

Queensland



Parliamentary Debates
[Hansard]

Legislative Assembly

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER 1901

Electronic reproduction of original hardcopy

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, 15 OCTOBER, 1901.

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

DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA—ACCESSION OF KING EDWARD VII.

MESSAGE FROM THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

The SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following message:—

S. W. GRIFFITH,
Lieutenant-Governor.

Message No. 8.

In reply to the Address, dated 17th July, from the Legislative Assembly, presenting a resolution of sympathy and congratulation for transmission to the King, the Lieutenant-Governor acquaints the Legislative Assembly that the resolution has been laid before His Majesty, and that he has received His Majesty's commands to convey to the Legislative Assembly of Queensland an expression of His most sincere thanks for their sympathy on the death of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria, and of His appreciation of their congratulations on His accession and their assurances of loyal devotion.

Government House,
Brisbane, 15th October, 1901.

PAPERS.

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

- (1) Fifteenth Report of the Registrar of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks.
- (2) Bulletin No. 3, North Queensland Ethnography, by Dr. Walter E. Roth, Northern Protector of Aboriginals, Queensland.
- (3) Preliminary Statement of Census for the year 1901.
- (4) Report, for the year 1900-1901, on the Marine Department.

The following paper was laid on the table of the House:—Supplementary return to order, relative to reports by Mr. Johnstone, teacher travelling in the Balonne electorate, made by the House, on motion of Mr. Story, on the 17th September last.

QUESTIONS.

SPECIAL TRAIN, CHIEF MECHANICAL ENGINEER.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*) asked the Secretary for Railways—

1. On what date was the special train used by the Chief Mechanical Engineer between Brisbane and Ipswich discontinued?

2. What was the cost of such train up to date of discontinuance?

3. Has the Chief Mechanical Engineer used any special trains since the stoppage of the special train alluded to in questions 1 and 2; if so, how many?

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. J. Leahy, *Bullooh*) replied—

1. From the date of instructions, 23rd September, 1901.

2. The cost of coal and wages is about 19s. per double trip.

3. No.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT LOAN REDEMPTION.

Mr. BARNES (*Bulimba*) asked the Premier—

Have the Government decided as to whether it is their intention to temporarily suspend payments due on account of local government loan redemption?

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

The Government will favourably consider the application of any local authorities who find difficulty in meeting their payments.

SUPPLY.

RESUMPTION OF COMMITTEE.

HOME SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT—POLICE.

The HOME SECRETARY (Hon. J. F. G. Foxton, *Carmarvon*), in moving that £172,663 be granted for "Police," said that there was an increase of £1,158 on the amount asked for last year, which he would endeavour to explain. Taking the various sub-headings, the departmental items amounted to £2,840, which was the same sum as was asked for last year. Then, with regard to "Executive," for 1900-1901 there was voted £121,510, and this year £122,182 was asked for. That had arisen from the fact that provision had been made for the office of Chief Inspector, at £450 a year, owing to the promotion of Inspector Douglas, who previously held the position of senior inspector in the Northern division. His salary was now £450, and was so during a portion of last year—after the promotion was made. The number of first-class inspectors had been reduced by the promotion of Mr. Douglas, and therefore his salary as first-class inspector at £425 a year came off, thus making an increase of £25. Third-class inspectors had been increased by one, at a salary of £200. This was one of the appointments strongly recommended by the commission. In the vote for constables there was a reduction, owing to nineteen men who were each receiving £132 a year having retired, and their places had been filled by men who were receiving £122 a year, making a reduction of £190. Additional pay to men attached to the Criminal Investigation Branch was increased by £37, and the additional pay to constables over four years' service £4, over eight years £4 additional, and over twelve years a further £4 additional for good conduct, was increased from £1,700 to £2,300; so that there was a total increase on the "Executive" vote of £672. The water police vote, £2,191, was the same as last year. The vote for 1900-1901 for contingencies was £47,250, and only £45,450 was asked for this year, showing a decrease in this subdivision of £1,800, which was due to the reduction in the items remounts, horses, fencing police paddocks, stores, and general contingencies. Altogether there was a total decrease

of £1,128. He would be very glad to give hon. members any information they wished with regard to these several items or with regard to the general administration of the Department.

Mr. MAXWELL (*Burke*) drew the attention of the Minister to cases where policemen in outside districts could not get a convenient school to send their children to. He suggested that young men who had just joined the force and were just married should be sent to spend their honeymoon to such places. Another matter was that the inspector in charge of the Gulf district reported that the horses there were a very bad lot, taken all round. The Burketown inspector sent policemen to report on fifteen head of horses. The first man reported that one of this mob of horses was good enough; the next reported that two would do, but the inspector bought up the whole lot. He pointed out that this transaction took place through a brother-in-law of the man in charge.

The HOME SECRETARY had no knowledge of the case mentioned by the hon. member, nor had the Commissioner. If the hon. member had mentioned the matter before, inquiries would have been made, and he would have been given any information that he wanted. It seemed, however, that the matter was one of ancient history, as he understood that the gentleman who was inspector there had been brought in to another district.

Mr. MAXWELL: Yes; quite recently, though. I wish to know whether you are going to keep policemen at places where there is no opportunity of getting education for their children?

The HOME SECRETARY: They could not provide schools for officers of police. They were not the only officers who were sometimes so situated. With regard to sending single men to outside places, it was not always that a single man was suitable for such stations, but now that the matter had been mentioned, no doubt the Commissioner would take a note of it, and endeavour to rectify it as far as possible. Did he understand that applications had been made in such cases, and that the applications had been ignored?

Mr. MAXWELL: They have made application to the inspector in charge of the district.

The HOME SECRETARY: If the men had made application, and they had reason to believe that they had not been fairly treated, they could appeal to the Commissioner. But the hon. member would see that in many of those outside places it was necessary to have a married man.

Mr. MAXWELL asked what amount was allowed to constables in charge of stations for "tuckering" prisoners?

The HOME SECRETARY: The allowance varied according to the actual cost of provisions in the district, and went up as high as 3s. a day—he dared say 3s. 6d. a day in some very outside places.

Mr. GIVENS (*Cairns*) had it on very good authority that in outside places where policemen had to keep prisoners, the accommodation was very insufficient. In many cases there was no lockup, and constables who were held responsible for the security of their prisoners had for their own protection to chain them to a log, or something of that kind. He also understood, on the very best authority, that cases had occurred in which constables who had applied for reasonable remuneration for the keep of prisoners were only given a bread and water allowance, and that in some instances where a constable had to keep a man he was out of pocket. That was unfair to the constable, and unfair to the prisoner who was not convicted, but merely arrested on suspicion. With regard to the case at Chillagoe recently mentioned by the junior member for Charters

Towers, he had made inquiries into the matter, and the only satisfaction he could get was that the constable had no other course open to him than that which he adopted—that was, to provide bread and water for the prisoner, or else pay for his keep out of his own pocket.

The HOME SECRETARY: According to the regulations bread and water was the diet which was allowed strictly, but it was not usual to adhere to that regulation with absolute strictness. Some indulgence was allowed, and invariably the constable was made a small allowance for extra rations supplied to prisoners, especially in places where they underwent considerable hardship. At night when a policeman was camping out with a prisoner it was sometimes necessary to secure the prisoner to a log or handcuff him to himself. In the particular case under consideration the fact that something of the kind did occur was owing to a misapprehension in regard to certain orders given by the sub-inspector, which apparently were not explicit enough or were misread by the constable. The matter was under consideration, and an explanation had been called for, but what was done in that case was not the usual practice.

Mr. GIVENS was very glad to hear the explanation given by the Minister. He knew the constable, and believed he was a very good officer. He did not wish to be placed undeservedly under a stigma, and he wrote to a friend asking him to make inquiries into the matter, and in reply he was informed that that was the first time in his life that the constable had done such a thing, and that he did it under express instructions from the sub-inspector, who told him to adhere strictly to the regulations.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, the sub-inspector referred him to the manual, and his instructions were not sufficiently explicit, or were misunderstood by the constable.

Mr. GIVENS: It was also stated that sometimes constables had to pay for extra rations supplied to prisoners, and he hoped that matter would be rectified in future.

Mr. DUNSFORD (*Charters Towers*): The questions that he had asked were in reference to two young *Charters Towers* boys who were arrested in the Chillagoe district, and who were kept chained up for seventeen days

[4 p.m.] and fed on bread and water.

A complaint to that effect was made to Judge Mansfield in *Charters Towers*, and, hearing of the complaint, he (Mr. Dunsford) thought such a thing required some explanation. The answer he received was that the Commissioner was calling for further particulars, and that the matter was under investigation; but he had not yet learned what the result of the investigation was. It should not be possible under the police regulations to keep anyone at all chained up in that way and fed on bread and water. Prisoners who were actually sentenced were not treated so severely, and it might be that persons arrested on suspicion were perfectly innocent. Those two young fellows had certainly been very inhumanely treated.

Mr. FORSYTH (*Carpentaria*) noticed that the Commissioner in his report spoke of the necessity of opening a police station at Lawn Hill. There was a considerable amount of mining going on there now, and, while he believed the people were very law-abiding, it was absolutely necessary that there should be a police station there, as the place was likely to develop very greatly. There should also be some police stationed in the neighbourhood of the Staaten River, not so much for the protection of life as for the protection of cattle. A large number of cattle were speared by the blacks there, according to Dr. Roth. If they had a sergeant and two or three black trackers, it

would be all that was necessary. He had had an interest in a small station in that district fifteen or twenty years ago, and a good many of their cattle had been speared by the blacks, although he believed that the losses from that cause were not nearly as great as they were in those days. With regard to the police horses in the Gulf country, some two or three years ago he saw about forty head of police horses in a yard in Normanton, and they were in very bad condition. Of course, they had a lot of work to do in the wet season, but the remounts should be kept up. In that district horses were very cheap now, as decent horses could be got for £5 or £6, whilst fifteen or twenty years ago they cost three times as much; so that there need be no difficulty in obtaining plenty of horses for remounts. He would like the Home Secretary to give an expression of opinion with regard to the police station at Lawn Hill, and police protection for the Staaten River district.

The HOME SECRETARY: The opening of a police station at Lawn Hill had been favourably reported upon by the Commissioner, and he hoped to be able to accomplish it as soon as he was in a position to do so. Unquestionably they were short of police—that was one of the matters in which they had to economise, unfortunately. The opening of a police station on the Staaten River was also favoured by the Commissioner, who proposed to make a tour of that particular district at the earliest possible moment. He might also say that, personally, he was strongly in favour of the extension of the jurisdiction of the Normanton police, for the reason that there was a very large aboriginal population in the North, and it was desirable that they should be taken in hand properly. The mission reserves at Mapoon and the Batavia River would have their boundaries extended as far as the Archer, and he hoped the Bishop of Carpentaria would open a station at the mouth of the Mitchell. By that means there would be a continuous line of supervision over the blacks from Normanton to Thursday Island.

Mr. J. HAMILTON (*Cook*) hoped if the mission reserves were extended facilities would be given to miners, because included in that area was a large area of mineraliferous country.

The HOME SECRETARY: On the west coast?

Mr. J. HAMILTON: Even on the west coast towards Cape York. He supposed there would be no objection to allowing *bond tide* prospectors to prospect that country?

The HOME SECRETARY: None whatever.

Mr. TOLMIE (*Drayton and Toowoomba*) congratulated the Home Secretary and the Commissioner on the decided improvement that had taken place in the treatment of females by appointing female searchers. That system had been found to work admirably in Brisbane, where the Salvation Army had come to the assistance of the department, and he trusted that the plan would be extended to the outside districts such as the Darling Downs and other large centres of population. He was sure that from the ranks of the Salvation Army some woman could be found who would act as searcher or attendant without being appointed permanently. If the services of such women were required they could be made available at very small remuneration. He would also draw attention to that part of the Chief Inspector's report where he spoke of the necessity for repairs to the Toowoomba barracks. He hoped the Home Secretary would see his way to carry out the suggestions during the present year.

The HOME SECRETARY could give the hon. member an assurance that the work would be carried out as soon as possible. There were, however, lockups in Queensland which consisted of a post, a couple of chains, and handcuffs attached.

He had a photograph of one of them, and when a very rapacious member came to him asking for expenditure, he usually pointed to that photograph and he collapsed. It was all a question of money. He freely admitted that a great deal more money should be expended on repairs and matters of that sort, but the Police Department, like other departments, had to economise. In regard to the matter of female searchers, the plan had succeeded excellently well, and he hoped to be able to bring it into vogue at all large centres when money was available.

Mr. FOGARTY (*Drayton and Toowoomba*) contended that instead of a decrease, there should have been an increase in the vote so as to give well deserved promotion to a number of men. A matter of that sort lay entirely with the Home Secretary, who should recommend extra expenditure to the Cabinet. He knew there were many deserving men in the force who should have promotion, and if it were possible to ascertain the opinion of the Commissioner, he was sure he would be only too glad to promote them if money were available. They possessed an excellent force at the present time; but unless encouragement was given to the men it was likely to deteriorate.

The HOME SECRETARY did not quite understand to what class of men the hon. member alluded to.

Mr. FOGARTY: I was not referring to any class in particular.

The HOME SECRETARY: Did the hon. member want everyone in the force to get promotion?

Mr. FOGARTY: No.

Mr. MAXWELL: It appeared to him that a good many branches of this department were being starved. There had been £250 taken off the vote for horses, £500 off the fencing of paddocks, £500 off stores and general contingencies, and even £50 off music. He did not think they would gain much if they starved the department; it would be much better to keep it in an efficient condition, especially so far as horses, etc., were concerned. He complained that in the district which he represented the police for the greater part of their time were out on the stations endeavouring to catch cattle thieves or doing some description of work which ought to be paid for by the owners of the stations. The result of this was that the townships for weeks together were left without proper police protection. He also drew attention to the congregation of young fellows around the corners of streets in Brisbane on Saturday and other nights, and thought that something should be done to move them on and to prevent their using bad language, and making the footpaths offensive by spitting on them.

Mr. FOGARTY said he had spoken seriously when he had advocated the claims of men of long service and unblemished record in the Police Department to promotion, carrying higher remuneration, but the Home Secretary did not seem inclined to treat it in that way. The hon. gentleman had said jocularly that he (Mr. Fogarty) had advocated a rise all round, but he was certain that the hon. gentleman's misunderstanding of what he had said was assumed.

The HOME SECRETARY: You have no right to assume that, because it is not correct.

Mr. FOGARTY: It was assumed, and he would repeat for the hon. gentleman's information what he had said before. He thought that it would encourage these men to further exertions if they received the consideration which they were entitled to.

Mr. KERR (*Barcoo*): With the hon. member for Burke, he was inclined to think that this vote was being starved. He had formed that opinion because he had found when coming

down the Thompson River last May that a number of the policemen had been taken away from the different townships and the acting sergeants only left there. As the acting sergeants were also acting clerks of petty sessions they were unable to attend to the wants of the surrounding districts, with the result that both the townships and the surrounding districts were left without proper police protection or supervision. The inspector at Longreach in his report stated that there had been an increase in sheep and cattle stealing in the district, and he (Mr. Kerr) instanced cases where it had been impossible to follow up offenders properly because the police had other duties to perform, or because there were not sufficient of them to do the work of the district. He had received complaints about the inadequacy of the police in the district from not one place merely, but Isisford, Stonehenge, Jundah, and even Blackall, he was informed, was working short-handed. He believed that this had been caused by the removal of policemen to take charge of newly opened up stations. He thought if men were taken away in that fashion there should be other men provided to take their places. With the member for Burke he also thought it was false economy to cut down the allowance for horses and for remounts. To make the force efficient in the country districts it was essential that the men should be well mounted. At the present time a good number of the police horses were so old that they ought to be disposed of and others obtained in their place.

Mr. SMITH (*Bowen*) sympathised with the hon. member for Barcoo in what he had said, for he knew that on some cases the [4.30 p.m.] police were supplied with horses which were not fit for the work they were required to do. Then, again, criminals were generally well mounted, and if the police were not equally well mounted, how could they be expected to catch those criminals? In many districts cattle-stealing was on the increase—in the Normanton district especially—owing to the increased value, and he did not think the department was sufficiently alive to this matter. Something ought certainly to be done to see that the police were well mounted.

The HOME SECRETARY: With regard to the matter raised by the hon. member for Barcoo, the department knew that the horses in that district were not satisfactory, and he could inform the hon. member that fourteen head were now being sent out to that district. These matters were not overlooked by the Commissioner. With regard to the statement that £750 was too little for remount horses—that the amount should be the same as was voted last year—he might mention that last year it became necessary to make large purchases of horses, and a number of these horses were still on hand; so it was not necessary to increase the expenditure this year the same as it had been last year.

Mr. FORSYTH: Last year the amount for "forage expenses" was £7,000. He would like to know if this £7,000 was the normal vote in this connection, and if that amount was included in the increase of £8,655, as mentioned in the Financial Statement.

The HOME SECRETARY: The exact amount expended last year for forage was £8,399, and that was included in the general increase.

Mr. JACKSON (*Kennedy*): It was very unpleasant for hon. members to have to ask the Government to spend money on the establishment of police quarters and lockups, still the necessity occasionally arose. As the hon. member for Toowoomba, Mr. Tolmie, had led the way he would follow in his steps. A little township called Brookville, or Donnybrook, had sprung into existence near Ravenswood, and after some

little agitation police quarters had been erected there, but he thought a lockup was also necessary, and he hoped the Home Secretary would see his way to cause one to be erected there as soon as possible. That was a very go-ahead district, the population there was increasing, and it promised very soon to become as large a town as Ravenswood itself. Then with regard to the employment of female searchers in Brisbane he recognised that the department had done its best, and the system might be extended with advantage. Of course the largest proportion of these arrests were in the towns. According to the table furnished by the Commissioner, 1,700 females were arrested last year, and the largest proportion was in the Southern portion of the colony, but something should be done in the way of having female searchers in towns in the outlying districts. Sergeants and senior constables out there were generally married men, and he thought that their wives should be allowed to act as female searchers.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is done everywhere. The other is a special arrangement.

Mr. JACKSON thought Salvation Army women could be got to act as searchers. However, he was very glad that the Home Secretary and the department had recognised that this system should be established, and that something had been done in that direction.

Mr. HARDACRE (*Leichhardt*) wished to refer to the police accommodation in his own district. He did not blame the Home Secretary in the matter, or his department. He thought the cause of the delay had been with the Works Department. Police buildings were passed for erection at Alpha and Daringa, and they had been promised as far back as four or six years ago. Action was taken in the matter, but there was some delay, and it was subsequently decided to erect buildings at a reduced estimate, when suddenly the retrenchment policy came in and the work was stopped. He would ask the Minister to push on the work at both Alpha and Daringa.

The HOME SECRETARY: As hon. members would see when they got further on with the Estimates, they had a very small amount, comparatively speaking, to spend on buildings of this kind, very much less than he could spend judiciously. There were certain urgent works which, having regard to the smallness of the vote, commanded first attention, such, for instance, as works on new goldfields which had become permanently established, where there was a large number of adult males, and where, as a rule, the population was necessarily more turbulent than in places which were more settled. Those places required attention. He could only say to the hon. member for Leichhardt, as he had said to others, that as soon as he was in a position to do it all those necessary buildings would be undertaken.

Mr. MAXWELL: Can you tell us if you are going to look after those young fellows who congregate at the corners of the streets?

The HOME SECRETARY: Although the police assumed, and very properly assumed, to deal with the street traffic, it was not necessarily their duty to do so, but he hoped that the matter would be placed completely under their jurisdiction before the session closed by the passage of the Bill now before the Assembly for the regulation of the traffic in Brisbane.

Mr. GIVENS: It is badly wanted.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes, it was, but there was an immense improvement in the matter compared with what was the condition of affairs five years ago.

Mr. KERR agreed with the hon. member for Leichhardt in his remarks about the courthouse at Alpha, but thought there were cases which more urgently required attention. For instance,

there was no lockup at Stoneherge. He understood that the department had decided to erect a place there, and it was very much wanted, for it was one of the places where a post and chain were made to do duty as a lockup. Places like that should receive attention in preference to places which had a lockup.

Mr. LESINA (*Clermont*) had a grievance in connection with the Police Force in his district. Capella had recently been granted a fine new State school, at which some eighty or ninety scholars attended. The population round the place, though scattered, was pretty large, there were several big stations in its vicinity, and settlement was going on very rapidly. Yet the population there were deprived entirely of any police protection. There were times when a number of visitors came into the town from the surrounding stations at the shearing season, and they were apt to get a little merry occasionally, and there was not even one policeman to cope with any outbreak that might occur. He believed that arrangements had been made for a constable from Clermont, who was some miles away, to visit the place on Saturday nights and other special occasions, but he thought that a constable should be stationed there permanently. When he was there he called to have a look at the local police station, which consisted of a small weatherboard cottage of about four rooms. The lockup consisted of a bottle-tree, which was located in the backyard, about 4 yards from the backdoor of the kitchen. Round the bottle-tree there was a heavy 2-inch cable chain, to which were attached a couple of handcuffs. When a man went on the "razzle-dazzle," and painted the town red, he was promptly taken in hand by the officer of the law, and chained up to the bottle-tree. When he (Mr. Lesina) was there the policeman told him that on some occasions when the weather was wet, and it was raining heavens hard, out of pure charity he had taken a "drunk" and put him into an empty bunk in the house, and that if the "drunk" were excessively blasphemous, or had an attack of the horrors, he roared, and yelled, and screamed all night within a few yards of where the policeman and his wife were sleeping. It appeared that the Government, not having money to build a lockup, promptly abolished the lockup they had and took the policeman away. But how was it possible for the Government to spend money on necessary reforms like that which he advocated when they expended about £3,000 in crackers a little while ago? The local divisional board, which consisted almost exclusively of true-blue supporters of the present Government, had sent down a protest against being deprived of police protection, and had intimated that they thought the time had arrived for building a small police station and providing suitable lockup accommodation. With regard to horse-feed, the policeman who had been there had informed him that he had no horse-feed, and that he had to send his horses to a paddock 8 or 10 miles away, which meant that if a child or man got lost in the bush the policeman would have to go round the district to borrow a horse in order to assist in the search. Possibly there were other reasons. In comparison with the reckless expenditure in every department in Brisbane, it appeared to him that those outside districts were treated in a most parsimonious fashion. He hoped that the department would take the matter into serious consideration, and, when it was able to afford it, that it would re-establish the constable at Capella, and that it would also provide him with decent quarters, and also some decent shelter for the casual criminal.

Mr. HARDACRE pointed out that since the police magistrate left Springsure the sergeant of

police had to do practically the Lands Department work as well as the registration work, with the result that the whole of the Springsure district, which extended over 100 miles in some directions, had only one constable left to do the whole of the police work. There had been a good deal of cattle-duffing in the past, and now that cattle had risen in price it was likely to go on to an even greater extent. It was therefore necessary, either that the strength of the police force in the district should be augmented, or else that the sergeant should be enabled to assist in looking after the district.

Mr. MAXWELL hoped that if the requirements of the hon. member for Barcoo and the hon. member for Leichhardt were attended to the police cells would be erected some little distance from the residence of the police, as the language of prisoners sometimes got beyond the crimson to the blue stage. He knew of three or four instances in which the wives and families of police constables were compelled to listen to such language through the cells being practically under the same roof as the police quarters.

Mr. KEOGH (*Rosewood*) said that one portion of his district was inadequately provided with police protection. He did not blame the Commissioner, as he had been informed by the Home Secretary that it was impossible to grant the protection that was required, owing to the necessity for economy. The population was closely settled in his electorate, and, owing to the erection of some new public-houses, there was a good deal of drinking going on. Petitions had been sent in by the people resident in the district stating that they were prepared to pay a certain amount to bring cattle-duffers before the court, which was more than had been done by the people in any other portion of the colony, and that should entitle them to some consideration. He thought the people would be satisfied if two or three men were stationed at Rosevale, Harrisville, and Rosewood. It was a very big electorate, and he thought they were justly entitled to such a small concession.

Mr. LESINA said that there were one or two items in the Commissioner's report with which he would like to deal. First and foremost he desired to congratulate the Commissioner upon the fact that he was the recipient of a memento from His Royal Highness the Duke of York during his recent visit, and it was to be trusted that the Commissioner deserved the high encomiums that were passed upon his administration of affairs at that time.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA: It was rather regrettable that the Attorney-General—who had attached himself like a limpet to the Duke—had not received some similar memento. However, the hon. gentleman got a signed photograph, he believed, for which they ought to be duly thankful.

Mr. JACKSON: The Attorney-General was only doing his duty.

Mr. LESINA: He knew that the hon. member for Kennedy was very loyal, and that he cheered vigorously at the street corners on every occasion during the visit of the Duke, and that he attended all the banquets.

Mr. BELL: He is a good deal more loyal than you are.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. LESINA: He noticed from the Commissioner's report that 18,861 persons were apprehended during last year, and of that number 8,837 were apprehended for drunkenness—nearly one-half of the total number of arrests. Taking into consideration that drunkenness was probably the most common offence in Queensland, its commonness was unquestionably due to

the dreadful adulteration which was referred to in Dr. Ham's report, which they had discussed the other night. The report also stated that in nearly every district stock-stealing was on the increase, and that it was largely due to the enhanced value of stock. They were frequently told, both in that Committee and outside, that all those who owned stock were practically ruined. The Commissioner said that stock stealing was increasing on account of the enhanced value of stock. Stock was increasing in

[5 p.m.] value; consequently the owners of stock were richer than they were.

That was a point well worth stowing away for future reference. He noticed, too, that reference was made to a number of prosecutions which had taken place under the Aboriginals Protection and Restriction of the Sale of Opium Act, and that fines had been inflicted on the offenders, who were chiefly Chinamen. That was another evidence of the evil of having the alien chow in our midst. He hoped after that that members on the other side, who had a curious weakness for the Chinaman, would not get up and defend him in the way they had done in the past, seeing that he was largely responsible for the degradation of the already degraded aboriginals. It was very refreshing to think that the Commissioner and those under him were actively prosecuting Chinamen who offended in that direction, and it was to be hoped that they would not relax their efforts, and that the men would be encouraged to exercise even greater vigilance. Members on his side had always contended that the Chinaman was largely responsible for the degradation of the aboriginal, and by insisting upon that point they were doing excellent work.

Mr. JACKSON had no doubt that the hon. member for Clermont's remarks about himself were meant in a jocular spirit; but jokes did not always appear in *Hansard*. With regard to what the hon. member said about his standing and cheering at street corners, and attending banquets while the Duke of York was in Brisbane, he might say that he had not been invited to any banquets; but if he had been he should have been glad to show his loyalty by attending. He would remind the hon. member that he had taken the oath of loyalty to the King, and it did not become any hon. member to make jokes of that sort.

HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Mr. LESINA hoped the hon. member for Kennedy did not misunderstand him. It was undoubtedly pleasing to hear that the hon. member found it necessary to attend public banquets to advertise his loyalty, and that his statement of that fact should be cheered so vigorously by the other side. The Empire no doubt felt safer since the hon. member for Kennedy had expressed his loyalty to it.

Question put and passed.

POLICE INVESTMENT BOARD.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £14,000 be granted for the Police Investment Board. That was the usual increased amount, and hon. members were well aware of the circumstances, and there was no help for it. Contracts must be fulfilled by the Government under the Police Superannuation Act. The increases would go on until £25,000 a year was voted, and then the amount would gradually decrease as the old pensioners dropped off.

Mr. TURLEY (*Brisbane South*): Were they to understand that the Government did not intend to deal with that matter except by allowing the vote to increase year by year? The hon. gentleman said the vote would increase until it reached £25,000. Already the fund owed

the colony half-a-million, and yet the Government did not attempt to deal with it in any way. There was not a penny at present to the credit of the fund from the 4 per cent. which was being paid in by the new members of the force, and he was of opinion that in a short while they would be in the same position as the New South Wales Government, who had had to vote a million of money in order to keep a pension fund solvent. The actuarial report which was obtained by the Government showed that the total liability to the Government was £463,981.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is not correctly stated.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes it was. Under the old Superannuation Act the members of the force paid 2 per cent., and received full salary on retirement. Under the new Act they paid 4 per cent., and received two-thirds of the average salary for the preceding three years. In addition to that, a considerable amount was paid into the funds from the police reward fund. Every penny of the fund was now being paid away, and, in addition, the Government were voting a large sum yearly.

The HOME SECRETARY: I said that would gradually decrease until it ran down to nothing.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman was not justified in making that statement. As a matter of fact he did not believe that even the new superannuation law was going to provide a sufficient fund to pay the superannuation allowances to the police. He thought it was Sir Hugh Nelson, when he was Premier, who said three years ago that he did not believe that the amount paid in by the constables would be sufficient, even supplemented by the police reward fund, to meet the liabilities that would accrue. It was not correct to say that the claim on the Government would go down to nothing; the amount would go up, and then it would decrease.

The HOME SECRETARY: It will gradually decrease.

Mr. TURLEY: Yes, but they did not know how far it would decrease. He thought it would be a long way better if something were done whereby the public would know exactly what their liability was to the Police Force. If it was necessary at the present time, or within a reasonable time, that the country should raise a sum of money, whether £300,000 or £400,000, to put this fund on a fair basis, it would be better that that should be done, and then it should be understood that whatever agreement there might be under this Police Superannuation Act, the colony would not be responsible for any more than was collected from the people themselves. He had always believed in insurance by the State, which included as a nucleus all persons employed by the State, with facilities to persons outside to join in it; but here they were giving year after year a gradually increasing amount, and they did not know where the liability would end. There was a general opinion that whilst the amount they would be required to vote might go up to £25,000, or go down to £10,000 or £8,000, the colony would be continually called upon to vote year after year a certain amount of money towards this arrangement. He wished the Government would deal with the matter in a manner that would be satisfactory to the people. In New South Wales they had voted £1,500,000 for the civil service superannuation fund, and that fund was insolvent again. They had decided to let it go on, and then after a while the colony would have to raise a loan of £1,000,000 or £2,000,000 to place the fund on a right footing.

The HOME SECRETARY: The police superannuation fund and the civil service superannuation fund in New South Wales he did not think were on the same footing.

Mr. TURLEY: No, but very near it.

The HOME SECRETARY: No, nor anything near it, because the Act under which these pensions to the police had accrued, so far as the provisions concerning pensions were concerned, had been repealed, so that there would be no further increases under it. Nothing further could accrue under the 2 per cent. contributions. They were now dealing with those pensions which until the lapse, perhaps from fifteen to twenty years, would gradually increase up to, say, £25,000 a year, and then would gradually decrease. These were the pensions to the men who contributed only 2 per cent, and by that time they would be getting the men who were contributing 4 per cent. just now. The amount required would gradually decrease from £25,000 down to £10,000 or £5,000, but no one could tell exactly what it would be. It was not correct to say that the State would have to find nearly £500,000 for this fund.

Mr. TURLEY: That is the liability.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was not correct. The liability of the State was the annual contribution, and if it took the interest on half-a-million of money to provide the amount of the annual contribution when all the pensions had been paid, the capital would remain to the State. If they provided a capital sum, by loan or debentures—and it was purely a Treasurer's matter—sufficient to provide at a given rate of interest the whole of the pension money required, then, inasmuch as the pensions would be paid out of interest, the capital would remain after the pensions had been paid.

Mr. TURLEY: That is not so.

The HOME SECRETARY: That is so.

Mr. TURLEY: I think you will remember there was a letter from the actuary in the Press after you had made that statement, and he pointed out where you were wrong.

The HOME SECRETARY: If it were necessary to raise a sum of money sufficient to pay these pensions until this particular pension system had run out, when the last pension had been paid the capital would remain to the State.

Mr. TURLEY: That is not so according to the actuary. He says it will take the whole of the capital and the interest to meet the liability.

The HOME SECRETARY: Then it only meant that the capital sum to be raised would have to be larger. It was simply a question of amount.

Mr. GIVENS thought the statement of the hon. member for South Brisbane was perfectly correct. The House would have to face an increasing expenditure under this head, unless something were done to put the fund on a proper footing. Last year they voted £11,000 to supplement the police superannuation fund, and this year they were asked to vote £14,000. The total amount disbursed by the Police Investment Board last year, as appeared from their report, was £16,000, and out of that £11,000 was contributed from the general revenue. In looking over the report he noticed that there were certain things which needed rectification in the management of the fund. A gratuity of £32 10s. had been paid, and he did not know what power this board had to grant gratuities. A little lower down the report said that the refundment of contributions amounted to £204 10s. 2d. This was a very serious matter, involving the exercise of political influence of a very grave character with regard to the administration of this fund, and also involving the question of fair treatment amongst the rest of the police. The Police Investment Board had not the power to refund the contributions paid in by any constable, who for any reason had retired from the force. If he was allowed to resign to

save dismissal, or was dismissed or resigned voluntarily, the board had no power to pay back any portion of the money he had contributed to the fund. But he knew that they had done so. He knew one case of a constable having his money refunded last year, and it had caused a great deal of dissatisfaction amongst other policemen who had either been dismissed or had resigned. These men rightly thought that if this money was refunded in one case of this sort it should be refunded in all other such cases. The report of the Police Investment Board bore out his statements, for it says that the refund of contributions amounted to £204 10s. 2d. He did not know whether that amount had been refunded in one case or not; but he knew there was one constable who had been stationed in the vicinity of Bundaberg, and he was informed that he was allowed to resign to save himself from dismissal; he applied to have his contributions to the fund refunded to him, and on the recommendation of the present Minister for Lands, Mr. O'Connell, the amount was refunded to him. That was the plain statement of the case, and yet the Home Secretary said that no political influence was allowed to come into these matters. He maintained that this fund was practically insolvent to-day; it was not able to pay one-third of the amount necessary to pay these pensions, and this House was asked to vote two-thirds of the amount required every year. And in this case the board did not make the refund, but it was done by Executive minute through the influence of the present Minister for Lands. That was a piece of gross political interference in a matter of this kind, which should not be allowed. No less than three constables, hearing of this case, had applied to him in order to get him to try and get refunds for them. He went to the Commissioner, and as soon as he understood the case from the Commissioner he did not try to bring any political influence to bear upon him, but he determined that the matter should be thrashed out in the House. If this sort of political influence was to continue it would be a bad day for the colony. If there was a clause in the Act which permitted refunds in one case, why should not that apply to all these cases?

THE HOME SECRETARY: The point was this: He knew that under certain circumstances the amount contributed could be refunded. He was perfectly satisfied of that.

MR. GIVENS: The fund is insolvent. If there is no money, how can you refund it?

THE HOME SECRETARY: Parliament was voting the money year by year. Clause 8 of the Act provided—

Subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, every member of the Police Force shall upon retiring from the force under the foregoing provisions of this Act be entitled to the superannuation allowance or gratuity, as the case may be, hereinafter prescribed and respectively applicable to his term of service and particular case.

MR. GIVENS: How could you refund this money under that? This is not a gratuity.

THE HOME SECRETARY presumed that this man got a gratuity.

MR. GIVENS: No, he got a refund. The police regulations say that the money cannot be refunded.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The Act says that a gratuity can be given.

MR. GIVENS: A refund cannot be given under the Act or under the regulations.

THE HOME SECRETARY: What was the difference? He knew that if he was going to receive it he would not inquire whether it was a refund or a gratuity, and if he was going to pay

it he would not inquire what it was either. It was a question of money, call it what you liked. He did not know the difference.

MR. AIREY: A refund was money that had been contributed.

THE HOME SECRETARY: A man would not be entitled to a gratuity if he had not contributed anything to the fund.

MR. GIVENS: A gratuity is something that is given to a man as an act of grace.

THE HOME SECRETARY: He was certainly entitled to a gratuity.

MR. GIVENS: There is not a word about a refund, and it is contrary to the police regulations.

THE HOME SECRETARY: He did not know the circumstances of the particular case mentioned, but he knew that gra-

[5.30 p.m.] tuities were granted, not only to men who retired, but in other cases.

The other day a gratuity was granted to a man who had lost a foot, and gratuities were constantly granted. He was told that the case the hon. member for Cairns referred to was that of a man named Tipping, but he did not know the details, and unfortunately he had not the papers with him.

MR. GIVENS: It was unfortunate that the Minister could not see the difference between a refund and a gratuity. A refund was a repayment of the amount contributed by the person concerned, and a gratuity might be more or less than the amount contributed. The Commissioner had informed him that a refund such as was made in the case of Tipping was contrary to the regulations, and that he had set his face against the breaking of the regulations, because so sure as the regulations were allowed to be broken to meet an exceptional case, so sure would that breaking of the regulations be brought home to him in a hundred other cases. The regulation was broken in the case he had mentioned, and the refund was made on the recommendation of the Secretary for Lands, Mr. O'Connell. The fund was practically insolvent. This year they would have to contribute £14,000 of the taxpayers' money, and he objected to the fund being subject to political influence of the kind he had indicated, and having to meet all sorts of calls. If, as stated by the Minister, the Act authorised refunds to be made, which he maintained it did not, then most assuredly if a refund was made in one case, it should be made in every case. There were dozens of instances where men had for various reasons to resign from the force after an honourable career in the force for any number of years up to twenty, and they had had to leave all their contributions in the fund. The result of granting a refund in the case he had referred to was that other men who had resigned or been dismissed from the service were applying wholesale to members of Parliament to use their influence to get them the same favour as was granted to Tipping.

THE HOME SECRETARY did not know the circumstances of the case in detail. If the hon. member had told him that he was going to bring the matter up he would have had the papers here, but unfortunately he had not got them with him. He understood now that the refund was paid to Tipping by way of a gratuity, but how it was arrived at he did not know, and the Commissioner did not remember the circumstances.

MR. TURLEY: It seemed to him that they were going on lines which would leave the colony with a large liability year after year. The Police Force was increasing in numbers, there was not a penny to the credit of the superannuation fund at the present time, and the annual contributions of the police were only about 50 per cent. of

what was required to keep the fund solvent. He always objected to that sort of pious fraud being perpetrated on the colony year after year. If the members of the Police Force were not paid sufficient wages to enable them to contribute the required amount to the fund, then they should either wipe out the fund or increase their wages, or else let it be understood that the colony was going to bear the brunt of whatever demands were made upon the fund. There was one man in Queensland who had paid to the fund during a number of years a total sum of £430, and had then retired on a pension of £700 a year. How long was that kind of thing to go on? One of the questions submitted to the actuaries who investigated the condition of the fund in 1899 was—

The percentage deductions that would give at sixty years of age, to those who may hereafter join the force, a maximum pension of—

(1) One-half the then salary.

(2) Two-thirds the then salary, and also provide, in the event of the death of a member whilst in active service, a gratuity to his family equal to a month's salary for each year of service up to twelve years. The age at entry not to exceed thirty years.

The report was signed by P. A. Blundell and George C. Matheson, the one being the manager of a financial institution in Brisbane and the other an accountant. Their reply to that question was as follows:—

From the foregoing it will be seen that we estimate, in reply to your first query, the percentage deductions would be—

(1) For one-half the then salary and assurance gratuity, £6 8s. 6d. per cent.

(2) For two-thirds the then salary and assurance gratuity, £8 5s. 6d. per cent.

They were piling up the amount payable by the State year after year. Some years ago they started with a contribution of £7,000, and the Home Secretary said that it would go on increasing until it amounted to £25,000, and that it would then begin to drop. But it was questionable whether it would drop back to such a great extent. The members of the Police Force paid in 4 per cent., while the actuaries who made the investigation stated that that was only half the amount necessary to be contributed to keep the fund solvent. The Government should either wipe out the fund altogether and repay the amounts that had been paid in with interest added, as was done in the case of the civil service fund—always having due regard to the fact that they had incurred a liability to a number of men who were under the old Act—or they should make the members of the force pay in a sufficient amount to keep the fund solvent. Of course the contributions were always supplemented by contributions from the police reward fund. If the pay of the police was not sufficient to enable them to contribute sufficient to keep the fund solvent, it would be far more honest for the Government to put a sum on the Estimates to increase their pay than for the State to be subject to that liability year after year. The whole system seemed bad, and when they had such an example as that of a man who had paid £430 into the fund receiving £700 per annum out of it for the rest of his life, that ought to be an object lesson that Parliament and the Government should profit by.

The PREMIER (Hon. R. Philp, *Townsville*): The hon. member for Brisbane South knew that that case arose under the old law. The police were not like the ordinary civil service. They were a semi-military force, and they were entitled to some pensions, especially as they were liable at times to lose their lives in the execution of their duty. Therefore, Parliament had de-

cided to pay one-half the amount to which they were entitled. That was provided for in the Act of 1891.

Mr. TURLEY: The argument was that their contributions would keep the fund solvent.

The PREMIER: Well, they had not. At the time the Act was passed it was thought that contributions of 4 per cent. would keep the fund solvent, but now it was found that it would require a contribution of £8 5s. 6d. per cent. He did not know in what other way the Government could make the fund solvent under the Act of 1891 than by the State paying the balance. As it turned out, the State had not made a good bargain, but, as the bargain had been made, they must pay. Under the old Act the police were entitled to pensions equal to their salaries, and their annual contributions were only 2 per cent. on their salaries. Under the Act of 1891 Parliament reduced the pensions to two-thirds of the salaries, while the contributions were increased to 4 per cent. Still the fund was not solvent, and the question was whether they should make the police pay more into the fund, or whether the State should continue to pay one-half. He was of opinion that another Bill ought to be brought in to define exactly how much the State should pay to the fund. He could not promise that it would be brought in this year, but it certainly ought to be brought in at a very early date. It was only last year that they had got the actuarial investigation.

Mr. TURLEY: Two years ago.

The PREMIER thought it was last year. That investigation showed what ought to be paid. Of course, in 1891, it was understood that a contribution of 4 per cent. would not be sufficient to keep the fund solvent, and that the State would have to contribute something; but until it was worked out by the actuaries, they did not know how much they would have to pay. Another Bill ought to be brought in, and then the country would know exactly what they had to pay.

Mr. TURLEY: That was what he contended. They were going along absolutely in the dark.

The PREMIER: We know exactly what we are paying now.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. gentleman knew that when the Act was passed in 1891 it was contended that a 4 per cent. contribution would be sufficient to relieve the colony of any liability.

The PREMIER: Who said that? I do not remember it being said.

Mr. TURLEY: That was the whole argument in connection with the Bill. If he did not mistake, the then member for Toowong, Mr. Unmack, was about the only one who pointed out that that amount would not be nearly enough to keep the fund solvent.

The HOME SECRETARY: You are thinking of the Civil Service Bill now. It was on that Bill that it was discovered that 4 per cent. was inadequate; but when the Police Act was passed I am quite sure that it was understood that the 4 per cent. would not be sufficient.

Mr. TURLEY believed that it was mentioned that that would be sufficient to keep the fund solvent, but now they knew that the police contributions were only one-half what was necessary to keep it solvent. If they were not paid enough they should be paid more, so as to enable them to stand the contribution to the superannuation fund. As a matter of fact, the Government were always liable to fall in over a bargain of that sort. The people who established the fund in the first instance imagined that everything was going to work out all right, and they did not think that the colony would be let in for from £10,000 to £20,000 a year. He objected to a charitable arrangement of that sort being carried

out in connection with one section of the community any more than with another. The whole thing was a pious fraud, and should not be tolerated any longer.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member really put the matter in a nutshell when he said it was a question of wages; but what was the difference between paying a slightly increased wage and paying the same amount into a fund in order to secure pensions? Take the case of a man receiving £150 a year. What was the difference between paying that man £162 a year and making him pay, say, 8 per cent. into a fund, or paying him £150 only and the State finding the whole of the pensions? There was no difference in fact.

MR. TURLEY contended that there was a great deal of difference, inasmuch as there were gratuities payable out of the fund. At all events funds of that character, as administered by the Governments of all the colonies, had never been solvent, and everyone of them had to be bolstered up by special grants. In New South Wales some years ago the Government had to borrow £1,500,000 in order to make the civil service fund solvent, and having exhausted that, it was proposed recently to borrow more, but the conclusion was come to that the time was inopportune, and that it would be better to pay the deficiency out of the consolidated revenue. It was simply a question of subsidising the wages of certain people who were employed by the State, and there did not seem to him to be any limit to the liability. If hon. members were satisfied to allow things to go like that, he was convinced that the big majority of the people were anything but satisfied. There was absolutely nothing in the fund at the present time, and the liability of the State to-day amounted to half-a-million of money. They were told by the hon. gentleman that there was no difference between paying extra wages or paying the money into the superannuation fund. But the Government were not paying the money into the fund, they were not paying in 4, 5, or 10 per cent. The hon. gentleman forgot altogether about the question of gratuities. There was no fixed rate in connection with them, and, as pointed out by one hon. member, political influence might be used to have a gratuity increased from £50 to £100.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The gratuity is provided for by regulation. It is according to scale.

MR. TURLEY: In a case that he knew of there was no gratuity allowed to a man who was dismissed.

THE HOME SECRETARY: There must be a certificate from the Commissioner that the man has served with satisfaction.

MR. TURLEY: He wanted a system of superannuation established under which the colony would not have any responsibility, and not be liable to be called upon to make up a deficiency of £10,000 or £20,000 a year. It was better to establish a system under which the colony would know the extent of its liabilities once and for all. The hon. gentleman thought it was only a little thing to vote a sum like that yearly.

THE HOME SECRETARY: I did not say that.

MR. TURLEY: That was what they were told by Sir Horace Tozer, who said it was better to vote £15,000 or £20,000 a year than to borrow the whole amount required to put the fund in a solvent condition. For his part he would rather see the colony borrow the money straight out, and put the fund in a solvent condition, so as to clear itself of all liability. He

[7 p.m.] would like to show the Home Secretary that the statement he had made in connection with the passing of the Act was

correct. The hon. gentleman would see in *Hansard*, vol. lxx. (1891), page 1380, that Sir Horace Tozer, in introducing the Bill, said—

The Government of the day directed that any police constable who joined the force after the 1st August, 1889, should pay 4 per cent.—the amount paid by officers in other branches of the service under the Civil Service Act of 1889—and that amount has since been paid; so that this Bill really legalises the action of the Government in 1889. That will make the superannuation fund something like solvent. After making careful calculations, and knowing that there will always be an addition to the fund from the police reward fund—taking the two things together—we have come to the conclusion that 4 per cent. will be sufficient to make the fund solvent as regards all those who have joined the force since the 1st of August, 1890, and that no further contribution from the consolidated revenue will be required.

The Bill was passed on that understanding, and in fact went through without any discussion. That was the reason why he contended that the House and the country should know exactly the position in which they stood so far as liability was concerned. It was not that he objected to the amount that was necessary to make the fund solvent, but he held that there should be a certain amount contributed, and after the date of that contribution the Government should accept no further liability in connection with this fund.

THE HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member had shown that the Bill of 1891 was estimated to provide all the funds that were likely to be necessary or approximately so, and it was after the Public Service Act was passed—

MR. TURLEY: The Public Service Act was passed before that, in 1889.

THE HOME SECRETARY: Yes, that was so. It was after the Public Service Act was passed that the question was raised.

MR. TURLEY: It was Mr. Unmack who fought the Bill, because he said the fund would not be solvent.

THE HOME SECRETARY: He had been under a misapprehension as to the date of the discussion with regard to the question. It was then questioned whether 4 per cent. would be sufficient to provide anything like an adequate fund. But as he had said before, it was purely a question for the Treasurer as to how this money was to be provided—whether by floating debentures, or by issuing Treasury scrip, or by voting the amount year after year. That, however, did not affect the question of the men who joined afterwards, under any new scheme which might be embodied in legislation. So far as the men who were under the present system were concerned they knew exactly where they were, as far as it had been possible to estimate their liability. That had been done by actuaries, and it only remained for the legislature to put those who might join after such legislation upon a more satisfactory footing.

MR. TURLEY: That is not my trouble. My trouble is the everlasting liability of it.

THE HOME SECRETARY: As the Premier had said, the liability would remain until some new scheme had been adopted, under which men would be allowed to join under different terms, and terms more favourable to the State. The liability, seeing that they would have to provide the money or repudiate, would be just as everlasting under one system as under another. It was purely a matter of bookkeeping and of procedure as to whether they should vote the money year by year, or whether the amount should be placed among the schedules. The matter would remain in exactly the same position until a new system was adopted under which those who joined afterwards would come in under a different basis.

Mr. GIVENS: He would like to know if the Home Secretary could give him any information on the matter which he had brought under his notice with regard to the contributions of one particular constable. He might state that the matter was brought under his notice by a man in the Police Force, who had resigned entirely on his own accord, after twelve or fifteen years' service. This man informed him that he resigned because his eyes were bad, and he asked him to endeavour to recover for him a refund on account of his contributions to the fund, in the same way as the member for Musgrave, now Minister for Public Lands, had obtained an amount for another man, who did not resign voluntarily, but who was allowed to resign to save being dismissed. He was satisfied beyond the shadow of a doubt that the refund was made at the instance of the Minister for Lands. The Home Secretary had practically admitted that this fund was insolvent, and the Committee was asked this year to vote £14,000 to make up the shortage. That being so, it was grossly unfair that political influence should be brought to bear to get a man a refund to which he was not entitled. Oftentimes when members went to see Ministers they were told that they would not allow political influence to bear; but hon. members were now brought face to face with the fact that political influence was rampant.

The HOME SECRETARY: I deny that.

Mr. GIVENS: Would the hon. gentleman deny that political influence had been used in the case he had mentioned? He made that distinct statement, and he challenged the Home Secretary's colleague to prove that he was wrong.

The HOME SECRETARY: Which colleague?

Mr. GIVENS: The Minister for Lands. He had not overdrawn the case one iota; he had merely given a true statement of facts. The Minister should give some explanation, and he thought that if this had been done in one case, it should be done in every other case.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was wrong in saying that it had not been done in other cases. In one case G. C. Hanlon was recommended for a refund by the Royal Commission, of £42 16s. 7d.; then W. J. Tipping received £65 10s. 9d.; W. J. Mills had received £45 18s. 10d.; and John Gray received something by way of refund on transfer to the public service. Personally, he did not remember these cases, but that would account for the £204 10s. 2d. refund. He could give the hon. member no more information than he had given.

Mr. GIVENS: I saw your colleague here.

The HOME SECRETARY said he had not, and he had been looking for him to ask him about the matter. It was quite possible that the Minister for Lands had mentioned the matter to him; but these sort of things frequently occurred, and were forgotten. The hon. member could call the sum a gratuity or a refund; but it was immaterial whether he called it one or the other. It was simply a matter of money.

Mr. LESINA would like to know whether this gratuity was given to this particular man at the instance of the Minister for Lands. When the hon. member for Cairns was speaking, he (Mr. Lesina) saw the Minister for Lands, and he had mentioned the charge that the hon. member for Cairns had made to him; but the hon. gentleman did not appear to take any notice of the matter. It was a very important matter, and it should be probed right home. The answer of the Home Secretary was not at all satisfactory, because if this sort of thing was done in one case it might be done in many other cases. Even if there was a suspicion of political influence it was a very serious matter. With regard

to the superannuation fund, he noticed that in moving the grant to that fund last year the Home Secretary said—

One of the Bills which he had hoped to introduce this session was a Bill dealing with the question of the police superannuation fund, but owing to circumstances over which he had no control, and to which he did not need to further refer, it would be quite futile for him to introduce it. That Bill, as a matter of fact, would not affect the present vote at all.

There was no mention made this session of a Bill on that subject. The hon. gentleman stated last year that the method of dealing with this fund was purely a matter of finance, and that the present method was as effective as any which might be provided in a Bill. The fund was in an insolvent condition. In 1897 Parliament voted £3,500 from the consolidated revenue towards the fund, in 1898 £7,000, in 1899 £9,000, in 1900 £10,500, in 1901 £11,000, and this year they were asked to vote £14,000, and he should not be surprised if next year they were not called upon to vote £15,000, £16,000, or perhaps £17,000. It would require about £500,000 to make the fund solvent, and if they went on at the present rate of progress they would before long require £750,000 or £1,000,000 to make good the deficiency in the fund. On looking over the report of the Police Investment Board for last year he found that the receipts of the board for that period were £16,565, that was including the sum of £11,100 voted by Parliament. The board were certainly entitled to the thanks of the House for administering the fund so economically, the cost for the twelve months being only £34 5s. In their report they said—

The total number of members of the force contributing to the fund on the 1st January, 1901, including fourteen members of the water police, was 874, of whom 394 were contributing at the rate of 2 per cent., and 480 at 4 per cent. on their annual salaries.

The total contributions from the force last year were £3,542, and the other sources of revenue were transfers from the police reward fund, and a vote of £11,100 from the consolidated revenue. The experts who investigated the fund said it would require £470,000, or roughly £500,000, to make it solvent. The matter would have to be faced sooner or later. It was a most important one, and he should not be surprised if some day the Government did not rise or fall on this question. The hon. member for South Brisbane, Mr. Turley, said that for years and years the superannuation fund in New South Wales had been bolstered up by the State, and that eventually the State had to borrow £1,000,000 to render it solvent. Now, he believed, it was insolvent again. The whole system of establishing pensions on the present basis in Queensland was wrong. If the Committee refused to vote this £14,000, that would be an act of repudiation, and they did not desire to refuse the vote, but he held that they should have some control over such expenditure, and they had none under existing circumstances. Half-a-dozen of the pensioners had died during the year, but fifteen others had come on the fund. He advocated last year, and still advocated that the Government should establish a State Life Assurance Office and compel every policeman and every civil servant in the colony to insure in that office. New Zealand had had such a scheme of life assurance established for thirty-one years, and it was advertised in nearly all their official publications. Every policy issued was guaranteed by the State, the security was absolute, the premiums were low, bonuses were high, all its funds were invested in the colony, and its business was restricted to New Zealand, which they pointed out was one of the healthiest colonies in the group. It would be far better if the Government of Queensland,

instead of tiddlywinking in this haphazard fashion with the police superannuation fund, would introduce a comprehensive measure providing for State life assurance. The Home Secretary, however, advocated that money should be voted annually for the purpose of insuring the solvency of this superannuation fund, and said that under it the police received a kind of old age pension. But apparently the hon. gentleman did not see that his argument, if there was any weight in it, applied equally to every citizen in the State. That must not be forgotten in future when they were discussing old age pensions.

Mr. DUNS福德: If the contention on that side was correct, that it was illegal [7.30 p.m.] to refund that amount of £204 10s. 2d., then they wanted to know whether it was going to be continued?

The HOME SECRETARY: It has not been contended that those payments were illegal.

Mr. DUNS福德: In no case did the Act mention refunds. Gratuities were mentioned.

The HOME SECRETARY: Look at section 19, which relates to transfers to other branches of the service.

Mr. DUNS福德: That provides for refunds in the case of transfer to other branches of the civil service.

The HOME SECRETARY: Most of the £204 was paid under that section.

Mr. DUNS福德: But this particular man was not transferred to any other department. He was transferred outside. If the hon. gentleman contended that every man who was dismissed or who left the service voluntarily was to be paid the amount of his contributions, with interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum added, they would have no end of applications. Besides, if that was to be done, it would materially reduce the amount which would be available to meet calls upon the fund, and the State would have to contribute a still larger amount. The key to the trouble was that certain funds should be obtained from some source or other and earmarked to meet the requirements of that fund, because it would never do to go on as they had been doing. It was a kind of trusting to Providence. He noticed that it was clearly stipulated in the Act of 1863 that, if the fund was short, the State should make up the deficiency; so that it would be tantamount to repudiation if they were to insist now upon the police relying solely upon their own contributions. He should be very sorry to advise anything of the sort. The police were fully entitled to the pensions they were now receiving under the Act of 1863, and the best way to meet the difficulty was either to earmark certain moneys, and allow the interest earned by that fund to meet the liabilities, or else to increase the pay of the police, and allow them to pay the 8 per cent. which was necessary to keep the fund solvent, instead of the 4 per cent. which they now contributed.

Question put and passed.

COURTS OF PETTY SESSIONS.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £26,256 be granted for courts of petty sessions. There was really a decrease on last year's Estimates, which was largely due to the shifting of certain officers and the saving of their salaries, and by transferring men to other departments, and so forth. For instance, one clerk was required at the metropolitan court last year who was not required this year. The assistant clerk at Rockhampton had been transferred, and another at £10 less appointed. Amongst the police magistrates Mr. J. V. Williams, police magistrate at Charleville, was not provided for,

because he had been appointed to the governorship of the South Brisbane Gaol, and one of the two relieving police magistrates had been sent to Charleville, and they were doing with one relieving police magistrate only. Then among clerks of petty sessions only four at £200 were required, and a transfer had been made of the clerk of petty sessions at Charleville to Gladstone. Altogether there was a saving on the vote of £920.

Mr. DUNS福德 asked what proportion of the police magistrate's salary at Charters Towers was charged to the Mines Department now that one officer was filling the dual position of police magistrate and warden?

The HOME SECRETARY said the whole salary was charged to the Mines Department, and the same in the case of the police magistrate at Gympie. On the other hand there were a number of places where police magistrates performed the duties of warden, and their salaries were paid by the Home Secretary's Department. If a warden's office was a very important one, an experienced mining man was sent to fill the position, and he also filled the office of police magistrate. In smaller places the police magistrates filled the office of warden. The proper principle to adopt was that in important places like Charters Towers, Gympie, and Croydon an experienced mining man filled the position of warden and also performed the duties of police magistrate. In less important places the Mines Department had the advantage of the services of the police magistrate, who acted as warden.

Mr. DUNS福德: He believed that on Charters Towers the gentleman who filled the dual position was experienced in both capacities, but it would be a more business-like method to adjust the charges proportionately to each department. He did not think it fair that an industry like the mining industry should be handicapped by being charged with the salary of the police magistrate, because it was desirable to know what the earnings of such a department were. It was only right that there should be a clear and distinct system of bookkeeping, and that each department should be debited with what was fairly chargeable to it.

The HOME SECRETARY: That would be a very absurd system. The Mines Department, as a matter of fact, had the advantage of the services of police magistrates to a much greater extent than the Home Secretary's Department had the advantage of the services of wardens. After all what did it matter? The State paid in each case, and it was far better that each officer should be paid one salary by one department. The old system which the hon. member advocated was abandoned deliberately in order that an officer should not be receiving two salaries from two different departments. The best and most economical plan was to adopt a system of give and take between departments. It was absurd to talk about handicapping the mining industry. The police magistrate represented no particular industry. He was there simply to administer justice, and if the hon. member's contention were agreed to, the Mines Department should share the cost of the Supreme Court, because a certain number of mining cases were decided by it. It was not advisable that one officer should draw two salaries from two departments, because it led to endless confusion and difficulty in transfer.

Mr. LESINA: In this matter he was at one with the Home Secretary, and believed his arguments were much stronger than those of the hon. member for Charters Towers. The plan suggested by the hon. member for Charters Towers would lead to an endless system of bookkeeping and cost, which would certainly be bad for the

general revenue, and no particular good would be served by it. The argument was that it was not fair to charge a big industry like the mining industry with the whole cost of a warden when he performed work for other departments, but he did not think there was anything in it. It would only necessitate a duplication of entries with regard to salaries, and would not do any good.

Mr. HARDACRE : He sympathised with the contention that men should be paid for the work they did for different departments. The principle now adopted was that they were paid one salary by one department, and they had to do work for several other departments. That was a bad system. The police in particular were treated as handy men for all kinds of work, and though they were given extra duties to perform they were not paid any additional salary. Police magistrates were also in some districts land agents, and if there was a mining field near they were gold wardens as well. They regarded these duties as thrust upon them, and the result was that, regarding themselves as the officers of only one department, they had no heart in the work they were called upon to do for others. He did not object to their doing the work, but he thought they should be paid for it, and paid separately by each department. The present system was particularly unsatisfactory where police magistrates were also land agents as well. They knew nothing about the land, and, as they were paid nothing for the work, they took no interest in it.

Mr. FORSYTH : On the face of it the remarks of the hon. member for Charters Towers looked a fair thing—that was, that each department should be debited with the cost of the amount of work done for it. That would be a good thing if it could be done, but he did not think it was possible. He did not see how they could split up or proportion the work done—say, by an officer who was police magistrate, gold warden, and clerk of petty sessions—so as to debit each department with its particular share of the cost. It would be a good thing if it could be done, but the Home Secretary would require an actuary or some other expert to do it. How would they arrive at the amount which should be paid to the officer for the work he did as police magistrate, as gold warden, or as clerk of petty sessions? He did not see how it could be done.

The HOME SECRETARY : There were many officers who occupied the position of clerk of petty sessions, and who held ten or twelve other appointments as well. How would they be able to divide the salary so that those officers should be paid proportionately by each department? Many years ago, he was informed, this was done to a certain extent, but it led to such endless confusion that the present system was adopted. A man now drew his whole emoluments from one department, and was responsible to that department. If the suggestion which had been made were adopted, he would have to be paid by each department and would have to send in a separate voucher to each department for its share of his salary. That would lead to endless work in every department, and was utterly impracticable. He had just run through a list of police magistrates, and taking seventeen or eighteen of them at random, they all performed the duties of gold wardens and drew their salaries from the Home Secretary's Department.

Mr. DUNSFORD : That is not right.

The HOME SECRETARY : It was right, because it was the simplest way of doing it, and these officers were the officers of that department, and primarily were responsible to its

head. If it were not so, they would belong both to the Home Secretary's Department and to the Mines Department. The system which hon. members had advocated had been tried, and it had been found objectionable from every point of view.

Mr. DUNSFORD : The Home Secretary's logic was not at all sound. The hon.

[8 p.m.] gentleman said that the officer at Charters Towers was paid as warden, and was only responsible to the Mines Department.

The HOME SECRETARY : I did not say that.

Mr. DUNSFORD : If that was so, the police magistrate at Charters Towers, although he did not receive one penny from the Home Secretary's Department, was not responsible to the Home Secretary's Department—that was the hon. gentleman's logic.

The HOME SECRETARY : No. He did not say that he would not be responsible to the Home Secretary's Department. Undoubtedly, an officer who filled half-a-dozen offices was responsible to the head of the department dealing with matters connected with that office. Take the case of an officer asking for leave of absence, and suppose he had to apply to ten different departments. Of course, that would be absurd. A case occurred at Gladstone, where as a matter of fact there was no police magistrate for a period of six weeks, and it only came under the notice of the Home Secretary's Department in this way : A gentleman there was performing the duties of Collector of Customs and police magistrate, and when the Commonwealth took over the Customs he got leave of absence from his superior officer in the Customs, he being then a Commonwealth officer. Nothing was heard of the matter by the Home Secretary's Department for nearly six weeks, when complaint was made that all the magisterial work had to be performed by honorary magistrates. In the matter of leave of absence, it was desirable that the officer should only have to deal with one department. One hon. member said why saddle the mining industry with the expenses connected with police magistrates, but the general taxpayers paid the cost of wardens and police magistrates. The mining industry did not pay any more towards this than the dairying industry or any other industry did. The salaries of these people were paid from the consolidated revenue, which embraced all sources of revenue.

Mr. HARDACRE : The Home Secretary stated that the old system had been abandoned because it had not worked well ; but it might be that the present system was worse than the old one, and it was only right that hon. members should point out defects in the present system. It was not a matter of dual positions, because the courtesy between one department and another would rectify that. It was a question of proportional payment.

The HOME SECRETARY : There would be five times as much bookkeeping as there is at present. Look at all the different entries there would have to be.

Mr. HARDACRE : No doubt there would be some additional bookkeeping, but there would not be much. The idea was to give the departments a lump sum approximately. In this very vote they were asked to give men £15 extra for performing extra duties.

The HOME SECRETARY : That refers to police.

Mr. HARDACRE : Yes ; but the hon. member for Carpentaria's argument was that if they could not get the proportion to a fraction they should give no proportion at all, but that was absurd.

The HOME SECRETARY: These men do work outside their ordinary duties, and most of it outside office hours.

Mr. HARDACRE: Yes, exactly; and he presumed that for the same reason they ought to get something extra for the other work they performed for the Lands Department. They often heard officers say, "This is not my work; I am not paid for it," and the result was that such work was neglected. The system was unfair to the officers, and it was a bad one for the department.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member was advocating a pernicious principle, and he was sorry to hear him suggest to public servants that they had a grievance because they had to perform the duties of more than one office. A sergeant of police drew a certain sum according to the regulations of the Police Department, and apparently the hon. member would not cut that up and divide it among the other departments for which that officer performed work, but would pay him additional sums for all the other work he had to perform, even though he might occupy eight or ten different offices. That man's time, within recognised limits, was the property of the Government, who paid him, and he was not paid his salary to sit down and do nothing for three-fourths of his time, which would be the case with many of those officers in country places if their duties were confined to one office. Imagine a clerk of petty sessions in some up-country village which was just sufficiently large to warrant the appointment of a clerk of petty sessions, having perhaps a couple of summonses a week, and then being idle the rest of his time. Why should they appoint half-a-dozen other officers to do the work which he did? The reason £15 was paid to a police officer holding the position of acting clerk of petty sessions was that he almost invariably held a number of other offices, such for instance as registrar of births and inspector of slaughter-houses, and he had to do a great deal of work in the nature of filling up returns in connection with those offices. If he was occupied during the day with his police duties, patrolling, and so on, those returns had to be filled up at night, and the work was all overtime. If they carried the reasoning of the hon. member for Leichhardt to its logical conclusion they would have to appoint half-a-dozen officers to do what was now performed by one officer, and pay each of those half-a-dozen officers a living salary to remain idle for three-fourths of their time, and they would also have to multiply the work of bookkeeping in connection with salaries five times.

Mr. HARDACRE: The Home Secretary was not very logical. The hon. gentleman stated that the extra £15 was paid to police officers who performed the duties of clerks of petty sessions because that was extra work. Why then should not a man who performed other work for the Lands Department or any other department be paid extra in exactly the same way? He knew one place where a police magistrate was gold warden and land agent as well, and actually had to take his work home at night, and get his wife to assist him with it, and yet for all that extra work he received no additional remuneration.

The HOME SECRETARY: He would tell the hon. gentleman an anecdote which related to his constituency to show how the principle which he advocated would work. Some fourteen or fifteen years ago it was suddenly discovered that a police magistrate, under the old system, was receiving over £800 a year, and that was all because he was paid different sums for the different offices which he filled, and his name did not appear on the Estimates. Nobody knew

he was receiving that sum until somebody took the trouble to go through the matter and work it out, because it was only the offices that were mentioned on the Estimates.

Mr. DIBLEY (*Woolloongabba*) noticed that the police magistrate at Rockhampton received £500, while the police magistrate at South Brisbane received £600. The clerk of petty sessions at South Brisbane, on the other hand, received £300, whilst the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton received £400. It appeared to him that either the police magistrate at South Brisbane was getting too much or the police magistrate at Rockhampton was getting too little, and the same with regard to the clerks of petty sessions. He thought the two districts were very similar in size, but, if anything, the work at South Brisbane was the heavier. He would like the Home Secretary to explain how it was he was able to work the one office so much cheaper than the other?

The HOME SECRETARY: It had been brought under his notice within the last two or three days that the clerk of petty sessions at South Brisbane was very much overworked.

Mr. DIBLEY: He is a very good officer, too.

The HOME SECRETARY: He believed he was a very good officer. As to the salary, it was largely a question of seniority. It was found that, in order to transfer officers with advantage to the department, it was necessary that police magistrates should carry their salaries with them, otherwise the department could not make every transfer that it would like without disrating officers. For instance, Mr. McDonald, the police magistrate at Warwick, was in receipt of £600 a year, whilst his predecessor had probably got £450 or £500. But Mr. McDonald was the senior police magistrate in the colony, and, when it was found necessary, for health reasons, to transfer him from Townsville to Warwick, it would have been very hard if he had had to suffer a loss of £100 or £150 a year, in addition to a corresponding reduction in his pension, if he was entitled to one. That was why there were certain inequalities in regard to police magistrates.

Mr. ANNEAR: The police magistrate at Townsville only gets £500.

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes. Townsville and Rockhampton both happened to be served by gentlemen who, although they were experienced officers, were perhaps in the second-class. He believed the clerk of petty sessions at Brisbane had more work to do than the clerk of petty sessions at Rockhampton, whilst he got a very much smaller salary. He thought the former was overworked and underpaid. Although he could not promise him any extra payment, he hoped to be able to relieve him of some of the extra work he had now to perform.

Mr. GIVENS: It was the opinion of a great many people that it would be much better for the administration of justice in the courts of petty sessions if the police magistrates were periodically transferred from place to place. The reason for that was that, when a police magistrate remained too long in one place, he was inclined to fall under the influence of a certain clique, and to become part and parcel of that clique; and, when any member of that clique had a case in his court, he was, perhaps unconsciously, biassed in his favour. He did not desire to make a charge against any particular police magistrate, but he knew of many cases in which police magistrates had acted in a way that was calculated to bring the administration of justice into contempt. He freely admitted that there were several honourable exceptions—exceptions in which police magistrates had been altogether above party or personal influence, but he had in his mind cases in which police magistrates had

adjudicated in cases in such a way as to bring the administration of justice into contempt. That was not a desirable thing. He was perfectly satisfied that anything which would tend to bring the administration of justice into contempt was a very serious danger to the general well-being of the colony. The administration of justice should be entirely above suspicion; but, unfortunately, especially in connection with courts of petty sessions, it was not. One way in which they could minimise the evil was to periodically transfer the police magistrates. Such transfers need not necessarily throw any discredit upon the magistrates, and should act automatically as a departmental rule; and he was satisfied that the very best results would accrue.

The HOME SECRETARY: It must be borne in mind that the transfer of police magistrates constantly was a source of expense, because, if they were transferred for public reasons, they could not be asked to bear the cost of their transfer. It was a source of complaint by police magistrates that they were put to a great deal of expense when they were transferred, through their having to sell their furniture and buy new furniture every time they moved, and they were entitled to a great deal of consideration on that account. Another reason why it would be difficult to carry out the hon. member's suggestion was that when they proposed to transfer magistrates or other public officers petitions were got up, and the Government was roundly abused for removing those officers. When it was proposed recently, for special departmental reasons of a very excellent character, to change the two officers at Gympie and Charters Towers there were petitions got up at both places, and a great deal of political influence was brought to bear upon the Government in order to induce it to leave those gentlemen where they were.

Mr. MAXWELL: It shows they wanted shifting badly.

The HOME SECRETARY did not think so at all. That was the first time he had heard anyone say these gentlemen were not giving general satisfaction. But even the hon. member for Burke would admit that police magistrates had occasionally to perform duties which did not tend to popularise them with a certain section of the community, and that section of the community would like to see a change of police magistrates once a fortnight.

Mr. PLUNKETT (*Albert*) said that the Home Secretary had stated that at Gladstone the police magistrate also did the Customs work. He wanted to know how much the State paid him and how much was paid by the Federal Government?

The HOME SECRETARY: It is changed now. The warden has been appointed police magistrate.

Mr. PLUNKETT: But in that particular case how much did the State pay him?

The HOME SECRETARY: We pay all the money; it is only a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. PLUNKETT noticed that the second item on the vote was for the police magistrate at South Brisbane and Southport. What cases in the Southport district had the police magistrate at South Brisbane to attend to?

The HOME SECRETARY said Mr. Yaldwyn was police magistrate at South Brisbane. He visited Beenleigh, was a member [8.30 p.m.] of the Licensing Board and the Fire Brigade Board. He was also official visitor to the Female Refuge, Valley Gaol, Reception House, Lock Hospital, and Dunwich Benevolent Asylum; so that he had his hands pretty full. Mr. Yaldwyn also visited Beaudesert, Nerang, and Southport, and was an inspector of Pacific Islanders.

Mr. W. HAMILTON (*Gregory*) asked if Mr. Yaldwyn received £240 as visiting justice to St. Helena in addition to receiving £600 for his other offices?

The HOME SECRETARY: £600 is his full emolument.

Mr. SMITH asked if any arrangement had been made to replace the police magistrate at Bowen, who had recently died? That gentleman, who was also sub-collector of Customs, was one of the best officers in the service.

The HOME SECRETARY: No arrangement had yet been made; but the matter had been brought under the notice of the Public Service Board, and as the officer was essentially a Customs officer, he presumed the Commonwealth Government would appoint someone else, and, if suitable, he would be asked to undertake the duties of police magistrate.

Question put and passed.

BACTERIOLOGICAL INSTITUTE.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £1,380 be granted for the Bacteriological Institute. There was a total reduction in the vote of £330. Incidentals were increased by £20, and as against that there were decreases of £250 in apparatus, chemicals, etc.; £30 experimental animals and fodder, £10 for scientific books and journals, and £60 in temporary employment. Last year it became necessary to thoroughly equip the institute with apparatus, chemicals, etc., but having been well equipped there was no necessity for repeating that vote this year.

Mr. LESINA regretted that the financial stress in which the Government found themselves compelled them to make a reduction in that vote. He believed the Bacteriological Institute was doing very excellent work, and he had no doubt its usefulness would be enlarged as time went by. He hoped therefore that next year the vote would be increased instead of decreased.

Question put and passed.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £40,992 be granted for Government printing. In that case there was a total increase of £637, which consisted of foremen bookbinders at £188 and £160, formerly paid as unclassified. Sub-foreman machinist, formerly paid as unclassified, £164; readers and compositors, etc., £18,014 provided last year, and now shown as unclassified, £18,960 being asked for for that purpose. The total increased amount asked for was £950 on that item. The total increase on the vote was £1,462. Against that there was a decrease of £75 in the Government Printer's salary, and £750 for paper, machines, etc., or a total of £825. Deducting that from £1,462 gave the increase, as stated, of £637.

Mr. JENKINSON: Is Mr. Gregory's successor appointed yet?

The HOME SECRETARY: Mr. Vaughan was only acting in the meantime.

Mr. BROWNE: With regard to the Government Printer, he should like to know whether the Government were about to make any appointment to the office? He saw there was one of those well-founded rumours they often saw going the round of the Press, that some well known and popular member of the Assembly was going to be appointed to the position. He thought they were all pretty well known, and most of them prided themselves upon being fairly popular, and it would save time and anxiety if the Home Secretary would let it be known who was the popular member of the Assembly who was going to be appointed Government Printer. The next thing he would like to ask the hon. gentleman was this: At the present time he

believed, on account of the Federal Government having taken over a lot of the work from the different departments, there was less work to be done in the printing office. If that was so, would it not be as well for some of the work that was being done outside to be done by the Government Printing Office? For instance, the *Government Mining Journal*, which was now being printed outside, might very well be printed at the Government Printing Office.

The HOME SECRETARY: We are still doing their work.

Mr. BROWNE: Of course, if they were still doing usual work, they would be kept employed. There was another matter. He understood that a lot of printing was being done at the present time with regard to the sugar industry, and he would like to know whether the Government was paying for it, or whether the gentlemen directly interested in the sugar industry were paying for it?

The HOME SECRETARY: What are you speaking of now?

Mr. BROWNE: He understood that a lot of pamphlets about the sugar industry were being printed.

The HOME SECRETARY: I do not think so—only official documents—such as Dr. Maxwell's report.

Mr. BROWNE: It was stated that a great amount of matter was being printed there for circulation—a lot of speeches that had been delivered in the House—Sir Samuel Griffith's speeches and things of that kind. Of course, if that was not so, it was all right. Seeing that the Federal Government had taken over the work of some departments, he would like to know if the Home Secretary would see that any of the State printing work now done outside was done in the Government Printing Office?

The HOME SECRETARY: That was a matter that rested with the Ministers in the different departments. He could not make them do their work at the Government Printing Office; all he could do was to say that they were prepared to do it if they would send it for them to do. With regard to any department that employed outside firms, the proper place to get an expression of opinion, or reasons for it, would be when the Estimates of that particular department were under consideration, because he had no control over the work not being sent to the Government Printing Office. He simply did the work that the other departments sent to be done.

Mr. BROWNE: Are the Ministers of the particular department responsible for work given to outside firms by their departments?

The HOME SECRETARY: So far as he knew they were.

Mr. FORSYTH: He found in connection with the Government Printing Office that the total amount of work done for the Post and Telegraph Department last year was £7,136. He presumed if that work was now being done by the State Government for the Federal Government, the Federal Government would pay for it. If that was so, it appeared to him that there should be some reduction in connection with that amount. Last year the appropriation for 1901 was increased by no less than £8,967. The total amount appropriated last year for this vote was £40,355, but this amount was increased during the year by £8,967. He only wished to know if they were doing the work for the Post and Telegraph Office, which amounted last year to £7,000 odd? He presumed

if they were doing the work for them here, it would be paid for by the Commonwealth Government. He certainly thought, with the leader of the Opposition, that if the Government Printing Office had not so much work to do now as formerly, they should do work which was now being done outside. He would like some explanation of this increase of £8,967. He would also like to know whether any work executed by the Government Printing Office on behalf of the Post and Telegraph Office had been taken over by the Federal Government.

The HOME SECRETARY: I have already said that we are continuing to do the work as before.

Mr. FORSYTH: If that were so, the amount should be less, because, although the department did the work, the Government were paid for it.

The HOME SECRETARY: It goes into the Treasury.

Mr. FORSYTH: Instead of paying for this work the Government were being paid by the Federal Government for it.

The HOME SECRETARY: It goes into the consolidated revenue.

Mr. FORSYTH: But here it was being charged against the consolidated revenue. As they were doing the work for the Federal Government, and were getting paid for it, the amount required for the department should be less than it was last year, when the Government had to pay for it themselves.

The HOME SECRETARY: The work had to be done, and people had to be paid for doing it. If the Federal Government paid any proportion of the cost of the work done by the printing office, it would go into the Treasury and not into the printing office at all. It did not get credit for the amount paid by the Federal Government; it was the country that got credit for that. It would, of course, be credited to the Government Printing Office, so far as the public accounts were concerned, but the money required to be spent by the department was exactly as it was before, and would be so long as they continued to do all the work.

Mr. JENKINSON (*Wide Bay*) said he would like to know what the intentions of the Government were with regard to the position of Government Printer. Mr. Vaughan had been acting as the Government Printer for a few months, and he presumed he had been carrying out his work satisfactorily. Was it the intention of the Government to keep Mr. Vaughan on as Acting Government Printer, or to appoint someone permanently to that office? He thought it was only right to go into this matter at the present, particularly as the hon. member for Croydon had stated that there were rumours about certain things happening. It appeared to him that the Home Secretary should disclose now the intentions of the Government with regard to this office. He understood that Mr. Vaughan had carried out his duties very satisfactorily, and that he had done, and was still doing, very good work.

The HOME SECRETARY: Hon. members would understand that there could not be two Government Printers at once. Until the 1st of January next Mr. Gregory would still continue to be Government Printer on leave, just the same as Lord Lamington was still the Governor of this State on leave. Until Mr. Gregory's leave had expired he was not prepared to say what the Government were prepared to do with regard to his successor. As far as he knew, Mr. Vaughan had carried out the duties of Government Printer with every satisfaction.

With regard to the rumours which had been referred to he had not heard them until to-night, and he knew nothing about them.

Mr. JENKINSON asked if the Commonwealth Government paid for the printing of Dr. Maxwell's report, or rather for double printing, because he had got a second report which was substituted for the first one previously issued. Were the Commonwealth Government being debited with the cost of that report?

The HOME SECRETARY: As a matter of fact the cost of printing that report had been debited to the Chief Secretary's Department in the usual way. It would make no difference if it was charged to the Commonwealth, because it would be charged back to Queensland. They debited each State with the expenses in connection with that State. It was merely a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. BROWNE agreed with what the hon. member for Carpentaria had said, and also that the Home Secretary was perfectly right in saying that the money in connection with the cost of anything done for the Federal Parliament would go into the consolidated revenue. Last year, according to the Auditor-General's report, the cost in connection with the Government printing was £49,322 0s. 10d.—about £9,000 more than was on the Estimates. People outside seeing this amount would not know that it did not represent the actual cost—that owing to federal work, the cost of the department was only £39,000 instead of £49,000. He could quite understand that it would be nonsense for cheques to be received in connection with each department; but in future estimates of this kind, it would be a very good thing to show in a footnote how much was paid into the credit of the Government Printing Office for federal work, and how much was paid in for Queensland work, so that the public could know how much they were really spending on Government printing for Queensland. That would give the public some idea as to whether the Government Printing Office was self-supporting or not. Most hon. members would admit that the Government Printing Office did very good work, and that it paid very well for itself; but it was doing a lot of work for people outside, which made the office look very expensive.

The HOME SECRETARY thought that would complicate matters very much. The work done by the printing office for each department was debited to each department, and the money actually received went into the consolidated revenue. He thought these footnotes would be larger than the estimate itself.

Mr. FORSYTH: As far as the various departments were concerned, Table A, attached to the report of the Government Printer, gave a full and complete statement of the whole business—how much was done for each department, and the class of work, but the amount and the class of work done for outside people ought also to be shown; for instance, say "for the Commonwealth Government, £10,000," and show the items also.

The HOME SECRETARY: We might show it in the schedule.

Mr. FORSYTH: That was exactly what he wanted, and he should be perfectly satisfied if it was shown in the schedule.

Mr. JENKINSON desired to call attention to the amount set down for printing *Hansard*.

He did not think the cost would [9 p.m.] be very much extra if it was printed in type somewhat similar to that of the Federal *Hansard*. The present type was certainly very trying to people whose eyesight was not as good as it used to be.

The HOME SECRETARY: We should have to get fresh type.

Mr. JENKINSON: He did not think many founts would be necessary, as there was type used in connection with other work in the Government Printing Office which might be made available for *Hansard*.

The HOME SECRETARY: The change of type would be very costly. There were about 15 tons of type for *Hansard*, and it would scarcely be wise to get new type until that was worn out.

Mr. JENKINSON: They need not wait until the present type was worn out before making a change, for, speaking as a practical man, he was quite sure that many country newspaper proprietors would be very glad to purchase it.

The HOME SECRETARY: At a heavy loss.

Mr. JENKINSON: The Government bought their type in bulk at a very much cheaper rate than country newspaper proprietors could buy it, and he was sure they would readily avail themselves of the *Hansard* type if they had an opportunity of doing so. He hoped the hon. gentleman would seriously consider his suggestion, because, from a printing point of view, the Queensland *Hansard* did not compare at all favourably with the *Hansard* issued by the other States.

The HOME SECRETARY: The Acting Government Printer said now that the cost of the change would be very considerable, but he would have a talk with that gentleman on the subject.

Mr. LESINA thought the suggestion of the hon. member for Wide Bay was worth serious consideration. What with the electric light and small type the average member was beginning to lose his eyesight, and the number of spectacled members was increasing. He hoped that a larger type, similar to that in vogue in the New South Wales and Federal *Hansards*, would be adopted in future. Looking over the annual report of the Government Printer he found that he complained that—

Additional room is daily becoming a matter of extreme necessity. The various branches are all overcrowded, which precludes a better classification of the staff and work, and militates against economy and despatch. The storeroom is totally inadequate to the requirements of the department, paper and material having to be stored outside, and in every conceivable place, and the weight in certain parts of the main building is so great as to be, in the opinion of an officer of the Works Department, a decided menace to its safety. I would therefore urge that the proposed extension be proceeded with as early as possible.

He was afraid that Mr. Vaughan would have to lie low for a while and wait until the finances improved before he got the additional accommodation required. The Royal Commission which was appointed to inquire into the working of the Government Printing Office suggested that labour-saving inventions, such as the linotype or monoline machines, should be adopted with a view to economy and speed in the preparation and publication of official documents. The Government Printer drew attention to that suggestion and made mention of the fact that the monoline, the new machine placed on the market, could be landed here for under £300, and that it was now largely in use in New South Wales, Victoria, New Zealand, and other colonies, and was apparently working very successfully. If the Government intended to carry out the recommendation of the Royal Commission, now was the proper time to obtain the machines and instal them, either in the present building or in the extension which was contemplated. He should be very pleased if the Minister could give them any information as to what was intended to be done in this respect.

The HOME SECRETARY: The question had been under consideration for the last four years, as was mentioned in the report of the Government Printer. First of all came the linotype, then the monotype, and now the monoline, which he understood would do the same work as the linotype, and was a very much less expensive machine; so that they had lost nothing by waiting. There was, however, some difficulty with regard to the patent at the present time, and in any case it would be injudicious to purchase any of these machines until the new building was ready to receive them, as they had not the necessary accommodation at present. The monotype was a large machine; the monoline was a smaller machine, and he believed more simple and effective. As soon as the accommodation, which was now being considered by the Works Department, was available, the question of providing the monoline, or possibly a more improved machine, would be considered.

Mr. HARDACRE: It appeared that the employees of the Government Printing Office, when they signed the paysheet every fortnight, were called upon to pay stamp duty, which now amounted to 4d. per month. He believed that it was not done in other departments. He did not know whether it was legal or not, but he would ask whether it could not be remitted.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was a petition got up by those officers asking that they should be classified, and placed in the position of officers in receipt of permanent salaries. The legal opinion of the Crown Law Department was that, as the result of that, the payment which they received was salary and not wages. Receipts for wages, properly so-called, were exempt from stamp duty, but receipts for salaries were not. They were not satisfied with wages, but wanted salaries, and they must pay stamp duty. It was a privilege of the bloated capitalist to pay stamp duty on what he received.

Mr. HARDACRE did not know whether what the hon. gentleman said applied generally or not, but surely there must be a number of employees who were not employed permanently. Some of them, at least, should be exempt.

The HOME SECRETARY: I suppose some of them are.

Mr. HARDACRE: In that case, he thought they might all be exempted. It pressed more heavily upon the employees in the Government Printing Office, because they were not paid monthly like the officers in other departments, but fortnightly. He did not know whether that distinction might not influence the Attorney-General to give another opinion. Was a fortnightly payment a salary or not? Salaries were usually paid monthly, and the fact that in this case payment was made fortnightly might bring it under the category of wages.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: Wages in many cases are paid monthly.

Mr. HARDACRE: That was so, but were salaries ever paid fortnightly?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes—weekly, sometimes.

Mr. HARDACRE thought those employees would rather go back to wages again.

The HOME SECRETARY: The exemption from duty in the Stamp Act reads thus—

All receipts or discharges giving by any seaman, labourer, or menial servant for the payment of wages.

Those officers were no longer labourers, but salaried officers of the Government.

Mr. HARDACRE: Is the printer's "devil" an officer?

The HOME SECRETARY did not think that the "devil" had to pay any stamp duty.

Mr. LESINA thought it was possible to effect some saving in the department. Members' boxes were filled to overflowing with documents which they never looked at. He would mention one as an illustration. It was a regulation relating to the registration of dogs in the Gilbert and Ellice Islands. Why should the country be put to the expense of publishing a document of that description? And that was only one of many papers that were put into their boxes every day of the week, which it was a waste of money to publish.

The HOME SECRETARY: There was a great deal of matter that was printed by the Government Printer that was very useless. Perhaps a good deal of the most useless matter was to be found in the pages of *Hansard*. If hon. members would restrict the length of their speeches occasionally, a very considerable saving would be effected, and for his part he thought it would be well if there were no *Hansard*.

Mr. LESINA: Well, abolish it altogether. Will you vote for its abolition?

The HOME SECRETARY did not know the document to which the hon. member referred, but he presumed it was an enclosure with and formed part of the substance of a despatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and, as such, it ought to be printed. He was quite sure that nobody would think of asking the Government to act as censors as to what should and what should not be published in regard to communications from the Secretary of State for the Colonies. They could save in better ways than that.

Question put and passed.

ADVERTISING BOARD.

The HOME SECRETARY moved that £6,820 be granted for the Advertising Board. There was a slight decrease owing to incidentals and postage being estimated at £25 less than last year.

Mr. BROWNE: Of whom does the Advertising Board consist?

The HOME SECRETARY: All the Under Secretaries, with the Government Printer as chairman.

Mr. LESINA: How many times during the year has the board met?

The HOME SECRETARY understood that there was no regular day of meeting, but they met about once a fortnight.

Mr. LESINA had one or two matters in connection with that vote which he wished to ventilate. The board every year had caused considerable discussion on account of its curious action in the expenditure of public funds. According to a return he had had laid on the table, the following journals received the following sums in payment for advertising by authority of the Advertising Board during the six months ended 30th June, 1901:—

	£	s.	d.
Worker	21	12	4
Progress	25	12	0
Week	25	16	0
Queenslander	33	12	6
Figaro	53	17	0
Street	80	4	0

The total amounts paid to the same journals for advertisements authorised and paid for by

the separate departments, irrespective of the Government Advertising Board, for the same period were—

	Worker.	Progress.	Street.	Figaro.	Week.	Q'lander.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
—	1 14 0	42 2 6	41 4 0	58 0 0	12 0 0	21 2 6
Railways	0 10 0	...	0 8 0	1 0 0	0 16 6	...
Registrar-General (Census)	...	0 18 0	55 7 0	0 11 0	0 14 0	108 12 6
Immigration	...	3 0 0	61 7 0	12 0 0
Savings Bank	0 12 0	...	0 9 0	0 15 0
Live Stock and Brands	59 2 0
Registrar of Titles	18 3 6	5 11 0	4 17 6
*Federal Elections Account	23 9 6	2 7 6	6 0 0
Totals	25 13 6	48 8 0	164 18 0	148 19 6	19 10 6	130 7 6

* Paid through the Government Advertising Board.

The total amount paid to Brisbane daily and weekly journals was £3,064 14s. 8d., while other journals issued in Queensland received £4,257 19s. 1d. If they analysed those figures they would find that the *Street*, *Figaro*, and *Queenslander* received respectively £164, £148, and £130, yet no one would maintain that either the *Street* or *Figaro* had anything like the circulation of the *Queenslander*. It was possible to prove that the *Street* had nothing like the circulation which it represented to the Advertising Board. He believed it represented its circulation as running into thousands.

Mr. GIVENS : It is given away.

Mr. FORSYTH : The *Worker* is given away, also.

Mr. LESINA : In no instance was the *Worker* given away, whereas it was the general policy to give away the *Street* to anyone who would take it at any time and anywhere. Even on the day that Lord Hopetoun was entertained by the Premier there was a small boy armed with hundreds of *Streets*, which he was handing out generously to the multitude, pressing upon the Governor-General, and imploring the leader of the Opposition to take. They did not see the *Worker* given away in that manner, but it was quite a common thing to see the *Street* distributed freely, although it was never sold, and they rarely saw the newsagents take it in. The proprietors of the paper maintained that it had a large circulation, and on the strength of that the Advertising Board pre-

sented it with large sums of the public money by way of subsidy. There was a time a few years ago when the same paper obtained a certain notoriety in connection with a leprosy case. At that time it was an uncompromising opponent of the Government, and never received a single Government advertisement. He ventured to say that if the Home Secretary applied to the Advertising Board for a return of the money it received while it was an opponent of the Government, he would find that it got not one single penny of public money; but since then the paper has altered its policy.

Mr. FORSYTH : And increased its circulation.

Mr. LESINA : There had been no increase of the circulation at all. It had increased its income, because it had received during the past six months an average of £10 by way of Government subsidy per week, and that was not its only means of support. It also received subscriptions from various prominent public men, some of whom were members of that Chamber and members of another place, in addition to subscriptions from other public men outside Parliament. Now that one time radical organ had turned its coat, and was supposed by some people to be able to influence public opinion by blackguarding the party sitting on that side from week's end to week's end by its cartoons and its paragraphs, it received a considerable amount of support in certain quarters.

Mr. FORSYTH : What does the *Worker* do?

Mr. LESINA : He had with him names of various members of Parliament who cheerfully handed over subscriptions to that organ, of which he understood the present Government whip was a sleeping partner. They on that side often accused the Government of extravagance, and in that case they might honestly accuse it of extravagance, because they were practically throwing the public funds into the *Street*. Ten pounds a week to that little fly-blistered paper that circulated in many mysterious backyards, which was never seen in the open light of day unless someone was giving it away! He had heard it asserted that that paper exercised an influence in certain departments of State because of the alleged connection of the Government whip with its proprietary. Whether it was true or not that the hon. member for Cook was a sleeping partner in this property he could not say.

The HOME SECRETARY : If he is a partner, you may depend he is pretty wide awake.

Mr. LESINA : That probably explained the £10 per week subsidy. He understood that

many advertisements were given by [9.30 p.m.] Ministers to this paper which ought to be given out by the Advertising Board. He understood that the Government exercised a discretionary power, and if they liked the politics of a paper they gave advertisements to that paper. He understood also that the board threatened to resign on account of being persistently ignored by Ministers in the matter of distributing advertisements. On one particular occasion the *Street* received an advertisement amounting to about £42—that was for one week. A little, obscure ex-Catholic paper published in the Valley, which ran for the hon. member for Fortitude Valley, Mr. McMaster, at the by-election—that little paper, which never got a Government advertisement before, received a four-page advertisement from the Government for supporting the Government candidate at that election. This prostitution of the Government funds should be stopped. It should be made public property that the Government were dipping their hands into the Treasury and ladling out the funds to owners of fly-blistered rags which had no circulation and could not live on their own merits. The *Worker*, which had a guaranteed circulation of 15,000

copies, got a very small amount; but the *Street*, which did not print 700 copies a week, got £10 a week Government subsidy. It was shocking that the taxpayers of Queensland should be bled in that fashion. He asked the Home Secretary to give the sworn figures relating to the circulation of the *Street*. During the federal election, when he and others were going through the Maranoa electorate with Mr. Page, they found post offices simply gorged with those little rags, and it was impossible to deliver the ordinary mails, because of those free copies being sent through the post.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That shows the large circulation.

MR. LESINA: They brought out a special issue with portraits of candidates, which were paid for handsomely, and they sent copies abroad all over the colony to influence votes. Chief amongst the portraits of the politicians was that of the hon. member for Cook—the walking bag-man. Judging of the influence by the result, what influence did that miserable little fly-blister have? The hon. member for Cook touched bed-rock at the poll with a terrible bump that was heard throughout Australia, and every other candidate who advertised in it went down in the same way. *Figaro* was another toady organ that was always crawling after the Government for advertisements. When the *Street* received £42 for one issue, *Figaro* had £60 for the issue of the same week. The joint circulation of these two papers only amounted to about 2,000 copies a week.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: If they were in favour of your side you would say the circulation was 60,000.

MR. LESINA: Absolute evidence could be given with regard to the circulation of the *Worker*. In six months the *Street* received from the Immigration Department £55 7s. That was for advertising Queensland as a good place for immigrants to come to. That advertisement was useless as far as encouraging immigration was concerned, because the *Street* was never seen outside Brisbane, except when it was scattered broadcast as it was at the federal election. At the Valley election, when it was supporting the Government candidate, the people were walking over copies of the *Street*. It was so much a Government organ that the hon. member for Port Curtis took copies with him in the train and dropped them out of the window at intervals. It was a specially subsidised organ of the Government. It was a little cur dog kept by the Government to bark at the heels of the Labour party, and every time the Government "sooled" it on it barked. There was another reason why he believed it was a Government organ. It had on its staff an eccentric genius named Mergentine, who happened to be the manager for the paper. This person, who was better known to fame in New South Wales as "Mossy" Barlow, had received in that State a sentence of eighteen months' imprisonment for stealing bicycles. He was the manager of this paper, and he waylaid and boasted of being able to get access to the Ministers presiding over every department in Brisbane. He boasted outside public houses, in private bars, and in the street that he had influence as a canvasser with Ministers of the Crown in Queensland which no other canvasser had. Why? Because he followed on the heels of the Government whip, and wherever you saw the Government whip you would see "Mossy."

MR. J. HAMILTON: That's a lie.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

MR. LESINA: He said it was a peculiar thing that an ex-convict from New South Wales should have the free *entrée* to every Government department, and be able to get £10 a week of

advertisements for his little fly-blister of a paper, where decent struggling journalists could not get 10s. a week from Government advertisements. That the Government could do this only showed how supine their supporters were. What object had the Government in giving this paper so many advertisements? He would like to ask the Minister in charge of this particular department what object they had to serve in giving these advertisements to the *Street*, which they put on a level with the *Queenslander*, a large and respectable journal circulating all over the colonies. This paper the *Street* had no office; it had no type; it had no machinery; it had no plant—yet it got £10 a week from the Government for circulating announcements as to public requirements. The thing was simply infamous, and he believed that if it were not for the fact that a gentleman who happened to be Government whip exercised a great deal of influence and engaged in a great deal of underground political engineering in the different departments it would not get any advertisements, even from the poor board which the Premier referred to the other day.

MR. GIVENS: Why, an Under Secretary threatened to resign owing to the way he was used by Mergentine.

MR. J. HAMILTON: That is untrue.

MR. GIVENS: That is not untrue.

MR. LESINA: This paper had an office over in South Brisbane, but no mortal man had ever been able to track the editor to his den in South Brisbane. It had an office in town, but that was an office for receiving advertisements—transacting business. It had also one office in Parliament House—a little room situated at the back of the *Hansard* gallery, which was occupied to a large extent by the Government whip, the Parliamentary lodger. There was another gentleman who was connected with this organ, who at one time exercised a large amount of influence with the Government. That was a Hebrew gentleman of the name of Loenstein, or a similar cognomen. This gentleman when he originally came here was the writer of the gallery notes in the *Courier*; but he made those notes, as even fair-minded members on the other side admitted, so brutally unfair to the Opposition, that even the *Courier* had to get rid of him. Then he drifted to the *Street*, and he was now on the *Street*. During the time that he was associated with the *Courier* that gentleman also became associated with two cases—one dealing with the cost of the preparation of certain medals for decorating the school children at the time of the jubilee, or the time of the Commonwealth celebrations; and the other was in connection with the fireworks over which the Government spent some £3,000.

MR. FORSYTH: We are getting a fair share of fireworks now.

MR. LESINA: These were facts that they wanted the public to know. There was a great amount of underground engineering going on in connection with this particular matter; and, according to the reports he had, the Government were assisting to keep this paper alive by giving it public money. He objected to that as one of the guardians of the taxpayers, and as one of the taxpayers. The gentlemen he had named were practically the staff, the body and the soul, if it had a soul, of this particular corporation, which at present exploited the Advertising Board and the different departments. When this matter was brought before the Premier the other day he said that the board was a very poor one. He (Mr. Lesina) re-echoed that sentiment, and he thought it was about time that it was abolished. He would rather trust the whole of the advertising in the Minister's hands, or else if members would not go so

far as that, they should reconstitute that board. At the present time the names of its members were hardly known to the Ministers; where they met was a matter of some doubt, and when they met no man seemed to know, but the net results always were that the greater part of the money that was expended somehow passed into the hands of persons who owned papers that supported the present Government. He said that was a prostitution of the public Press. He was strongly opposed to it, and so long as he occupied a seat in the Chamber he would always raise his voice against it. He expected from some Minister, or from the gentleman who was so deeply interested in the sailing of this little vessel, some explanation of the attitude that they had taken up, some argument why this paper should receive Government advertisements, some proof that it had any circulation at all, and some proof that it deserved any consideration. He wanted some explanation of why this paper received £10 a week for Government advertisements, when the *Worker*, which circulated all over Queensland, could only get £24 a year. It was an infamous thing that Government money should be spent in this way. He thought the Government should either reconstruct the board or abolish it altogether—lock, stock, and barrel.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The hon. member was simply carrying out the universal policy indulged in by certain persons who delighted in wallowing in cesspools of their own making. Under the cloak of the Chairman, the hon. member for Clermont made certain statements regarding certain persons which he would not dare to say outside this House. Everyone knew that there was no one more ready to slander people inside the House than the hon. member for Clermont; but outside he was timorous as a fawn. With regard to his statement respecting one person, it was not his (Mr. Hamilton's) province to ascertain the characters of everybody belonging to limited liability companies, such as this was. The *Street* had, at any rate, never been called upon to pay damages, and the editor had never been fined £500 for uttering a foul libel. A few years ago the *Street* was a different sort of paper—when it was edited by a gentleman who was subsequently the editor of the *Eagle*, a paper of which the hon. member for Clermont had also been editor. He had been very much amused for the last few months at the way in which the hon. member for Clermont had insisted that he (Mr. Hamilton) was connected with the *Street*, and would now let hon. members into a secret as to how the hon. member got this information. Hon. members might recollect that some time ago he informed the House that he had caught the hon. member for Clermont at his waste-paper basket piecing scraps of paper together. Having found a Paul Pry, he had since made use of him. On one occasion he told Mr. Glassey, Mr. Annear, and Mr. Story that, by virtue of his waste-paper basket, he would publicly proclaim himself and them shareholders in this paper. He accordingly wrote out a sham agreement, in which the names of Mr. Story, Mr. Annear, Mr. Glassey, and his own name appeared as shareholders. He then tore it up and threw it in the waste-paper basket, and these names were published, not in the *Street*, but in the *Worker* soon after.

Mr. LESINA: What issue of the *Worker*—what date?

Mr. J. HAMILTON said he did not know; hon. members could look that up for themselves and would find the names.

Mr. LESINA: Another invention.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The hon. member for Clermont had made certain statements about a gentleman named Mr. Low; they could see why

the hon. member made use of his position to attack that gentleman—because, when chief political writer on the *Courier* that gentleman did not flatter the hon. member. The hon. member had said that he (Mr. Hamilton) was interested in the *Street*. He would be very pleased to have a share in such respectable papers as the *Courier*, the *Street*—(Opposition laughter)—or the *Telegraph*, but unfortunately he had not. What did the editor of a Labour payer say, whose writings were quoted with approval by all the worker journals—*The Grafton Grip*—Mr. E. J. Brady, one of the most able writers in the colonies—and his reputation was not confined to Australasia, but his writings were to be found in some of the first-class journals in England—what did Mr. Brady say about this Mr. Low? He would read that gentleman's remarks—

BRISBANE "STREET."—Brisbane has a really brilliant weekly in *Street*, conducted by Herbert Ingram Low, whose articles in the *Sydney Morning Herald* sparked in a setting of solemnity. Mr. Low was recognised as the ablest all-round man on Australia's senior morning journal, and readers will always remember "Wamba's" "shifting scenes." Before he enlivened the *Herald* with leader, sketch, and paragraph, he was the most versatile member of the staff of the *Melbourne Age*. Nobody is therefore surprised at the excellence of Brisbane *Street*, which will be welcomed throughout the Commonwealth. A notable series of articles in *Street* is "Australian Press memories," which, so far, deal particularly and delightfully with the journals and journalists of Melbourne and Sydney. The "memories" have a permanent historical value.

Mr. Low had told him that the editor of the *Worker* had asked him to write some articles for the *Worker*, and when he respectfully declined, he was scurrilously attacked in that paper. Mr. Low was one of the ablest writers going, and he had only seen lately that Rudyard Kipling and others of that ilk had féted Mr. Low's brother in the old country—he was a writer for the *Daily News*, and one of the most distinguished pressmen in England. The attack the hon. member had made on the *Street* must be very flattering indeed to those connected with it. It was a splendid advertisement. The advertisements in the *Street* were infinitely more numerous than those which appeared in the *Worker*, for business men knew which paper was the best paper to advertise in.

Mr. BROWNE did not know whether the Home Secretary was going to take any notice of what had just been said, but the hon. gentleman must recognise that this was a very serious question. He knew that hon. members on both sides had received complaints from literary men drawing attention to the manner in which advertisements were given to journals which had a very small circulation, while journals of double and treble the circulation were absolutely neglected. The reason for advertising was to give publicity to matters, and in this way men wanted the value for their money. He contended that the Government departments in spending public money on advertisements should advertise where it would be to the best advantage.

[10 p.m.] But such was not the case. For a long time past complaints had been made about the way in which advertisements were distributed, and they showed that there was something radically wrong in regard to the advertising—either the Advertising Board was utterly incompetent and did not know what they were doing, or there was some influence behind them that no one knew anything about. There was not a member in the House who could defend the way in which money had been spent on advertising, as shown in the return which had been laid on the table of the House. He remembered that on one occasion a member on the other side of the House passed stronger remarks with regard to the journal which had been so ably advertised by the hon. member for Clermont and the hon. member for

Cook than anything he had heard in the House. When a picnic was being given to Lord Hope-toun on board the "Lucinda" a boy was standing on the gangway distributing copies of that paper, and no one could pass him without having a copy thrust on him. He heard a journalist sitting behind, and supporting the Ministry, say to another, "Why can't you give your paper away like that?" The reply was, "If they gave me as many advertisements as they give to that rag I could give my paper away too." He had no hesitation in saying that if a boy had been standing there distributing that much-abused organ, the *Worker*, the biggest policeman that could have been found would have taken him by the ear, and put him outside the domain pretty quickly.

The HOME SECRETARY: You know that is not correct.

Mr. BROWNE: Did the hon. gentleman remember any other occasion where at a Government picnic like that welcoming the Governor-General a newspaper boy had been allowed in the domain to give papers away? The matter was one of importance, and its discussion should not be left to two or three members who wished to vent their spleen against each other. A great deal of the success of business men was secured by successful advertising, and they always looked out for the organs with the best circulation. Complaints had been made earlier in the session about the way in which the Government sent advertisements of the sale of land to local newspapers about the time the sale was going on, with the result that the people in the district did not know anything about the matter. He would ask the Minister to consider the matter seriously, to leave the slang-whanging out of the question, and look at it in a really practical light, and see that the money spent in advertising was expended to the best advantage for the State.

The HOME SECRETARY desired to approach the matter from a serious point of view, and was not aware that he had displayed any levity.

Mr. BROWNE: Oh, no.

The HOME SECRETARY: The hon. member for Croydon's own friend had indulged in that particular recreation which the hon. member so graphically and poetically called slang-whanging, and that was the first time he (the Home Secretary) had a chance of speaking on the subject. He sincerely wished that there was no necessity to advertise in any paper at all. When they found that, whatever might be the action in the way of advertising by a specially appointed board composed of men who from their position were most likely to know what was best to be done in the way of advertising, they were subjected to the sort of criticism they had heard that evening, he thought it was greatly to be regretted.

Mr. LESINA: You subsidise a paper to slang-whang this party.

The HOME SECRETARY: He did not subsidise any paper; he had nothing to do with them. The hon. member should keep cool.

Mr. LESINA: The Home Secretary's Department advertised with it last year.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was quite possible, but all these advertisements went to the Advertising Board. It was a very significant fact if, as stated by the hon. member for Cook—and he took it for granted that it was true—the *Street*, which was the paper in reference to which complaint had been made, had a large number of business advertisements. The hon. member for Croydon had pointed out that business people advertised where they considered it would pay best. Some papers might have an exceedingly

large circulation, but the people among whom it principally circulated would also have to be taken very materially into consideration in deciding whether it was a better advertising medium than some other paper which had a circulation in a different sphere altogether—more in business circles—but had not so large a circulation as the newspaper first mentioned. The hon. member for Clermont had stated that the *Worker* had a circulation of 15,000. He (the Home Secretary) was informed that the circulation of the *Street* was 9,000 (Opposition laughter.) Hon. members might laugh; it was their cue to laugh because the *Street* did not support them.

Mr. JENKINSON: I believe it is a sworn statement.

Mr. LESINA: It is not a sworn statement.

Mr. JENKINSON: It is a sworn statement.

Mr. LESINA: Then they ought to be prosecuted for perjury.

The HOME SECRETARY: That was the information which was given to him. At all events, a circulation of 9,000 amongst business people was certainly better than a circulation of 15,000 amongst people who were not likely to do business on the lines of the advertisements that might appear. There were papers with a very large circulation in which it would be absolute folly to advertise. It all depended upon the people amongst whom the advertising medium most largely circulated. He could not speak from personal experience of the circulation of any of the papers for the simple reason that it was no part of his business. There was the Advertising Board to attend to those matters, and he supposed the secretary had information of that kind. Although the board was nominally in the Home Secretary's Department, it was carried on independently with a view to relieve Ministers of what was to him a great relief—the exercise of newspaper patronage. He deprecated the personalities that had been indulged in. They did not commend the cause of those who made the attack. He might say that he read the *Street*, and he was pleased to say that it was probably, so far as the editorial work and the reading matter went, the best reading matter to be found in any paper in Queensland. As to its circulation, he had no information except what had been conveyed to him in an indirect way.

Mr. JACKSON: It was quite evident to him that, although the Government did not appear to patronise the *Worker* with advertisements, the pastoral industry did, because in the issue of 12th October he found the *Worker* had a full page advertisement which was headed, "The Pastoral Industry. Extracts and Sworn Evidence taken by the New South Wales Royal Commission on Western Lands at Parliament House, Brisbane, 14th March, 1901."

The HOME SECRETARY: I suppose they want to reach the employees in the West. It only bears out my argument.

Mr. JACKSON: He was a little bit astonished at the *Worker* taking an advertisement of that sort. (Government laughter.) Whilst hon. members on that side were doing their best on behalf of the grazing farmers, they found the *Worker* putting in a full page advertisement in favour of the bloated squatter. He was surprised that the *Worker* did not get more advertisements from the Government seeing its large circulation was undisputed.

The PREMIER: They would not take our advertisements.

Mr. JACKSON: It did not affect him one bit what the policy of a paper was. It might be an unscrupulous organ, but, if he had to advertise, that would not affect him in deciding in what papers he would advertise. As a matter

of fact, the *Worker*, for which he was now saying a good word, was in his opinion, most unscrupulous in its opposition to himself.

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

Mr. JACKSON: Only in the issue of 5th October he found it published a paragraph containing a most unscrupulous attack on himself—a thing that was very seldom done by any reputable journal. Under the heading of "Political Pellets" it said—

Some of Jackson's views from last week's *Hansard*—"I am not in favour of reducing the Governor's salary by any large amount."

It stopped there, and went on with an extract from a totally different speech—

I am anxious to give the pastoralist as fair play as possible.

Then it stopped again. Then it went on—

I am animated by nothing but friendly feelings towards the pastoralists.

It stopped again, and went on—

I am not prepared to say how I shall vote on the second reading of this (Pastoralist Extension of Leases) Bill.

Now, that was one of the most cowardly and dastardly things that could have been done—

MEMBERS on the Government side: Hear, hear!

THE HOME SECRETARY: Blackguardly.

Mr. JACKSON: To quote those extracts from his speeches without giving the context. He felt ashamed to recognise as a Labour organ a paper which would be guilty of such a cowardly thing.

Mr. McMASTER: The *Street* would not publish that.

THE SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE (Hon. D. H. Dalrymple, *Mackay*): The objection which had been made against the *Street* that it had not a large circulation was not borne out. The speech of the hon. member for Clermont would lead one to suppose that it had one of the largest circulations in the colony. The hon. member had shown that it was studied by the Labour party, and had evidently caused them much worry. The hon. member had shown that it was more pushing in connection with the disposal of its papers than any other journal. Some hon. members had objected to the advertisements on the score that some paper boy actually presented himself in a place where other paper boys did not succeed in getting, and, from that, hon. members argued that therefore it was a paper that should be boycotted. He should say that where a paper showed evidence of extraordinary push, that was the paper in which people should advertise. The hon. member for Clermont had shown—as he generally showed when he left declamation and got to argument—that his case was a bad one. He had not only shown that there were most pushing people in connection with the *Street*, but had alleged without supplying a particle of proof that there were also people of a very bad character in New South Wales who had got rehabilitated in Queensland, and who had established a company which had succeeded in obtaining a good many advertisements—which, if it proved anything, was a sign of their competence, because, if the hon. member had ever been in trouble in New South Wales, it was quite possible that, if he had come to Queensland, he would have suffered the penalties for what he had done before. Those men had rallied. They had come here and established a business. The hon. member also told them that they might go all over Queensland and find copies of the paper showered in all quarters. How, then, could the hon. member be foolish enough to think that he had induced members to believe that he had proved the case against the *Street*? He had proved, in fact, that it was one of the most widely

circulated papers in the colony. The Home Secretary had said that he possessed a sworn statement of the circulation of that paper. Hon. members opposite expected them to believe their simple statements in regard to the circulation of the *Worker*, but they utterly discredited a sworn statement about the circulation of its adversary. He proposed to read a document which would show that when the Government were charged by hon. members opposite with corruption and improper use of the public funds the charges were made also against other persons than the Government. If the Government were dead to the interests of the colony, and were actuated by improper motives in advertising in a paper unworthy to be advertised in, he would point out that the Brisbane Jockey Club advertised in the *Street*, as did also Howard Smith and Company, the Mutual Life Association, the Australasian United Steam Navigation Company, the Queensland Milling Company, the Independent Order of Oddfellows, and numerous other smart business firms. It seemed to him, therefore, that the calumnies of the hon. member for Clermont, who contended that the *Street* should be edited in St. Helena, affected a good many people, and there was a very strong probability from what had been said, and the excitement which hon. members had displayed, that the paper was one which had a large circulation and considerably hurt the feelings of members of the Labour party. The following was the extract to which he had alluded:—

Over a year ago the Advertising Board, with a view to holding the balance of advertising level between the various weekly papers published in Brisbane, asked the respective proprietors to furnish it with sworn statements of their circulations. Some of the papers did not reply, others gave evasive answers; but the *Street*, knowing that it had nothing to fear and everything to gain by an examination of its books, sent the following reply to the board:—

Brisbane, November.

The Chairman, Advertising Board.

Sir,—Yours of the 22nd November received, requesting a reply to the following questions:—

1. Number of single copies of each issue of the *Street* posted during November.

2. Number of bundles posted during same time, and number of papers contained therein.

Reply to Question 1—

Number of single <i>Streets</i> posted in G.P.O. of	
3rd November issue	1,800
10th " "	1,953
17th " "	2,027
24th " "	2,044
	7,824

Question 2—

Number of bundles *Streets* posted of 3-11 issue—62, containing 1,843 *Streets*.

Number of bundles *Streets* posted of 10-11 issue—62, containing 1,914 *Streets*.

Number of bundles *Streets* posted of 17-11 issue—62, containing 2,027 *Streets*.

Number of bundles *Streets* posted of 24-11 issue—63, containing 2,044 *Streets*.

Total number of *Streets* printed of issues of 3rd, 10th, 17th, and 24th November, 37,000.

We append our declaration testifying to the correctness of said statements, and enclose printed list of subscribers' names and addresses, numbering 2,020, in proof of same.

We also send declaration by our machinist re the number of *Streets* printed by him during the month of November.

Our books, which are kept in accordance with the L. L. Coe. Act of 1863, bear out all of the above statements. We invite you, or anyone you may choose to send, to inspect same at any time.

I remain, yours faithfully,

On behalf of *Street* Newspaper Company, Ltd.,
(Signed) MANAGER.

With this letter were appended sworn declarations and post office certificates; but since that date, when the *Street* proved a circulation of over 9,000 copies weekly, it has, at times, risen to very much more than that figure.

He thought that was quite enough, in addition to the statements made by hon. members opposite, to lead to the conclusion that the paper must necessarily have a large circulation. He entirely endorsed what was said by the Home Secretary that the *Street* was extremely ably conducted, and contained some very brilliant writing, but the whole truth in connection with the opposition which had been shown by hon. members was that it did not happen to support the party to which they belonged, and consequently they took every opportunity, as they did with their political opponents, of "downing" it.

Mr. TURLEY: It seemed to him from the records they possessed that a paper which was absolutely independent in politics received no advertisements from either the Advertising Board or the Government. The year before last the *Street* received for Government advertisements the sum of £3.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: The circulation has gone up since then.

Mr. TURLEY: Could anyone doubt that it had gone up when the paper was receiving a subsidy of £10 a week? There was also the paper which supported the junior member for Fortitude Valley that had not been going on particularly well, but it was no wonder that with a large Government subsidy its position was improving.

The PREMIER: What paper is that?

Mr. TURLEY: The *Australian*; and there was never a Government advertisement appeared in that paper before the person who was connected with it was bought by the Government by getting a brief from the Department [10:30 p.m.] of Justice. The Premier thought it was not good enough to endorse him as a candidate for the Bulimba election.

The PREMIER: Who was that?

Mr. TURLEY: Mr. St. Ledger.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He has nothing to do with the *Australian*.

Mr. TURLEY: He had; and the hon. gentleman knew it.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: He has not a sixpence in it.

The PREMIER: He was never a candidate for Bulimba.

Mr. TURLEY: His name was mentioned prominently by the deputation that waited on the hon. gentleman.

The PREMIER: No.

Mr. TURLEY: And Mr. Lilley's name came up at the same deputation. The reputable journals of Queensland must be highly gratified at the statements of the Home Secretary and the Secretary for Agriculture that the reading matter in the *Street* is the best to be found in any journal published in Queensland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Isn't it?

Mr. TURLEY: He didn't know anything about it. He very seldom saw it. He was offered a copy the other day, but he didn't want it.

The HOME SECRETARY: You were afraid to read it.

Mr. TURLEY: No. He knew the source it came from, and he didn't want it.

Mr. McMASTER: You only read one side.

Mr. TURLEY: He read both sides—a great deal more than the hon. gentleman. The Secretary for Agriculture said that when a paper was being pushed forward on business lines, that was the paper to support. The greatest pushing of this paper was in Government offices—where there was an opportunity of getting support for a particular reason. He went about 100 miles outside Brisbane the other day, and he was informed that an attempt was made by the people

in connection with that journal to use the schools for the distribution of that particular organ, and, he assumed, with the sanction of the department.

The SECRETARY FOR AGRICULTURE: That is a slander on the department.

Mr. TURLEY: That was what he heard. He knew that schools were made use of for a great many purposes with the sanction of the Minister; but he thought it was a scandal and a disgrace for anyone to permit the Education Department to be put to a use like this.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: You ought to give some proof of your statement.

Mr. TURLEY: He was told by Mr. Armytage, a member of a school committee. The papers were sent in bundles to the schoolmaster, with the request that he would see that the copies were distributed to the children to take home. When those things were being done—he supposed it was with the consent of the Minister—it was a scandal and a disgrace.

The PREMIER: I am sure there is no truth in it.

Mr. TURLEY: It was a scandal to the person who consented, and to the responsible Minister of the Crown.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a scandal to make such an imputation against an absent man.

Mr. TURLEY: He was not particularly troubled about the paper one way or the other, but when a paper like the *Queenlander* received very little more for Government advertisements than the amount received by this paper, it seemed to him that Government officers were doing with public money what they would not do with their own. It was an abuse of the power placed in the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with the public funds. Some hon. members might not see any harm in it. In fact, they might be in favour of the sort of political morality by which a journal supporting the Government was subsidised with public money; but hon. members on his side were decidedly opposed to that standard of morality. He believed that the papers in which it was required to put Government advertisements should have those advertisements given to them somewhat according to their circulation, or according to the parts of the country in which they were circulating. If it was necessary to put a Government advertisement in a paper in connection with the sale of land, it should be in a paper circulating in the locality in which the land was situated, and in larger quantity than any other papers. At the same time it should be also put in papers that had a wide circulation.

Mr. TOLMIE: He did not propose to discuss the merits of the *Street* or the *Worker*. He thought they had had quite sufficient about that. There were other issues involved in connection with this matter. He thought there was a great mistake made in connection with advertising of the lands of the colony that were put up for sale or for lease. There was not sufficient publicity given to them. He quite agreed with the hon. member for South Brisbane when he said advertisements should be inserted in the papers published or circulating in the districts in which the lands were situated, in order to bring them prominently before the local public. They should also be advertised in the weekly papers which had a large circulation. The usual practice was to send a small advertisement of about 2 inches in length, costing 5s. or 6s., and a request for a free advertisement, in the form of a local, and, generally speaking, that was the only advertisement that the land got in country newspapers. He was not there to advocate the claims of any one particular paper, but throughout all Queensland there were a great number of papers which supplied the wants of their particular neighbourhoods, and he was sure that the lands taken up in those particular districts were taken up by the

residents. Very few outsiders came in. If it was desired to get as much as possible for lands offered for sale or lease, the Government should advertise them more freely. The Government would advertise the sale of land to the extent of 11s. where a private firm of auctioneers would spend £10 or £20 upon it. The result was that private firms of auctioneers got very much higher prices than the Government. He believed that there was a lot of money lost to the Treasury through parsimony in advertising. Being closely connected with a journal himself, it might be thought that he was speaking rather in favour of newspapers because it would serve his own particular purpose, but he wished it to be understood that he was not doing so. He was speaking in the best interests of the country so far as the advertising of land sales was concerned.

Mr. JENKINSON: With the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba, he thought not only was not sufficient publicity given in local papers to the sale of lands but the situation of the lands was not made sufficiently plain. All that was generally seen was that on a certain day the land agent would sell portions so-and-so, in the parishes of so-and-so, and he ventured to say that not 50 per cent. of the people in the locality had any idea where they were situated. He had suggested to the Minister that where different portions were to be sold in different districts each district should be given a separate headline in the advertisements, so that the position of the land in each particular district should be prominently brought before the local public. The extra charge would be very small, and the department, he was sure, would obtain a better price for the land. Reference had been made to the sale of the Baramba lands, and he understood from the *Brisbane Courier* that the Advertising Board were blamed for the fact that the lands were not advertised once in the local papers. He was not sure whether that was correct, but he had in his hand a paragraph in which it was stated that the land was advertised in the Brisbane papers and not once in the local papers, the result being that instead of realising £5 an acre, as some of the land was said to be worth, it only realised 12s. 6d. That only served to bear out the contention of the hon. member for Drayton and Toowoomba. Reference had been made to the circulation of the *Street*. It was very easy to get up the circulation of a paper if it was distributed free, broadcast. Only during the last two or three weeks several of his constituents had brought under his notice the fact that bundles of that paper had been sent to certain portions of the locality and were distributed free to anyone.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: That is how the *Daily Telegraph* in Sydney got its circulation.

Mr. JENKINSON: He had nothing to say against that as a piece of enterprise on the part of a newspaper. The bundles of papers which he had referred to were sent to a resident of the locality, and then addressed by him to the school, with a note asking the teacher to give them to the children to take home to their parents. He did not think they should blame the Education Department for that. They could only admire the enterprise of the paper, but he said that if all newspapers got the same amount of subsidy from the Government to enable them to distribute their papers free they would be able to enter into the same sort of competition as this paper, but he believed that in this matter it should be the survival of the fittest. Those papers which went on their merits, and which circulated largely, should receive more consideration from the board and the Government than they had been receiving. From his knowledge of the board and of newspapers, he believed that the

patronage of the board—if he might so term it—in this respect had been very fair—as fair as possible from the statements they had before them. The Secretary for Agriculture had read out a statement with regard to the circulation of the *Street*, but he did not know that the board had any opportunity of verifying that statement without they consulted the printer of the paper; and under the circumstances they had good grounds for giving these advertisements to that paper, but the main point was to consider the class of people the different papers circulated amongst. If large areas of land were to be sold, it would not be much good advertising in papers which chiefly circulated amongst artisans, but the idea should be to bring the matter prominently before men who had the wherewithal to purchase these lands. If the board had been guided by that principle, it was not fair that these aspersions should be cast upon them.

Mr. BURROWS (*Charters Towers*): It appeared to him that the discussion had only been limited to Brisbane; but Brisbane was not the whole of Queensland. Queensland was a very large place. There were newspapers scattered all over the colony. And the same way of subsidising newspapers by way of advertisements that took place in Brisbane also took place elsewhere. He believed in advertising, and he had had some experience in that matter. He noticed that two papers had been largely advertised in the Committee, and he would take the advantage of advertising another paper—a very deserving paper, and one which was in a principal mining centre in Queensland. That paper had had very little support from the board or from the Minister, although it had the largest circulation in Charters Towers—he referred to the *Eagle*. He noticed that when the Secretary for Agriculture read out the advertisements contained in the *Street*, he only read out a few—one or two—and from the fact that one or two people advertised in that rag, he wished the Committee to infer that that paper was a good advertising medium. But hon. members should look at the list of advertisers in the *Eagle* in Charters Towers. This paper circulated largely all over the Charters Towers Gold Field and throughout the whole colony, and even further. Yet it only received £2 8s. last year, whereas other papers there, with only half the circulation, and in some cases, only one-fifth the circulation, had received considerably more than that. The daily morning paper there had a good circulation, and he had no objection to that paper getting these advertisements. The reason why the *Eagle* had not received a fair share of advertisements was because it was opposed to the Government in politics. To show that the principal business people in Charters Towers recognised the value of the *Eagle* as an advertising medium, he would give the names of some of the business people there who advertised in that paper. In the boot department there were Daking, Smith, and Co., J. J. Connolly, J. D. Arida, T. Carroll, R. Terrell, and W. H. Green. In the drapery line, Daking, Smith, and Co., J. D. Arida, All Nations' Warehouse, R. Mathieson and Co., Criterion House. Also twenty-three hotels, all the hairdressers, six of the tailors, and all the watchmakers. There was a column in small type of the list of advertisers to this paper, yet the amount of advertisements it got from the board was infinitesimally small compared to the amount of advertisements given to other papers there. What was the principle on which the board went? What actuated them in giving advertisements in this way? The *Eagle* was absolutely the cheapest paper on the Towers per issue. It was a weekly paper, and the rate for the first inch in the other papers was nearly 25 per cent.

higher than the price charged by the *Eagle*, and it was higher for each succeeding inch. The *Eagle* had not cut prices, and that paper got a higher price for its standing advertisements than any other paper on the Towers. The *Eagle* was only published once a week, while other papers there were issued six times a week. It could not be on the score of economy, or on the score of circulation that that paper had been treated so badly in the way of advertisements, but it was because its policy was opposed to the policy of the Government.

Mr. W. HAMILTON did not think it was a fair thing for the Premier to say that the Advertising Board was useless, for they had got to do what they were told. Last year a sum of money was passed for certain artesian bores—two of them in the district of the hon. member for Bulloo, and two of them in his (Mr. Hamilton's) district. The Government advertised for tenders in the *Brisbane Courier*, the *Telegraph*, one of the *Charleville* papers, in the *Longreach* paper, and in the *Hughenden* paper; but no advertisements were put in the papers in the Winton district, where the chief bores were going to be made. Although there were a lot of artesian borers there with their plant waiting to find out if the

contracts were to be let, yet not one [11 p.m.] advertisement was given to either of the local newspapers in the first instance, though the matter was afterwards advertised in those papers, and in the *Thargomindah Herald*, which circulated in the district where two of the bores were situated. When he went to see why it was that tenders were not advertised for in the local newspapers, he was informed that the Advertising Board knew nothing about the matter. He did not see why tenders should have been advertised for in the *Courier* and the *Telegraph*, seeing that there were no artesian borers in Brisbane. With regard to the circulation of the *Street*, he knew that there was not an elector in his district who did not receive a copy of that paper during the time of the federal elections; the mailbags were filled with copies of the *Street* simply because it advocated the cause of the Government candidates. But its advocacy had very little effect, and it would be found that it would have very little effect at the next general election in Queensland. He believed that the *Street* was largely subsidised by the National Liberal Union, which comprised among its members all the Government supporters in the House, and in some places the returning officer for the district. In the district of Dalby the returning officer was the treasurer of the local branch of the union, and he believed the hon. member for Dalby was present at the meeting at which he was appointed. It was a scandalous thing that a returning officer should occupy such a position.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the hon. member confine himself to the question before the Committee?

Mr. W. HAMILTON: He was pointing out that the *Street* was circulated by that association and bolstered up by the Government. An obscure journal like the *Street* actually received more advertisements from the Government than any three of the principal newspapers in Brisbane, more than the *Queenslander*, which had a large circulation. It was no doubt true that the *Street* had a circulation of 8,000 or 9,000 during the time of the federal election, but he was sure he was quite within the mark in saying that it had not one-fourth of that circulation at the present time. It was a scandalous thing that the Government should subsidise it in the way they did, simply because it supported the Government and misrepresented members on that side of the House.

The SECRETARY FOR RAILWAYS: What about the misrepresentations of the *Worker*?

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The *Worker* was not "bolstered" up by the Government; if anybody got a free copy of that journal it was paid for by the members of the workers' organisation. As far as the Advertising Board was concerned, he thought it would be a very good thing when it was wiped out, and Ministers were made responsible for the advertisements issued by their respective departments.

Mr. BELL (*Dalby*): Mr. Gladstone once described a political party in the House of Commons as marching through rapine to the dismemberment of the Empire. It seemed to him that they had a political party in that House who were attempting to march through innuendo and misrepresentation to the Treasury benches. When they considered the general tactics pursued by a minority of members on the other side in regard to the proceedings of the House, and when they remembered the method of attack on a number of members on this side which was invariably observed by the journals which supported them outside the House, hon. members could certainly see that innuendo and misrepresentation formed a very important part of their tactics, and it did not lie in the mouth of hon. members opposite to make any insinuations with regard to one or other of the journals which supported the party on his side of the House. The hon. member for Gregory, whose appearance would rather suggest that he would conduct his politics on a higher plane, went out of his way to say that in the town of Dalby there had been on the part of a public official a gross dereliction of duty, inasmuch as he had associated himself with a party organisation. It was quite true that the individual who for the moment was the returning officer for the electorate of Dalby happened to be the temporary treasurer of the Dalby branch of the National Liberal Union, which had scarcely yet come into being. He might say that the returning officer in Dalby, Mr. P. F. Bodkin, on the eve of the federal elections, had duties to perform elsewhere, and Mr. Vowles was temporarily appointed. It was only two or three days ago that he (Mr. Bell) wrote a letter pointing out that Mr. Bodkin was now prepared to return to his office, and so Mr. Vowles was now, and had been for some time, expecting an intimation that he was relieved of his office. The statement was of a class which he should have thought no man who was entitled to the term of "hon. gentleman" would have made. The hon. member might at least have taken the trouble to verify his facts, but he went out of his way to create a false impression in that Chamber, and publish it through *Hansard* in the country. As one who desired to see the level of debate kept up, he wished to say that the whole tone of the discussion was to be regretted, and for that the hon. member for Clermont was responsible, as he had made about as low a class of attack as the four walls of that Chamber had ever heard.

Mr. W. HAMILTON: The hon. member had not said that his statement was untrue. In fact, he had verified what he had said. His reason for making the statement was because he held very strongly that it was not right for any returning officer to be officially connected with any party organisation, as elections were sometimes decided by the casting vote of the returning officer. The National Liberal Union was an organisation whose object was to keep the present Government in power, and the Government should see to it that no returning officer occupied such a position.

Mr. McDONNELL (*Fortitude Valley*): Last year the Home Secretary had furnished a list

showing the manner in which the advertising vote was distributed, and he would be glad to get a similar list from the hon. gentleman now. He was sorry to see from the return which was laid on the table some time back that the Advertising Board had not acted impartially in the distribution of their favours, because they found that those papers which were the strongest supporters of the Government and the bitterest opponents of his party were those which got the lion's share of the Government advertising. The discussion which had taken place should lead the Advertising Board to see that their actions would be closely scrutinised in that Committee. He would ask any reasonable business man what comparison there was between the *Queenslander*, which circulated largely in all parts of Queensland, and also in the other States, and the *Street*, which circulated only in Brisbane. Yet during the last six months the *Queenslander* received £163 for Government advertisements, whilst during the same period the *Street* received £101 more. With the exception of the *Worker*, which was the best advertising medium in Queensland, the *Queenslander* was the best, and there could be no doubt that if the merchants of Queensland were consulted they would give the palm to the *Worker*. There seemed to him to be a great deal of objection to the action which had been taken, and no reasonable man could come to the conclusion that the Advertising Board had acted in a business-like way, or had obtained value for the money spent. When such a paper as the *Street* was put in the same category with splendid advertising mediums such as the *Queenslander* and *Week*, it was about time that protest was made against the way in which the Board conducted their business. When they came also to consider the advertisements distributed by the Government they found the same partiality displayed. Those papers which supported the Government received seven-eighths of the money spent in advertising, while other journals received practically nothing. He could mention a journal which, after making a most pronounced somersault, immediately received an advertisement which it had been persistently refused twelve months before; and if the Advertising Board could be got at in that manner, it was about time that a board was constituted which would deal with the matter impartially, and distribute advertisements where the Government would get best value for their money.

Mr. McMASTER (*Fortitude Valley*): It appeared to him that the Advertising Board had done their duty so well that they had pleased neither side. Hon. members had asked for a justification of the advertisements given to the *Street*. They had given it themselves, and had shown that the Government had acted wisely, for one hon. member said that a certain post office was blocked with *Streets*, while another said that during the federal election the *Street* was in every house. It was nothing that the paper was distributed free. When a business man opened a business he sent round handbills and pamphlets free.

Mr. BROWNE: But the public do not pay for them.

Mr. McMASTER: If a larger share of advertisements had been given to the *Worker* not a word would have been said about the public having to pay for it. He thought his colleague had made a most unworthy insinuation about a certain paper getting Government advertisements after it gave its support to the Government. The fact was the hon. member was very much annoyed because he was not at liberty to use that paper as he did two years ago. At that time he had free access to it, and wrote articles for it; but because the paper saw that it had

been deceived, it had turned round and supported the Government. That was the whole grievance. He did not read that paper very often; but when he did he believed that what it printed was true. That could not be said of the *Worker*.

He thought the Advertising Board [11:30 p.m.] acted wisely in advertising in a paper that circulated amongst the public.

His colleague stated that the best medium for advertising was the *Queenslander*. That paper belonged to the same company as the *Courier* and the *Observer*, and they all three got a fair share. Whoever the proprietors of the *Street* were, they would no doubt be thankful for the advertisement they had received from members on the other side during the debate.

The PREMIER thought they had heard enough of newspapers to-night. What he complained of was that the board did not advertise enough. The last two land sales were not properly advertised, and he hoped that land sales would be properly advertised in future. Of course, the Government could not advertise land in the same way as a private individual would—enlarging on the beauties and other advantages—but they ought to advertise more fully and locally. With regard to the remark about an association he was connected with sending out copies of a certain paper, he might say that the National Liberal Union had only been in existence six months.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is the same one under another name.

The PREMIER: At the last election they did not spend a shilling in sending out newspapers—they only sent out leaflets. In reference to the statement of the hon. member for Brisbane South, about papers being distributed with the sanction of the Education Department, he might inform the hon. member that the Education Department was the most conservative department in the colony, and would never dream of allowing a teacher—if they knew it—to be made use of by anyone in the colony for the distribution of newspapers.

Mr. TURLEY: The hon. member for Dalby stated that the debate had got down to a lower level than he had ever witnessed inside the Chamber before. They had not got down in this debate to the level of accusing hon. members opposite of being associates of thieves and forgers, or saying it was a pity to have to associate with twice convicted felons.

The HOME SECRETARY: He agreed that such statements ought not to be made. What the hon. member said was just about barely true, when he said they had not got to that level during this debate; but they had only to go down another row of bricks to get to it.

Mr. BROWNE: He did not think they had got to the lowest level when they had two Ministers of the Crown stating their opinion that the paper which had been so extensively advertised to-night was the most brilliant specimen of journalism in Queensland. With regard to what had been said about a certain association having no connection with the National League, he wished to say that first of all there was the Federal Electoral League, of which the Premier was president; then that merged itself into the Queensland Electoral Registration Association; and that association now stated that it was merged into the National Liberal Organisation. So that, as a matter of fact, it was the association of which the Premier was head that had sent out all that literature.

The PREMIER: They never sent out an ounce of *Street*.

Mr. BROWNE: He had no objection to that sort of literature going about, because it killed

the cause it was advocating. The more candidates on the other side were supported by it the greater "down" they were going to get all the time. So far as this matter of advertising was concerned, he did not look at it from the point of view of any paper—he did not care whether the papers supported one side or the other—but he looked to the fact that it was the country's money that was being spent. There was not a Ministerial organ in the country but what was complaining since the return of the distribution of Government advertising had been produced. There were both the *Queenlander* and the *Week* papers which were not in sympathy with his side of the House, but papers which would be found in every camp in the West, and at ever digger's camp, from Cape York to the Condamine, and yet a wretched rag, which had a cover of the same colour as the plague flag—that was being carted around and given away—was held up as a superior advertising medium to those papers. Apart from politics and looking at the matter purely from a business point of view, that was absurd. It had been said that the giving away of this paper was push and enterprise, but if it was enabled to do this by the assistance which it received from the Government in the shape of advertising and subsidies, he did not know how any other journal which had not those advantages could compete against it. He did not argue the question from a party point of view, but looking at the distribution of the Government advertising generally, it appeared that the papers which supported the Government received a great deal more advertising from the Government than those which supported his side of the House. It was on account of the complaints which had come from newspaper proprietors all over the colony that he now raised his voice against this, and he intended to go further. He intended to take the opinion of the Committee upon it. He knew there would be, as there always was, a great majority on the other side of the House; but as long as he remained a member of the House, when he thought there was a right principle involved he would fight for it, even if he stood alone. He intended to call for a division to show how many members of the House there were who were game to give their vote as a protest against the way in which this vote had been administered. He did not do that as a reflection on the Advertising Board, because he did not think individually they would show any political partiality, but on the principle that the taxpayers ought to get the best value for their money, he would move a reduction of the vote by £20.

Mr. McDONNELL asked the Home Secretary if he would give the Committee the list of the papers in which the advertisements had appeared.

The PREMIER: Call for a return.

The HOME SECRETARY: It is a long list, and last time I asked hon. members, if they wanted it, to call for a return.

Mr. LESINA: I asked to have it placed on the table before this vote came on. That was last year, and you promised to put it on.

The HOME SECRETARY: You never asked for it this time, or I should have been glad to have supplied it.

Mr. McDONNELL: If the hon. gentleman would allow the report to appear in *Hansard*, he did not want to give him the trouble of reading it.

The HOME SECRETARY: I shall have pleasure in laying it on the table of the House, and it will be printed.

Mr. McDONNELL: He would like it printed in *Hansard*.

The HOME SECRETARY: If hon. gentlemen like to take it as read, I suppose it can be done.

The PREMIER: The leader of the Opposition had said something about the National Liberal Union and the association which amalgamated with it. When he was connected with the association it never sent a single paper or newspaper to any district in the colony. Handbills were sent out but they were paid for by the association. The Government had spent no money on those circulars. The National Liberal Union had only been in operation for a little time, and the old association only sent out things which they paid for.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: They were circulated very freely.

The PREMIER: Not by the old association.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: By the Electoral League.

The PREMIER said he could assure hon. members that that was not so.

Mr. BROWNE said he was quite prepared to accept the statement of the Chief Secretary. He had never seen a copy of these documents; he only had referred to them, but he understood it was the same old association—it was all merged, he understood, into the National Liberal Union.

Mr. LESINA: Before this vote came to a division he would like to say a few words. The hon. member for Cook had fairly proved that he was interested in the *Street*. He had had a good go in defence of the *Street*, but he found that that paper would not be allowed inside the shops of Messrs. Gordon and Gotch, Thompson and Co., and other firms.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER: No wonder.

Mr. J. HAMILTON: The *Worker* will not be allowed in certain shops.

Mr. LESINA: The *Worker* would be allowed to be inside those shops. This literary and artistic gem two Ministers pretended to admire. The *Gympie Truth* had received two letters from correspondents with regard to the *Street*, complaining of the way in which it had been subsidised by the Government. Copies of this wretched rag had been circulated in Labour constituencies in order to try and secure seats for Government candidates. Thynne and Macartney were mentioned as subscribers to this paper, and their cheque was to be always ready, and they did all they could to assist in pushing it forward. That was one firm that was mentioned, and he had heard of other firms being mentioned in this connection. The Government by their action in this respect were only trying to secure the return of men of their own shade of opinion. If the statements he had made were not true, they should be contradicted. In the city, if a journalist wanted to make a living, he should never advocate democracy—he should never decry the Government—he should never make an attack on a Government supporter—all the sins of the Government he should cloak up—then, if he did that, he would probably get a fat billet. Why should all this money be paid to the *Street*, in which the hon. member for Cook was so much interested?

Mr. J. HAMILTON said his only regret was that he did not possess any share in the *Street*. As to the statements made by the hon. member for Clermont, he was so well known that no one ever took the trouble to contradict anything he said. When he looked at him he thought of a little, miserable remnant of an ill-spent life who was continually hopping on to his feet and making a noise in Congress. A friend of Lincoln's said, "Why don't you stop him?" "Take no notice of him," said the President, "he reminds me of a rickety little steamer on the Mississippi I once knew with a five-foot boiler

and a ten-foot whistle, and every time she whistled she stopped. His voice is the biggest part of him."

Question—That £6,800 only be granted—put; and the Committee divided :—

AYES, 15.

Mr. Airey	Mr. Hardacre
" Barber	" Kerr
" Browne	" Lesina
" Burrows	" Maxwell
" Dibley	" McDonnell
" Dunsford	" Ryland
" Givens	" Turley
" W. Hamilton	

Tellers: Mr. Hardacre and Mr. Turley.

NOES, 18.

Mr. Bartholomew	Mr. Hanran
" Bell	" Leahy
" Bridges	" Macartney
" Campbell	" Mackintosh
" T. B. Cribb	" McMaster
" Dalrymple	" Newell
" Fox	" Philp
" Foxton	" Rutledge
" J. Hamilton	" Tooth

Tellers: Mr. Macartney and Mr. Newell.

Question resolved in the negative.

Mr. McDONNELL asked the Home Secretary if he was prepared to lay on the table the return with reference to the expenditure on advertising and move that it be printed?

The HOME SECRETARY: Yes.

Mr. MACARTNEY (*Toowong*): The hon. member for Clermont had said that his firm were contributors to the cost of circulating the *Street*. He could only say that that statement had no foundation whatever, and was absolutely untrue.

Mr. LESINA: If the statement was untrue, he was very pleased to hear it. He did not say that it was true; he only said that it had been alleged that the firm, of which the hon. gentleman was a member, had contributed to the cost of circulating that paper.

Question—That £6,820 be granted for the Advertising Board—put and passed.

The House resumed; the CHAIRMAN reported progress, and the Committee obtained leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

EXPENDITURE ON ADVERTISING.

The HOME SECRETARY: I beg to lay on the table of the House a return showing the amount paid to newspapers by the Government Advertising Board during the year ending on the 30th June, 1901, and move that it be printed.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The PREMIER: I move that the House do now adjourn. The business at a later hour of the day will be the further consideration in committee of the Port Norman, Normanton, and Cloncurry Railway Bill.

Mr. BELL: I should like to ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government whether he will lay on the table of the House any correspondence there may be with regard to the position of New Guinea. I see that some papers have been laid on the table of the New South Wales Assembly by Mr. See.

The PREMIER: Telegrams from Mr. Barton?

Mr. BELL: Any correspondence with regard to the future government of New Guinea.

The PREMIER: Yes, I will lay the papers on the table. The correspondence with Mr. Barton is all by telegram.

Question put and passed.

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