to find a seat for him in the Assembly, where he could be attacked with more readiness than in his absence.

MR. REID (*Enoggera*): He noticed in the Agent-General's report that special numbers of the *Queenslander*, the *Sydney Mail*, and other papers were sent home for the information of the people in the old country through the Agent-General's Department, and he advised the Chief Secretary to make arrangements for a special number of the *Week* or the *Telegraph* containing a complete history of the North Chillagoe prospectus to be published and sent home for the benefit of the people there. The hon. gentleman should at least get Sir Horace Tozer's Queensland secretary to cut out a few columns of the *Telegraph* to send home for the Agent-General to distribute amongst the masses there, so that they might know exactly what kind of leading public men there were in Queensland; and if not distributed amongst the masses, they might be sent to the stock exchange to show the investments waiting for them in this colony. He had it on the best authority that this Queensland secretary to Sir Horace Tozer, who had been engaged to cut up newspapers at 10s. a day, sent a lot of political stuff with the cuttings he sent to the Agent-General—stuff which even the Agent-General himself objected to; and he wished to know from the Chief Secretary why that individual, who was a Civil servant in the employ of the Government, should be allowed to dabble in politics and write long screeds to the papers abusing the Labour party, and then cut them out and include them in the stuff he sent to the Agent-General. Any one who knew the style of that individual could tell when anything from him appeared in the papers. They knew that the Agent-General was a truthful man, and he had made the statement that he got political bit-bits particularly referring to the Labour party.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: Does he say that in his report? I cannot find it there.

MR. REID: People had told him that Sir Horace Tozer had told them so. Why was that individual allowed to dabble in politics, abusing one side, when no other Civil servant was allowed to do so?

MR. FORSYTH: Why should you object to him getting 10s. a day for abusing that side when you get £1 a day for abusing this side?

MR. REID said he got £1 a day for instructing the other side, and it was an exceedingly hard-earned £1. If the individual who used the scissors could not do as he had suggested in regard to the columns of the *Telegraph* referring to the North Chillagoe Company, no doubt the Bris-

bane Newspaper Company would be glad to issue 4,000 or 5,000 copies of a special number to be sent to the old country for distribution.

MR. RYLAND (*Gympie*) had seen those reports among many other famous [9 p.m.] things that he had seen in his wanderings, and could see no reason why the Government should not lay them on the table of the House. They consisted of newspaper clippings pasted on sheets of foolscap with notes in red ink on the margin. One extract he read referred to mining on the Etheridge, and was very fair information. Sir Horace Tozer told him that he wished to be in touch with the colony, and it saved him a great deal of time getting his information in that way, but that sometimes there were references to the different political parties in the colony, and he did not want that kind of thing at all, as he represented Queensland, and not any particular political party in the colony. It would certainly be more satisfactory if references to politics were avoided.

MR. STEWART (*Rockhampton North*) was surprised to hear one or two hon. members dilate on the minuteness and elaborateness of the report of the Agent-General. When he analysed it he found that it was chiefly—like the Agent-General himself—padding. Ten pages were devoted to the all-important question of immigration, and one page to what was, he believed, the real work of the Agent-General's office, that was the indent department. At page 12 the padding began. Under the heading of "Commercial" they were told how much meat was imported into Great Britain from all quarters last year. They were also told about salted hides, honey and beeswax, Queensland honey, shell, tortoiseshell, and rubber, and all about the butter trade between Australia and Great Britain, and how much sugar was imported into Great Britain from different countries. All that information was very interesting, but it was available in a dozen different places, without paying any man £1,500 a year to furnish it to them in an official report. It appeared to him that the Agent-General's office was a most expensive one, and that they were paying far too much for the service which it rendered. There were a dozen men in that office, and they divided among them nearly £5,000. The Chief Secretary would no doubt tell them what a hard-worked man Sir Horace Tozer was. He had no doubt that Sir Horace Tozer would work hard, or talk hard, wherever he was. He had heard that although that gentleman had a very great reputation in Queensland, he was one of the worst Home Secretaries they ever had in this colony. He had gone to that gentleman's office day after day, but could not see him; Sir Horace was simply inside his office talking his time away with people who went to visit him. Without seeking to flatter the present Chief Secretary, he (Mr. Stewart) made bold to say that, when he succeeded Sir Horace as Home Secretary, he got through his business in a much better way. No doubt Sir Horace Tozer could spread himself out beautifully in London, but what substantial return did the colony get for the money that was spent? They paid the Agent-General £1,500 per annum, his secretary £800 per annum, and a number of other officials hundreds of pounds per annum; and what return did the colony get for that expenditure?

HON. T. MACDONALD-PATERSON: He is out of pocket.

MR. STEWART: He might be; but what had the country to do with that? If he (Mr. Stewart) got £300 per annum, and spent at the rate of £50 per month—which was poverty

according to the hon. member for North Brisbane—what had the country to do with that? His contention was that taking that report they were not getting value for their money. Last year there were 125 indents.

Mr. FORSYTH: Look at the amount.

Mr. STEWART: One indent might be worth £100,000, and it might not occupy a day. A number of small indents would give much more trouble than one big one. Then, with regard to the consignments, there were 389 shipments. He supposed they would involve a little labour, but then they had a staff of twelve in the office. It appeared to him that they were particularly occupied in sending out leaflets, for last year they sent out 682,000. That office appeared to him, at a distance of 16,000 miles, to be overmanned and overpaid, and he hoped it would be overhauled to try if the expenditure could not be reduced somewhat. He saw that Sir Horace Tozer mentioned that his expenses for travelling were fixed at £4 per month. What travelling could a man in Sir Horace Tozer's position do in England on £1 per week travelling expenses? It would more likely be £1 per day—if he had to travel at all. He noticed that the management of our stock cost £10,206 per annum—about half what they paid the whole of our members of Parliament. He supposed it was due to some contract with the Bank of England, which had not expired and probably would not expire for some considerable time, but he suggested that when it did expire the management of their stock should be left in the hands of the Agent-General—if he was continued in that position—and that any new stock should be placed under his management. That was done in the case of South Australia, and if they could save £10,000 per annum in that way it would be very beneficial for the colony. On the credit side of Appendix B he saw an amount of £1,501,831 15s. 1d., and he wanted to know how that money was sent home, for the Treasurer had told them times without number that the interest on our national debt was paid out of exports.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: By bank exchange.

Mr. BROWNE wanted to get some information in connection with the following reference by the Agent-General to the military adviser:—

Major-General E. Harding Steward, C.M.G., has acted as adviser and inspector in connection with all matters relating to stores, etc., supplied on account of the Defence Force of the colony. I am not aware of the provision now made by the other colonies in this connection, but I adhere to the opinion I expressed last year—that a selection by all the colonies of one capable man to act for all is still advisable.

The hon. member for Brisbane North had brought up the matter about the inspecting engineer, and there were three inspectors and the military adviser also provided for, though the vote showed no salary for the military adviser. On page 11 he found that there had been 125 indents during the year, sixty of which were for defence (land and marine), nine for post and telegraph stores, thirty-one for railway requirements, and the remainder, twenty-five, miscellaneous. It appeared that the inspecting engineer had about sixty indents to attend to in the year.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It had always been considered unfortunate that the southern colonies would not agree with Queensland in maintaining Major-General Harding Steward as inspector of military stores. Hon. members would be aware that in January, 1899, it had been deemed advisable that an officer of the South Australian Defence Force should act for that colony, and Victoria and New South Wales concurred in that appointment. He understood that that officer had since returned to South Australia, and there

was at present no representative of the southern colonies acting in England as inspector of military stores. Queensland had continued connection with Major-General Harding Steward, who had given complete satisfaction, and no more efficient officer could be appointed. The appointment of an officer to represent Australia would doubtless come up for consideration, but in the meantime the connection with Major-General Steward would continue until some other arrangement was made.

Mr. BROWNE: What salary or allowance does he get?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: An amount of £120 would be put down for him on the Defence vote—not a very large fee. In the matter of the indents referred to, the hon. member had overlooked the consignments, and apart from those connected with the Defence Force, there had been 286 separate consignments which had to be attended to.

Mr. BELL saw that on page 22 of the report in connection with the selection of the Commandant of the Defence Force the Agent-General said—

During my absence in the United States an infantry officer was selected by the War Office for the post of Commandant. Various reasons presented themselves to me as calling for another and more suitable selection from another branch of the service.

He wanted to know whether the Agent-General took action in that matter without reference to the Chief Secretary?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Agent-General communicated to the Chief Secretary his views concerning the officer who was selected for the position by the War Office. For various reasons he thought a different selection should be made. In his opinion, Sir Horace Tozer had exercised a wise discretion in the matter, and the colony was to be congratulated on having secured the services of so excellent a commandant as Colonel Finn.

Mr. BELL: The hon. gentleman had missed his point. The paragraph he had read was either too egotistical or it was laying down a new departure which, in his opinion, ought to be checked. The Agent-General was taking a duty upon himself which should really fall upon the Chief Secretary. He wanted to know whether the appointment of the Commandant was entirely a matter for the Agent-General, or whether reference was made to the Cabinet and the Chief Secretary in Brisbane.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The matter was referred by him, through the Agent-General, to the War Office, and they made a certain selection. The Agent-General represented to the Chief Secretary in Brisbane that he thought a better selection could be made, and he was then instructed to communicate with the War Office, and make such representations as were necessary; and upon those representations another selection was made by the War Office.

Mr. HIGGS asked whether there was any record of the matter, and whether the House could get the official correspondence. Sir Horace Tozer appeared to have taken a most exalted view of his position.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He took a very judicious view.

Mr. HIGGS: Before proceeding further he would remark, by the way, that although the Agent-General was supposed to have only £4 a month for expenses, yet he drew no less than £311 11s. 3d. travelling expenses to the continent of Europe and attending the Philadelphia Trade Congress. During the absence of Sir Horace Tozer the War Office selected an infantry officer, and he represented to the War Office that various reasons presented themselves to him calling for

another and a more suitable selection. The Committee ought to be made acquainted with those reasons. Was any compensation paid to that officer who was selected when his services were dispensed with?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No; he was not engaged.

Mr. HIGGS: It would also be interesting to know whether the change was made owing to certain social reasons which were always prominent in making appointments of that kind.

Mr. LESINA understood the Agent-General had the final right of approval in appointments of that kind. Did his approval bind the colony to any appointment made?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Representations were made to the War Office, through the Agent-General, that an officer was required. When the War Office made a selection, the Agent-General had an opportunity of interviewing the officer so selected, and then he reported to the Government his recommendation or otherwise. Upon that he was instructed to approve. The Agent-General had not the right of appointment himself, but his recommendation would go a very long way with the Government. There had been no social influence whatever exercised in the matter. There was no reflection on the gentleman originally selected, but Sir Horace Tozer thought an officer from another branch of the service would be better qualified to discharge the duties of commandant. There was no correspondence on the subject—only a confidential telegram, which he should not produce.

Mr. LESINA asked whether it was possible to get copies of the various leaflets issued by the Agent-General; he should like to read them. The list on page 10 of the report showed that emigration leaflets, various, had been distributed to the number of 682,000, and that 30,000 copies had been issued of "Homes and Homesteads on the Darling Downs." Of "Queensland—How it is Progressing" (periodical), 35,000 [9.30 p.m.] copies were sent out; "Guide to Queensland" (illustrated), 30,000 copies; and "Dairying in Queensland" (leaflet), 5,000 copies.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: All those are obtainable here.

Mr. LESINA: He wanted to know where they could be got. Last session he had managed to get a couple of leaflets, brought out from the old country by immigrants, and he discovered on reading them that they contained many misstatements. It was just as well that they should be able to exercise some censorship in connection with such literature.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The leaflets dealing with immigration could be obtained from the Immigration Department. He fancied that "Homes and Homesteads on the Darling Downs" could be obtained from the Agricultural Department. The leaflets were contributed chiefly by the Departments of Agriculture, Lands, and Mines. They could all be easily obtained if hon. members were curious about them.

Mr. RYLAND: He found the following reference to the Queensland exhibit in the Imperial Institute on page 18 of the Agent-General's report:—

It is gratifying to be able to state that the Queensland section is one of the best equipped and most attractive in the commercial collections of the Imperial Institute.

He was surprised to read that, because, on visiting the institute, he had been greatly disappointed with the Queensland section, both as regards the exhibits and the general get-up of the section. It was the most forlorn and God-forsaken portion of the institute. He had been especially disappointed on account of the report

made last year by the Agent-General having been so very encouraging. It contrasted very unfavourably with the Western Australian section, which contained a splendid gold trophy, and presented the various resources of the colony in a most attractive form. In the Queensland collection there was hardly anything that was characteristic of the products of the colony, the finest exhibit being some pearl-shells.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He had also felt, on visiting the Imperial Institute, that the Queensland court did not present that attractive appearance which he had expected, but he had learned from Sir Horace Tozer that what had been done was very largely due to Mr. Dicken, Secretary to the Agent-General, and that before several exhibits had been sent to the Earl's Court Exhibition the Queensland section had presented a very different appearance. They could quite understand it when they remembered that there were two exhibitions being held simultaneously.

Mr. RYLAND: But the exhibits were back from Earl's Court when I was there.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The gold exhibit, for instance, had been sold, so that it could no longer be seen at South Kensington. No doubt West Australia had a very fine gold trophy; but, after all, it was only gilt blocks to represent the product of gold. He had no doubt that if the Queensland gold exhibit had been deposited in the South Kensington Museum it would have attracted a great deal of attention. He was very sorry he had not seen the exhibition at Earl's Court, the Queensland exhibit at which had been spoken of as one of the finest that had been made by any of the Australian States. The Queensland Court at the Imperial Institute needed a good deal to fill it up and make it attractive, and he only hoped that the Agent-General would continue his efforts to make the exhibit something worth inspection by colonists who visited it.

Mr. JENKINSON: At the exhibition held in Brisbane two years ago the gold exhibits in the mining court were dummies. Now, why could not similar models have been made for exhibition in the Imperial Institute? He agreed with what the hon. member for Gympie had said. The exhibit was enough to make a Queenslander hide his head. It was a standing disgrace to the colony, and also to the Agent-General who allowed it to be in such a condition.

Mr. BROWNE: Queensland is very seldom mentioned in the "Imperial Institute Review."

Mr. JENKINSON: With regard to the Greater Britain Exhibition at Earl's Court, there was one matter that he wished to refer to. He did not wish to use strong terms, but the announcement had been made in the papers, and also in the Agent-General's report, that several awards were made of diplomas, and gold, silver, and bronze medals. He happened to have been instrumental in sending one exhibit of gold and ores to that exhibition, and, as chairman of directors of the company, he received a notification to the effect that they had been awarded a gold medal. Accompanying that was a statement that, if they would send a cheque for the amount of the value of the medal, it would be forwarded. Now, in the face of the announcement in the Press that the medal had been awarded to them, it did not seem fair that they should be asked to pay for it.

Mr. BROWNE: The same thing was done with regard to the cake of gold from Croydon.

Mr. JENKINSON: He would also like to ask the Chief Secretary what were the Chillagoe Gold Mines referred to on page 19 under the heading of "Mining Section—diplomas of honour," etc., paragraph No. 2.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With regard to the models, he thought it would be a very good idea. In fact, he had a conversation with the Agent-General with regard to doing something in that direction when he noticed the bareness of the court in the South Kensington Museum. He thought it would be a very good idea, and he would communicate with him on the subject. With regard to the request for the recipients of awards to pay for valuable medals, he had no correspondence on the subject, and the information which the hon. member had given had come to him as a surprise. If the hon. member would write to the Chief Secretary's office on the subject, he would pursue it, and see what redress could be obtained. Of course these things were done through Dr. Jack, but he had left the department; in fact, he had left England before he (the Chief Secretary) reached there, so he had no opportunity of any conversation with him.

Mr. BROWNE: It is the promoters of the exhibition, not Mr. Jack.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Well, that officer had a very free hand in connection with the distribution of medals and awards. He could not explain why the words "Chillagoe Gold Mines" had been introduced. It was evidently a misprint. He presumed the manuscript had been printed just as it came from London.

Mr. JENKINSON: The hon. gentleman had said that he would write to the Agent-General with regard to making these medals. With all due respect, he (Mr. Jenkinson) did not think that was the proper way of doing it. We had the models in Brisbane at the present time. Why could not similar models be made here and sent home? He was sure that both Sir Horace Tozer and the Imperial Institute would be only too glad to receive them, and they would help to advertise the resources of the colony. With regard to the medals he would adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion and write to him on the subject.

Mr. LESINA: He noticed a list of papers that had been distributed. Among these were: *Sydney Mail* (special Queensland North number) 1,000 copies, and the *Queenslander* (West Moreton number) 2,000 copies. He regretted to see that that very intelligent organ, the *Street*, was not in the list. He would like to know how these papers were paid for?

The CHIEF SECRETARY explained that they were charged to the advertising vote.

Mr. LESINA: There was another matter—"William Finucane, Commercial Agent." That gentleman was down in the receipts and expenditure for the sum of £279 10s. What was that itinerant traveller doing now?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was relieving police magistrate now. This money had been well spent. Mr. Finucane possessed a great deal of ability and experience in commercial matters. He might at once inform the Committee that if we established a commercial depot in the City of London, he thought there were very few men better qualified to take charge of it than Mr. Finucane.

Mr. GLASSEY: Excuse me. I think there would be a good deal of opposition to that.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Mr. Finucane collected a great deal of very valuable information.

Mr. GLASSEY: Only in regard to one or two matters.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Sir Horace Tozer had a very high opinion of his abilities in that direction. Of course, hon. members would understand that he did not speak of any contemplated appointment, but he thought it only right to intimate that the money paid to Mr. Finucane

for travelling in England and over Europe, in connection with endeavouring to extend the industries of the colony, was well spent.

Mr. GLASSEY: He had not the slightest objection to the amount which Mr. Finucane's mission had cost. He thought Mr. Finucane did some splendid work, and was not overpaid for it. Indeed, he had been struck with the small amount which his mission had cost. Mr. Finucane was an exceedingly able man, but were it suggested that he should be appointed as the commercial agent of the colony in London, he should take very strong exceptions to the appointment. That brought him to another point. They were now within measurable distance of the establishment of the Commonwealth, and the time had arrived when the Government should reorganise the office in London, and make provision for the appointment of a first-class, broad-minded, and thoroughly well-equipped commercial man to represent the colony. Speaking generally, he thought that Sir Horace Tozer had made an excellent Agent-General, and had never spared himself in endeavouring to forward the best interests of the colony; but he quite agreed with the leader of the Opposition that the time had come when Queensland should be represented by a thoroughly capable commercial man, and not merely by an ambassador. He had in his mind such a man as Dr. Cockburn, of South Australia, who represented that colony in London. He was a most excellent man for the position, being a great enthusiast in all matters relating to the agricultural industry and its development. It was only during the last four years that they had established in South Australia an elaborate system for encouraging the producing interests of the colony. Large stores and receiving warehouses had been erected in Adelaide, and throughout the country there were branches to which a man could take a few cattle, either dead or alive, poultry, rabbits, or any kind of agricultural produce. There they would be received, an advance made, and the goods sent on to Adelaide, where they would be prepared for shipment and sent to London to be sold under the superintendence of the colony's representative. Subsequently the proceeds were remitted to the colony and handed over to the owners of the goods less the costs which had been incurred. In the establishment of that system Dr. Cockburn had taken a leading part, and the system had been brought more or less to perfection. He had taken a deep interest in that question for many years, and as far back as 1888—when addressing the electors of Bundamba—he had urged the establishment of such a system for Queensland. He should be glad to know if the Government had done anything with a view of making provision for the rearrangement in London of the Agent-General's office, so that the colony might be prepared when federation was accomplished. He thought it was a matter of some importance, and that was the only opportunity they were likely to have of discussing the question before federation was accomplished, and when things for some little time would be thrown more or less into a state of chaos.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No action had yet been taken in the direction indicated by the hon. member. It would be remembered that at no very distant period he had advocated a somewhat similar course being followed. He thought if the products of the colony were to be dealt with to the best advantage they must have an office in the city of London, but his suggestion had been met somewhat coldly by hon. members, who thought that to locate the Agent-General in Victoria street was the more advantageous arrangement. No doubt it had its advantages, and it placed him within easy communication with

the Colonial Office and his brother Agents-General. But he had always foreseen that the time must come when it would be necessary to have a special agent in the city of London to represent the colony. He did not believe the Australian States, even when the high commissioner who had been spoken of was appointed, would be likely to give up their individual representation in London.

Mr. JENKINSON: South Australia has an Agent-General and a commercial agent.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Quite so; but we had not advanced to that stage yet. Sir

John Cockburn was a gentleman [10 p.m.] capable of fulfilling both duties.

That was a matter that required a great deal of consideration. When federation was accomplished there would be many changes in connection with the offices in London and elsewhere, and then the Government would be in a far better position to judge of these matters than by anticipating what the results of federation would be. One of the primary duties of an office in London, hereafter, would be to place itself in contact with the commercial men of Great Britain, with a view to introducing Queensland's products more directly before the people there than was possible at present. The matter would receive the consideration of the Government; but at present they had no idea of altering the status of the Agent-General.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Agent-General, in his report, on page 18, says—

It would be desirable to have the samples of grain, etc., replaced at regular intervals. In spite of the utmost care, it is found that weevil will often appear in the samples, and though the grain is immediately cleaned, its appearance is often somewhat spoilt, and there are at present several samples of wheat and barley which require replacement by new specimens.

He would ask if anything had been done in the way of replacing damaged specimens? Was it the intention of the Government to send new samples?

Mr. LESINA wished to point out that on page 18 of the report it was also stated—

I shall be glad to avail myself of the presence of the Chief Secretary in London to point out to him some respects in which I consider there is room for improvement in this court, more especially connected with a regular supply of those products which bring home to visitors at a glance the fertility of agricultural lands.

He would like some information on that matter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: With regard to the query of the hon. member for Wide Bay, he believed that the Agricultural Department had been communicated with, and no doubt they would take steps to see that the samples were renewed from time to time.

Mr. JENKINSON: Has that been done?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He could not say. Unfortunately the Minister for Agriculture was ill, and the Under Secretary for that department was not present.

Mr. JENKINSON: It is four months since this report was received.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The report, when received, had been minuted on to the several departments concerned. Under the circumstances, the better course would be for hon. members to give notice of these questions, or they could get the information privately, if they so desired. He could not say what had been done by the Agricultural Department without inquiry. In reply to the hon. member for Clermont, he might explain that he did not see this report in London—he had only read it since his return to the colony. When he was in London the Agent-General had a great deal of work to attend to, because Mr. Dicken had to take his wife to Norway, on account of her health. Sir Horace was conse-

quently overwhelmed with work, and he might have overlooked some of these matters, but he promised to communicate with him on all matters that he had not attended to when he (the Chief Secretary) was in London.

Mr. RYLAND took exception to that portion of the report which said—

It is gratifying to be able to state that the Queensland section is now one of the best equipped and most attractive in the commercial collections of the Imperial Institute.

The experience of the Chief Secretary, the hon. member for Wide Bay, and himself was that the Queensland section was one of the worst in the institute. Such carelessness as to facts had a tendency to damage the whole report. He would like to hear the Chief Secretary's views on the matter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He had already referred to that matter.

Mr. RYLAND: The report is not correct.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That was a matter of opinion. He could not say what it might be like at the present time. There was an appearance of bareness when he saw it, but if filled up with the models and specimens it would very soon recover its attractive character.

Mr. RYLAND: One portion of the Agent-General's report he knew to be not correct, and that discredited the whole report as far as he was concerned.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES (Hon. R. Philp): In reference to the specimens that had been referred to, he might say that the gold had been sold, but the specimens remained intact. Sir H. Tozer had suggested that the specimens should be sent to the Imperial Institute, and the Mines Department had agreed to the suggestion.

Mr. TURLEY (Brisbane South): Supposing no members of the Assembly had seen the Imperial Institute, they would have been inclined to believe from reading the report of the Agent-General that the Queensland Court was the best furnished in the institute and the most attractive, but two members on the Opposition side and the Chief Secretary himself said that as a matter of fact it was the least attractive. When they had no evidence to refute statements made in the Agent-General's report, they were led to believe they were absolutely true; but if the report in one particular was proved to be not correct—putting it very mildly—what credence could be placed in the other portions of the report?

Mr. JENKINSON said that when he was in England he met the secretary of the Birmingham University, who was very anxious to know where it was possible to get samples from the various mines of the colony for the mineralogical section of the new university in that city. He (Mr. Jenkinson) mentioned the fact that samples had been sent from the colony for exhibition at Earl's Court, and said it might be ascertained from the Agent-General whether, after the exhibition, samples could be given to the university. He believed that if samples were presented to that institution it would assist in advertising the resources of the colony.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES said the specimens were not wanted back in the colony, and he would be very glad to instruct the Agent-General to hand over samples to any museum or institution, such as that mentioned by the hon. member, requiring a collection. They wanted to advertise the mining resources of the colony, and they could not do it in a better way.

Mr. HIGGS said that what had been stated by hon. members who had visited the Imperial Institute proved his contention that Sir Horace Tozer was not a reliable man to have in the

position of Agent-General. Sir Horace Tozer once stated that, after a shower of rain and during a single day, the grass grew a foot high.

The SECRETARY FOR MINES: He never said that.

Mr. HIGGS said he read it in a report of one of that gentleman's speeches.

Mr. COWLEY: He said a foot in a week.

Mr. HIGGS: They had been told by hon. gentlemen who had visited the Imperial Institute, that when Sir Horace Tozer said the Queensland Court was the most attractive, he was telling an untruth. It was another evidence to him of Sir Horace Tozer's incapacity to be Agent-General for the colony. Sir Horace should give up his position and start as a novelist, for a gentleman with his vivid imagination and fertile pen would be able to make a more ample salary as a novelist than he did as Agent-General. He would be the man to get to inspect mines, and write reports. He (Mr. Higgs) hoped the Minister would draw Sir Horace's attention to that discrepancy in his report. The office of Agent-General was an expensive one for the overburdened taxpayers of the colony, and his duties could be very well performed by the secretary, Mr. Dicken, at £800 per annum.

Question put and passed.

DEFENCE—FEDERAL GARRISONS.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £2,657 be granted to defray the expenses of federal garrisons. This amount was the proportion due by Queensland for the maintenance of the garrison at Thursday Island and the garrison at St. George's Sound. There was a decrease of £58 as compared with the amount voted last year. The men were to be put in khaki this year, which was a more suitable dress for Thursday Island. There was a small increase in the amount for good conduct pay, and an increase of £50 for clothing. Hon. members would find the total amount paid for the maintenance of those garrisons at page 20 of the Estimates, the sum being £9,250.

Mr. GLASSEY: In view of the lessons taught by the war in South Africa, he thought it was desirable that the Committee should know whether those garrisons were equipped with the most modern weapons. He was aware that the matter was one which would shortly be dealt with by the Federal Parliament, but it was desirable that they should see that in the meantime the garrisons were armed with up-to-date weapons.

Mr. BROWNE: The Commandant, in his report, said—

I have not seen this battery, but it is evidently by no means efficient. The attendance has been very bad throughout the year, and it has taken some of the members three years to pass into the ranks. The officers cannot know their drill, as they never get the opportunity to learn it, owing to their not having enough men on parade to drill with; in fact, the battery would be of little or no use if required to carry out the work of garrison artillery allotted to it in the scheme of defence of Thursday Island. It would seem that the officer commanding has done his best to keep the battery going under very adverse circumstances, but I am of opinion that it should be disbanded, unless great improvement be made during this year.

There was a footnote to that paragraph, in which the Commandant said—

Since writing this paragraph, I have inspected the T. S. G. Battery at Thursday Island. It merits a better report now and appears to have developed a new lease of life; it knows it is on its trial.

From those remarks it was evident that there had been something very wrong there for some time.

The CHIEF SECRETARY was informed that the remarks read by the hon. member for Croydon referred to the militia battery, and not

to the large guns belonging to the Federal Battery, which, he was told by the Commandant, were in thoroughly good order, and efficient.

Mr. REID suggested that when the arms collected from the Boers were being distributed among the colonies which had sent contingents to South Africa the Premier should endeavour to get up-to-date trophies—good, serviceable weapons—as that would save the colony expense.

Question put and passed.

CONTINGENTS FOR SERVICE IN SOUTH AFRICA.

The CHIEF SECRETARY moved that £40,000 be granted for expenses of contingents for service in South Africa. This amount represented the sum required for eight months from the 1st July, at the rate of £5,000 a month, and it was hoped that it would suffice to cover the expenditure connected with their contingents in South Africa, along with the contributions from the Imperial Government.

Mr. BROWNE: He did not know how long the hon. gentleman intended sitting; but he might mention that this vote was likely to take up a considerable time. Members required a good deal of information about the contingents, and the discussion upon that vote was the only opportunity they would have of getting it.

The PREMIER: I think we may wait until next week for it.

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

PAPER.

The following paper, laid on the table, was ordered to be printed:—Return to an order for copies of all correspondence between the Chief Secretary and the Secretary of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Department of Public Works.

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